

“The Varieties of Religious Experience” by William James Revisited “As Variedades da Experiência Religiosa” de William James Revisitada

Luís Malta LOUCEIRO

M. A. Graduate at the Pontifical Catholic University of São Paulo, Brazil
louceiro@uol.com.br

Abstract: *In 1901 it was up to William James (1842-1910) to give the renowned Gifford Lectures in Edinburgh, Scotland, where he spoke about “The Varieties of Religious Experience,” published afterwards in a single volume by The Modern Library (NY) in 1902. Our objective herein will be, firstly, to review his Lecture XVIII, which deals with “Philosophy” – in which he shows the impotence of theology and of idealism to handle Life in general and mystical experience in particular -, introduces Peirce (1839-1914) and Pragmatism as the ideal method of investigation. Secondly, once there is a major difference between James’ Pragmatism and Peirce’s Pragmaticism, we will try to retrace the trail of this idea, Pantheism, or Objective-idealism, of which Peirce is legitimate heir, which Schelling (1775-1854) -, departing from Kant’s (1724-1804) Critiques and from Fichte’s (1762-1814) Science of Nature -, went to fetch, especially (I) in the mysticism of Meister Eckhart (c.1260-c.1328), (II) in the occultism of Böhme (1575-1624), inspired in the Jewish kabbala, (III) in philosopher and theologian Franz Xaver von Baader (1765-1841) and, (IV) in the Upanishads, translated (1844) for him by Max Müller (1823-1900) -, to change the course of Western Philosophy and help to bring about the advent of a new science, Psychology. Thirdly, we will pass on to Lectures XVI and XVII on Mysticism, in which we will introduce Astanga-Yoga – the heart of this magnum-opus of Hindu mystical literature, which are the Yoga-Sūtras (“Aphorisms of Yoga”), codified by Sri Patañjali in c. 147 BCE – as an example of the “methodic cultivation” (James, 390) which promises to lead the practitioner to “mystical experiences of plateau” (Pierre Weil; Ken Wilber). So as to analyze it better -, when possible with the lenses of Peirce (or else with other thinkers’) -, we will reveal the socio-historical context (large sense), its epistemic-ontological structure (strict sense), always aiming at “translating” it through analogies with the narratives produced by other mystics and artists of that and other traditions.*

Key-words: *Astanga-Yoga. Emerson. Fernando Pessoa. James. Jung. Meister Eckhart. Mysticism. Peirce. Religious Experience. Schelling. Schopenhauer. Tantra. Upanishads. Zen.*

Resumo. Em 1901 coube a William James (1842-1910) dar as prestigiosas *Conferências Gifford* em Edimburgo, Escócia, onde falou sobre “As Variedades da Experiência Religiosa,” publicadas depois em um único volume pela *The Modern Library* (NY) em 1902. Interessar-nos-á, aqui, em primeiro lugar, rever a sua *Palestra XVIII*, que trata da “Filosofia” – em que mostra a impotência da *teologia* e do *idealismo* para dar conta da *Vida* em geral e da *experiência mística* em particular -, e apresenta Peirce (1839-1914) e o *pragmatismo* como *método de investigação* ideal. Em segundo lugar, uma vez que há uma grande diferença entre o *pragmatismo* de James e o *pragmaticismo* de Peirce, buscaremos refazer a trajetória dessa idéia, o *panteísmo*, ou o *idealismo-objetivo*, de que Peirce é legítimo herdeiro, que Schelling (1775-1854) -, a partir das *Críticas* de Kant (1724-1804) e da *Ciência da Natureza* de Fichte (1762-1814) -, foi buscar, especialmente (I) no *misticismo* de Mestre Eckhart (c.1260-c.1328), (II) no *ocultismo* de Böhme (1575-1624), inspirado na *cabala judaica*, (III) no filósofo e teólogo Franz Xaver von Baader (1765-1841) e, (IV) nas *Upanishads*, traduzidas (1844) para ele por Max Müller (1823-1900) -, para mudar o curso da Filosofia Ocidental e ajudar no advento de uma nova ciência, a Psicologia. Em terceiro lugar, vamos passar às *Palestras XVI e XVII sobre Misticismo*, em que apresentaremos o *Astanga-Yoga* – coração dessa obra-prima da literatura mística indiana, que são os *Yoga-Sūtras* (“Aforismos da Ioga”), codificado por *Sri Patañjali* em c. 147 AEC – como um exemplo do “cultivo metódico” (James, 390-2) que promete levar o praticante, gradualmente, a “experiências místicas de platô” (Pierre Weil; Ken Wilber). Para melhor analisá-lo -, sempre que possível com as *lentes* de Peirce (senão com a de outros pensadores) -, mostraremos seu contexto sócio-histórico (*sentido lato*), sua estrutura epistêmico-ontológico (*sentido estrito*), sempre buscando “traduzi-lo” em analogias com as *narrativas* produzidas por outros *místicos* e *artistas* dessa e de outras tradições.

