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ABSTRACT

DELIBERATE DARKNESS:

A COMPARATIVE INTERPRETATION

OF DARK DEITIES

by

Matthew Kelly

Whether it's the Black Madonna in Christianity, the dark god Krishna in Hinduism, the Black Stone for Muslims, the Green Tara in Tibetan Buddhism, or the Holy of Holies for the Jews, the positive representations of darkness have a suprisingly hallowed place in many religious systems. What is the function of these dark figures?

Much of the perennial wisdom handed down by sages throughout time is that, what we call "God," is an inexhaustible mystery. Sages have used paradoxical language to point to a divine reality that transcends most categories of thought. Both Meister Eckhart, a proponent of Christian negative theology, and Acharya Shankara, a spokesperson for Hindu Advaita Vedanta came to similar conclusions about the divine reality. They referred to this "God beyond God" as a Divine Darkness.

I contend that at least some dark deities are imaginal equivalents to the linguistic concept Divine Darkness. The Hindu goddess Kali and the North American aboriginal god Raven both function paradoxically. I argue, using a Jungian hermeneutic, that by virtue of this function they are the Image equivalent to the Word. I see them as mediators of that Dark Ground known only through symbolic discourse.
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I shut my eyes to see;  
I bleed my bones, their marrow to bestow 
Upon that God who knows what I would know.

He will have arrived in this world  
in one place or another, at one time  
or another, to unfold, in the conditions  
of his time and place, the autonomy  
of his nature. And in youth, though  
early imprinted with one authorized  
brand or another of the Western religious  
heritage, in one or another of its known  
historic states of disintegration, he  
will have conceived the idea of thinking  
for himself, peering through his own  
eyes, heeding the compass of his own heart.
Introduction

You are waiting for me to describe what this silence is so that you can compare it, interpret it, carry it away and bury it. It cannot be described. What can be described is the known, and the freedom from the known can come into being only when there is a dying every day to the known.

J. Krishnamurti

In his fundamental analysis of ontology, Martin Heidegger laid bare the phenomenological fact that human beings, by their very constitution, are hermeneutical. The human being is constitutionally an interpreter of Being and an interpreting being. Perhaps it would not be an extravagance to suggest a revision of the Cartesian maxim to "I interpret, therefore I am!" The purpose of this thesis is to highlight how one's existential meaningfulness is made manifest in a commitment to the questions posed by life, and to the value of questioning itself. The thesis question is: What is the function of dark images of deity in relation to the human meaning of Divine Darkness? Throughout there will be a concern with this question, and in the conclusion some answers will be attempted.

This guiding thesis question is based upon, at least, one fact and one assumption. First, the fact that whether it be the Green Tara (green in Tibetan can mean dark or black) of Buddhism, the Black Madonna of Christianity, the Black Stone at the Ka'ba for Muslims, or the Holy of Holies for the Israelites, the positive representations of darkness and blackness have a rich and essential place in religions and mythologies. Secondly, this thesis assumes, and will provide a case that, at least some divinized dark images are linked symbolically with
the philosophic concept of Divine Darkness.

The task of this thesis is to provide a comparative definition of Divine Darkness, and then to phenomenologically investigate the black goddess Kali in the Hindu religious tradition and the black god Raven of the native North American religious tradition. A case will then be made as to how the function of these two dark deities relates to the concept of Divine Darkness.

Following is the methodological approach, followed by a brief synopsis of the chapters comprising the thesis. The methodology will be a phenomenological and analytical approach to theoretical extrapolation from various accounts of comparative metaphysics, using a Jungian hermeneutic to consolidate my claims. The approach will be primarily interpretive and comparative.

Chapter One will present a working definition of symbol, a brief background to the thought of Carl Jung, and a succinct presentation of his theory of human cognition.

Chapter Two will consist of a comparative definition of Divine Darkness according special credit to Acharya Shankara (8-9 C.E.) of India and to Meister Eckhart (14 C.E.) of Germany. This will be supplemented by a concise examination of the Jungian concept of the archetype of the Self. Briefly stated, Divine Darkness refers to the philosophic concept that what is commonly designated "God" in religious traditions is an infinite and absolute mystery, ever penetrable yet never exhaustible, that transcends all conclusive attempts at categorical definition.

Chapter Three will elucidate the characteristics of the fierce
black goddess Kali and her role in the Hindu religious tradition. The root of the study will involve the exposition of the ancient Indus Valley civilization, the arrival of the Vedic culture of the Aryans, and the rise of goddess worship in mediaeval Hinduism. There will be a discussion of the composite role of the Mahadevi (Great Goddess) in relation to the Devi (goddess) Kali. Whereupon the history of the rise of Kali from the periphery to the centre of the H. Iu pantheon, including the various personifications of her image as the black deity, the fierceness of her character, and the esteemed role she plays as divine embodiment of Life, will be traced. A case will be made for her psychological import as providing a context in which the human can accept the awful dimension(s) of Divinity. When applicable, there will be recourse to textual sources. The chapter will close by tying in the role of paradox in an understanding of Kali as well as rearticulating the notion of paradox as being at the heart of the concept of Divine Darkness.

In Chapter Four, an elucidation of the characteristics and role of the black trickster god Raven of Pacific Northwest American aboriginal religious traditions will be found. A brief history of the migration of the First Peoples to the North American continent will be delineated, followed by a focus on specific aboriginal tribes of the Pacific Northwest. In the context of aboriginal spirituality in general, an analysis of the role of the Trickster will take place. From there the characteristics of Raven will be elucidated. There will be recourse to the various stories handed down by oral tradition that signify the important role of Raven as creator of the world and cultural
hero. The chapter will include a discussion of the traits of this bird in the wild, along with the reasoning that Raven provides a psychological container in which contradictory elements of Divinity are acceptable. The chapter will close by highlighting the role of paradox in an understanding of this cunning god as well as reiterating the place of paradox in the thesis definition of Divine Darkness.

The concluding chapter will consist of a synthesis of Divine Darkness symbolism especially as this is derived from the role of paradox within the study of Kali and Raven. In this chapter a response will be given to the thesis question of how the function of these two dark deities relates to the notion of God as a dark, incomprehensible mystery. In the final synthesis of the data, attention will be drawn to the traditional understanding of light metaphors, as well as the more familiar, negative view of darkness metaphors, i.e. as evil, destructive, repugnant. In a final synthesis of the data, using Jungian concepts, a case will be made for the importance of dark images of Deity as symbols which can readily point beyond their concrete symbolic expression to the dark Ground which Martin Buber calls, not merely a "relative mystery of that which is inaccessible only to the present state of human knowledge and is hence in principle discoverable," but rather:

It is the essential mystery, the inscrutableness of which belongs to its very nature; it is the unknowable. Through this dark gate the believing (person) steps forward into the everyday which is henceforth hallowed as the place in which (one) has to live with the mystery.5
ENDNOTES: Introduction


Meaninglessness inhibits fullness of life and is therefore equivalent to illness. Meaning makes a great many things endurable—perhaps everything. No science will ever replace myth, and a myth cannot be made out of any science. For it is not that "God" is a myth, but that myth is the revelation of a divine life in (humanity). It is not we who invent myth, rather it speaks to us as a Word of God. The Word of God comes to us, and we have no way of distinguishing whether and to what extent it is different from God.

Carl G. Jung

Throughout this thesis there is a concern to elucidate the possible function(s) of the deities Kali and Raven. The proposed introduction to a handling of their function(s) is to question: What do these deities symbolize? The present thesis endeavour is to argue that these two figures are representations of the abstract intellectual concept Divine Darkness. More succinctly, a case will be made for the congruence of the symbolic linguistic concept Divine Darkness with the symbolic phenomenological occurrence of the figures of Kali and Raven in their respective religious traditions.

Human beings are interpreting beings by virtue of their symbol-making propensities. Symbolic discourse is such an essential part of human existence that, as Radhakrishnan states, "the use of symbols and images is forced on us by our nature." A definition of symbol would include the recognition that symbolic activity is generated when one thing stands for, or represents, another thing; involved in this exchange is the relation of concrete to abstract, particular to
In the main, modern consensus also assumes that any "genuine" symbol is the result of the interplay between conscious and unconscious factors. In accepting the concrete as representative of the abstract, it is expected that one can then explain the concrete by reference to the abstract, the visible by the invisible; and then extract from the concrete its hidden meaning for an understanding of the abstract.

An anthropological approach to symbolism, such as Structuralism, might take this thesis down its own exhaustive path. It would surely take as its starting point the universality of human nature, and would delve into the structures and systems at the heart of a culture's myths in which the meaning of cultural symbols would be explained. It would likely study the myths of neighboring cultures to explain the meaning of the antecedent one, and perhaps not emphasize the task of elucidating the functions of these symbols in their own right.

For the purpose of this thesis, the observed universality of human nature is also recognized as an essential starting point. Where a Jungian hermeneutic of religious symbolism differs, from perhaps the bulk of antropological approaches, is where Mircea Eliade joins with Carl Jung in saying that "the essential function of the symbol is precisely in disclosing the structure of the real inaccessible to empirical experience." It is my belief that modern symbol study tends to de-emphasize any natural link between symbol and thing symbolized; symbolic association tends to be seen as the result of cultural determination, convention, or simple arbitrariness. Such an approach tends to deny the object for which the symbol stands. It will be postulated that certain religious symbols "have some factor in their
referent which goes beyond the human sphere of comprehension."

This Jungian approach is relevant since the present thesis is based on the premise that the concept of Divine Darkness does refer to some reality which, although represented symbolically in human terms, is taken to exist. Chapter Two will make a firm case for the present statement that knowledge of Divinity is accessible to human cognition only by symbolic means, and by virtue of paradoxical apperception. Paradoxically, any and all God-talk is then an expressible representation of something which in itself lies, for the most part, outside of human expression and description. Consequently, an experience of the numinous is always richer than an interpretation of it. Rudolf Otto declares this experience as "that which is absolutely and intrinsically other than and opposite of everything that can be thought." Furthermore, Eliade states that the function of a symbol is to reveal the deepest aspects of reality, inaccessible by other means of knowledge. For Eliade to affirm, throughout his literary life in comparative religion, that the symbol brings "to light the most hidden modalities of being," is not too far-fetched for me. As Merton affirmed:

...to demand that a symbol should fill the function of information and explaining, or clarifying and scientifically verifying all the most intimate facts of the cosmos, of (humanity), of (one's) place in the cosmos, of (one's) relation to God, of (one's) relation to (one)self, and so on, is to demand that the symbol should do what indicative or quantitative signs do.

To the extent that a symbol embodies the truth of its referent, it participates in the referent. But the symbol is not therefore proxy for its object, rather, it remains the vehicle for the conception
of the object as yet not wholly known in itself.\textsuperscript{16} As stated previously, not all scholars are unanimous about whether symbols always have natural links to their referent. Clearly they do not always; some symbols are arbitrarily assigned to a referent—such as the whole region of human language-use. Within a Jungian hermeneutic, some so-called religious symbols are taken to have a natural operative link with their object of reference involving partial participation with the referent—the reason the symbol is numinous is because it "excites" the individual into contacting the referent. It is when an individual mistakes the symbol for the referent that perception is skewed. It is for this reason that the mythologist Joseph Campbell could assert: "Symbols...must not be mistaken for the final term, the tenor, of their reference."\textsuperscript{17}

Carl Gustav Jung (1875–1961), a renegade student of Sigmund Freud and a pioneering psychologist in his own right, was partially responsible for the scientific articulation of the human unconscious. "The hypothesis of an unconscious underlying consciousness is the hallmark of psychological research in this century."\textsuperscript{18} It may seem contradictory to hear Jung state that "the only things we experience immediately are the contents of consciousness,"\textsuperscript{19} and yet to hear him say that the human psyche is grounded upon a "psychoid" substratum which is "not this thing or that; it is the Unknown as it immediately affects us."\textsuperscript{20} How does Jung know that there is an unconscious substratum if it seems to be so disconnected from daily ego consciousness? Jung's response, which he makes abundantly clear in his literary works, is that its existence is an inference. The existence of an unconscious substratum underlying
consciousness is inferred from observations of "categories of the imagination,"\textsuperscript{21} and "universal parallelism"\textsuperscript{22} underlying motifs found in dreams, fairytales, and comparative religion and mythology.

For purposes of this thesis I will be highly selective in my use of a Jungian hermeneutic. I wish to focus only on that model of the psyche and symbology which aids in my approach to the thesis question.

Aniela Jaffé suggests that a Jungian model of the human psyche consists of three tiers: A conscious level, a personal unconscious level, and a collective unconscious substratum. Consciousness is that level of the human psyche most accessible to human experience. It is that part which perceives and responds to what is experienced; it goes a step further from that consciousness observed in other animals by its being aware of its perceiving, and understanding what it experiences.\textsuperscript{23} Consciousness is established in the faculties of reflection and insight, it seems to "stream into us from outside"\textsuperscript{24} by sense-perception, and processes such as recognition, evaluation, intuition, and volition.\textsuperscript{25} The personal unconscious consists of all those contents that were once conscious but due to conscious repression or their decrease in intensity, were consequently forgotten by consciousness. This second level of the psyche also encompasses those contents that never had adequate intensity to penetrate consciousness, yet have managed to enter the psyche. The substratum of the psyche is what Jung termed the collective unconscious. As the other two levels contain unique contents for each individual, this level holds contents common to all humans, and perhaps all life-forms. Its contents include the "ancestral heritage of possibilities of representation...and is the true basis of the
individual psyche." According to Jung, these contents have never been individually acquired, they have never been conscious, therefore they owe their existence exclusively to heredity. "Whereas the personal unconscious consists for the most part of complexes, the content of the collective unconscious is made up essentially of archetypes." 

Etymologically from the Greek, archetype means "prime imprinter." Plato's Socrates had much to say in classical Athenian society about the immaterial Ideas or Ideals that eternally dwell in the world of the psyche (soul), guiding the soul to remembrance of innate truths. Jung accorded credit to the precedent of the early Platonic philosophy, affirming the priority of a rationalism over a tabula rasa empiricism. For Jung, the archetypes (or Ideas) in their foundation, remain essentially hidden, they only become "indirectly discernable through the arrangements they produce in our conscious." Accessible to consciousness are only the archetypal motifs; what is observable and knowable to human consciousness is the objectification of the archetypes which are "altered by becoming conscious and by being perceived, and it takes its colour from the individual consciousness in which it happens to appear." An observation of these archetypal motifs in comparative religion and mythology prompted Jung to declare that "all the most powerful ideas in history go back to archetypes. This is particularly true of religious ideas." Further more, he distinguishes the final substratum by stating:

The collective unconscious contains the whole spiritual heritage of (human)kind's evolution, born anew in the brain structure of every individual...it is the function of consciousness not only to recognize and assimilate the external world through the gateway of the senses, but to
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Jung sets himself up for somewhat of a contradiction when he states a philosophical rationalism over an empiricism. If the archetypes of the collective unconscious are innate (rationalism), how is it that they also owe their existence "exclusively to heredity" (empiricism)? Perhaps a partial way out is the previously used word "priority." Jung affirmed the priority of a rationalism over an empiricism. Nonetheless, this is an important highlighting of an ambiguous claim by Jung.

Within this Jungian hermeneutic, a given symbol presupposes that the expression is the best possible formulation of a relatively unknown fact, which is nonetheless postulated to exist.\(^{32}\) If symbols are the objectified effects of the inferred to exist archetypes, then for the symbol to remain operative it must signify something "more and other" than itself which eludes our present knowledge.\(^{33}\) When properly apprehended as a symbol, the symbol's participation in the referent can only be partial, otherwise it would be a sign and not a symbol. In this way it can be said that signs have a natural link to their referent. For example, thunder and lightening are clear signs of a storm and not symbols of a storm.

The reason that the referents of symbols, properly so called, are relatively unknown is that—while it is possible to speak of such referents as a class, The Archetypes of the Collective Unconscious, and to specify to some degree distinguishable 'characters' among them—it is a delusion, Jung warns, to pretend that one can 'explain' what they are.\(^{34}\)

The impact of such thinking clearly has its implications for the role of symbol in a religious context. As Campbell emphatically states: "The problem of the theologian is to keep (his/her) symbol translucent,
so that it may not block out the very light it is supposed to convey."

In a still wider circumference he states that:

The personality or personalities of God—whether represented in trinitarian, dualistic, or unitarian terms, in polytheistic, monotheistic, or henotheistic terms, pictorially or verbally, as documented fact or as apocalyptic vision—no one should attempt to read or interpret as the final thing.35

Radhakrishnan ponders similarly when he affirms that:

Truth is always greater than (humanity's) reach; there is more in God than we know. The seers speak of the 'Divine Dark', and their reverent agnosticism is a more fitting attitude than the flippant vulgarity with which some dogmatists speak of divine mysteries.36

And in equal accord Eliade bemoans that:

The history of religions, too, abounds in unilateral and therefore aberrant interpretations of symbols. One could hardly adduce a single great religious symbol whose history is not that of a tragic succession of innumerable 'falls.' There is no heresy so monstrous or orgy so infernal, no religious cruelty, folly, absurdity, or religious magic so insane, that it may not be 'justified' in its very principle by some false—because partial and incomplete—interpretation of a grandiose symbolism.37

It does not take much looking around to see the tyranny that religious belief has caused in the history of the human race. Nationalism, zealous ideologues, and inhumane dogmas have wreaked great havoc on the earth and its inhabitants. Indeed, we do seem to conclude that humans were made "for the sabbath" (read: rules), and not the other way around...as the assassination of that Nazarene testifies.

In a time, like our own, when it is assumed that the more spiritually mature one is reckoned to be, the more one "should" know about God, it is perhaps apt to provide another, arguably more ancient,
understanding of spiritual maturity. The transcendence of abject ignorance by a more discerning and informed ignorance, leads one to affirm that the more spiritually mature one is, the more confident one can admit to being "in the dark" about the workings and nature of that which we, carefully, call God.

How teach again, however, what has been taught correctly and incorrectly learned a thousand thousand times, throughout the milleniums of humanity's prudent folly?...How render back into light-world language the speech-defying pronouncements of the dark?38
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Chapter Two: Eckhart and Shankara's Divine Darkness

The Tao that can be told is not the eternal Tao. The name that can be named is not the eternal name. The nameless is the beginning of heaven and earth. The named is the mother of ten thousand things. Ever desireless, one can see the manifestations. These two spring from the same source but differ in name; this appears as darkness. Darkness within darkness. The gate to all mystery. Lao Tzu

The endeavour to image God in darkness symbolism borders on sacrilege for many people. Almost all the traditions of Western and Eastern religion symbolize Divinity, both in language and in image, as Light. Even so, throughout human history, it was religion that cultivated and preserved a sense of the dark mystery of life. Conceptually, mystery and darkness go hand in hand. Modern science offers a powerful light to penetrate the dark unknowns of this world, yet even the pursuits of modern science offer a paradoxical reaping.

Western post-industrial culture is a child of the Enlightenment. The en-light-en-ment gave human society a firm technological advantage over the, seemingly random, rhymes of nature. The light bulb, the radio, the television, and the computer lured us outside of ourselves. This externalization of consciousness was not the case in pre-industrial societies. In so-called "primitive" cultures, stories, rituals, and myths brought the listeners further within themselves to a hint of an intrinsic Mystery ever present as the backdrop of life and death. As one modern theologian would attest: "A light-oriented spirituality is superficial, surface-like lacking as it does the deep, dark roots that nourish and surprise and ground." Yet, as much as science has
enlightened our world in ways that imply progression from darkness and ignorance, it has also brought forward a new story, a new myth, which, like the "primitive," points to that ancient darkness which nonetheless envelopes our lives.

A famous mythologist meditated on the following scenario and found it the proper place for our modern civilization to reconsider the importance of myth, mystery, and enlightened ignorance. Consider: The universe began in an unfathomable darkness. Scientific theory ascertains that a "great featureless mass" \(^3\) acquired a critical point of concentration and, confined to a single nucleus, this inconceivable pressure converted to energy and mass in the awe-full explosion of the Big Bang. As this sudden manifest sphere of spacetime spread at the speed of light, its awesome heat began a cooling which continues to this very moment. The universe continues to expand at its initial velocity, speeding out into the distance. Our sun does not penetrate all of this dark space. It is just one of several hundred billion suns that constitute our galaxy. Travelling at 219 kilometres per second, it circles the periphery of our native galaxy once every 230 million years. The diameter of our galaxy, "this Milky Way of exploding stars," \(^4\) is 100 000 light years. The nearest sun to ours is 40 trillion kilometres away. Our sun is just one of billions of "exploding nuclear furnaces," \(^5\) and beyond these explosions which litter the outermost reaches of space with dust and gas, "out of which new stars with circling planets are being born right now," \(^6\) are the microwaves echoing the greatest cataclysmic explosion of them all, the Big Bang of some 18 billion years ago. Furthermore, Albert Einstein's modern theory of relativity
describes how there is "no still point"\textsuperscript{7} to determine the parameter of our place within the universe. From the hypothetical still point of our planet Earth astronomers see streaming away from us, and away from each other, myriads of galaxies speeding off into distant space, "the furthest of them at such distances that, finally, our greatest telescopes lose track of them entirely--the light coming from them arriving so late that their present positions are out of sight."\textsuperscript{8}

This all-enveloping darkness is also intimately near to us. Consider: In the dark contentment of our mother's womb we gestated for nine months. Similarly, the seed anchored securely in the soil unlocks its potential in the deep heat of the dark. As well, the marvellous workings of our brain, liver, heart, and intestines all take place completely in the dark.\textsuperscript{9} Modern science has indeed offered our culture a paradoxical reaping. It is the bright child of the enlightenment, yet in its far reaching and prodding, it has become the new storyteller of a familiar and ancient endarkenment.

If one general observation can be made in the study of comparative religion, it is that people invariably become attached and stuck in their symbolizing, mistaking the symbol for the object signified. People seem to forget, or are educated and conditioned not to see, that the symbols they so cherish of God are yet symbols, void of intended substance and value when apprehended in a literalist way. Human impressions and conceptions of God are but pointers to a vast darkness. Two great sages promise that if we sink into the pregnant darkness of "nothing" (Eckhart), we will find our true identity in a qualityless and unconceptual unifying force (Shankara) that resides at
the core of our experience.

In this chapter, the endeavour is to explicate the parallel concept of God found in the works of Acharya (master) Shankara and Meister (master) Eckhart. The extrapolation of these two masters' works will not be comprehensive. Instead special emphasis will be on the concepts of Higher Brahman and Godhead articulated by these theologians. A brief examination of Jung's concept of the archetypal Self will then ensue.

Paradox is the operative quality in a foundational definition of Shankara and Eckhart's dark God. It is an element that will run throughout the entire thesis. "Deliberate Darkness" is this author's own metaphorical invention. It refers to the notion that we are ignorant of a full and absolute understanding of what is commonly designated God, not because we lack studiousness or adequate faith to attain to this assurance, but rather, we are denied this assurance due to the natural limits of human knowing. Hence, this darkness is not the child of abject ignorance; it is an informed ignorance which respects the boundaries between what is currently known from what is, as yet, unknown. These limits, in their turn, I haltingly attribute to the nature of the Author(s) of mystery, Who's nature(s) seem illusively cloaked in an inexhaustable and deliberate darkness. Mystics attempt to convey the sense that there is a true knowing of God that transcends all false-knowing, and that even our false-knowing is the product of the great Mayan (illusionist), God. De-liberate Darkness can also hint at the quest to honour the mystery of our dark God, being vigilant not to "liberate" our idea(s) of God from the perennial wisdom of neti, neti.
Acharya Sankara and Higher Brahman:

Contrary to what many westerners casually observe, Hinduism is ultimately a monotheistic and not primarily a polytheistic religion. From earliest times, and Radhakrishnan claims Hindu scripture to be the oldest known literature of the Indo-Europeans,\textsuperscript{11} Indian spiritual seekers were in search of the unifying One that permeated the manifest multiplicity of being. These earliest known Indo-European religious writings, the Vedas, are evidence of this attempt at articulation and illumination of a monistic ontology. "Veda" is derived from \textit{vid}, meaning "to know," denoting the highest kind of \textit{gnosis}, sacred wisdom.\textsuperscript{12} Vedic scripture is recognized by all orthodox Hindus as \textit{sruti}, divinely revealed literature;\textsuperscript{13} as "that which is heard."\textsuperscript{14} It consists of four main categories: the Vedas, the Brahmanas, the Aranyakas, and the Upanishads. Within the first category are the Rigveda, the Yajurveda, the Samaveda, and the Atharvaveda.

The Rigveda is the oldest text and contains rich poetic outpourings of worship to \textit{devas} (deities) such as Surya (sun), Soma (moon), and Agni (fire); there emanates from this text the pre-Vedic animism of the defunct Indus Valley Civilization.\textsuperscript{15} There is also evidence of a henotheism, whereby deities such as Indra, the king among the gods; Varuna, the regulator of cosmic and moral order;\textsuperscript{16} Praja-pati, the lord of creatures; and Visva-karman, the world-maker,\textsuperscript{17} are each valued by their respective devotees as the Supreme Deity, with the
neighboring deities being merely manifestations of this One.\textsuperscript{18} As Radhakrishnan observed of Hindu beginnings:

Thus the logic of religious faith asserts itself in favour of monoteism. This tendency is supported by the conception of rta or order. The universe is an ordered whole; it is not disorderliness. If the endless variety of the world suggests numerous deities, the unity of the world suggests a unitary conception of the Deity.\textsuperscript{19}

Within the Rigveda are the earliest accounts of invocation to an unknown agent behind the sun, moon, and fire. Especially in the hymn of Creation (X. 129) is it evidenced that "the One" is eagerly sought for. This "first principle" or primal ground to existence is rendered uncharacterizable, thereby "concealed in darkness."\textsuperscript{20} Gradually, belief in One Great Power, unknown and unseen; fervent faith in one Divine Essence of which Father, Lord, and Maker are the pratika, face, manifestation, persona or, mask, asserted itself.\textsuperscript{21} This monistic leaning led the Vedic thinkers to view the many deities as symbols, not gods themselves, awakening the worshipping to see the many deities as various expressive qualities of the One.\textsuperscript{22}

The Yajurveda contains the hymns used in perfecting sacerdotal acts which were believed to control the unfolding of the cosmos. The Samaveda consists of songs of worship. The final text, the Atharvaveda, consists of verses used to guide the orthodox brahman (priest) in undoing various pollutions incurred in the course of fulfilling sacerdotal rites.\textsuperscript{23} This early Vedic faith movement is also referred to as Brahmanism.

The Brahmanas are the next category of Vedic texts. This compilation of sacrificial manuals dealt extensively with the most
minute details of Vedic ritual instruction. The "forest books," or Aranyakas, are the third major category of Vedic scripture. Within this text is the highly metaphorical interpretation of the Brahmanas, which is also the inspirational point of departure for the philosophical speculations of the Upanishads. In the course of perhaps many generations, the Vedic people became increasingly dissatisfied with the rigidly formalized rituals of the hereditary priesthood. Against this backdrop, the "Whispered Wisdom" of the Upanishads has its origin. The meaning of the word upanishad takes its derivation from the roots upa (near), ni (down), and sad (to sit): Hence, to sit down near the teacher to learn the sacred doctrine of enlightenment. Hindu traditionalists recognize one hundred and eight upanishads which they aptly call the Classical Upanishads. The Principle Upanishads refer to the oldest Vedantic writings, determined to number from ten to eighteen texts. Due to the seminal place the Upanishads have in Sankara's conception of Higher and Lower Brahman, it is important that more be said about the content of this scripture.

Originally, Vedanta referred exclusively to the Upanishads as the culmination of Vedic scripture. Vedanta means the "end of the Veda." The Upanishads are the chronological conclusion, as well as the goal and central aim, of the preceding Vedic texts. Only later did Vedanta come to mean a philosophical doctrine within Hinduism, of which the greatest exponent was Shankaracharya. The Upanishads were written by countless authors, and it is disputed whether there is contained throughout a systematic teaching. Regardless, it is coloured with
metaphorical language throughout which heightens its esoteric quality.  

Found in the earliest Upanishads are attempts to associate the word "Brahman" with something lofty and esteemed. First, there is an identification of Brahman with the sun. But this "visible" representation soon gave way to that of Prana (vital breath), thereby representing by something "invisible" the wholly Other character of Brahman.  

Brahman gradually became synonymous with Reality, Supreme Being, and Highest Self (Parama-atman). Although the exact etymology of the word is doubtful, it is supposed to derive its meaning from the root brh "to be great" or "to grow," denoting that which breaks forth, either in thought or word, or in the form of creative power or physical force.  

By virtue of a sublime process of negation, the Brahman or Self, was described by way of the formulation neti, neti, "not this, not this" (Brhad-aranyak Upanishad IV 5.15).  

They could not point out what the Brahman was like in order to give an utterance to that which was unutterable, they could only say that it was not like aught that we find in experience.  

The desire to know the ground of Reality implies that to some extent it is known already. "If we know the Real, it is because the Real knows itself in us." Quest for the knowledge of Brahman was concluded to be due necessarily to the workings of Brahman in the enquirer.  

Alongside Brahman, the other most essential concept in the Upanishadic teaching is that of "Atman." Max Müller speculates that "Atman" had become a mere pronoun at the time of the Vedanta's articulation; freed from all metaphorical taint it is presumed that it asserted nothing more than self-existence. Atman probably meant "to
breathe" from the root an, it denoted "self" and evolved to mean the soul or essence of the human individual.\textsuperscript{40} In the earliest Upanishads, Atman referred to the ground of the individual consciousness, and Brahman, the suprapersonal ground of the cosmos. Brahman, as the transcendent ground of being, is known through Atman, the immanent manifestation in human consciousness.\textsuperscript{41} By virtue of this philosophical association, which Rudolf Otto attributed to the \textit{intuitus mysticus},\textsuperscript{42} the culmination of Vedic instruction had its climax in the teacher's declaration of "That thou art" (Chandogya Upanishad),\textsuperscript{43} or Brahman=Atman,\textsuperscript{44} to the inquiring student.

With this brief overview of Vedic scripture complete, I will now articulate the philosophical system of Shankaracharyya whereby an understanding of the Deity as Divine Darkness will be advanced. It is primarily from the Upanishads that Shankara drew his inspiration for an understanding of a divinity which transcends the conceptual finery of human intelllection.

\begin{quote}
There the eye goes not, speech goes not, nor the mind; we know not, we understand not how one can teach this. Other, indeed, is it than the known; and also it is above the unknown.\textsuperscript{45}
\end{quote}

The philosophical system of Advaita Vedanta is that school of Vedanta which affirms that Reality, or Brahman, is non-dual (a-dvaita), that the world is false (mithya), the product of a creative illusion (maya), and that the human being (jiva) is essentially identical to Brahman.\textsuperscript{46} It has been the most dominant system of metaphysics in Indian philosophy from the time of Shankara (ninth century C.E.) to the present. Shankara did not claim to invent an original school of philosophy. Instead he accredited his knowledge to the philosophy
taught in the Upanishads and summarized in the Brahmasutras. The Brahmasutras consist of a summary of the teachings of the early Upanishads; their authorship is ascribed to Badarayana. Sutra in Brahministic usage meant "thread," illustrating how a systematic philosophy is woven coherently together as cloth is made from threads. The aim of any Sutra is to state in the briefest possible, aphoristic way the propositions of a topic. Shankara's famous commentary on the Brahmasutras forms the substantial body of Vedantic doctrine, with the Sutras serving mainly as a useful index.

Shankara was born in the state of Kerala, India, in 788 C.E. Legend surrounds his life, but as a youth it is said he quickly accomplished his Vedic studies and soon became a samnyasin (renouncer, wandering monk), much to the dismay of his mother. Shankara's guru (teacher) was Govinda, and Govinda in turn was the pupil of Gaudapada, the sage who wrote the first widely available treatise on the Advaita Vedanta philosophy. Sankara in turn became a phenomenally successful teacher, travelling most of India establishing Advaita monasteries and engaging in related activities. Most significantly, he is esteemed for his highly authoritative commentaries on the Brahmasutras, the Bhagavadgita, and several of the Upanishads. For all his historic influence, Shankara had a short life, dying at 32 or 33 years of age. To this day, his written works rank in equal prestige with the Bhagavadgita, the great Epics, Puranic and sectarian traditions, and law books as smrti literature, that which is "remembered."

Shankara endeavoured to show throughout his teachings that the erudition of the Upanishads did not favour a dualistic interpretation;
that the absolute monism of the Brahman concept was the true intended
creed of both the Upanishads and the Sutras. The claims of Advaita
Vedanta are that, beyond verbal conceptualization, beyond all logic and
empiricism, knowledge can nonetheless be acquired of a "trans-empirical,
immortal Being, the Supreme Ground of all beings, as the means of
overcoming the problems posed by existing and acting in a world of
mortality and suffering." In a world of painful multiplicity and
ceaseless change Vedantic Hindus affirmed that:

...while Buddhism does not admit of any permanent
being Vedanta admits of Brahman, the permanent
unchangeable reality as the only truth, whereas the
illusory and momentary perceptions are but imposi-
tions on it.

Shankara was a theologian, not a philosopher. he was impelled
by a longing for salvation from the cycle of birth and death. "Fear,
not of death, but of birth," runs through the whole of Indian
philosophy. And empirical immortality was not the highest aim of
salvation. For Shankara, it is avidya (ignorance, false knowing) that
permeates the human condition, and as long as the perceiver sees
him/herself as a separate being (jiva), there will be entanglement in
samsara (the cycle of birth and death). The aim of salvation is moksha
(release) from all identification with separateness and multiplicity.
In truth, says the Vedanta, the empirical, phenomenal world is an
illusion (maya) having no reality in itself. To know this truth, to
experience this intuitus mysticus, necessitates an ontology of
elemental being. In the language of the ancient and venerated
Upanishads:

By mind alone is this to be obtained. There is
nothing of variety here. Whoever perceives any-
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thing like variety here, goes from death to death.
(Katha Upanishad II.1.11)62

(S/he), verily, who knows the supreme Brahman,
becomes (that) very Brahman.
(Mundaka Upanishad III 2.9.)63

As the modern Vedantist, Radhakrishnan, confirmed, it is knowledge
(jnana) that leads to ultimate liberation (moksha): "Unquestioning
belief in the inherent power of knowledge underlies the whole
intellectual fabric of the Upanishads."64 Directly opposing this self-
reliant way to Brahman are the equally compelling Upanishadic passages
that credit the grace of Brahman, or the Self, with the saving action of
winning release.

The Self cannot be attained by instruction nor
by intellectual power nor even through much
learning. (The Self) is to be attained by the
one whom (the Self) chooses. To such a one the
Self reveals (its)nature.
(Mundaka Upanishad III 2.3.)65

This apparent impasse and contradiction is the point of entrance
into Shankara's formulation, and this implies the Upanishadic
formulation of Higher Brahman and Lower Brahman. The absolute monism of
Shankara's school of Advaita is not without its qualifications. This
school adopts a decidedly positive relationship toward theism.66
Initially, this may come as a surprise, especially when it is taken into
account that Shankara's understanding of God or Brahman is such that he
asserts:

...there is no class of "substances" to which the
Brahman belongs, no genus commune. It cannot
therefore be denoted by words, which, like "being"
in the usual sense signify a category of things.
Nor can it be denoted by quality, for it is without
qualities; nor yet by activity, because it is with-
out activity...Neither can it be denote by relat-
ionship, for it is "secondless," is not the object of
anything, but is its own self. It is therefore true
that it cannot be defined by word or idea; it is the
One as the scripture says: "Before whom words
recoil."67

Opposed to everything empirical, Shankara established his suprarational
Brahman as not anti-theistic or even atheistic, but rather as super-
theistic.68 Examining the doctrine of Maya will make this point more
transparent.

The foundation of Shankara's entire "system," and some scholars
have deduced that in fact he had no method69 save his expounding an
intellectual mysticism,70 is the notion of an inexplicable ignorance
inherent in the soul's embodied existence.71 The principle of
explanation for the discrepancy between the oneness posited of
transcendent Reality, and the multiplicity of common experience is that
Lower Brahman (Isvara, Creator-God, the Lord) is operating a creative
maya at the phenomenal level of reality.72 Maya is said to be
indescribable in terms of being and non-being and is without beginning.
This maya conceals the One Reality by substituting the world of "name
and form"73 in place of Higher Brahman (Godhead, the One Reality). On
account of the fact that the world is experienced to exist, it is taken
not as a non-reality (asat), nor as the true reality (sat), but rather
as having a mere practical reality (vyavahara). The world of maya is
maintained by the ignorance of falsely identifying the true self (Atman)
with the varying associations of mind and matter.74 Maya is not
illusion itself, but rather that which produces the illusion of
multiplicity. By another name, that which produces illusion is
Brahman.75 Higher Brahman is the "great Mayin" and "Magician" who is
responsible for the actions of Lower Brahman and the world of
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multiplicity; at least this is so from the perspective of one "lacking real insight." With Nirguna (qualityless) Brahman arises the Lower Brahman, who sustains the world of name and form which has its roots in Higher/Nirguna Brahman, yet does not constitute the nature of this qualityless Brahman. From the standpoint of Maya, Isvara or the Personal God is seen as a real creator and sustainer of the objective universe.

Shankara understands this Lower Brahman as the One, unique, world-surpassing, free, omnipotent God. This Personal God is purely spiritual, omnipotent, omniscient, all-wise, just, and omnibenevolent. Isvara is known to exist by virtue of the accounts in the sacred Veda, which Isvara is said to have breathed forth at the beginning of time. Saguna (with attributes, Isvara) Brahman is said to be the material and efficient cause of the world, the scholastic first unmoved mover, manifesting the cosmos out of the divine nature. Out of sheer sport or divine play (lila) Isvara brings the world into being and then re-absorbs it in recurring cycles. Isvara is also the guardian of cosmic and moral order. In turn, Saguna Brahman/Isvara/Lower Brahman is said to be absorbed into Nirguna Brahman. From the standpoint of entanglement in multiplicity, Isvara is a real indication that the practical reality of this world points beyond itself for its meaningfulness. From the standpoint of Reality, there is in fact no creation, no Isvara, and no subject and object; the effect is only an apparent manifestation. Ultimately there is only Higher Brahman, without distinctions and without the contrasts of knower, known, and knowing. And, according to Shankara, it is this One that the
Upanishadic sages declare "That Thou Art," "Thou art the eternal impersonal Brahman."\textsuperscript{81}

This salvific knowledge is the highest knowlege, yet the lower knowledge which attributes such lofty qualities to Isvara is not an erroneous knowledge; instead Shankara sees it as a necessary and gradual knowledge in its own right.\textsuperscript{82} "Where a person is not yet Brahman, where there is the contrast of seen and seer, there Brahman must be seen as Isvara."\textsuperscript{83} To understand the Infinite Mystery, the Ground of Being, Higher Brahman, as humane and gracious, and to understand the core of human subjectivity as infinitely wise and universal, implies an affirmation of meaningfulness such that the world of "name and form," being not the cause of itself, instead is an effect which does not fully comprehend in language the source of itself.