Palavras-chave: *Astanga-Yoga*. Emerson. Experiência Religiosa. Fernando Pessoa. James. Jung. Mestre Eckhart. Misticismo. Peirce. Schelling. Schopenhauer. Tantra. Upanishads. Zen.

* * *

“It is my belief that a large acquaintance with particulars often makes us wiser than the possession of abstract formulas, however deep.” – William James. *The Varieties of Religious Experience*. Preface. xv.

Right after the 9th International Meeting on Pragmatism, Professor Peter Hare from the University of New York at Buffalo and editor of the renowned Journal *Transactions of the Charles Sanders Peirce Society*, in his evaluation of that meeting, was surprised with the absence of William James (1842-1910) from our Meetings. It was with this in mind that I decided to revisit one of the most important works of Emerson’s (1803-82) godson in this *Communication*.

In 1901 it was up to William James (1842-1910) to give the renowned *Gifford Lectures* in Edinburgh, Scotland, where he spoke about “The Varieties of Religious Experience,” published afterwards in a single volume by *The Modern Library* (NY) in 1902. Our objective herein will be, firstly, to review his *Lecture XVIII*, which deals with “Philosophy” – in which he shows the impotence of *theology* and of *idealism* to handle *Life* in general and *mystical experience* in particular -, introduces Peirce (1839-1914) and *Pragmatism* as the ideal *method of investigation*. Secondly, once there is a major difference between James’ *Pragmatism* and Peirce’s *Pragmaticism*, we will try to retrace the trail of this idea, *Pantheism*, or *Objective-idealism*, of which Peirce is legitimate heir, which **Schelling** (1775-1854) -, departing from Kant’s (1724-1804) *Critiques* and from Fichte’s (1762-1814) *Science of Nature* -, went to fetch, especially (I) in the *mysticism* of Meister Eckhart (c.1260-c.1328), (II) in the *occultism* of Böhme (1575-1624), inspired in the Jewish *kabbala*, (III) in philosopher and theologian Franz Xaver von Baader (1765-1841) and, (IV) in the *Upanishads*, translated (1844) for him by Max Müller (1823-1900) -, to change the course of Western Philosophy¹ and help to bring about the advent of a new science, Psychology.² Thirdly, we will pass on to *Lectures XVI* and *XVII on Mysticism*, in which we will introduce *Astanga-Yoga* – the heart of this magnum-opus of Hindu mystical literature, which are the *Yoga-Sūtras* (“Aphorisms of Yoga”), codified by *Sri Patañjali* in c. 147 BCE – as an example of the “**methodic cultivation**” (James, 390) which promises to lead the practitioner to “mystical experiences of plateau” (Pierre Weil; Ken Wilber). So as to analyze it better -, when possible with the *lenses of Peirce* (or else with other thinkers’) -, we will reveal the socio-historical context (*large sense*), its epistemic-ontological structure (*strict*

¹ Think of Schopenhauer (1788-1860) and Nietzsche (1844-1900), and of their heirs.

² Think of Freud (1856-1936) and Jung (1875-1961), and of Transpersonal psychologists like the French-Brazilian Pierre Weil (n. 1924) and American Ken Wilber (n. 1949), the latter with an impressive opus and yet, practically Unknown in Brazil, despite the unrelenting efforts to divulge it by Ari Raynsford (PhD at MIT) in the last 17 years.

sense), always aiming at "translating" it through analogies with the *narratives* produced by other *mystics* and *artists* of that and other traditions.

Lecture XVIII on Philosophy

James starts this lecture with a series of questions on whether philosophy may supply – or not – "universal authority" (*VRE*, 421) – i.e., objectivity – to the *mystical experience*, which would be far too "private" and "dumb" (*VRE*, 422). He commences by saying it *may*, once, though, "*feeling* is the deeper source of religion," (emphasis added) and "philosophical and theological formulas are "secondary products, like translations of a text into another tongue" (*VRE*, 422), "we are thinking beings, and we cannot exclude the intellect from participating in any of our functions. Even in soliloquizing with ourselves," he says, "we construe our feelings intellectually" (*VRE*, 423). And adds,

Both our personal ideals and our religious and mystical experiences must be interpreted congruously with the kind of scenery which our thinking mind inhabits. The philosophic climate of our time inevitably forces its own clothing on us. Moreover, we must exchange our feelings with one another and in doing so we have to speak, and to use general and abstract verbal formulas. Conceptions and constructions are thus a necessary part of our religion; and as moderator amid the Clash of hypotheses, and mediator among the criticisms of one man's constructions by another, philosophy will always have much to do. (*VRE*, 423).³

What he proposes next, however, is to exclude "intellectualism" (*VRE*, 424) - "dogmatic theology" (*ibidem, ibidem*) and the "philosophy of the absolute" (*ibidem, ibidem*) – from the sphere of "the science of religions" (*ibidem, ibidem*) so as to arrive at Pragmatism, before which he states:

When all is said and done, it was the English and Scotch writers, and not Kant⁴, Who introduced "the critical method" into philosophy, the one method fitted to make philosophy a study worthy of serious men. For what seriousness can possibly remain in debating philosophic propositions that will never make an appreciable difference to us in action? (*VRE*, 434)⁵

James then introduces Peirce (*VRE*, 434-5) to his public, as "an American philosopher of eminent originality," about whom he says:

[He] has rendered thought a service by disentangling from the particulars of its application the principle by which these men were instinctively guided, and by singling it out as fundamental and giving to it a Greek name. He calls it the principle of

³ This, matter of fact, is one of the central thesis of Gershom Scholem (1897-1982) in his book "A Cabala e seu Simbolismo" ("Kabbala and its Symbolism": "But if [the mystic] tries to communicate his experience – and it is only by so doing that one can know him – he is obliged to interpret it by means of pre-existing language, images and concepts" (p. 13).