It is this Brahman, this Highest Nirguna Brahman, that is the "darkness" beyond all human enlightenment. Why does manifoldness originate from Unity? The answer to such an angst-based question lies silently, perhaps, in the "deliberate darkness" of Being/Brahman Itself. Perhaps a hint of the answer lies in the dance of Shiva whereby the reason is the dance and the dance, the reason. Even the one who realizes his or her Brahman-identity within manifoldness remains constrained within the paradox of embodied existence. In this vein Ludwig Wittgenstein affirmed the need to remain cognizant of the restraints of human language where, in his early work the \textit{Tractatus}, he imparts to us that "whereof one cannot speak, therefore one must be silent."\textsuperscript{84} Shankara equally does not venture to answer the demands of reason; instead, he consigns to faith its own reasons which reason alone
fails in understanding. "The reason the One appears as the many lies in the One itself." 85 This is the zenith of religious mysticism, which draws its clarity by surpassing its original rational context. Or, perhaps, as Aristotle says of philosophy: that all philosophy begins in wonder, so too perhaps, any and all articulations of the Ground and Source of Being have their aboriginal home not in rationally articulated archetypes or models, but in undifferentiated awe.

Rudolf Otto highlights an elasticity between the borders of Higher Brahman and Lower Brahman, noting that often Shankara uses the most solemn names of Isvara, the personal God, for the absolute Brahman. Yet, Otto is sure that, if pressed by his opponents, Shankara would surely retreat to the position that such names are fitting only for the lower wisdom. 86 Otto concedes that Shankara affirms the world of multiplicity as having a ground in reality. Brahman, that is, Higher Brahman, is taken to be the existing substratum upon which multiplicity is sustained and perceived. 87 Once again, this higher wisdom does not preclude a lower wisdom, instead it sees it as that which ultimately needs to be surpassed. "The one who is redeemed from God does not turn back, but on the path of gradual redemption finds at last Brahman-nirvana." 88

In Advaita Vedanta, the goal of individual existence and the aim of salvation is not to be united with the One, rather it is to be the One. 89 "Isvara" has the same full solemnity as "Lord" does in the Christian West, 90 yet for Shankara, the emergence of Isvara and the phenomenal cosmos is the great mistake of false knowing. 91 Brahman alone is, and the most that can be said of this One is that It is Being
(sat), Consciousness (cit), and Bliss (ananda). Knowledge of the ineffable transcendence of Brahman is revealed initially in Vedic scripture; this knowledge soon shifts to the transcendent experience of the Unnameable. "Brahman cannot be conceptualized, but only intuitively realized." This is the knowledge based on negative predications, the via negationis meant to highlight the limitation and impoverishment of all definitions of the Hidden One. Neti, neti, "not this, not this," leads to the vigorous negation of negation whereby, bordering on the abyss of absurdity, Brahman is declared to be "Not-Being and not Non-Being." Thereby, the container of meaning is sustained and the hermeneutic of being retains its centre within the paradox of language and silence. "Those who know do not talk, those who talk do not know." (Tao Te Ching)

When speaking of the Darkness beyond being, Plato says, "We cannot help talking in dualities." To give a name to the "Nameless," to call It "Brahman," "Tao," "YHVH," "Allah," "Nirvana," "Godhead," "One," is to feign certainty of that which when experienced far outstrips the impoverishment of interpretation. According to Shankara, insofar as two levels of knowledge exist, two Brahmins also exist. From the experience of multiplicity, Isvara has a true and real existence. This is the paradox of transcendence-immanence whereby the grace that awakens the soul to its Oneness with All, originates from a grace-bestower Whose one Reality manifests many sides. Isvara, multiplicity, and the world simultaneously signify and reflect the Divine Darkness which is intuited in Atman and dissolved in Brahman. Shankara recommends the worship of determinate forms such as Isvara and
lesser deities as a preparation for the apprehension of non-determined Reality. 99

In closing this exposition of Shankara's Higher Brahman, I would argue for a modification of the "practical reality" of Isvara, and refine it by stating that Isvara together with all the divine attributes and all the lesser deities are symbols and symbolic renderings of the Supreme Reality with which they participate in, and to which they point. As Indian metaphysicians are so fond of saying, this world is like a dream, a maya, of which symbol, metaphor, and analogy are the only ways to illuminate the dark root that alone is bright. Those who worship the names and forms, go to the place of name and form and not to the place where arrival and departure have no meaning. 100

Here is the line beyond which thinking does not go...like the last stop on a mountain railroad from which climbers step away, and to which they return, there to converse with those who love mountain air but cannot risk the heights. The ineffable teaching of the beatitude beyond imagination comes to us clothed, necessarily, in figures reminiscent of the imagined beatitude of infancy.101

Meister Eckhart and the Godhead:

To discern a kinship between the theologies of Shankara and Eckhart is no novelty. Numerous scholars have affirmed their striking parallels. One scholar in particular would say that, unaffected by geography or race, there is found in mysticism a strong primal impulse common to all humanity. 102 With regard to Eckhart's mysticism, a brief sampling of scholarly appraisal might look like the following:

He lived on that high level, on the same highlands
of the spirit that were disclosed in the Upanishads and Sufi classics. To go where Eckhart went is to come close to Lao Tzu and Buddha, and certainly to Jesus Christ.103

Another would concur that, "we feel ourselves transported back into the spacious atmosphere of the Upanishads."104 Still another would exclaim:

Who is this person who has attracted monks and Marxists, philosophers and psychologists, Zen thinkers and Hindu scholars, Polish poets and American novelists?105

Evidently, the impact of Eckhart's work has been tremendous.

The Meister was born Johannes Eckhart in the village of Hochheim, in the province of Thuringen, Germany, about 1260 C.E.106 His father was the steward of a knight's castle and it is said that the Meister entered the mendicant order of Dominican friars while in his teens.107 It is unlikely that he studied directly under the tutelage of Albert the Great, But he did come under the influence of the then recently deceased great fellow Dominican Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274). Around 1302 the Dominicans sent Eckhart on a teaching mission to the University of Paris where he was to champion the Dominican theology over that of the Franciscan. At this time, in medieval Europe, the new moderate realism of Aristotle was gaining currency over the long cherished neoplatonist Augustinian thought of the Church.108 At Paris he retained the same chair of theology as his Dominican predecessor Aquinas. In 1314 Eckhart became the German prior, professor, and preacher at Strassburg. By 1323 he was assigned to Cologne in his final installment as preacher.109 Like his Eastern counterpart, Eckhart was more impassioned theologian than speculative philosopher.110 At this time both Strassburg and Cologne were hotbeds of the spiritual renewal movement known as
Rhineland Mysticism.\textsuperscript{111}

Eckhart lived most of his life in the Rhine Valley and apparently came into a great deal of contact with spiritual movements such as the semi-monastic brotherhood of Beghards, the laywomen order of Benuines, and the Friends of God.\textsuperscript{112} It was while preaching to huge audiences in this setting that in 1326 Eckhart was charged, by the Franciscan Archbishop of Cologne, with heresy. Without reviewing the subject of his condemnation in depth, according to the reactionary stance of the Holy Inquisition, Eckhart's preaching "incited ignorant and undisciplined people to wild and dangerous excesses." He was implicated with having affiliation with the Beghards and Benuines whom once the Church saw fit to bless and now vehemently sought to stamp out.\textsuperscript{113} As was his special right, Eckhart went to Avignon to be tried by a papal court, it was here that he defended his teachings with the terse assertion: "I may err but I may not be a heretic— for the first has to do with the mind and the second with the will."\textsuperscript{114} He died subsequent to his defence in 1329 and was posthumously condemned by Pope John XXII in a papal bull delivered that same year. Speculation has it that he died on the way home from Avignon. Although his heart must have been broken, in keeping with his buoyant theology of letting-go and detachment, some consider that he may have died laughing.\textsuperscript{115}

Since the time of the ancient Greeks, Western philosophers have pondered what kinds of attributes can be predicated of the supreme nature.\textsuperscript{116} In late medieval philosophy it was considered a common supposition that Aristotle set the rules of reasoning and grammar, and that Plato provided for a mental and physical philosophy.\textsuperscript{117} Eckhart
the preacher was thoroughly ecumenical in his thought, borrowing as readily from Greek, Arab (Avicenna 900-1037, Averroes 1126-1198 C.E.) and Jewish (Maimonides 1135-1204 C.E.) philosophers as from the Greek and Latin Church Fathers. Like Shankara, Eckhart was established in the sacred scripture of his culture. He took his point of departure from the belief in the revelatory nature of the Bible. Like his theological predecessors, Eckhart was concerned with how humans should understand the supreme nature. With recourse to the Bible, Eckhart saw it as a fact that God used certain names when disclosing the divine nature. As a believer, a "hearer of the Word," he took it as incumbent upon himself to elucidate how God discloses the divine nature and how the believer is to understand this.118

Even though Eckhart welcomed the incursion of Aristotelian thinking into theological dialectics, like all medievalists he saw himself as a follower of Augustine.119 Scholarly consensus regards much of Eckhart's teachings as thoroughly paradoxical — this is especially true in his writings on God. Using language couched in paradox is not necessarily an indication of a misuse of language; with Eckhart "the technical virtuosity of the Latin works and the lyrical outbursts of the vernacular writings provide strategies not for expressing what is inexpressible but for suggesting what lies beyond speech."120 It has been postulated that Eckhart did for the German language what Dante did for the Italian.121 The difficult task that Eckhart set for himself was to clearly enunciate that "the true meaning of divine existence insofar as we can grasp it is rooted in an incomprehensible dialectic of Absolute Mystery."122
The Meister was concerned with preaching a simple and genuine faith in God that warned the believer against dissipation into the multiplicity of senses, thoughts, and objects. Comparable to Shankara's concept of *maya*, Eckhart believed that heaven was more real and solid than earth, and that creatures of themselves were mere nothings. He endeavored to teach that people must get rid of the conceived and apprehended God; people should put off God, and "know nothing of God." Like Shankara, he did not believe that God was unknowable, instead he spoke of a superconceptual comprehension available in an "unknowing knowing." At par with his Eastern peer, Eckhart understood knowledge to be the pathway to salvation. Yet, he qualified this by stating that the knowledge that matters is not that which is found in instruction and teaching, nor is it a scriptural knowledge, these can at best point the way. Having nothing in common with a visionary and emotional mysticism, he espoused an essential knowledge, an intellectual mysticism based on an immediate inward self-apprehension or intuition that the ground of the soul and the ground of God are identical. Without contradiction, Eckhart adamantly implored that one "should not have merely a God intellectually conceived...Rather, one must have an essential God; who is high above the thoughts of (Humanity)." His was a move beyond Christian trinitarianism to a form of mystical unitarianism which makes the manifest trinitarian God as distinct from the hidden unity of the Godhead, as "heaven is from earth." In his sermons he would often stress the value of "knowing nothing."

This ignorance should not come from ignorance; instead, from knowledge we must come to a state of
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ignorance. Then we shall become knowledgeable with the divine knowledge, and then our ignorance will be ennobled and adorned by supernatural knowledge.133

It is by virtue of Eckhart's devotion to the long and hallowed tradition of Christian negative theology134 that his distinction of the Godhead is most clearly enunciated. Although the God/Godhead distinction in Eckhart's works are by no means uniform,135 much can nonetheless be said with certainty about his articulation of a dark and hidden "God beyond God."136

Medieval Scholasticism classified God as Being. This pure Being was not determined to have being as others have their being. Rather, God was understood to have being as essentially God's own essence.137 God's essence was God's existence. Scholasticism backed this understanding with scriptural exegesis such as the "I Am Who Am" (Exodus 3:14) of God's own self disclosure. Like the Pseudo-Dionysius and Moses Maimonides before him, Eckhart held that negative propositions about God are true, but that affirmative propositions are "partly equivocal."138

Beyond the insistence of Maimonides, that only negative propositions could legitimately be used of God, Eckhart stressed the ultimacy of the neoplatonic dialectic of the negation of negation.139 The Meister held that no negation, nothing negative, belonged to God, save the negation of negation. For Eckhart, God's Being is completely "fashionless,"140 this "fashionless" God is the Godhead of pure incomprehensibility and inexpressibility. Consequently, every predicate of this Godhead veils and upsets the very concept espoused. In this way Eckhart could boldly affirm that the highest conception of God, the Godhead, is a "Not-God, a Not-Spirit, a pure silence, a soundless void, a sheer
Nothing." This Godhead is to be understood as an absolute unity whereby "no distinctions can exist or be understood in God." This statement, along with several similar ones, were singled out for papal condemnation. This Godhead, which Eckhart just as frequently referred to as God, is not so much indescribable as above description, not so much unnameable as "omnimineable." If there is perceived a distinction of attributes in God, it is completely on the side of the receiving intellect. This notion closely parallels Shankara's notion that multiplicity, maya, is perceived on the part of the unenlightened intellect which mistakes the world of "name and form," and Isvara contained within it, as the final reality and not instead as the pointer to a unity transcendent of it. Called to mind is the quote by Campbell from my introductory chapter on symbolism: "Symbols are only the vehicles of communication; they must not be mistaken for the final term, the tenor, of their reference."

For Eckhart, the way of negation, the via negationis, is esteemed over the way of affirmation. Its preference is due to the fact that it highlights how nothing of what our senses apprehend in things is to be found in the Godhead. The two main advantages to the via negationis are that: First, all negations are founded upon affirmations, in that every negation presupposes some act of affirmation, so that every negation leads to a positive conclusion. For example, if God is not matter, then it can be affirmed that God has none of the attributes connected with matter. Second, Eckhart concluded that those who use negative names at the very least come to know more about the divine nature than those whose ignorance prevents them from removing
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imperfections from their conception of God. The gradual removal of terms such as corporality, temporality, creaturliness leads to a gradual "locating" of God within a logical space framed by negations.\textsuperscript{146} This is why, for Eckhart, the purest form of negation is the negation of negation.\textsuperscript{147}

Out of the suprapersonal Godhead "melts" the personal Creator-God. "God becomes and ceases to become, God waxes and wanes."\textsuperscript{148} The Godhead is an "abyss," a divire "wasteland," a "hidden" ground; whereas God is dynamic, active and accomplishes deeds.\textsuperscript{149} The Godhead tradition, of which Eckhart was so eloquent a proponent, was an effort to restore the transcendence of the name of God to an ineffable Deity.

Steeped in Biblical exegesis, Eckhart could make the Christian assumption that God and humanity are of the same genus, and, therefore, that they share a divine kernal of being. In its exalted form, it could then be concluded that within the depths of the human soul one comes to know the ultimate source of Being. Eckhart affirmed just this conclusion.\textsuperscript{150} Although the Meister would say that "creatures of themselves are pure nothings," he could equally affirm that "there is something uncreated, something divine in the soul."\textsuperscript{151} Akin to the much lauded Upanishadic declaration that Atman=Brahman, for Eckhart, God and the soul share the identical ground. There is a "spark" of reason in the soul where God dwells perpetually; God is a fire, and in our core we have, and we are, a spark of that fire.\textsuperscript{152} This spark of reason is not of the discursive, but rather, of the intuitive kind. Humans are made in the image of God and not only according to an image God had.\textsuperscript{153} We are destined to return to the silent void of the Godhead—beyond-God just
as we emanated out as "words" of God. When the soul returns to this suprapersonal Godhead its experience of separateness will be "dead and buried in the Godhead." For Eckhart, the soul is troubled so long as it perceives created things in their separateness. For this reason, once one attains to the highest intuitus mysticus, one can say with Eckhart that "I become so rich that God is not sufficient for me." Beyond the trinitarian God, hidden behind it, is the dark eternal unity which is the substratum of all manifest reality. Insofar as beings exist, they exist because they participate in Being itself, and point beyond themselves to that Being. This sounds a lot like my thesis definition of how a symbol functions! This observation will be tied into the conclusion.

The acutely paradoxical nature of Eckhart's work comes to the fore when he states that creation is good and reflects God's glory, and in the same vein, that creation is empty and transient. Equally paradoxical is his taking the philosophical assumptions of his day, such as, that God is pure being, and stating that God works above being in "non being" creating being where none had previously existed. God, meaning here the Godhead, is "as high above being as the highest angel is above a gnat." With such a puzzling ontological assertion, Eckhart claims to not deny being to God, but to elevate it in God. The human soul also works in non being through the "spark" of the divinity evidenced in the faculty of intellect. Being is God's antechamber, whereas intellect is God's temple. With Augustine before him, Eckhart affirmed that God is "wise without wisdom, good without goodness, powerful without power."
In highlighting the importance of the intellectual contemplation of the Godhead, Eckhart states that to love God is to receive God under "the coat of goodness," where intellect then draws aside this coat and "perceives (God) bare as (God) is stripped of goodness and of being and of all names." 163 This union of the soul with the Godhead is not to be necessarily understood as a matter of ecstasy or visions. Instead, Eckhart sees it as a penetration of ordinary reality to reveal the extraordinary awareness that the meaning of everyday life is founded upon the identical ground shared by God and the soul. 164 In the radically inward unifying activity of the intellect, one realizes that God is not a Something "out there," rather, God is in us as we are in God. 165

When I come into the core, the soil, the stream, and the source of the Godhead, no one asks me where I'm coming from or where I'm going.166

In conclusion, Meister Eckhart implores the believer to follow the mandate that one should seek God in such a way as to never find God. For, in the end, "the final goal of being is the darkness or the unknowability of the hidden divinity." 167 The zenith of religious paradox is that the more one seeks God, the less one finds God. As Eckhart was so fond of repeating:

You should seek (God) in such a way that you never find (God). For it is when you do not seek (God) that you find (God). May God help us to seek (God) in such a way that we may remain with (God) forever.168

In the quest after this holy ignorance, Eckhart gives ample remembrance that "the path is beautiful and pleasant and joyful and familiar." 169
A Jungian Synthesis:

As postulated in the introduction, I support the reasoning that knowledge of Divinity is accessible to human cognition only by virtue of symbolic means and paradoxical apperception. Any and all God-talk is then an expressible representation of something which in itself lies outside of human expression and description. Jung's hypothesis of a "psychoid" or non-conscious substratum underlying ego consciousness was a conclusion based upon the results of observed categories of the imagination and universal parallels, the contents of which was seen by Jung to be the inherited ancestral heritage of known possibilities of representation. A structured "unknown" was predicated to exist due to the observation of its effects in consciousness. Knowledge of this collective unconscious and its accompanying archetypes was discovered indirectly by virtue of archetypal images and concepts occurring in consciousness. Jungian psychology confines its study "to the manifestations arranged by the archetype(s) in the human psyche."170

Grounded upon a model of the human psyche that is triple tiered, Jung developed a psychological system that formulated the psychological conditions and limitations which make religious knowledge so abstruse to the embodied intellect.

If archetypal content surfaces in consciousness, its mode of manifestation is symbolic. Archetypes, in themselves, are not knowable directly.171 Anything archetypal reveals its "type" to consciousness by way of symbol. Just as the Platonic Idea of Tree can only be referenced to this tree or that tree, so too, the archetypes can only be known by reference to the commonality to this or that manifestation of a
categorized idea. Jung says:

    The symbol attempts to elucidate, by means of analogy, something that still belongs entirely to the domain of the unknown.\textsuperscript{172}

At this point I endeavor to articulate a Jungian synthesis that conceives Eckhart's Godhead and Shankara's Higher Brahman as parallel concepts to the Jungian concept of the Self. Indeed, to the Jungian, the archetype of the Self is linked causally to the manifest concept of Godhead and Higher Brahman. Of all the archetypal motifs, Jung felt that the one most occurring in human experience, and the one most crucial to human development, was the archetype of the Self. Amidst the polarities in psychic experience of good-evil, life-death, inner-outer, active-passive, meaningful-absurd--to name only a few, is the "mediatory product"\textsuperscript{173} of the archetypal Self, which, by transcending these tensions of opposites, produces a unifying function. The function is that of psychic wholeness in its most zenith form, its symbol-concept is that of indivisible, integrated, harmonious, perfect singularity. Jung writes:

    I have found myself obliged to give the corresponding archetype the psychological name of the "self"--a term on the one hand definite enough to convey the essence of human wholeness and on the other hand indefinite enough to express the indescribable and indeterminate nature of this wholeness.\textsuperscript{174}

Many are the names given to the symbols of the archetypal Self. The concepts and images carry variance due only to cultural conditioning and the historical situation. Whether it be the symbol of the Anthropos, Creator, Father, Mother, Child, Light, Word, Trinity, Quaternity, Circle, these are all manifestations of what Jung called the
Self. Jung understood all God-images and concepts of God to be indistinguishable from the archetype of the Self. The "Self" is itself a God-image. As well as being understood as the psychologic archetype responsible for all images of transpersonal wholeness.

The spontaneous symbols of the self, or of wholeness, cannot be distinguished from a God-image.

For psychology the self is an imago Dei and cannot be distinguished from it empirically.

One can never distinguish empirically between a symbol of the self and a God-image...they always appear blended together.

Although the ideas of the Self and God are indistinguishable in our subjective experience, says Jung, they are not thereby assumed to be identical entities. Jungians emphasize validation of the synonymity of the two concepts. Synonymous with the function of God-images, the "Self" of the collective unconscious has a hidden and unutterable quality about it. Jung would honour this unconscious nexus as "one of the darkest most mysterious regions of our experience!" A region that, drawing upon the empirical findings of his patients, contained an ever-present impulse to wholeness. Jung emphatically stated that his psychology "reserves the rights to the poverty, or the riches, of not knowing about the self." For, even the concept of the Self is finally a model constructed only by its effects in consciousness.

Anything that (one) postulates as being a greater totality that (oneself) can become a symbol of the self. For this reason the symbol of the self is not always as total as the definition would require.

Jung consistently stated the limits of his scientific endeavor; he affirmed that the ontological nature of the Self and its ground in the collective unconscious was unknown. Further, he was concerned
primarily with the statements, concepts and images that humanity conjured of God. He would say:

I do not by any means dispute the existence of a metaphysical God...But I allow myself to put human statements under the microscope.187

Jung's phenomenology of the human psyche respected the fact that the very specimens to be examined were, by necessity, symbolic in nature. And that the language of conveyance of these findings would equally be of a metaphorical and refracted kind. Jung's model of the psyche is precisely that, a model. To say that Jung's scientific endeavor led finally to paradoxical assertions should not be surprising. He attempted to articulate how the deepest structures of human consciousness are grounded in a reality, or, that they are a reality, that is constitutionally irrepresentable. So too, that the images and concepts to elucidate this are, in the end, only tins, models and conceptualizations.

Where is the psyche? Is it behind your nose? Is it the mind? What is the mind? Does it have a "region?" And what can we point to in our experience that is God? Is God an absolutely external "thing" void of human experience, or is this Being concurrent with our being? If this God is completely transcendent of human experience, then how are we even prompted to ask questions of such a psychological non-item? I am aware of the taking-for-granted quality that permeates discussion on the psyche. I am trepidatious enough to see "it" as some "thing" much more fluid and pervasive than the ease of uttering the phonetics or resorting to unqualified concretization. In Jung's Answer to Job, he states agreement with this caution by the following psychological elaboration:
It is only through the psyche that we can establish that God acts upon us, but we are unable to distinguish whether these actions emanate from God or from the unconscious. We cannot tell whether God and the unconscious are two different entities. Both are border-line concepts for transcendental contents...There is in the unconscious an archetype of wholeness which manifests itself spontaneously in dreams etc...it does not seem improbable that the archetype of wholeness occupies as such a central position which approximates it to the God-image. The archetype (of wholeness) produces a symbolism which has always characterized and expressed the Deity...strictly speaking, the God-image does not coincide with the unconscious as such, but with a special content of it, namely the archetype of the self. It is this archetype from which we can no longer distinguish the God-image empirically.188

Being mystics, Shankara and Eckhart cared little for constructing *a priori* models of human cognition. They longed for salvation in an incomplete world, which they viewed as wholly meaningful and not collosially absurd. They saw manifest reality as an elusive reflection of the One Reality. The world, for them, was an illusion of multiplicity and manifestness. How to pay homage to the One without then pruning this One down to the world of "name and form?" They concluded that the Godhead when conceived is worshipped and imaged as God; and the Higher Brahman when named becomes the Lower. Two aspects of divinity emerged for these mystics—one as infinite beyond understanding, and the other as finite in its historical and individual manifestations.189 So too, the Jungian concept of the Self, being wholly unknowable in itself, has yet, in symbol form, specific knowable contents.190 It becomes evident that Jung's notion of the Self, partially known through its archetypal images, parallels the mystics' notion of the Godhead/Higher Brahman: Known intuitively, which when
rendered conceptually, converts to God/Lower Brahman. Little wonder that mystics of all strips admonished their disciples to silence. For only in contemplative silence and paradoxical equivocation is genuine mystery sustained. The endeavor of Jung, Shankara and Eckhart was nothing less than to reside in the crucible of paradox to engage in penetrating circumlocutions with suggesting the indescribable in such a way as to avoid the danger and folly of conceptual and imaginal concretisation.191 Says Jung:

I am quite aware that I am moving in a world of images and that none of my reflections touches the essence of the Unknowable. I am also too well aware of how limited are our powers of conception --to say nothing of the feebleness and poverty of language.192

Eckhart's Godhead and Shankara's Higher Brahman are surely a most sophisticated and tangible articulation of what Paul Tillich called "the God beyond God."193 With symbolic discourse they attempted to speak of that which is beyond symbol; knowing full well that when the symbols become transparent and are pared away, as the masters' felt they should, all notion of darkness and light dissolved, language and imagination paled—silence and emptiness reigned supreme. Yet, both these mystics felt it not only plausible, but highly imperative, to speak of the One Who is closer than speech and farther than conception. Most mystics chose silence to communicate the path of readiness for encounter with the fullness of the Ineffable One. However, if the misguided person, immersed in the world of multiplicity, is to be corrected from the error of concretizing language-symbol as referent to itself alone, then language and symbol is often the only viable recourse to unfetter attachment to a ephemeral image or concept. The paradox being that
although we dwell in a world of multiplicity, we are loath to give that
same allowance to the fluidity of our ideas of God, and/or the gods(!).
The devout tend to declare "This is not just my concept of God, God is
this!" Humans tend to long for psychological fixity when it comes to
existential matters which are, at the most, tentatively certain.
Perhaps, just as the mystics tell of the world as not the cause of
itself, so too, perhaps, the human psyche (read: soul, being) is an
effect, a motif, a symbol, a "word" of a deeper ground of which we
remain mostly unconscious, yet, none the less, participate in and point
to.

Deity, Wholly Other, Inner Ground, Everlasting, One, Godhead,
Higher Brahman, Spirit, Great Mystery are apt terms for articulating
this Divine Dark. Only with non-gendered, non-antropomorphic, and
transpersonal apprehension can discourse on divinity be aligned to the
wisdom of the sages and the ages. Perhaps even non-monotheistic notions
of the divine should play a greater emphasis when discussing concepts of
the divine. Such an emphasis would take this thesis down a completely
different path and perhaps upset Jung's emphasis on a unifying
psychological mechanism. It nevertheless reveals a huge assumption that
all three thinkers take when speaking of that which is ultimately beyond
speech, i.e. they assume a foundational monism. Perhaps too, a
polytheistic apprehension of the divine has its own inherent unifying
principle that humbles a Western intellect and need not upset Jung's
psychological priority of an underlying wholeness mechanism. These
concerns will be dealt with more fully in the conclusion of the thesis.
Jung concluded that there could be no definite figure capable of
expressing archetypal indefiniteness, to attempt to elucidate the referent of, for example, the archetypal motif of "mystery" was impossible. When Jung mentioned that there is no definite figure capable of expressing archetypal indefiniteness, one wonders whether he meant a concept or, in fact, a phenomenological/imaginational image. James Hillman, a highly noted Jungian, shifts the emphasis with his statement that: "The image is always more inclusive, more complex than the concept." This only undergirds my present thesis assessment which maintains that humankind has a deep psychological need to image the boundless, paradoxical background. Does the concept Divine Darkness have an imaginal equivalent?

If the Hindu chants the Vedas on the banks of the Ganges, if the Chinese meditates on the Analects, if the Japanese worships the image of Buddha, If the European is convinced of Christ's mediatorialship, if the Arab reads the Qur'an in (one's) mosque, and if the African bows down to a fetish, each one of them has exactly the same reason for (their) particular confidence. Each form of faith appeals in precisely the same way to the inner certitude and devotion of its followers. It is their deepest apprehension of God and God's fullest revelation to them. The claim of any religion to validity is the fact that only through it has its followers become what they are. They have grown up with it and it has become a part of their being... The different creeds are the historical formulations of the formless truth.

Could it be that the dark deities Kali and Raven function as images of this Deliberate Darkness in its more inclusive and complex form?
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Chapter Three: Kali

Because Thou devourest Kala (time), Thou art Kali, because Thou art the Origin of and devourest all things Thou art called the Adya (primordial) Kali. Resuming after dissolution thine own nature, dark and formless, ineffable and inconceivable. Thou alone remainest as the One. Though having a form, yet are Thou formless; though Thyself without beginning, multiform by the power of Maya, Thou art the Beginning of all, Crectrix, Protectress, and Destructress that Thou art.

1. Tantra of the Great Liberation
   (Mahanirvana Tantra)

I am black but lovely, daughters of Jerusalem, like the tents of Kedar, like the pavilions of Salmah. Take no notice of my swarthiness, it is the sun that has burned me.

The Song of Songs

On the whole, Hinduism maintains an unperturbed stance toward pluralism. This is evident to the extent that Hindus are usually very bothered by attempts to eliminate alternative views in their Weltanschauung. Preston says, "it is almost paradoxical that the major integrating factor of Hinduism is its very tolerance for diversity through a constant process of incorporation." The Jungian concept of the interpla, of opposite tendencies in the personality and the Freudian concept of ambivalence indicate a Western parallel to the Hindu recognition of contradictory aspects of experience. O'Flaherty writes, "Indians carry off this sort of thing better than we do, but we do it too." The Hindu acceptance of diversity and paradox may result in large part in the fact that Hinduism is more orthoprax than orthodox; if one behaves correctly, it does not matter what one believes.
In this chapter there will be a brief examination of the Indus Valley civilization and its impact on the development of Hindu goddess worship; following this will be an explication of the Mahadevi and the function she serves in goddess theology; there will then be a study of the history of Kali's rise in the Hindu pantheon, including textual descriptions of her image; a brief analysis of Hindu iconography will then follow; the chapter will conclude with highlighting how an adequate understanding of Kali involves appreciation of her paradoxical function.

Indus Valley Civilization:

It is estimated that humans have been on the Indian sub-continent for at least three hundred thousand years. The civilization of the non Indo-European Indus Valley, the foundation upon which modern Hinduism partially stands, dates back to about two thousand five hundred B.C.E. In this pre- and non-Vedic civilization "there appeared in myth and ritual an important goddess, associated with the moon and with mares." The unearthing of numerous terra-cotta figurines of females led some scholars to conclude evidence of goddess worship in the ancient Indus civilization. Ancient Indus goddess worship was assumed to be related to the Great Mother cults in Asia Minor and the Mediterranean. Although it is true that many of these Kulli and Zhob figurines represent females, other scholars call it "a conjecture to suggest they were images of goddesses." Beane states that "there has been perhaps an exaggerated tendency to regard these as a manifestation of the Great Mother Goddess in the religions of western Asia and parts of Europe."
Aboriginal spiritualities the world over see the Earth as the repository of the sacred. This mysterious "fertile source of being" became aligned to the female principle of sustenance and fecundity. In *Patterns of Comparative Religion*, Eliade wrote:

The Earth-Mother never entirely lost her primitive prerogatives of being "Mistress of the place," source of all living forms, keeper of children, and womb where the dead were laid to rest, where they were born to return eventually to life, thanks to the holiness of Mother Earth.

Another modern scholar, Galland, gives this summary of the ancient spiritual understanding of the Earth:

The material world is the female side of God, *mater* (mother). The problem is that we don't recognize it, so we are consumed by it rather than nourished. We are under the spell of materiality; if we don't recognize this, we will be devoured.

The Hindu Vedic tradition knew several sky goddess, but was dominated by male deities, and the medieval period saw a noticeable shift in emphasis to goddess mythology. It is tempting to explain this by reference to the prototype Indus Valley figurines, but the evidence of a continuity between these two phenomena is disputed. Similarities between Hindu goddess iconography and the Indus Valley figurines end with the similar attention to lavish adornment, especially as this pertains to the hair.

All one can justifiably conclude is that there is evidence of goddess figurines in two peasant cultures in the hills of Baluchistan in the second of perhaps late third millenium B.C.E. Insofar as male figurines are lacking, one might go further and suggest that if these figurines represent goddesses, their religion, whatever it might have been, was more open to the divine or the sacred as revealed through women than through men and that this might have something to do with the fertility of the crops.
Mahadevi Theology:

Eventually, the ancient understanding of the Earth as "the fertile source of being" was left behind for a more anthropomorphic and gynaecormorphically expressed sacred symbol. Within post-Vedic Hinduism, the Earth began to be viewed, quoting Beane, as "the incarnation of Devi (the Goddess)," and the Devi came to be understood as the supreme embodiment of Sakti (manifest power). The Mahadevi (Great Goddess), like the male God in numerous theologies, is described as an all powerful, active, dynamic, female being who creates, pervades, governs, and protects the universe. This transcendent-immanent being is often identified with prakriti (material reality) and maya in Hindu philosophy. Two of her most common epithets are Mulaprakriti (She Who Is Primordial Matter) and Mahamaya (She Who Is Great Maya). Within the divine fullness, the Mahadevi is seen as "the complementary pole of the divine tendency toward quiescence and stillness." When the world of nama-rupa (name and form) is lauded in Hinduism, its origin is thought to take shape "in the womb of the unfathomable Brahman," and the Mahadevi is then celebrated as the ultimate reality. When Nirguna Brahman (Qualityless Reality), the Absolute Noumenon, whose Para-Form (transcendent form) "none knows" is made manifest, she reveals Her reality in the shape of the universe, gods and goddesses, humans, and all such living things. The Mahadevi is conceptually at par with that of Godhead and Higher Brahman. Hence, classical Shaktism sees the Mahadevi as the Source, Dynamic, and Embodiment of the World-Reality.
She is ultimately formless. Yet, paradoxically, she is given "sensuous-spatial existence." As prakriti and maya, she is seen as the cause of samsara (the changing world) and of preoccupation with phenomenal existence. As such, she is also the ground of all things. The Mahadevi creates the world, she is the world, and she enlivens the world with creative power. She is understood in Shakta cults as the ultimate reality itself (equivalent to Nirguna Brahman), and the source of all divine manifestations (Saguna Brahman).

Kinsley says of the great Hindu Shakta tradition:

Her association with spiritual knowledge, wisdom, and liberation also makes the point that the Devi transcends the world she creates, that she not only underlies the world and is its creator but is the means to transcend (emphasis mine) the world, which is the ultimate spiritual goal in Hinduism.

In the Aryastava text the Mahadevi is called mukti (liberation), she who speaks of the knowledge of Brahman, and she who is the knowledge of Brahman. In the Lalita-Sahasranama her epithets include; she who is great intelligence, she who is knowledge of atman, she who bestows knowledge, she who bestows salvation, and she who is the lamp that dispels the darkness of ignorance.

Mahadevi theology has two levels of incorporation. On one level a particular goddess is affirmed as the highest deity (Mahadevi), or the consort or sakti of the highest deity, and all other goddesses are then understood as manifestations of her. The second level sees only a transcendent Great Goddess (Mahadevi) possessing all the classical characteristics of ultimate reality in Hindu tradition and subsuming all particular goddesses under her as partial manifestations of her. On the first level, Kali would be affirmed as the supreme deity,
"triumphant over all others, equivalent in fact, to Brahman." In the Nirvana Tantra Brahma, Visnu, and Siva are all said to arise from Kali "like bubbles from the sea." The Kamada Tantra states unequivocally that Kali is attributeless, neither male nor female, sinless, the imperishable saccidananda (being, consciousness, bliss), Brahma itself. On the second level of Mahadevi theology, the Mahadevi is said, like Visnu, to have ten incarnational forms. Durga, Kali, and Candika are three of her fierce forms; Laksmi, Sati, and Parvati are three of her benign forms, these and other goddesses are all viewed as incarnations of a transcendent divine economy governed by the Great Goddess. The Mahadevi plays the role of a Saviouress, coming to her devotees in times of great distress. Central to this level of Mahadevi theology is the insistence that she assumes both benign and "terrible" or fierce forms.

Although her concern is that of a mother for her children, hence a passionate and ever-watchful concern, her favorite role as protector and preserver of the cosmos is that of a warrior.

Kali:

The eighteenth century poet Ramprasad eulogized Kali as "a dark that lights the world." But Kali's emergence and acceptance into the Hindu pantheon happened gradually and reluctantly.

Kali's origins do not and cannot adequately explain her subsequent history. She eventually transcends her origins.

Kali the Protectress, the manifestation of preference for the Mahadevi, is best known for her fierce character. As a subject of paradox, Kali
does not disappoint! She is both a loving Mother and a terrible Destroyer. It is for this reason primarily that this indigenous, non-Aryan deity\textsuperscript{43} is "held suspect by some, worshipped by many."\textsuperscript{44}

Kali noticeably entered the literary or Great Tradition of Hinduism in the Epic and Puranic periods of approximately two hundred B.C.E. to three hundred C.E. It is speculated that she was known earlier outside of the literary tradition among tribal peoples.\textsuperscript{45} During this period Kali was not recognized as a major Hindu deity, she was not yet identified with any deity in the established pantheon, and she existed as a very minor deity on the fringes of the tradition.\textsuperscript{46} In the Devi-mahatmya (500-700 C.E.), Kali officially emerges as the central deity; in this text a full account of her birth, appearance, and central mythological deeds are given in detail.\textsuperscript{47} This text is divided into three major episodes. In the first two episodes the Devi as Durga, meaning "Beyond Reach,"\textsuperscript{48} is created by a merging of the key powers of all the most powerful of the male gods.\textsuperscript{49} In Durga, the Mahadevi incarnates as a ferocious, invincible warrior who descends into the world from time to time to combat evil.\textsuperscript{50} Durga has defeated the two demons Kaitabha and Madhu who were born from Visnu during his cosmic sleep.\textsuperscript{51} And she has destroyed the buffalo demon Mahisasura or Mahisa who had been granted a boon making him invincible to all opponents but a female.\textsuperscript{52}

In the third episode, the demon brothers Sumbha and Nisumbha have subdued the gods and now rule over them. The Mahadevi had previously promised her assistance to the gods whenever they should find themselves in difficulty. The gods collectively petition Durga and she appears to
them in the magnificent guise of Parvati. She calms the worried gods and goes forth to battle the demon hosts. When the armed demons approach the Goddess she becomes so furious that her face becomes dark as ink. Suddenly there springs forth from her brow the terrible goddess Kali, armed with a sword and noose. Kali the "death dealer and life-giver, the end and beginning of time...naked and sky-clad," flings the demons into her mouth and crushes them in her jaws. She wades through the demon hosts decapitating and crushing all who stand in her way. She returns to Durga with the demon heads as trophies. The Mahadevi's terrible form results from her fundamentally protective role as guardian of the cosmos.