⁴ Kant says: "It was Hume who woke me up from the dogmatic slumber" (*CPuR*).

⁵ On page 433 he had already said: "What God hath joined together, let no man put asunder, The Continental schools of philosophy have too often overlooked the fact that man's thinking is organically connected with his conduct. It seems to me to be the chief glory of English and Scottish thinkers to have kept the organic connection in view. The guiding principle of British philosophy has in fact been that every difference must *make* a difference, every theoretical difference somewhere issue in a practical difference, and that the Best method of discussing points of theory is to Begin by ascertaining what practical difference would result from one alternative or the other being true. What is the particular truth in question *known as*? In what facts does it result? What is its *cash-value* in terms of particular experience?" (p. 433-4). We are here, therefore, on the threshold of Pragmatism.

pragmatism, and He defends it somewhat as follows:⁶ - “Thought in movement has for its only conceivable motive the attainment of belief, of thought at rest. Only when our thought about a subject has found its rest in belief can our action on the subject firmly and firmly Begin. Beliefs, in short, are rules of action; and the whole function of thinking is but one step in the production of active habits. [We only wish to know] [W]hat conduct it is fitted to produce; that conduct is for us its sole significance” (*VRE*, 435).⁷

To James, the “principle of pragmatism” will serve to “help us on this occasion to decide, among the various attributes set down in the scholastic inventory of God’s perfections, whether some be not far less significant than others” (*VRE*, 435). The main issue to him is that “in the theologians’ hands” [...] “verbalism has stepped into the place of vision, professionalism into that of life.” (*VRE*, 437). However, deep down, “what keeps religion going is something else than abstract definitions and systems of concatenated adjectives, and something different from faculties of theology and their professors” (*ibidem, ibidem*). Moreover, according to him, if every “ratiocination [of dogmatic theology] is a relatively superficial and unreal path to the deity” (*VRE*, 438) - and, we owe the understanding of such a failure to modern Idealism, i.e., to Kant (1724-1804), with his doctrine of the “Transcendental Ego of Apperception” -, modern Idealism itself, i.e., those who came after Kant -, he refers especially to Hegel (1770-1832) – had no better luck (*VRE*, 439).⁸ Why not? Precisely because “conceptual processes can class facts, define them, interpret them; but they do not produce them, nor can they reproduce their individuality” (*VRE*, 445). To James “There is always a *plus*, a *thisness*, which feeling alone can answer for” (*ibidem, ibidem*). We are, therefore, back to the epigraph.

To James, when He concludes his *Lecture XVIII on Philosophy*, what is left to it is to bow humbly toward life, the “residuum” (*VRE*, 446) that don’t quite fit the concepts, which, to him, can become “*hypotheses*” (*ibidem, ibidem*) for a “critical Science of Religions” (*ibidem, ibidem*). The truth of the matter is that, he concludes,

Philosophy lives in words, but truth and fact well up into our lives in ways that exceed verbal formulation. There is in the living act of perception always something that glimmers and twinkles and will not be caught, and for which reflection comes too late (*VRE*, 446-7).

We are then left with the *pragmatic method* to analyze the *mystical experience*. However, before we look into the *mystical phenomenon* through *pragmatic lenses*, I believe it would be important not only to remember that there are differences between James *pragmatism* and Peirce’s *pragmaticism* – which everyone knows which are -, but to go back in the *History of Philosophy*, more precisely to Kant (1724-1804), Fichte (1762-1814) e Schelling (175-1854) – who had an immense influence upon Emerson (1803-82) and Peirce (1839-1914), the two pillars of my Master’s Dissertation -, so we

⁶ There is a footnote in which James makes reference to Peirce’s article *How to Make Our Ideas Clear*, published in *Popular Science Review* in January 1878 (vol. xii, p. 286).

⁷ Peirce, when he founds Pragmatism, shows how *belief* is the *inner side* of (outer) *habit* i.e., that both are intimately connected, so that it would be only through the *conduct* (of the *Dynamical Object*) that one could (as the *Interpretant*) know (though only *mediate, semiotic and fallibilistically*) *what something* (or *someone*) *is like* (CP 5.2).