In another incident in the cosmic battle, the demon army has been nearly defeated. But there still remains the dreaded demon Raktabija who is nearly invincible. Every time he is wounded and begins to bleed from the blows of Durga, other demons matching his image, might, and ability to reproduce are instantly born from his blood. Durga soon realizes that her battling the demons only gets worse. She calls upon Kali to defeat the beasts. Kali swoops onto the battlefield and opens her mouth to swallow the blood-born creatures and also drinks up the blood from Raktabija's wounds. She sucks away the last of the life blood from the great demon who falls to the ground dead. Kali is born from wrath, is horrible in appearance, and is ferocious in battle. Taking delight in destruction and death, she epitomizes the wild, fearful aspects of the "otherness" of the divine, transcending the human sphere to a reality essentially untamed. Kali's love of blood imparts the "irreducible truth (of Nature) that life sustains itself on life."
Kali's role in this text is ultimately subservient to Durga; Kali proceeds from the Devi and is finally drawn back into her. When the Mahadevi incarnates as Durga or Kali, people both fear and respect her. Like a protective mother bear with cubs, in this fierce aspect the Goddess is capable of great vengeance against those who would cross her. At the time of the Devi-mahatmya, Kali's identity is that of a negative, dark, and terrible fiend worshipped only by wild tribes and thieves.

In the Bhagavata-purana, Kali is the patron goddess of a band of thieves. The leader of the thieves, in wishing for a son, captures a saintly brahman to sacrifice to Kali. The virtuousity of the saintly brahman "scorches" Kali who leaps from her image and slaughters the band of thieves. In this account, clearly the "good demon" Kali embodies the paradoxical behaviour of esteeming moral virtue while admitting the supplications of the lewd. O'Flaherty comments on such a one:

Figures that transcend categories or mediate between them are usually sacred in either a positive or a negative way...But if this transcending, mediating character is taken in a positive sense, one experiences the coincidentia oppositorum, the deity who is wonderful...she shatters all categories.

In this early Medieval period Kali is represented as primarily a terrifying, demonic creature worshipped by those on the periphery of society. In fact, for some inexplicable reason, the entire cult of the Mother Goddess belonged exclusively to the domain of the oppressed classes, looked down upon by the upper strata of society.

In the Linga-purana, the demoness Daruka obtained such power through asceticism that she usurped the gods and began to rule the world. Seeing the gods didn't want to fight a woman, Siva turned to
Parvati who created Kali from herself. Kali saves the day. Then Siva appeared as an infant in the battlefield amidst the corpses. Kali picks him up and nurses him, when this does not calm him, she dances among the dead until he becomes delighted and calm.\textsuperscript{67} In this text the "ambivalent Kali"\textsuperscript{68} is the evil mother whose milk is poison,\textsuperscript{69} yet she ultimately plays a positive, motherly role.

In the \textit{Ramayana} epic of Rama and his wife Sita, Rama attempts to prove his virility to Sita by hunting the demon Ravana. Rama becomes despondent at the strength of Ravana and weeps. Sita instantly becomes Kali and fights to the victory. Kali gets drunk on the blood of the demon and dances an Earth shattering dance. The gods are petitioned to calm Kali. Siva throws himself down among the corpses under her feet, Brahma tells Kali that she is dancing on her consort Siva. Kali is astonished and embarrassed and stops dancing.\textsuperscript{70} Surprisingly, here the terrible goddess has a reservoir of feminine modesty.\textsuperscript{71} If Siva did not calm Kali the universe would have been destroyed. Her fury is equated with \textit{prakriti} (matter) while Siva represents \textit{purusha} (spirit).\textsuperscript{72} The Mahadevi is said to assume the terrible form of Kali as her real form, the form she assumes for the tasks of creation and destruction. "It was her form as universal deity."\textsuperscript{73} In Kali the two levels of Mahadevi theology are integrated: Kali is the Mahadevi, and Kali is an instance of the Mahadevi incarnate.

She is the distillation of the furious, raw, savage power and lust of the frenzied warrior, and as such she is truly a terrible being, feared by her enemies, to be sure, but a threat to the overall stability of the world itself.\textsuperscript{74}

In traditional Tamil epics dating back to the second century
C.E., Kali is seen as the goddess of death, she is referred to as the "Dark Mother," and is said to delight in human blood sacrifices. Today Kali has gained full independence from Durga. "Her character has become richer and more complex, indeed she has come to represent for millions the highest manifestation of the divine in India." A sampling of descriptions of Kali's appearance is now in order.

From the Syama-praharanam the Dhyana-mantra says:

Of terrible face and fearful aspect is Kali the awful. Four-armed, garlanded with skulls, with disheveled hair, she holds a fresh cut human head and a bloodied scimitar in her left hands and makes the signs of fearlessness—assurance and bestowing boons with her right hands. Her neck is adorned with a garland of severed human heads dripping blood, her ear-rings two dangling severed heads, her girdle a string of severed human hands, she is dark and naked. Terrible, fang-like teeth, full prominent breasts, a smile on her lips glistening with blood, she is Kali whose laugh is terrifying. Her flowing disheveled hair streaming over her left side, her three eyes as red and glaring as the rising sun, she lives in cremation grounds, surrounded by screaming jackals. She stands on Siva, who lies corpse-like beneath her.

Preston describes her as such:

Kali is intentionally portrayed as a frightening Hag with disheveled hair, pendulous breasts and a garland of skulls around her neck. In this form the Great Goddess is the embodiment of the fury which can be raised in the divinity under emergency conditions. For this reason Kali is associated with death, cemeteries, funeral pyres and the darkness of the night.

Beane says of her:

It is in India that the experience of the Terrible Mother has been given its most grandiose form as Kali, "dark, all-devouring time, the bone-wreathed Lady of the place of skulls"...In her "hideous aspect" the Goddess, as Kali...raises the skull full of seething blood to her lips; her devotional images show her dressed in blood red, standing in a boat.
floating on a sea of blood: in the midst of the life flood, the sacrificial sap, she requires that she may, in her gracious manifestation as the World Mother, bestow existence upon her new living forms in a process of unceasing generation. 79

The Mahanirvana-tantra describes her as drenched in blood from grinding up the world at the time of dissolution. In the Lalita-sahasranama her epithets include: she who is seated on a throne of five corpses; the terrible one; she who destroys; she who has flaming tusks; she who is a great eater; she who is wrathful. 80 The Chutiyas of Assam worshipped various forms of Kali, their favourite was that of Kesai Khati "eater of raw flesh" to whom human sacrifices were offered. 81

In Myth, Dreams, and Mysteries, Eliade shows that the frightening aspect of the Earth-Mother as the Goddess of Death is explained by "the cosmic necessity of sacrifice, which alone makes possible passage from one mode of being to another and also ensures the uninterrupted circulation of Life." 82 Kali and other fierce goddesses must be appeased by blood sacrifices. Blood nourishes, for "in order to give life, they must receive life back in the form of blood sacrifices." 83 Her awesome creative power is matched only by her awesome hunger. 84 As Kinsley succinctly stated:

If she were only to give birth to and nourish her creatures she would soon grow weak, and creation would cease. This seems to be the perception underlying the insistence in Mahadevi theology that she possesses a variety of terrible forms. 85

The origin of the name Kali is not easy to trace. In the Mahanirvana-tantra, Siva says to Kali:

At the dissolution of things, it is Kala (time) who will devour all, and by reason of this He is called Mahakala (an epithet of Siva), and since Thou devour-est Mahakala Himself, it is Thou who art the Supreme
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Kala is said perhaps to refer to a black god, and Kali to a black
goddess. But this is not certain, perhaps these names allude to Time,
the destroyer of everything. Kala can mean time, destiny, fate and
death. The goddess Kali has been called Adyakali (the Timeless),
Kalamata (Mother of Time), and Kalaharshini (Destroyer of Time). In
check with the Hindu Shakta-Tantric perspective to which Kali belongs,
time is both the enemy and the friend of human beings. It is thought
in Hinduism that we are now in the last great yuga (age) of the four
cosmic ages: the Kali Yuga (the Dark Age of the Goddess Kali). "Only
the Great Mother (Kali) is capable of combating the enormous forces of
evil unleashed upon the world during this last dark age."

From the early medieval period Kali assumed great popularity
within Tantrism. Tantrism in many ways is an antibrahmanic system.
For one thing, the Vedic gods were generally associated with light.
Tantrism is a ritually oriented practice of uniting opposites in the
body i.e. male-female, microcosm-macrocosm, sacred-profane, Siva-Sakti,
to bring about the fractured world of "name and form" into wholeness and
unity. Everything has an outer and inner reality for the devotee of
the goddess. The Tantric practice of panca-tattva, the ritual of the
five forbidden truths: wine, meat, fish, parched grain, and sexual
intercourse, only highlight the importance of Kali in the Hindu
pantheon. By practicing the panca-tattva, the devotee "overcomes the
distinction (duality)...and breaks (one's) bondage to a world
artificially fragmented." Pertaining, perhaps, to sexual intercourse,
Ajitcoomar Mookerjee would say that "the one which becomes two
constantly aspires to become one again." 98 In Tantric sexual rites there is a reversal from the orthodox (male to female) to the esoteric (female to male). 99 Paradoxically, the outer view of tantric sexual acts may appear perverse, but from the inner view, the same act signifies creation, "a moment of divinity," two different views of the same symbolized reality. 100 One scholar would say that paradox is at the heart of Tantric-Shakta worship. If gods have both power and authority in relation to humankind; and if human men have authority over human women, while human women have more power than human men; how can a goddess have authority, being female, but how can she not have authority being a goddess? 101 The redemptive qualities of devotion to the dreaded demon-slayer Kali are such that she illustrates what the world looks like to one who has seen beyond appearances. Dwelling in the cremation grounds she "mocks the ultimate significance of a world grounded in the ego." 102 She cannot be merciful for she is here to enable people to face death with maturity by dying to their ego—or by having Kali shatter it. 103 Kali serves as a catalyst to see beyond the chaos of maya, to what is eternal and permanent. 104 By the devotee’s loyalty to the "Black Goddess," 105 the devotee affirms the essential worth of what his/her society forbids, and causes the forbidden to lose its power to pollute, degrade and to bind. The boon of fearlessness is granted to such a one. 106 In Tantrism, Kali represents the forbidden par excellence. "The Tantric hero has refused to flee before the wrath of the goddess and in that refusal has gained mastery over her and over (one)self." 107

By the fourteenth century, Kali’s identity with Shaktism was
The sixteenth century saw eulogies to Kali by the poet Mukaunda and saw her as a fierce defender of Hinduism. This same century also saw Vishnuism go through an infusion of bhakti (devotional worship) revival. This influence may have been felt by the Shakta cults. The devotional love evident in Kali-worship by the eighteenth century brought out an aspect of the Mother often implied. And although Kali was not strictly identified with one geographical region, she began to be seen as a defender of Bengali nationalism and was a coveted Bengal goddess. At this time the poet Ramprasad took bhakti of Kali to its loftiest heights. His devotion was based on a mother-child relationship. Kali is no longer described as emaciated and ugly. She is seen as mild and beautiful. Now she no longer symbolizes death but rather, triumph over death. Through self-surrender and child-like acceptance of Kali, Ramprasad lost his fear of the death of the self. He would say:

O Kali! Thou art fond of cremation grounds; so I have turned my heart into one that Thou, a resident of cremation grounds; may dance there unceasingly.

Instead of an esoteric and fringe Tantric event, Ramprasad made worship of Kali a public affair.

In present-day Bengal, Kali is worshipped as a protectress deity. Parts of India, especially coastal and agriculture-based areas suffer oppressive poverty and unpredictable, capricious weather. In these places Kali is often worshipped and honoured with blood sacrifices.

One surrenders with ease to a goddess who offers some degree of hope in the face of overwhelming tragedy. A history of constant suffering from oppression, combined with endemic natural disasters
which constantly threaten the delicate balance of the agricultural cycle, produces an atmosphere of submission and surrender in the subcontinent. No wonder the Indian mother goddess is a beacon of hope and a source of renewal for her people.119

For Hindus it is possible to understand the occurrence of tragic events, either mythic or actual, as a form of lila (divine play) which symbolizes that the storms and stresses of the cosmic trauma and existential delusion will eventually pass.120 Yet, it would be a gross simplification to attribute Kali's so-called ambiguity to the human experience of the "vicissitudes of nature."121 Some scholars would even say that she is in fact not a two-faced, ambivalent being, that she is not a contradiction of extremes. Rather, she would be seen as the embodiment of divine wholeness of which the two facets of terrible and benign are wholly interrelated.122 In this form, Kali is seen as the manifest world in the form of a great being.123

The twentieth century saw the Indian Ramakrishna synthesize an idealist doctrine of which Kali was the pivot.124 He was responsible for bringing the solely loving, transformed Mother into this century. Kali's presence was not to be feared in Ramakrishna's doctrine. Nonetheless, though it is said that he held only to the benign aspect of Kali, the following account shows that he saw the possibility of her fierce side:

Ramakrishna once had a vision of maya. In this vision he saw a beautiful young woman, pregnant and about to give birth, emerging from the Ganges. She lay down on the bank and soon gave birth a son. She suckled him and carressed him fondly. Suddenly she was transformed into a terrible hag. She grasped the infant, crushed him in her mighty jaws, and returned into the waters of the Ganges.125

Ramakrishna pondered upon the terrible beauty of life: "Who would create
this mad world unless under the influence of divine drunkenness?"\textsuperscript{126}

Vivekananda, Ramakrishna's disciple, held to the fierce and the benign aspects of Kali simultaneously. He saw that destruction is necessary for creation, and that Kali only destroys the evil forces.\textsuperscript{127} He saw her as the embodiment of this world and the stimulus to transcend it. Kali as \textit{prakriti}—the topsy-turvy, blind, irresistible multiplication of matter—invites an acceptance of the dark side of life and the mystery of things as they are.\textsuperscript{128} Vivekananda implores, "Let us embrace the Terrible, because it is terrible; not asking that it be toned down."\textsuperscript{129}

Reflecting on modern Indian society, Kinsley says of Kali:

Kali's shocking appearance and unconventional behavior confront one with an alternative to normal society. To meditate on the dark goddess, or to devote oneself to her, is to step out of the everyday world of predictable dharmic order and enter a world of reversals, opposites, and contrasts and in doing so to wake up to new possibilities and new frames of reference. In her differentness, strangeness, indeed in her perverseness, Kali is the kind of figure who is capable of shaking one's comforting and naive assumptions about the world. In doing this she allows a clearer perception of how things really are...she invites a wider, more mature, more realistic reflection on where one has come from and where one is going.\textsuperscript{130}

As much as the benign aspect of Kali is emphasized today, Kali—the-fierce is still prevalent in India, particularly in the Northeast.\textsuperscript{131} To this day, goats are sacrificed daily to Kali at the Kalighat temple in Calcutta.\textsuperscript{132} Expecting to see only the Terrible Mother, a twentieth-century scholar expressed surprise at finding such a benign aspect of Kali at a temple in Varanasi:

I had never seen her depicted in this way before.
No necklace of skulls, no red tongue, protruding,
this was not the embattled, gaunt hag sprung from Durga's brow. This was a lovely, peaceful being seated in the cross-legged posture of meditation, her hands gracefully folded, wearing a beneficent smile.133

The element of paradoxical valuation was never lost in the symbology of Kali. Being finally and absolutely beyond the opposites of phenomenal existence, Kali could proclaim in the Devibhagavata-purana that "When everything melts away, i.e. there comes the Pralaya (general dissolution), then I am not female, I am not male, nor (am I) hermaphrodite."134

The comprehensive Form, Nature and Activity of the goddess are akin to the Trimurti of Brahma, Visnu and Siva: A dimension of preservation-and-destruction in Creation; a dimension of creation-and-destruction in Preservation; and a dimension of preservation-and-creation in Destruction.135

The paradoxical iconographic symbolization of Kali is so intrinsic to her definition that Kinsley would intiate my thesis on Divine Darkness and how it relates to the function of dark deities. "The peripheral 'jungly,' wild nature of these dark beings affirms the truth that the divine cannot be circumscribed. It is totally 'other' in its essential nature."136

Eric Neumann affirms the same understanding of these paradoxical dark images especially in relation to their feminine principle. "The Great Mother remains true to her essential and eternal mysterious darkness, in which she is the centre of the mystery of existence."137
Iconography:

Prior to my Shastri Indo-Canadian Institute sponsored 1990 Summer Programme in India, my dear friend and mentor Maurice Alberda gifted me with Eck's book *Darshan*. This small book proved invaluable in its countless applications to "sacred sightseeing" while in India.\textsuperscript{138} Coming from a deep-rooted Western antagonism to imaging the divine, save my rich Catholic upbringing, I truly needed to develop a hermeneutic of the visible, to address the problem of how I would understand and interpret what I would see.\textsuperscript{139} I ran the ethnocentric risk of misinterpreting my new experiences by relegating them to old schemata.\textsuperscript{140}

Coming from my conditioned "myth of monotheism,"\textsuperscript{141} I was overwhelmed by India's polycentric stand on divinity. With Eck, I saw that "for all its famous otherworldliness, India is a culture that has also celebrated the life of this world and the realm of the senses." Partially through Eck's "metaguide book," I was provided with a visual hermeneutic of the Image instead of the Word as a trustworthy mediator of the divine that would enlighten instead of alienate my experience.\textsuperscript{142}

Hinduism is an "image-making" religious tradition in which the sacred is affirmed as present in the visible world. That summer I began to see how for the Hindu, the deity is present in the image. It is not the image that is idolized, rather, the divine resident is glorified. This "fact of presence" allowed me to take *darshan* (see and be seen by the deity) in the presence of the deities. I was being stretched to embrace the greater paradox of Hindu perception. Eck writes:

*Although some Hindus, both philosophers and radical reformers, have always used the term nirguna*
(qualityless) and nirakara (formless) to speak of the One Brahman, this can most accurately be understood only from the perspective of a tradition that has simultaneously affirmed that Brahman is also saguna (with qualities), and that the multitude of "names and forms" of this world are the exuberant transformations of the One Brahman.143

India's unity is based on its cultural genius for embracing diversity.144 Hinduism is distinct for its refusal to make the one and the many into opposites.145 Side by side with the numerous cultic images is the abiding search for the Neti-Neti (not this, not this) Brahman.146 Again Eck polished my vision:

The very images of the gods portray in visual form the multiplicity and the oneness of the divine, and they display the tensions and the seeming contradictions that are resolved in a single mythic image.147

Eck identified two types of images: the aniconic and the iconic. Transculturally, the aniconic is older than the iconic. Stones, natural symbols, earthen mounds, Siva's linga, Buddha's footprint, Jesus' cross signify the presence of the deity; they are the deity's token or sign, rather than the deity's face.148

Iconic images address a more anthropomorphic need in the human imaging of the divine. Iconography, meaning "writing in images,"149 summons the artist to the task of giving "shape to those things we cannot readily see." Eck explains,

The images of the gods are not "likenesses" of any earthly form. They are fantastic forms, with multiple heads and arms, with blue, green, or vermilion coloring, or with part-animal bodies. They are not intended to "represent" earthly realities, but rather to present divine realities. They stretch the human imagination toward the divine by juxtaposing earthly realities in an unearthly way.150

The visual "theologies" of Hindu images had its genesis in the Gupta
Period, the Golden Age of Indian Art (400-700 C.E.). The ensuing rise of bhakti brought the personal Lord "with qualities" (saguna) into a more cherished position. God was not only seen to be accessible in incarnations but also in images; in this way the icon or image was seen as a form of the Supreme.