⁸ It is impressive how Peirce, twenty-three years before James *Lectures*, in the essay *The Fixation of Belief* (1877), enlightens this question, by showing the limitations of the methods of *Tenacity* (personal), *Authority* (dogmatic), and *Idealism*, to propose the *Scientific* or *Pragmatic Method*.

know better the "sources" from which the great Schelling went to drink so as to give a new direction to Western philosophy and help give birth to a new science, Psychology⁹.

Schelling. Well, we all know that Kant, to solve the impasse brought about by Hume's (1711-76) skeptical Empiricism – which had "woken him up from the dogmatic slumber" – that was Leibniz' (1646-1716) and Wolff's (1679-1754) dogmatic Rationalism, he showed, through his first *Critique* (CPuR, 1781; 87), *the limits of Reason*, to deal with the "thing-in-itself."¹⁰ He therefore showed the importance of *Will* (Practical Reason), in his second *Critique*¹¹ (CPrR, 1788) and the importance of the *biological as teleological* in the second part of his third *Critique* (1790). We all know that Fichte (1762-1814), by "inverting the (Cartesian)¹² Cogito" reasserted the primacy of *Will* (of *Action and*, therefore, of *Ethics*) over *thought* (a merely mediatic, *a posteriori* function). As for Schelling (1775-1854), Ibrri always makes a point of reminding us that it was Goethe (1749-1832), Schiller (1759-1805) and that brilliant constellation of the Romantics of Jena – Friedrich Schlegel (1772-1829) and August Schlegel (1767-1845), Hölderlin (1770-1843) and Novalis (1772-1801), among others -, who urged the talented philosopher of Leonberg to come up with a *Philosophy* that could deal with *Life, Liberty* and the *Singular* – that is always "left over" (so to speak) when we try to subsume it – as a *Particular* – into a *Universal*.¹³

What fewer people might know – for that demands a transdisciplinary dialog – is that such *Philosophy of Life* – the *Objective-idealism* of which Peirce is heir¹⁴ – was avidly supped up – and digested (Sir Bacon) - by the great Schelling from four main "sources" which are legitimate for us to mention and know better: (I) *Meister Eckhart* (c.1260-c.1328), perhaps the greatest Western mystic and whose major scholar is, today, Bernard McGinn, from the University of Chicago;¹⁵ (II) *Jakob Boehme* (1577-1624),

⁹ Think of *Schopenhauer* (1788-1860) and *Freud* (1856-1936) and their successors.

¹⁰ He says, "I had to suppress *knowledge to find room to faith* (CPuR, Preface to 2nd edition, p. 17). After all, what man wishes to know is about: (i) *God*; (ii) *Liberty*; and, (iii) the immortality of the *Soul*.

¹¹ J. Ferrater Mora. *Dicionário de Filosofia* (Dictionary of Philosophy; 4 vols.), says the following: "Some authors (such as Richard Kroner) have stated that Kant's authentic *Weltanschauung* was of an ethical character – or, if you so wish, an ethical-religious one" (p. 1625).

¹² See Santaella, Lucia. *O método anticartesiano de C. S. Peirce* (Peirce's Anti-cartesian Method). São Paulo: UNESP, 2004.

¹³ Jair Barbosa, the Brazilian scholar who translated Schopenhauer's *The World...* into Portuguese, says the following about this theme, in his *Infinitude Subjetiva e Estética – Natureza e Arte em Schelling e Schopenhauer* (*Esthetic and Subjective Infinitude – Nature and Art in Schelling and Schopenhauer*): "Schelling, therefore, radicalizes Kant, affiliates himself to the Romantics and establishes philosophically that which Novalis translates exemplary in his fragments, that is, if all "beginning of life is antimechanical" (Novalis, 1942, p. 330), as the third Critique itself admits, *then its origin must be sought in the non-mechanical absolute*, that is, in a living cosmic "soul," in a "violent irruption" of life itself: "All life is a *continuous* torrent – Life comes solely from Life..." (ibidem). That is why Peirce, as a legitimate disciple of Schelling – and Emerson – founded his Normative Sciences on Phenomenology (Life); and in the former, Ethics on Esthetics; Induction and Deduction on Abduction and, in Mathematics, Ontology [(mediated, fallibilistic) Knowledge about Being] on Cosmology (the coming-into-being whose Synechism is pregnant of Tychism).

¹⁴ Schilling scholars are unanimous in referring to his philosophies in the plural: (i) Initial Philosophy; (ii) Philosophy of Nature; (iii) Philosophy of Transcendental Idealism; (iv) Philosophy of Liberty; and, (v) Later Philosophy (Philosophy of Mythology). See, for example, *As Filosofias de Schelling* (The Philosophies of Schelling) in the Bibliography.