The image of Kali presented in this chapter affirms her to be the shatterer of all concepts of divinity. It is said that Kali is black because black is the colour in which all distinctions are dissolved. As a symbolic phenomenological occurrence of the intellectual concept Divine Darkness, Kali operates paradoxically, for in her fierceness is her benevolence, in her destruction is her creative generativity, and as a vidya (manifestation) of the Mahadevi she is also the Goddess's own form and essence. Kali's transition may not yet be complete, but the Hindu tradition is reinforced and enriched in its acceptance of Kali from the periphery to the centre. In pointing beyond her image-self, sages observe: "unless one comes to know Kali; it is said that the desire for liberation is futile."
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"I have completed my work except for one thing. The raven."
"What about the raven?" Mark asked.
"That's just it. There is a mystery about the raven they will not tell me. If I ask one of the Indians, he says he knows but he can't translate it. When I ask the chief, he says he knows but the older Indians know better and I must ask them. And when I ask the older Indians, they say they knew it once and cannot remember."
Mark promised to help her, and went straight to Mrs. Hudson with his problem, who said she would arrange it.
"It is a long myth," said Mrs. Hudson, "and T.P. Wallace knows it well. He is going on a five-hour trip tomorrow on his son's seiner, and if the lady anthropologist cares to go along, the time should be ample."
The Englishwoman never mentioned the trip, and Mark did not question her, but late on the night of the day it was made, old T.P. came to the vicarage to apologize.
"We had bad luck. We went into Knight's inlet and on the way back we hit a very strong tidal sweep."
"You told her the myth?"
"Certainly. I started the minute we left the float and I didn't reach the end until we returned. But you know, boss, she was so seasick, she didn't hear me. All she could say was, 'Oh, ghastly, ghastly.'"

I Heard the Owl Call My Name

The raven is an ominous bird. Being sometimes good and sometimes evil, "it has an ambivalent character." The environmentalist, Suzuki, in his recently co-authored Wisdom of the Elders, says that Raven is "paradox incarnate, often ingeniously so. He is wise and foolish, compassionate and cruel, chaste and lecherous, potent and petty." This parallels an old folk ballad: "To see one raven is lucky, 'tis true, / But its
certain misfortune to light upon two, / And meeting with three is the devil!"  

In this chapter there will be a brief exploration of the presence of ravens in world mythologies. Following this will be a description of ravens in nature; there will then be an examination of the migration of the First Peoples across the supposed Beringia land-bridge from Siberia into the Pacific Northwest of America. A study of the Raven cycle of tales from the Tlingit, Haida, and Tsimshian peoples, considered to be the centre of Northwest Coast culture, will ensue; an explication of the function of Trickster myths will follow. The chapter will conclude with highlighting how an adequate understanding of Raven involves appreciation of his paradoxical function.

Ravens in Myths Around the World:  

Because of its natural predilection for carrion, scavenging on the carnage of battlefields, the raven came to be associated with death. It has been recorded that, throughout Europe, and in parts of Africa and Asia, "a croaking raven portends death."  

It was similarly thought that this bird could predict impending doom. In Swedish folklore ravens were considered to be the ghosts of those not given a Christian burial. In Germany they were considered to be the souls of the damned; and in some folk-tales the devil appears as a raven or is seen as Satan's messenger. In Celtic legends supernatural beings turn themselves into, or are regarded as, ravens. Celtic war-goddesses, those Kali-like terrible hags who feast on the vanquished, appeared often as ravens.
In the Bible ravens are a symbol of desolation (Isaiah 34:11). Semitic people, such as the Syrian, tell stories of how evil spirits take the form of ravens to assail saintly people. Moving away from a strictly negative depiction, Shakespeare's works have numerous references to ravens as both malevolent and beneficial. Again in the Bible, the Deluge myth tells of Noah sending the raven out as the first of the land-seekers (Genesis 8:7); elsewhere, helpful ravens are sent by Yahweh to feed Elijah bread and meat (I Kings 17:4,6); in Job's time of trial Yahweh declared, "Who makes provision for the raven / when his squabs cry out to God / and crane their necks in hunger?" (Job 38:41); finally, Jesus regards the ravens worthy of God's care (Luke 12:24). Tibetan mythology intimates that the raven might have once had the status of a god, being the prime messenger of the Supreme Being. In Greco-Roman myth, ravens brought news to the god Apollo of the unfaithfulness of Koronis. Ravens guided Alexander to the temple of Jupitor Ammon, as well as led the Boetians to the site for their new town. In Chinese legends ravens fly through the forests causing storms and warning that the gods are soon to ride past. The Vikings used ravens in their discovery of Iceland; elsewhere in Norse lore the chief of the gods Odin/Wotan "God of the Ravens", is accompanied by his two raven companions, Hugin (Thought) and Munin (Memory). In the Middle East the raven was thought to have been a coadjutor in the work of creation. In Wales it was believed that if blind folk were kind to ravens they would regain their sight; in Wales and Cornwall, as well as with many other places throughout the world, it is considered unlucky to kill a raven.
To Siberian shamans the raven is a messenger and guide who speaks and understands human language.\textsuperscript{20} In Pacific Northwest American myth the raven "serves as a protective genius,"\textsuperscript{21} serving humankind as the emissary between the divine and the human.\textsuperscript{22} The raven is seen as a symbol of the sun, as a "solar bird"\textsuperscript{23} in Europe, China, Japan, Northeast Asia, and Northwest America.\textsuperscript{24}

In closing, it is evident that in pre-Christian times this bird was as much revered as feared.\textsuperscript{25} In early magico-religious cultures of the stormy northern latitudes this was a bird of slaughter, a storm bird, a sun/fire bird, a messenger, an oracular figure, and a cultural hero.\textsuperscript{26} Even in more southern latitudes, such as the Australian aborigines, the Malays, and the Vietnamese, all have stories tantalizingly similar to those of the Raven figure on the Northwest Coast of America.\textsuperscript{27}

Ravens in Nature:

In ornithological study The Common Raven (\textit{Corvus corax}) is similar in appearance to the Common Crow (\textit{Corvus brachyrhynchos}) but much larger. Its bill is heavier, with the feathers of the throat elongated and pointed, and the tail somewhat wedge-shaped.\textsuperscript{28} This thesis will focus on the Northern Raven (\textit{Corvus corax principalis}) native to most of the Northern Hemisphere.\textsuperscript{29} World-wide the Common and/or Northern Raven range from Northwest subarctic Alaska, throughout arctic Canada, Greenland, south through the western United States and Mexico to Nicaragua, and in eastern North America south to Minnesota,
northern Michigan, Maine, in the Appalachian Mountains, south to northern Georgia. In the Eastern Hemisphere their range is from northern Eurasia south to northern Africa, Asia Minor, northwest India, and Japan.\footnote{30} In Canada they range from Prince Patrick and southern Ellesmere Islands in the north, to southern British Columbia, to the Algonquin district of Ontario, into the Maritimes.\footnote{31}

The raven is of the crow family (\textit{Corvidae}) which is thought to have originated in the Old World during the Miocene Period, some five to twenty-three million years ago.\footnote{32} Within the almost worldwide family \textit{Corvidae} there are twenty-six genera and some hundred and sixteen species. This thesis is concerned with the species of the genus \textit{Corvus}. In the geographical area pertinent to this thesis—southwestern Alaska and northwestern British Columbia—the crow family is made up of seven species: the Northern Raven, the Common Crow, the Northwestern Crow, the Canada Jay, the Steller Jay, Clark's Nutcracker, and the Magpie.\footnote{33} Scientific tests indicate that ravens are the bird world's most supreme intellects. This member of the \textit{Corvus} family has the largest avian cerebral hemisphere relative to its body size.\footnote{34} It is the largest passerine, or perching, bird in the world. An adult raven is all black with purplish or violet lustre.\footnote{35} "No temperature or weather limits the raven's appearance"\footnote{36} Its deep black plumage serves to maximize solar absorption, for this reason, ravens survive the harsh winters in the North, tending to be non-migratory.\footnote{37} In the coldest weather ravens are active; "their adroitness in flight and keenness in finding caribou killed by hunters or wolves are much admired."\footnote{38} Due to its huge wing-span, ravens glide and soar more than crows. In their avian runs they
are often seen to do barrel rolls, dives, and tumbles, "diving down in complex flight patterns." Ravens are admirable fliers and their courting antics in the early spring are real aerobatic displays. They do full barrel rolls, hang motionless, tumble, dive, turn twist, and spiral with a symmetry of motion that is a delight to watch.

The commonest call of the raven is a hoarse, melancholy, far-carrying, rather wooden croak or kwark. It does not caw like the crow. It also has a wide variety of other notes at its disposal: a quick, throaty cur-ruk; a bell-like croang-croang; a thung-thung-thung "bearing a remarkable resemblance to the mellow twang of a tuning fork;" as well as making numerous performances in stricking imitation of other birds such as geese and gulls. Ravens are largely scavengers, partial to the shores of rivers, lakes and the sea. This opportunistic omnivorous bird will eat almost anything nature presents: from carrion, freshly killed mammals, birds, birds' eggs, reptiles, small vertebrate, and fish, to insects, assorted vegetable matter, and garbage. Ornithological reports say that this bird is notoriously solitary, being intolerant of humans; other reports comment that ravens don't always shun civilization, when not persecuted they could be quite tame. Ravens also have a natural cleverness and trickery evidenced in their native setting. Ravens have been seen to harass Turkey Vultures, forcing the distraught birds to disgorge their food only for them to then eat. A biologist on North Baffin Island observed three ravens systematically antagonize a large sledge-dog in the successful effort to snatch the dog's frozen seal meat dinner, taking turns luring the dog from its meal, one raven finally snatched the meat,
flying away with the booty and its companions in toe. Stories abound like the above mentioned, indicating that Trickster myths about the raven may have much of their grounding in the bird's natural cunningness.

The First Peoples and Pacific Northwest Culture:

The most commonly accepted modern theory accounting for Homo sapiens and various flora and fauna on the American continents is that of ingress via a land-bridge spanning Eurasia and North America. This bridge is thought to have existed more than twenty-five thousand years ago. Constituting a broad flat plain, the so-called province of Beringia, this tract of land now lies submerged under the shallow waters of the Bering Sea. During the Pleistocene or Ice Age, the Beringia bridge was thought to have been over fifteen thousand kilometres wide; most of present-day interior Alaska, and parts of western Yukon Territory were included in this relatively transient province. It is speculated that the route of migration was an ice-free corridor called the Alaskan Refuge extending from the Canadian Rockies eastward to central Canada.

Aboriginal Americans comprise a distinct racial population closer in physical type to the Mongoloid Asiatic population than to any other. The first Asiatic migrants to enter the Alaskan Refuge from Siberia would have been of the same Homo sapiens stock that evolved into the modern Mongoloid. Genetic drift, mutations, isolation, and environmental selection processes would have operated differently in the
two hemispheres, producing two quite different populations. Even so, except for the Eskimo and Aleut who migrated much later, the American aboriginal physical type is more homogeneous than the Asian. This greater homogeneity is thought to have resulted from a small number of original settlers who provided a "found" gene pool.\textsuperscript{54} The earliest evidence of a human presence in the Americas is found on the very eastern edge of the Alaskan Refuge, at a location called Old Crow Flats on the Old Crow River in Yukon Territory. Scientists unearthed the foreleg of a caribou along with a skinning tool, carbon dated at twenty-seven thousand years ago.\textsuperscript{55}

The culture of the Northwest Coast, especially the Deluge myth, seems related to that of the Asiatic. The cultural similarities are so strong in places as to warrant the argument for the diffusion of culture across the Bering Strait.\textsuperscript{56} So too with flora and fauna:

\textit{(T)he fact that many North American birds are closely related to Asiatic species clearly means that their ancestors must have come over "from the old country" when the Bering Strait was a land-bridge.}\textsuperscript{57}

The Pacific Northwest of America is a geographic entity in itself, tied to the sea from the west and the Coast Range Mountains to the immediate east. Due to the temperate Japanese Current, and the moist prevailing westerly winds, the area is assured of a long, rich growing season and an abundance of marine life. "The Northwest Coast is a jungle in a literal sense."\textsuperscript{58} The culture of the region was oriented to the sea and food was always in surplus. As much as I would like to speak in the present tense when addressing the native cultures of this region, it would be with "wishful thinking" since so much of the rich
ancient culture is in decline. As was already stated, the highest concentration and integration of Northwest Coast culture resided in the northern tier; the centre and south portions of the coast showed variations of the northern pattern.\textsuperscript{59}

The Tlingit inhabited the northern maritime mainland, their neighbours to the west were the Eyak (Ahtena) of the Copper River Delta, an interior group with Athabascan affinities which pushed to the sea and became marked by Northwest Coast culture; beyond the Eyak, one again would enter the Eskimo country of the Chugachmiut.\textsuperscript{60} The Tlingit also occupied the coastal islands as far south as the northern half of Prince of Wales Island. It is estimated that their pre-European contact population was approximately nine thousand five hundred.\textsuperscript{61}

The Haida, an exclusively maritime people, settled Haida Gwaii, or the Queen Charlotte archipelago, located just south of the present-day Alaskan Panhandle and almost one hundred and fifty kilometres from the mainland. The Haida also reside on the southern half of Prince of Wales Island, which—according to tradition—they dispossessed the Tlingit from some two centuries ago. Haida pre-European contact population, the greatest population concentration for the area, is estimated at close to ten thousand.\textsuperscript{62}

The Tsimshian inhabited the area of the near islands abutting the mainland coast due east of the Queen Charlotte Islands and the surrounding area at the mouth of the Nass River. Their pre-European contact population numbered about three thousand five hundred. Their linguistic neighbours the Gitskan and Niska, residing further up the Nass River, numbered about the same. All totalled, the population of
these three major cultural groups would have been about twenty-seven thousand; this is relatively large compared to the populations of the Eskimo and Interior peoples. 63

The central coast area consisted of the Kwakiutl and Nootka people. They were a whaling people residing from the north of Vancouver Island covering the mainland and islands down to the northwest head of the Olympic Peninsula in Washington state. Their culture was more elaborate than the north; the development of secret societies, a combination of matrilineal and patrilineal descent, and extremes in the potlatches are some of the differences that marked these cultures. 64 The southern coast area was dominated by the Gulf of Georgia Salish, Comox, Cowichan, and other Coast Salish peoples. 65

The Tlingit, Haida, and Tsimshian had no strong delineation of nation, and no pre-eminent chief welding tribal political unity. 66 At the most, the chiefs were expected to be proud and overbearing to outsiders and those counted as rivals, but on the home scene they were obliged to be humble, gracious and generous. To some degree every individual, except the slave, was thought to be a noble. 67 Social organization was through matrilineal descent; individuals belonged to a group by virtue of descent through the female line. Girls were preferred to boys. This was due to economics and status, boys would one day leave the parental household, while girls remained until marriage and then added to the number of the lineage. 68 For the regulation of marriage, all three native communities had an exogamous system whereby individuals would marry outside of their own group. This grouping consisted of a moiety system. The Tlingit moiety were the Raven and Wolf clans; the
Haida were the Raven and Eagle. The Tsimshian had a unique four-fold division of Raven, Wolf, Eagle, and Killer Whale. In areas of daily life, it was lineage rather than moiety that assumed greatest importance.

Reciprocal exchange relationships marked the social structure of these peoples. The only way that social rank could be validated was by a wealth-distributing feast called the potlatch. Villages remained a place of permanent residence for its members, and the huge longhouse accommodated many families under one roof—a veritable village itself. They were not whalers like their southern neighbours; salmon was their most important food source, followed by halibut, smelt, and otlachon. "Of privation there was none; the culture was marked by abundance." The Northwest Coast of America was perhaps the only area of the world where a nonagricultural society possessed the institution of slavery. At the dedication of a new home, or the celebration of a special event, a wealthy member of a clan might have his/her slave(s) killed. This was void of religious intent and served only to show the community the wealth of the owner. Slaves were the product of wars between communities, and were seen as property.

As for the spiritual customs of these peoples, the creator-transformer and trickster myths, of which Raven is central, led to an incipient theology. As is typical in aboriginal Earth-based spirituality in general, there was a strong polytheistic and animistic element in the culture. Tempered with this was a vague belief in reincarnation. It is commonly thought by cultural historians that theriomorphic deities preceded anthropomorphic deities in the
development of ancient religious systems. In the culture of the Northwest Coast, there appears to have been a blending of these two types of beings; animals were seen to be immortal, returning to their natural, and essentially anthropomorphic state if given proper treatment. Suzuki notes that in aboriginal myth the "Earth's powerful original inhabitants were extraordinary hybrid human-animal beings." Commenting on aboriginal culture world-wide Suzuki goes on to say:

The diverse inhabitants of the natural world are seen as intimately bound together by virtue not only of their common mythic origins but their kinred "human" qualities, their capacity for consciousness, their inherent and unquestioned "social" worth. They are thought of as being "like persons" in that they act intelligently and have wills and idiosyncrasies, and understand and are understood by (humans). They are unabashedly embraced as kindred relations.

It is for these more subtle spiritual reasons that, prior to a hunt, a hunter would purify himself by a ritual sweat-lodge ceremony, maintain sexual constinence and avoid drinking water. Only then could a kill take place, provided the hunter was deemed worthy by the animal's spirit, and only if the spirit of the animal "gave" itself to be taken.

In closing this section the following quote highlights the prodigious level of cultural integration that these coastal people enjoyed.

Nonliterate, lacking the development of the state as such, yet the Northwest Coast becomes virtually a complex civilization. It unquestionably represents the most elaborate nonagricultural society in the world.
Raven Tales:

Science, as mentioned previously, has its explanations accounting for the origins of the North American aboriginals. So too do the natives have their own. It was in those long chilled nights of winter, when much of the year's bounty was stored, that the Raven tales were most eagerly sought after and celebrated. To the traditional Northwest Coast person everything, from the origin of humans to the creation of the world, was recognized within the gravitational pull of the stories of Raven.

Some considered Raven "a symbol of creation; others considered him a symbol of an ancient deity." In villages his image, usually with the sun or moon in his mouth, was often the most important on the totem poles. The Raven tales are essentially folktales. According to Thompson, the folktales of primitive cultures are synonymous with myths. Northwest Coast myths, or tales, stem from an ancient oral tradition. Consequently, the tales were rarely perfectly consistent. A Tlingit once said that the Raven tales are so numerous, no one person could know them all. Goodchild notes that although people were bound to tell the stories in slightly different ways, a good storyteller was one who did not try to be original. Rather, the person who could remember a story in detail, and who could tell it without deviating from its standard form was especially prized. Most scholars concede that the richest Raven cycle tales belong primarily among the Tlingit, Haida, and Tsimshian. To the Tlingit Raven is Yetl meaning "raven;" to the Haida Raven is Nankilslas "He Whose Voice Is Obeyed;" and to the Tsimshian Raven refers to Dsamsem meaning "Giant."
Raven the creator, cultural hero, trickster, and transformer of Northwest Coast lore has been extensively studied. Boas listed forty-five principal Raven tales. Thirty-seven of these appear among the Tlingit, who possess the most fully developed Raven cycle—this leads one to consider a link between the Tlingit tales and those of eastern Siberia.³⁸ Thirty-nine of Boas' list appear among the Haida; their cycle is less developed than the Tlingit and has slight deviations, "The Theft of the Sun" for instance, becomes "The Theft of the Moon." Thirty-two of those listed by Boas appear among the Tsimshian.³⁹ Boas also arranges the Raven tales into four groups: "origin tales;" "incidents based on raven's voraciousness;" "amorous adventures;" and "miscellaneous adventures."⁴⁰ Following Goodchild, I place the tales into two categories: origin tales, numbering thirteen; and trickster tales, numbering eighteen.⁴¹

ORIGIN TALES

1) The Birth Of Raven: The Deluge:

"No one knows just how the story of Raven begins, so each starts from the point where he does know it."⁴² It is now held as indisputable that the North American "Deluge" and "Earth Diver" tales have Old World origins.⁴³ In the Tlingit version of this opening tale, there are two "Raven" characters: Raven-at-the-head-of-Nass Nas-caki-yel, and Raven himself. Nas-caki-yel residing at the mouth of the Nass River created Heron and Raven. Nas-caki-yel's sister's children are all dying. Suspicion is that her brother, Nas-caki-yel, is to blame because he doesn't want her to have boys. Heron finally comes to alleviate her grief; he orders her to go to the beach at low tide, put a smooth, small
stone in the fire, and then to swallow it while it's red hot. She does this and soon gives birth to Raven.94 "Raven was made invulnerable by his mother."95 Next, Raven's same jealous uncle tries various ways to have Raven killed "accidentally." When even trying to boil Raven to death doesn't work, the uncle curses the world and brings down rain to cover the world. Raven's mother puts a loon skin on and Raven puts the skin of a white bird on, and they fly away. Raven hung in the clouds for many days and when he dropped the waters had begun to recede.96 Raven was "created" twice here but he is thought to have existed "before he was born."97

The Haida version is thought to be a combination of the Tlingit and Tsimshian.97 In the Haida version, Chief Hole-in-His-Fin (Killer Whale) and his wife Flood-Tide Woman have a son, Raven. Raven soon seduces his aunt Ice Woman. Raven and his mother are consequently sent away. Raven continues to cause trouble. One day he kills a raven and upon wearing the skin he becomes a raven. He is caught seducing his second aunt and this uncle causes a great flood to come from his hat upon finding out. Raven puts on his skin and flies to the sky. In a supplementary version, Raven creates the Queen Charlotte Islands and the mainland by following the instructions of a mysterious old man who gives Raven two pebbles.98

In the Tsimshian tale, a chieftainess wants to take the chief's nephew for her lover—the jealous uncle theme once again! In order to do this she fakes her death, at night the nephew comes to the burial grounds and she gets pregnant. She gives birth to a boy but is spotted by the chief's slave and reported. The chief has her killed but the boy
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is spared. The child survives by sucking his dead mother's intestines. Glowing like fire, the boy is finally welcomed in the community. He flies in bird skins to the "hole in heaven" where he marries a chief's daughter. He is subjected to very dangerous tasks by the chief and becomes the father of a boy--Raven. Raven falls to the sea and is soon adopted. The deluge idea here is only hinted at. Boas states that the idea behind these birth myths is the acquisition of supernatural power by Raven. In the Tlingit and Haida it is through contests with the maternal uncle and in the Tsimshian it is through his heavenly birth.

2) Raven Becomes Voracious:

In the Tlingit version Raven finds out that if he eats the black spots on his toes he will be voracious. He does so and then wanders the world in search of food.

In the Haida and Tsimshian (Tlingit also) version Raven refuses to eat, he is advised to eat the scabs off of his body, he does so and then eats the village food supply. He is sent away. Goodchild comments that, the body feeding on itself is close to not eating at all, so the divine Raven—who never needed food—becomes transformed into an earthly creature.

3) The Theft of the Sun:

This tale is the most popular of the Raven tales among the three groups. In the Tlingit version, the world is in darkness, Raven decides that he will go to the rich man (sometimes it is Nas-caki-yel) who keeps the light at the Nass River. Raven transforms himself into a small piece of dirt and floats in the spring near the house so that the
man's daughter will drink it (him). When she swallows it she becomes pregnant and gives birth to a boy who cries all the time, wanting to play with the bag of stars. The boy's grandfather finally lets him, the boy sends these into the sky, then he cries to play with the bag of the moon. The same happens. Then the boy manipulates his way into playing with the final bag with the sun in it, when he has the sun he flies out the smoke hole transformed as Raven.\textsuperscript{105}

In the Haida version Raven "shape-shifts" into a conifer needle and steals the moon instead.\textsuperscript{106}

As with the other two, the Tsimshian have many versions to the same tale. In this one the main line is that, out of pity for the people living in darkness, Raven flew to the headwaters of the Nass to steal the ball of light from the Chief of the Sky. The story remains consistent with the other two versions after this.\textsuperscript{107}

4) \textbf{Raven Threatens to Let Out the Light:}

The Tlingit tale continues with Raven returning with the sun at the mouth of the Nass, and, upon hearing many noisy people fishing, threatens that if the people keep making noise / won't take him across the river / won't give him some fish to eat, he will break daylight upon them. He is branded a liar and in his anger he reveals the daylight. The people run into the forest and become the animal of the skin they are wearing.\textsuperscript{108}

In the Haida version, Raven is coming back with the moon at the mouth of the Nass and tells the people that he will give them light if they give him fish to eat. They refuse him, so he shows a little of the light, they give him their fish, he breaks the moon into the sun and the
moon and releases them into the sky. 109

The Tsimshian tale is basically the same as the other two except
that the people are frog-people turned to stone for refusing Raven 110 or
a ghost tribe banished to the wilderness. 111 Could comments that from
darkness, chaos, and formlessness, the origin of daylight "marks the
beginning of order and in particular, social order." 112

5) The Theft of Fresh Water:

The Tlingit tale begins with the mention that there is no fresh
water in the world except for that found in the everlasting spring
 guarded by Petrel—a secretive person "without beginning or end, older
and mightier than Raven himself." 113 Raven tries to lure Petrel away
from the spring to no avail. Raven sleeps with Petrel and smears dog
dung on Petrel's buttocks. Petrel awakes and runs outside to clean,
thinking he defecated. Raven drinks up almost all the water and as he
flies up the smoke hole Petrelsummons his spirits to trap Raven (or
Raven is trapped up a tree). A fire is set under Raven turning this
once white bird black, "all other ravens with him became black." 114
When Raven does escape he spills water in various places creating the
great rivers of today. 115 This Tlingit version is the only one where
Raven changes colour after stealing the water. 116

The Haida and Tsimshian tales are the same except for omitting
the colour change. It is speculated that Petrel was perhaps an ancient
water-deity or sea-god. 117

6) The Origin of Eulachon:

In the Tlingit version Raven and Gull are arguing, Gull flies out
to sea and returns with an eulachon. Gull refuses to share so Raven
tells Heron that Gull is calling Heron names. Heron kicks Gull who
vomits up the fish only for Raven to then swallow.\textsuperscript{118}

The Haida version varies with Raven seeing the fish floating in
the sea and scooping them out with an octopus tentacle.

The Tsimshian version remains the same except that Heron is off
the scene, with Raven doing the kicking.\textsuperscript{119}

7) The Origin of the Tides:

The Tlingit tale has Raven come to a door in a cliff where the
old woman in charge of the tide lives. Raven eats a sea urchin in front
of her, when she asks at what low tide he got it, he ignores her. The
old woman pesters him until he jabs her with a sea-urchin spine in the
buttocks and has her promise to make the tide rise and fall
regularly.\textsuperscript{120}

The Haida and Tsimshian versions are very similar; Raven may be
eating sea eggs or using spruce needles to jab the woman.\textsuperscript{121}

8) War with the South Wind:

This tale is apparently not found among the Tlingit.\textsuperscript{122} In the
Haida and Tsimshian version, the South or Southeast Wind is blowing too
hard. Raven and many other animals, suffering from wind-burned eyes,
canoe to the Wind's house. The Wind's constant flatulence makes landing
difficult. They drive the Wind from his home and set a fire under him /
bite him and cause him to slip on Halibut. A compromise is reached and
Wind agrees to alternate good weather with bad.\textsuperscript{123} Hoebel claims proof
that this tale is derived from very similar and widespread Asian
tales.\textsuperscript{124}
9) The Theft of Fire:

Versions of this tale is one reason why Raven is valued as a cultural hero. In the Tlingit tale Raven sights fire far off in the sea. He gathers numerous fowl and orders chicken hawk, who had a very large bill, to fly out and retrieve some of the fire. Chicken hawk does so but by the time he returns his bill is burned off / or Raven himself suffers this fate. Raven takes some red cedar and some white stones from the beach and puts fire into them, making fire available to people all over the world.¹²⁵

The Haida and Tsimshian versions are identical, except that the fire is said to be on an island / in a house / on the bottom of the sea. Deer usually succeeds in getting the fire (or Raven wearing deer skin) with his tail consequently blackened.¹²⁶

10) The Origin of Humans; The Origin of Death:

The Tlingit tale says that Raven turned the surviving people of the flood into stone. He made a new generation out of leaves, and now people die quickly in the autumn when leaves fall to the ground.¹²⁷

Another Tlingit version recorded by Swanton states that Raven's infamous uncle, Nas-caki-yel, made humans from rock and leaf simultaneously. The leaf transformed quicker than the rock, therefore humans die quickly.¹²⁸

Boas recorded another version whereby Raven unsuccessfully attempts to make humans from stone, earth, and then wood. Finally he tries grass and it comes to life as humans, humans now grow up and die like grass.¹²⁹

The Haida have a completely different tale. Raven traveled all over the earth until he discovered a cockle on the waves of the sea. He
heard noise coming from the shell, so he hid and watched. Soon he opened the shell and discovered many people (or Raven marries a clam who gives birth to humanity). Death came into the world when Raven rejected a son who looked different from himself. As well, it is said that Raven made humans mortal to give the little wren, who sings under graves, a place to call from. Some Haida believed that when a raven called for some time and ruffled its feathers, a death would soon take place.

The Tsimshian version is close to the Tlingit. Raven overhears Stone and Elderberry Bush argue about who will give birth first: if Stone is first, people will live long; if Elderberry is first, people will die quickly. Stone is on the verge of giving birth when Raven touches Elderberry Bush and urges her to give birth first, which she does.

11) The Painting of the Birds:

All three groups have marginal tales of this sort. The Tlingit involves birds, such as Blue Jay, decorating each other; Raven turns black in "The Theft of Water" previously mentioned. The Haida and Tsimshian have an account of the blackening of crow in the soon to follow trickster tale, "The Killing of Salmon." "The Painting of Birds" is a popular motif in the tales of the Arctic and south-central Northwest Coast region. In most accounts it is either smoke, soot, ash, sun, charcoal, or lamp oil—substances related to fire—that cause the blackening of Raven. Tales attributing Raven's colour change as resulting from sin are due to Semitic, post-European contact, rather than native tradition.
12) The Origin of Fog:

The Tlingit version has Raven meet up with Petrel again while they are both in separate canoes. They argue about who is older. Petrel pushes Raven's canoe away and then puts on a fog hat. Raven cannot see Petrel and concedes that Petrel is older. Raven tells Petrel to keep the fog in the world. The Haida and Tsimshian version is the same as the Tlingit but may have Eagle or Gull replace Petrel.

13) The Origin of Salmon:

In the Tlingit tale Raven marries the daughter of Fog-over-the-salmon. When Raven is hungry, his wife washes her hands in a basket of water and salmon appear. She does this until they have plenty. Raven gets angry at her and hits her with some salmon, she leaves him. Raven begs his father-in-law to have her back but he refuses since a promise was broken to respect the woman.

In the Haida and Tsimshian versions, Raven goes to salmon country and abducts the chief's daughter. She reluctantly makes salmon for Raven by hand washing. Raven insults her by cursing the fish or accusing her of his own bad luck, she leaves and takes the salmon with her.

TRICKSTER TALES

14) Raven Kills the Salmon:

The Tlingit version begins with Raven down at the beach with his nephews, the crows. Raven has tempted a salmon to come close to shore to kill it. He sends his nephews to fetch skunk-cabbage leaves to steam the fish. While they are away he eats the salmon, and then pretends to be asleep. Upon the crows return, Raven accuses them of eating the fish
and blackens their previously white plumage with ashes. 142

The Haida tale is basically the same except that while the crows are supposed to be away to get a baking dish for the salmon, they eat the fish as Raven sleeps. The crows then place a piece of fish in Raven's mouth, Raven awakes and is not fooled. He spits at them, turning them black. 143

In the Tsimshian version the crows keep bringing back inadequate baking dishes, so Raven fetches one himself. Upon his return, Raven discovers that the crows have eaten the fish so he turns them black. 144

15) The Killing of Grizzly Bear:

In the Tlingit tale, Raven and Grizzly Bear go fishing. Raven catches lots of fish while Grizzly Bear catches none. Grizzly Bear inquires as to Raven's bait, Raven replies that he is using his testicles. Grizzly Bear cuts off his own testicles and dies (then follows "Cormorant's Tongue" sequence). Raven returns to Grizzly Bear's house and feeds his wife halibut stomachs filled with hot rocks. Raven then urges her to drink lots of water, the water turns to steam and kills her. 145

The Haida and Tsimshian versions are the same except that Raven tells Bear's wife that her husband has fainted / that he's away making new hooks, and that she should eat red-hot stones to bring her husband luck / swallow halibut stomachs whole as is the custom, when she drinks water the steam kills her. 146

16) Cormorant's Tongue Is Torn Out:

Continuing with the Tlingit version, Cormorant has accompanied Raven and Grizzly Bear fishing. In order to keep Cormorant quiet about
the killing of Grizzly Bear, Raven tricks Cormorant into sticking out his tongue, then Raven tears it out—this is why cormorants only make a gabbling sound now. 147

The Haida version is the same. In the Tsimshian tale, Raven and Cormorant are out fishing. This time it is Cormorant who catches all the fish, Raven tricks Cormorant into sticking his tongue out, and tears it off. When they arrive to shore Raven tells everyone that he caught all the fish and that Cormorant lost his voice / pulled his own tongue out with a fish hook. 148

17) The Killing of Pitch:

The Tlingit version is that Pitch has a house full of halibut, Raven convinces Pitch to show him where he caught all the fish. When they are out in the hot sun, Pitch melts and dies, Raven returns to the house and eats all the halibut. 149

The Haida and Tsimshian version is that Raven coaxes Pitch to go fishing with him. In the hot sun Pitch begins to melt, Raven pretends to be paddling hard but is really paddling edgewise, Pitch dies. 150

18) Raven's Beak Is Torn Off:

In the Tlingit tale, Raven tries to steal bait from some people fishing. He gets his beak caught on a hook and braces himself against the underside of the boat but loses his beak. The people think it's a monster's nose and hang it on a wall. Raven makes himself a false nose with spruce gum, pulls a hat over his face and inquires about the monster's nose. When he sees it he grabs it and flies off. There is no Haida or Tsimshian equivalent. 151
19) **Raven Is Swallowed by a Whale:**

With the Tlingit version, Raven enters the belly of a whale with firemaking equipment. He lives off the whale's catch of fish and then feeds off the whale itself. Finally Raven kills the whale by eating its heart, he then uses magic to land the carcass on a beach. Next he yells until some people come and cut the whale open. Raven flies away and returns after the whale's fat has been rendered to oil. He asks the people if they heard strange sounds and saw something fly away after they cut the whale, they answer affirmatively, he tells them that this is a terrible omen. The people run away and Raven has the oil to himself. This tale is found among the Haida in the same detail but is missing from the Tsimshian cycle.  

20) **Raven Travels with His Slave:**

Due to the highly stratified nature of Northwest Coast society, a tale with a chief-slave relationship is almost surely native to this region and not attributable to the Old World. By virtue of tradition, a chief is not to address his underlyings directly. Therefore he needs a "speaker"—usually a slave. Raven transforms a raspberry bush into the man Kitsino. Kitsino was to be Raven's speaker. Upon arrival to a village they are offered food, Raven welcomes the offer, but Kitsino says that Raven isn't hungry. Raven goes without food. At another village Raven gets the idea to play dead (putting fish oil in his eye), and instructs Kitsino to tell the people to leave the house. Kitsino puts Raven in a box and has the people leave. Kitsino eats all the food. Raven then wanders the earth with Butterfly, and tricks Butterfly into crossing a long fjord on a piece of giant kelp.
Butterfly falls and Raven, pretending he is mourning, eats the intestines of his friend and then revives him to life. The Haida version, Raven creates a slave as a speaker. Raven wants the slave to tell the chief that Raven has weasels hanging from his nose, the slave disobeys and tells the truth that it is really salmon heads hanging from Raven's nose. The Tsimshian and Haida continue with the extension that Raven tricks the slave into crossing a fragile bridge, the slave falls to his death and Raven, pretending he is mourning, eats the contents of the slave's stomach.

21) Raven Gathers Poor Food:

In the Tlingit version, Raven only catches small fish while his friend Cakaku catches all the large ones. Cakaku has an enormous amount of fish grease from the catch while Raven has barely any. Raven has a dream that a great enemy is coming to attack them. To fulfill the dream, Raven assembles a great flock of birds to fight. Cakaku goes outside to watch the spectacle and Raven begins drinking up the grease in a box. Cakaku catches Raven and traps him in the box. While Cakaku is tying the box with a strong rope, Raven tells him to use straw as did their forefathers. Cakaku complies, and when he throws the box from a cliff, Raven easily escapes with a full belly. The Haida version is fairly different, Eagle shows up and Raven tells him to rub black cod on a stump. Raven becomes the stump but instead of tasting cod, Eagle rubs red-hot stones. There is apparently no Tsimshian version.

22) Raven Becomes a Woman:

The Tlingit tale has Raven decide that he wants to be a woman. She sees some killer whales and marries one. When she arrives at a
village the people think Raven is very important since only a chief's
daughter is ever fetched by canoe. The whales food supply begins to
mysteriously disappear. Raven's labret is found in a grease box, she
claims that it has a habit of wandering off on its own. Next she claims
she had a dream her husband died, to fulfill the dream, that night she
kills her husband with a sharp stick. She asks that she and her husband
be sent far away so that she could mourn. Instead of mourning she eats
the whale. Later she comments to the whales that she turned the birds
flying overhead white. They ask her to turn them white. She says it
will be painful and take courage, they line up in a row and Raven kills
all but one, who escapes, with the sharp stick.159

The Haida have a similar tale that begins with Raven asking for
food for her child, but instead she eats it all. The whales don't die
in this version. The Tsimshian appear to not have this tale.160
Scholars speculate that Raven's change of sex is a parody on the
homosexuality and transvestism common to the custom of shamanism. Such
a tale would have served to release psychological tension from the daily
fear of such powerful people.161

23) The Bungling Host:

This popular tale is found throughout North America in various
versions, it is perhaps of Old World origin.162 In the Tlingit version,
Bear invites Raven to a meal. While he is serving, Bear slits his
wrists and lets grease fall onto Raven's salmon. Then Bear cuts flesh
from his own thigh to feed Raven. When Raven invites Bear to a meal he
tries the same tactics but fails utterly.163 There doesn't seem to be a
Haida or Tsimshian version.164
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24) The Visit to Shadow Town:

In this Tlingit and Haida tale the moral seems obvious. Raven arrives on his boat to an abandoned house. The house is full of floating shadows and feathers, at first Raven is afraid. He then spots numerous boxes of food, he decides to cook a meal and the shadows supply him with cook-ware. After the meal he begins to gratefully leave, but decides to take all the food with him. Upon loading down the boat, the shadows come and beat him up. When he is revived the food is gone, upon his return he tells everyone he fell from a rock.165

25) Raven Kills Deer:

In this Tlingit tale Raven pretends to befriend Deer. Raven tricks Deer into crossing a bridge made of wild celery / a rotten stick. Raven, being lighter, crosses without incident. When Deer tries to cross he falls to his death. While pretending to mourn a friend, Raven eats Deer.166

In the Haida version, Raven and Deer go out to chop wood. Raven asks Deer to hold the wedges, but then strikes Deer on the head with the hammer and eats him.167 There appears to be to Tsimshian version.