¹⁵ See *The Mystical Thought of Meister Eckhart – The Man from Whom God Hid Nothing* (The Edward Cadbury Lectures). New York: The Crossroads Publishing Company, 2001. The epigraph chosen by McGinn is extremely clarifying: "Thus says Meister Eckhart: 'Better one master of life than a thousand masters of learning; but no one learns and lives before God does' [Sprüche 8 (Pfeiffer 599.19-21)]. McGinn shows how, to Eckhart, all things flow out of the divine ground (*grunt*) – to Eckhart, the intellect

perhaps the greatest Western Occultist and whose major scholar was Alexandre Koyré (1892-1964) -;¹⁶ Böhme who was, in turn, influenced by the Jewish *kabbala*¹⁷, whose major scholar, in the XX century, was Gershom Scholem (1897-1982),¹⁸ (III) the philosopher and theologian *Franz Xaver von Baader* (1765-1841), and, (IV) *Oriental mysticism* – especially the *Upanishads*, translated for him by Max Müller (1823-1900), the first Professor of Comparative Religions in history, in this case, at *All Souls College*, in *Oxford* (1868-75)].¹⁹

(*vernünfticheit*; p. 5) – and how they ought to return to it. This return, however, would demand a *sublimatio*, an *ennoblement* (*edler mensch*; p. 11). Well, this implies in our becoming so simple (*einvaltigez ein*) – through unattachment (*abegescheidenheit*) until we realize (pragmatically) that “God’s ground and my ground is the same ground” (p. 38 and p. 97). So as to penetrate this ground which has no ground, “the person must penetrate and transcend everything created and temporal” (p. 44). Well, this ground is the “little sparkle” (*vunkelîn*) or the “little castle” (*burgelîn*), “the uncreated something *in* the soul” (p. 45). We are fortunate for the recent translated publication (2006), by Vozes Press, of the first volume of Eckhart’s “German Sermons.” Says Eckhart: “Many times it has been said that there is a Power in the soul, which nor time nor space touch; it flows from the spirit and remains in the spirit and it is entirely spiritual. In it, God is so flowering and verdurous in all [His] joy and in all [His] glory, as He is in Himself. There, joy is so cordial, so incomprehensibly great that no one is able to exhaust [his/her] narration. For, this power, the eternal Father creates unceasingly his beloved Son, in such a manner that it co-creates the Son in the Father and itself as the same Son in the unitive power of the Father” (p. 48). Naturally – as in all mystical Traditions – there is an *intimate experience* (a *third vision* that ‘opens’) – and gives to the one Who arrives at the *unitive experience* – in the *instant* (present, p. 95) which contains in itself *the whole time*” (p. 84) – the certainty that one has arrived. Says Eckhart: “Then Peter says: ‘Now I know truly.’ Why does He know truly here? It is because there is a divine light that cheats no one” (p. 52). “The [spiritual] eye with which I see God is the same eye with which God sees me; my eye and God’s eye are *one eye* and *one seeing* and *one knowing* and *one loving*” (p. 105).

¹⁶ Alexandre Koyré, besides having defended his Languages Doctor’s thesis on “La philosophie de Jacob Boehme” (1929), also wrote three important works that have already been translated into Portuguese: *Estudos de História do Pensamento Científico* (Studies on the History of Scientific Thought); *Estudos de História do Pensamento Filosófico* (Studies on the History of Philosophical Thought); and, especially, *Do Mundo Fechado ao Universo Infinito* (From the Closed World to the Infinite Universe; 2006), all by Forense Universitária Press. On the influence of Böhme on Schelling, says Edward Allen Beach: “Jakob Böhme’s doctrine of the world’s creation in an original fire of longing (*die Sucht, in sich zu ziehen*), as well as with his own theory of the first Potency, whose “inward-drawing, collapsing Power” (*zusammenziehende Kraft*) formed the basis for the Potencies that followed” (p. 37; see also p. 72 and p. 133). Besides Böhme, we must not forget the equal influence Swedenborg (1688-1772) has exerted, on Schelling, Emerson and James, Sr. On the influence of this Swedish scientist and visionary on Schelling, see Friedmann Horn. *Schelling and Swedenborg – Mysticism and German Idealism*. (Translated by George F. Dole with a preface by Xavier Tilliette). West Chester, Pennsylvania: Swedenborg Foundation, 1997.

¹⁷ Edward Allen Beach says: “Jakob Böhme combined in his thought a deep Lutheran piety with abstruse theosophical ideas derived from several mystical traditions. One probable influence was the Jewish Kabbala, from which He apparently borrowed the notion of a cosmic evolution via progressive precipitations of the Divine Unity” (p. 69).

¹⁸ Gershom Scholem, Walter Benjamin’s (1892-1940) great friend, published many fundamental works on Jewish Mysticism. See *A cabala e seu simbolismo* (Zur Kabbala und ihrer Symbolik) & *As Grandes Correntes da Mistica Judaica* (Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism), both by Perspectiva Press, 1978 & 1995, respectively. Edward Allen Beach says the following about Baader: “Baader’s worldview emphasized the dynamic interplay between the unity and multiplicity inherent in all things. He developed an organic model of reality and forcefully opposed the growing tide of mechanism in physics and philosophy. All things, to Baader, are fundamentally alive, and life always involves a Constant movement of Exchange between the variety of externally directed functions and the synthesizing of activity within.” (p. 76). Still according to E. A. Beach, “Baader” – unlike Schelling – “proposed that the stuff out of which God created nature was and is external to himself. This outward aspect of God is, as it were, his divine ‘glory’.” (*ibidem, ibidem*).

¹⁹ It was Max Müller who first translated Kant’s *Critique of Pure Reason* into English in 1881.

It is up to us to finally ask: what was Schelling looking for – and found, and reelaborated – in these four “sources” – which he bequeathed especially to Peirce? The answer is: *Pantheism*!²⁰ The Idea that (I) there is an Absolute Being²¹ (II) that manifests Itself as Nature²² (III) and that becomes Conscious of Itself as Man.²³ This process of becoming gradually *conscious of itself* is the one that – as we will see farther ahead, when we deal with *Yoga* (and *Vedānta*) – leads man from a “dual” and fully “extraverted”²⁴ state of consciousness – through which (s)he takes everything denotatively, i.e., with a flabbergasting naïveness and “laterality” (Emerson)²⁵ – and by

²⁰ Naturally, it is not Spinoza’s (1632-77) pantheism, from which he ‘departed’, especially in his work “Ideas for a Philosophy of Nature.”

²¹ Be it Plotinus’s *One*, the *Infinite* or *Ein Sof* of the Kabbala, (Hindu) Vedanta’s *Brahman*, (Hindu) *Sāṅkhya-Yoga*’s *Purusa*, Jakob Böhme’s *Divine Essence*, Meister Eckhart’s *Deity*, Schelling’s *Absolute Spirit* or Peirce’s *Agape*. For a better (philosophical) understanding of this Onto-cosmology, see Ivo Assad Ibri. *Kosmos Noetos*. São Paulo: Perspectiva Press, 1992 & Márcia Sá Cavalcante Schuback. *O Começo de Deus* (“The Beginning of God”). Petrópolis, Rio de Janeiro: Vozes Press, 1998.

²² Be this Plotinus’s *Emanations*, the Kabbala’s *Sefirot*, the *Māyā* of the Vedānta philosophers or Buddhist monks, the *Prakṛti* of *Sāṅkhya-Yoga*, the *Divine Manifestation* of Schelling or Peirce’s three *Categories*. Anyway, what we ought to bear in mind is that Science is only possible because the scientist is absolutely sure that -, like the Emerson (of the Humanist phase, until 1841, according to David Jacobsen (“Emerson’s Pragmatic Vision”) says in *Nature* (1836) “the intellect searches out the absolute order of things as they stand in the mind of God” (p. 13), and in “The American Scholar” (1837), “[b]ut what is classification but the perceiving that these objects are not chaotic, and are not foreign, but have a law which is also a law of the human mind?” (p. 47).

²³ I cannot but expound a fundamental excerpt by Schelling: “The beginning, to the extent that it derives from the ground and is obscure, is the will of the creature itself; but, to the extent that it has not yet risen to perfect unity with the light (as a principle of understanding), in other words, to the extent in which it is still not able to conceive it, it is mere search or desire, that is, blind will. This self will of the creature itself opposes itself to understanding, as universal will, which makes use of it and subordinates it to it, as if it were a mere instrument. But when, finally, through a progressive transformation of all the powers, the most intimate and profound point of originary obscurity is totally transformed in light in a being, the will of this very being carries on being, in the same way, private will (to the extent that such being is a private being), but in itself, or as center of all other private wills, it is united to the originary will or to understanding, in such a manner that now, both make up a whole. This transformation into light of the most profound center does not occur in any other creature that we know, but in MAN [our emphasis added]. It is found in man all the power of the most obscure beginning and also, at the same time, all the power of light. In him we find the profoundest of the abysses and the most elevated heaven, that is, both centers. The will of man is the hidden germ in the eternal nostalgia of God that is still *only* present in the bottom; the ray of divine life shut up in the depths, the ones God contemplated when He conceived the will that wills nature. It was in MAN, [our emphasis added], only that God loved the world; and, precisely, it was this image of God that the nostalgia captured in the center, when it opposed light. Through the fact that man had its origin in the bottom (for being a creature), he has in himself a beginning relatively independent of God; but precisely due to the fact that this beginning becomes light – without, for that reason, the bottom having not left its being obscure – opens in itself, at the same time, something more elevated, *spirit*. Because the eternal pronounces, in nature, the unity of the Verb. The (real) pronounced Verb exists only in the unity of light and obscurity (of the vowel and the consonant). Now both principles are, in fact, in all things, but without a perfect consonance, due to imperfection of what came from the bottom. Only in MAN [our emphasis added], therefore, expresses itself completely that which in other creatures is only retained and imperfect Verb. But the spirit, that is, God as existing *actu*, manifests itself in the pronounced Verb. To the extent that the Soul is the same identity of both principles, it is spirit; and the spirit exists in God. If in the spirit of man the identity of both principles were as indissoluble as it is in God, there would be no difference, that is, God would not manifest with spirit. That unity, which is inseparable in God, must be able to separate in man – and this is the possibility of Good and Evil.” (*Investigations*, 68-70).