Although most of the better known Raven tales are found among the Tlingit, there are some major stories missing from the Tlingit: "Raven Steals Salmon Eggs" (Haida); "Raven Burns a Girl's Groin" (Haida); "The Master Fisherman" (Haida); and, "The Arrow of the Supernatural Being" (Tsimshian).168

Conclusion:

The explication of the main Raven cycle is complete. It is important to remember that versions of some of the above mentioned tales
appear in the Arctic and other more southerly Northwest Coast tribes. I will briefly examine the question of Raven's status as a deity as well as discuss his trickster role and his paradoxical function within the myth cycle.

Raven is very hard to categorize. Is he good or bad? He certainly has a history of helping humankind, yet he is also the epitome of greed and opportunism run rampant. How could such a difficult figure find its way into the bedrock of a culture? The issue is not whether Raven tales are a product of Old World diffusion or not. The issue is, why is he so attractive to people in the first place? He threatens order with his pushing at the bounds of social custom...yet he gives fire, low tides, warm west winds. Lévi-Strauss considers tricksters like Raven to be "mediators;" Raven mediates between the polarities of experience just as his omniverousness "mediates" between the carnivore and the herbivore. From a Jungian perspective, von Franz says that the trickster reminds humans that each of us is born in an imperfect and questionable state, that "to be wrong and split is human nature." 170

There is the myth of the trickster god who is especially stupid, and from a certain angle (the human) is very stupid and does not have enough sense to be balanced. 171

Further more, she sees the trickster archetype as psychologically arousing "the desire for some kind of compensation," especially as this relates to the extreme devotionalism evidenced in religious rites. 172

Raven is not just a trickster though, he is very much a creator as well. The question as to whether Raven is a deity only highlights how the human mind likes to dichotomize experience. If he doesn't stand within our accepted notions of the godly then he isn't a god.
Tricksters are too sly for that kind of thinking! Goodchild asks, was he a deity first and then later demoted to buffoon; or was he always a clown and only recently became clumsily elevated to the role of a deity?\textsuperscript{173} Why formulate an either/or question? Is it not possible to see Raven as a holy buffoon? Surely there are noble and deceitful figures in Greco-Roman myths who we wouldn't hesitate to see as deities— not to mention other religious traditions.

The general view of the raven as a creator, as a sacred or divine figure, may be related to the fact that a dozen anthropomorphic Old World gods have the raven as their pet or messenger.\textsuperscript{174}

Jung says that all mythological figures correspond to inner psychic experiences.\textsuperscript{175} What inner experiences does Raven speak to? Why does he spring from our psyches in the first place? Perhaps as von Franz says, trickster gods (and goddesses) remind us of our imperfect state as human beings. Jung understood the trickster character to be "an archetypal structure of extreme antiquity."\textsuperscript{176} Hence, the trickster is a product of the collective unconscious, and, when present, is welcomed by the individual as something familiar. The trickster function is a personification of a collective shadow figure. The "shadow" is simply all positive and negative personality traits relegated to the unconscious due to repression. "The trickster function is a personification of traits of character which are sometimes worse and sometimes better than those of the ego personality."\textsuperscript{177} When the trickster emerges in myths or dreams it is serving a compensatory function. Its purpose is to have a therapeutic effect upon the individual. It has "a secret attraction and fascination for the conscious mind."\textsuperscript{178} Jung states that the trickster myth operates with
two contradictory tendencies: the desire to get out of an earlier condition of unconsciousness, and the desire to not forget what it was like to be in that place.

It is no accident that we are forced to contradict ourselves as soon as we try to formulate (the human) paradoxical attitude to myth...Something in (people) is profoundly disinclined to give up (their) beginnings, and something else believes it has long since got beyond all that.179

The conflict between these two dimensions of consciousness express the polaristic structure of the psyche, "dependent upon the tension of opposites."180 The trickster serves to remind people that the many disasters that befall people as a result of unconscious functioning contain the seed of its opposite. Garfield notes that the trickster cycle nears completion with an "awakening social responsibility and ends on the motif of the culture hero voluntarily divested of his trickery role."181 And we see just this with Raven. By the end of the myth cycle he is going to all created things and saying, "Are you going to hurt human beings? Say now either yes or no." Those that said "No" he passed by, those that said "Yes" he rooted up.182 Campbell states that the trickster represents,

the chaos principle, the principle of disorder, the force careless of taboos and shattering bounds. But from the point of view of the deeper realms of being from which the energies of life ultimately spring, this principle is not to be despised.183

Raven compensates the ego personality's need to have everything ordered and categorized. Like the savior, Raven embodies the divine and bestial, the sacred and profane.184 Raven shakes up our notions of how a god "should" act. He is the embodiment of paradox and as that embodiment he leads the "hearer of the Word" (of the tale) beyond the
opposites that are indicative of the soul/psyche caught in false
dualities. Raven, god and fool, points to a greater mystery, the
darkness, that enables one to laugh at the folly of falsely dichotomized
perception.

Raven reminds us to question the established ruts we are born
into. He points beyond himself—as does his "sister" Kali. These dark
deities remind us that the reality beyond (and beneath?) the ebb and
flow of this tumultuous one, is the true One. Raven, the mischievous
and majestic, fools us into seeing in him the (seemingly) irreconcilable
opposites. But to the mind capable of holding the tensions, Raven
rewards by pointing to the Divine Dark by virtue of his paradoxical
function. Raven, our "inner" trickster and benefactor, creates an
opportunity for meaning where none seems apparent.

Never forget me. Never forget Raven,
Creator of the world.
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Conclusion

I believe in the kingdom come.  
When all the colours will bleed into one.  
But I still haven't found what I'm looking for.  

U2  
(Irish rock group)

When the knowledge of non-difference dawns, black forms blend with one another.  

Prasada\(^1\)

I said to my soul, be still,  
and let the darkness come upon you  
Which shall be the darkness of God.  

T.S. Eliot\(^2\)

What is the function of dark images of divinity in relation to an understanding of Divine Darkness? This has been the guiding thesis question. In the study of Kali and Raven, as image equivalents of Shankara and Eckhart's concept of Divine Darkness, I have accomplished an hermeneutic of the visible. My endeavour has been to explore the success of the Image, instead of the Word, as a trustworthy mediator between the known and the unknown.

In Chapter One, I presented a working definition of symbolism. Drawing upon Carl Jung's theory of human cognition, I suggested that certain numinous symbols have a natural link to their referent—the archetype(s) of the collective unconscious. The chapter acknowledged that not all scholars are unanimous with regard to whether even some symbols have a natural link to their referent. Jung's theory postulates that although the archetypes in their foundation are essentially hidden, by virtue of symbolization they become "indirectly discernable through the arrangements they produce in conscious"(p. 11). This Jungian hermeneutic recognizes certain religious symbols as manifestations of
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the archetype(s) of the collective unconscious. I stated that these symbols "partially participate" in their referent, thereby giving the symbol a numinous quality. I closed the chapter highlighting that, although some symbols have a natural link to their referent they must not be mistaken for their referent.

In Chapter Two, I explored the concept of "Divine Darkness." I began with an in depth examination of Vedic scripture; the Upanishadic philosophy of Atman and Brahman; and the life of Acharya Shankara. In the Advaita Vedanta school, of which Shankara was the greatest proponent, I examined the concepts of Higher Brahman and Lower Brahman. I showed how the Higher Brahman is considered the only true reality, while the Lower Brahman, and manifest reality, is considered an illusion. There followed an in depth analysis of how false perception can be overcome and knowledge of the ineffable and qualityless Higher Brahman attained. From there I introduced the thought of Meister Eckhart. Beginning with a history of his life, then turning to his Christian negative theology, I gave an in depth analysis of his concepts of Godhead and God. I showed how Eckhart's understanding of the Godhead very closely parallels the Higher Brahman of Shankara. Eckhart stated that creation is a mere "nothing," and yet that creatures share the same ground as the Godhead. He conceived that although the Godhead is a mystery it can be known in an "unknowing knowing." Finally, I explored the thought of Jung and his notion of the archetypal Self. I juxtaposed the Self with the Godhead and the Higher Brahman as parallel concepts. With a Jungian backing, I made a case for seeing certain religious symbols as manifestations of the Self. I re-introduced Jung's theory of
symbols and speculated that the Lower Brahman, the gods/goddesses, and
God, are symbolic representations of the essentially hidden Self. I
closed the chapter with a statement by a modern Jungian that images are
more inclusive and more complex than concepts.

Chapter Three involved an exposition of the ancient Indus Valley
civilization; the arrival of the Vedic culture of the Aryans; and the
rise of goddess worship in medieval Hinduism. From there I discussed
the composite role of the Mahadevi in relation to the Devi. Whereupon
the history of Kali from the periphery to the centre of the Hindu
pantheon was explored. As image equivalent to the concept Divine
Darkness, I explored the personification of Kali's image as the black
deity; the fierceness of her character juxtaposed with her maternal
benevolence; and her role as divine embodiment of Life. I made
reference to textual sources, and highlighted her paradoxical nature.

In Chapter Four, I briefly examined raven myths from around the
world. From there, I presented an ornithological study of ravens; the
arrival of The First Peoples to the Pacific Northwest of America,
especially the cultures of the Tlingit, the Haida, and the Tsimshian;
and gave an elaboration of the Raven cycle of myths from these cultures.
With recourse to numerous stories handed down from oral tradition, I
examined the composite role of Raven as creator, cultural hero,
transformer and trickster. I made a case for how this figure should be
considered a god even though he seems like such an unlikely candidate.
Then I examined his trickster role, supplementing this with Jungian
insights. Finally, in highlighting the seemingly contradictory
qualities of this cunning god, I discussed his paradoxical nature.
Synthesis:

It is Aristotle who said that "the soul never thinks without an image;"\textsuperscript{3} Hillman who said that "the image is always more inclusive, more complex than the concept" (p. 51.); and the Venerable Tulka Chagdud Rinpoche who affirmed that "(t)he water of the mind runs through the cleansing filter of the image."\textsuperscript{4} I contend that humans have a deep psychological need to image the boundless paradoxical background of life. It has been my contention throughout that Kali and Raven, by virtue of their paradoxical nature, function as images of the concept Divine Darkness. Using a Jungian hermeneutic—especially as this relates to the notion of the archetype(s) of the collective unconscious—this thesis discussed Kali and Raven as symbolic representations of the hidden ground of the Self.

Shankara, Eckhart, and Jung give hints of what lies on the other side of darkness. Shankara sums up the teachings of the Upanishads with the declaration that Brahman=Atman. Eckhart encapsulates the teachings of the Bible when he states that the Godhead and the soul share the same ground. And Jung affirms that manifestations of the Self, the tendency toward wholeness and meaning in the psyche, cannot be differentiated from experiences of the Godhead.

This thesis has encountered many paradoxes. For example, if the Godhead (Higher Brahman, Self) is ineffable, then can it truly be represented? I have argued that the Godhead cannot be "revealed in itself," it can be known only through symbolic representation. Just as the concept Divine Darkness is meant to communicate the final inadequacy of language when referring to the Godhead; so too, the images of the two
dark deities, Kali and Raven, are meant to show the final inadequacy of symbolic images when referring to the Godhead. Ultimately, both concept and image are of the illusory world of "name and form" and so are only partially helpful in a knowledge of the Godhead. Yet, as the sages discovered and paradoxically communicated, knowledge of the Godhead can be acquired through a supraconceptual comprehension; symbolic discourse and images "forced on us by our nature" (p. 6.) pave the way for such an understanding. Eckhart declared, "I become so rich that God is not sufficient" (p. 42.). Shankara conceded that, "(t)he one who is redeemed from God does not turn back, but on the path of gradual redemption finds at last Brahman-nirvana" (p. 32.).

In showing how certain numinous symbols have a natural link to the archetype(s) of the collective unconscious, I contend that Kali and Raven symbolize the incomprehensibility at the core of the archetypal Self. Kali and Raven are dark because they symbolize the Unknown. The Unknown remains essentially preserved in unintelligibility when any and all concepts and images about the Godhead function paradoxically. Kali contains the paradox of fierceness in her benevolence, and destruction in her creative generativity. Raven contains the paradox of wisdom in his foolishness, and majesty in his mischievousness. The nature of these two deities is paradoxical enough to illuminate the fact of essential unknowability in the Godhead without making the error of espousing final intelligibility by merely symbolizing the Unknown. It is to be remembered that as symbols of the Unknown, these deities are only partially revelatory towards their referent—as any numinous symbol only partially contains the seed of its referent.
Both Kali and Raven shatter illusions resulting from dualistic thinking. Kali and Raven's voracious appetites consume the manifold pairs of opposites. Their voracious appetites mirror manifest reality in its cycle of birth and decay. They reveal the folly of desire by themselves being victims of their own appetites. Yet, they show how the world of "name and form" has within it the seed of the Godhead: Kali lives off of blood, and Raven swallows the sun—both symbols of Life/the Divine.

Kali and Raven's blackness hints at the dissolution of distinctions in the Godhead, and their colour is, as the concept Divine "Darkness," a fitting symbol of ultimate mystery and ineffability when referring to the Godhead. These deities illuminate the ineffability of the Godhead in the same way that the concept Divine Darkness does. By virtue of their paradoxical quality, the concept and the image point beyond themselves. As numinous symbols contain archetypal seeds, so too, the image and the concept owe their existence to emanations from the archetypal Self.

A Jungian perspective considers all that takes place in life, to take place in the psyche of the individual. For a Jungian, the tensions are held between seeing Kali and Raven as deities in their own right, and yet as archetypal images, manifestations of the collective unconscious. Just as a symbol is not to be mistaken for its referent, so Kali and Raven must not, in the end, be mistaken for the Godhead (Self, Higher Brahman). They are "mediators" of this dark reality.

Von Franz asks the question: Are there many archetypes, or just countless expressions of the one (of the Self)? Von Franz, herself,
suspects that the multitude of archetypal constellations are one in the Self. She urges a "double attitude" toward life so that the individual may be open to the unconscious. And here "unconscious" is a concept that simply refers to that which is unknown or unclear to consciousness. Just as the darkness of Kali and Raven contain the seeds of illumination, she finds "the light of the unconscious" within the "unapproachable, disgusting shell of depressing blackness" found in dreams. She goes on to say,

Clearly there are two possibilities of consciousness, namely a rigid one and one which has a paradoxical attitude and therefore does justice to the paradoxical factor of the unconscious. The latter would be what you could call a consciously open system, an open Weltanschauung which is always ready to accept its opposite, or meet the opposite and accept its contradictions. If you have a conscious attitude which is ready to accept the opposite, to accept the conflict and the contradiction, then you can connect with the unconscious.

From this connection with the unconscious, a Jungian stated that enlightenment can "come from that dark place," provided one takes the "dangerous, paradoxical passage to the 'other side.'"

Concluding Comments:

The journey into the study of darkness is no delight. Everything must change. I had to lose God in order to gain the Godhead. I had to lose myself in the dance of Lower Brahman in order to gain insight into the Higher. Like the Tibetan dākṣiṇa, a person compelled onto the spiritual path due to illness, I was unwittingly catapulted onto the "nameless" path. Descent into the wilderness, initiation by fire, return to my kith and kin; so marks my journey. By such a rite of
passage I could not help being scorched by the fires of confusion, rejection, self awareness, and abiding love. The darkness of Kali and Raven redoubles onto me. It is said that dark deities are dark (scorched) from entering lives on fire. My life has certainly been on fire with the desire to illuminate the darkness of our world through the power of an ancient wisdom, an ancient ignorance. It is an interesting paradox that darkness can result from light. To move ever closer to the Godhead is to be burned by the brilliance of the light, perhaps. Like Arjuna needing new eyes to apprehend the Higher Brahman (Bhagavad-Gita 11:8), and Moses at the burning bush unable to look at the brilliance of the Godhead (Exodus 3:6), so too have I needed, from time to time, a refractive light: Kali, Raven, and other dark figures have served this purpose. Just as any astronomer uses averted vision—looking away, paradoxically, in order to see a stellar object more clearly—so too these black figures allow me to "see," to penetrate, the boundless mystery residing in my Self.

With Eckhart, in my dark night of the soul, I prayed, "God rid me of God." I was answered with a wisdom so ancient that its darkness has been lost to many—and its luminosity. Why do I call something as lofty as this perennial spirituality dark? Because for the thinking mind, the grasping ego, this wisdom is utter darkness. As the Buddha experienced the direct insight of non-duality, beyond the world of "name and form," so I anticipate the parting of the dark curtain. What will I find? The hushed wisdom of the sages say, "It is you who must make the effort, the masters only point the way." Perhaps to part the curtain will be to "arrive where we started and know the place for the first time."
To say that one is "longing for darkness" is to say that one longs for transformation, for a darkness that brings balance, wholeness, integration, wisdom, insight.\textsuperscript{13}

What seems to be clear from the research before us is that Kali is a mediatrix between the unconscious and the conscious, and Raven, that scorched messenger of the sun, is equally so. They tell us to keep an open paradoxical attitude in order to encounter the numinous. Kali and Raven, creator-destroyer-majestic-buffoon, remind us that the Godhead is more and other than what we think from our dualistic perspective. They tell of an ineffable numinosity which sees that "(c)reation is as much destruction as construction."\textsuperscript{14}

Why should we listen to the message of these deities? We live in a world of untold suffering and anguish. We live the great illusion of separateness: spirit-matter, good-bad, right-wrong, strong-weak, in this duality we find the justification to destroy each other and to pillage our cosmos. It is Kali who shocks us out of illusion, and it is Raven who allows us to laugh in the face of death—the final illusion! All this to prepare us for the encounter with the Godhead.

Just as seriousness is no substitute for humour, the Word is no substitute for the Image. Yet, just as seriousness is antecedent to humour, so the Word prepares for the Image. My hope is that this thesis has been the preliminary for marvelling at the Image. Darkness, the place of introspection and waiting, emptiness and ripening, also has many negative connotations. In the tradition of The People of The Book (Jews, Christians, Muslims), the dark angel Satan was once Lucifer the light-bearer; perhaps early on in the tradition this figure was banished to the side-lines because the quality of paradox could not be sustained
by the orthodoxy; it is clear that as the tradition stabilized this figure became a bonafide demon, symbol of pure evil. Evil, repugnance, inferiority, disgust, abject ignorance, all these associations are also connected with the word "darkness." Yet, this is not the darkness I long for. I long for the Neti, Neti (Not This, Not This)-God, that spacious Godhead beyond the monopolies of bureaucratic religions and ideologues. "Gospel of Bondage," a modern folk-song by Bruce Cockburn, laments that "God cannot be reduced to an ideology." I feel hopeful.

Suffering, death, and ignorance is a mystery. I do not know why I see the world as separate, nor why I perceive the Divine outside of my own ontological being. This I call the "Deliberate Darkness" of God. It is a great metaphorical message that the moon appears blackest (new) when it's nearest the sun. Perhaps the further we go into the dark, unknown regions of our Self, the more blackened we become to those we leave behind in the world of "name and form." As Raven swallowed the sun, in my difficult and holy ignorance I remind myself that I contain a great fiery wheel of light within me—burning in the heart of Darkness.

"In a dark time, the eye begins to see."\(^{15}\)

The body is a bow, On the arrow, the mind its tip, darkness the target. Pierce the darkness, and you will come to that which is not shrouded in darkness. Pierce that again, and you will see as it were a wheel of sparks, throbbing, of the colour of the sun, mighty in power and vigour—Brahman beyond the darkness, shining in the sun up there, shining in the moon and lightning. And seeing Brahman you will draw nigh to immortality.

(Maitrayana-Brahmana Upanishad VI 5.24)\(^{16}\)
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