²⁴ The notion I refer to is a literal one. To know the sophistication with which Jung (1875-1961) sees this “psychological type”, see *The Portable Jung*, pp. 182-229.

²⁵ Says Emerson: “All man’s thinking runs laterally, never vertically” (*Jacobson*, 97). This is understandable, once man, in his verticality (“uprightness”; with the connotation of “character”; *Jacobson*, p. 37) he does not need to think, only “to see clearly.”

which he/she merely “reproduces” (biologically) and merely consumes and reproduces “culture” (by “imitation”)²⁶ – until he/she “matures”²⁷ and begins to take notice of his/her *interiority*, when he/she can “convert” -, i.e., “introvert”, and finally “awaken” to his/her “nothingness” – which is, precisely, what James *opus*, and this *communication*, are all about – for only empty (he/she may become a “favorite of the Muses.”²⁸

It is only from this *eternal-instant-point* (in us)²⁹, Eckhart’s *cintilla divina* – which is our very c(u)ore and being – we can, with Schelling, state: “Nature must be spirit made visible, spirit nature invisible” [*Ideas para uma filosofia da natureza* (“Ideas for a Philosophy of Nature”), p. 115]³⁰. And what is the nature of this *Spirit*? In his superb “Philosophical Investigations on the Essence of Human Freedom” Schelling tells us that “ultimately and in the highest instance, He is no other than will. Will is the Original Being” (p. 53). It is precisely this “Will” that Schopenhauer (1788-1860), in his classical “The World as Will and as Representation” (1819) – championed as being the up to then unknowable Kantian “thing-in-itself.” Nothing fairer and wiser, therefore,

²⁶ Emerson in *Self-Reliance* (1841): “There is a time in every man’s education when He arrives at the conviction that envy is ignorance; that imitation is suicide” (p. 146). This wonderful Emersonian essay has already been translated into Portuguese by José Paulo Paes and is part of a marvelous book, *Pensamentos sobre a Arte de Viver* (Thoughts on the Art of Living). São Paulo: Cultrix, 1995.

²⁷ Peirce would simply say that “symbols grow” (The Essential Peirce II, *What is a Sign?* p. 10). See also, in the same book, *Ethics of Terminology*, p. 264; and, *New Elements*, p. 324. After the initial chaos, “a pure nothing”, “the pure indeterminacy having developed determinate possibilities, creation consisted in mediating between the Lawless reactions and the general possibilities by the influx of a symbol. This symbol was the purpose of creation. Its object was the entelechy of being which is the ultimate representation. We can now see what *judgment* and *assertion* are. The man is a symbol. Different men, so far as they can have any ideas in common, are the same symbol. Judgment is the determination of the man-symbol to have whatever interpretant the judged proposition has. Assertion is the determination of the man-symbol to determining the interpreter, so far as he is interpreter, in the same way.” (*New Elements*, 324).

²⁸ This leads, naturally, to the “Play of Musement” in Emerson’s essay, *A Neglected Argument for the Reality of God* (1908), where he says: “In the Pure Play of Musement the Idea of God’s Reality will be sure sooner or later to be found an attractive fancy, which the Muser will develop in various ways.” (The Essential Peirce II, 439). In a footnote (13; p. 543), there is reference to the *Spieltrieb* (ludic impulse) which Peirce supposedly was introduced to in the *Esthetic Letters* by Friedrich Schiller. There is, moreover, a close relation between the “Play of Musement” and “Abductive Logic,” which requires “a fine tuning” (Peirce) between Man and Nature so one can see – “diagrammatically” – *Thirdness* (Law) in *Secondness* (Existence).

²⁹ Peirce would say -, with that strike of genius with which Poe (whom He loved and played as a teen), “There is nothing I cannot express in words” -, thus his aversion towards “unknowables”_: “It is only a matter of breaking a point in the *continuum* of *Firstness* to arrive at the Nothing (that was/is before creation).” And Peirce would not be far from describing nor the “peak experience” Moses had on top of Mount Horeb, wherein when inquired whom He was, God replied: “I am that I am” (Exodus 3: 13-15), nor from Jesus’ *experience* when he said: “Verily, verily, I say unto you, Before Abraham was, I was.” (John 8:58) and before he gave himself totally into verticality on the cross He asked: “And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was.” (John 17: 5), for “I and the Father are one.” (John 10:30). For another point-of-view on the instant, see *L’ intuition de l’instant* (“The Intuition of the Instant”) by Gaston Bachelard.

³⁰ In his *Philosophy of Art* (1802-03), Schelling says: “Only man can, due to the unity of his nature as Idea, produce objectively the Absolute. That eternal concept of the human being in God, as immediate cause of his productions, is that we call *genius* (genius, so to speak, the divine *point*” (p. 391; our emphasis). This is so because the genius – the favorite of the Muses! – is the one who has annulled himself completely so that the Absolute (and his archetypes or Muses) may come and manifest itself through him. As Márcio Suzuki says, in the Preface to this work of Schelling, which he translated, “strictly speaking, it is not the subject, the philosophizing consciousness who builds its object, *but it is the object itself that must build itself in the subject.*” (p. 14; Suzuki’s emphasis).

that we, according to him, take up a *practice* – such as *Yoga* – through which we may “overtake” the dual states of consciousness and arrive at the *Unitive Experience*.³¹

Lectures XVI and XVII on Mysticism and Yoga

Although James had made reference to many Mystical Traditions, both Western and Eastern: to the *Sufis* and the *Dervishes*, in the Islamic Tradition³² (p. 393); and to Saint John of the Cross (1542-91; p. 398),³³ Saint Teresa of Avila (1515-82; p. 399),³⁴ Jakob Böhme (1575-1624; p. 401), George Fox (1624-91; p. 402),³⁵ Saint Ignatius of Loyola (1491-1556; p. 404)³⁶, Meister Eckhart (c. 1260-c.1328; p. 408), poet Angelus Silesius (1624-77; p. 408),³⁷ in the Christian Tradition -, without forgetting to mention that this tradition has as its fountainhead Dionysius, the Areopagite – “who describes absolute truth by the *via negativa*” (p. 407)³⁸ and ends up quoting American “pantheist-naturalist” poet Walt Whitman (1819-92; p. 416),³⁹ what we will investigate thenceforth will be “**the methodic cultivation**” – as James denominates it (p. 390) – of *mysticism*, but in the *Hindu* Tradition – especially in *Yoga* and the *Vedānta* (p. 392) -, areas I know well, for I have been studying and practicing *Yoga* for 25 years. Says James:

In India, training in mystical insight has been known from time immemorial under the name of yoga. Yoga means the experimental union of the individual with the divine. It is based on persevering exercise; and the diet, posture, breathing, intellectual

³¹ So as to know thousands of mystics and the subject more profoundly, see *Dicionário de Mística* (Dictionary of Mysticism). São Paulo & Petrópolis, RJ: Loyola & Paulus Press, 2003 (1083 pages).

³² On the mystical tradition of Islam, see *The Essential Writings of Fritjof Schuon* (Edited by Seyyed Hossein Nasr. New York. Amity House, 1986.) about whom Houston Smith says: “In depth and breadth, I know of no living thinker who begins to rival him.” And the Anglo-American poet T. S. Eliot (1888-1965) said about the work: “I have met with no more impressive work in the comparative study of Oriental and Occidental religion.”

³³ See *São João da Cruz – Obras Completas* (Saint John of the Cross – Complete Works). Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes Press, 2002.

³⁴ As impressive as the life and work of this Spanish mystic is the sculpture by Gianlorenzo Bernini, “The Ecstasy of Saint Teresa” (1647-52) in the church of Santa Maria della Vittoria in Rome, about which H. W. Janson said, in his *History of Renaissance and Baroque Art* (p. 410): “it is the magnum-opus of the greatest sculptor and architect of his age.

³⁵ It was thanks to Fox that the *Society of Friends* (or *Quakerism*) – whom Evelyn Underhill (1875-1941) called “that great experiment in corporate mysticism” – prospered. Fox says about his mystical experience: “Now I come up in Spirit, through the flaming sword, into the paradise of God. All things were new; and all the creation gave another smell unto me than before, beyond what words can utter.” (Freemantle. *The Protestant Mystics*, pp. 86-87 in Michael Cox, p. 194).

³⁶ Founder of the Society of Jesus (Jesuit Order) and famous for his “Spiritual Exercises” (1522-24). *Loyola Press* já Just published “Exercícios Espirituais de Santo Inácio de Loyola” (2006; The Spiritual Exercises of Saint Ignatius of Loyola).

³⁷ For an introduction to the works of poet and mystic Johannes Scheffler, see *Angelus Silesius – A Mediação do Nada* (Angelus Silesius – The Mediation of Nothing). São Paulo: T. A. Queiroz, Press, 1986 (by Hubert Lepargneur and Dora Ferreira da Silva): “The creature is more in God than in itself: // In Him it rests, even when it dies.” (Cherub Traveler, 193, p. 75).

³⁸ Both Dionysius, the Areopagite and the Indian mystics talk about the so called *via negativa*; in India (Vedānta) it is called *neti, neti* (not this, not this) – as the adequate philosophical conduct through which one arrives (sculpturally) to *Brahman*, the non-manifest aspect (*Saguna*, without attributes) of the Absolute.

³⁹ In his Preface to the “Leaves of Grass” (1855), the poet says: “The greatest poet hardly knows pettiness or triviality. If he breathes into any thing that was before thought small [,] it dilates with the grandeur and life of the universe. He is seer... He is individual... He is complete in himself... the others are as good as He, only He know sees it and they do not.” (in Perkins et al. *The American Tradition in Literature*. New York: Random House, 1985, p. 751).

concentration, and moral discipline vary slightly in the different systems which teach it. (p. 391).

The truth is that, after Hegel (1770-1832) -, as shown by Merleau-Ponty (1908-61) in his work “Everywhere and Nowhere. II. The East and Philosophy”⁴⁰ – Western scholars started despising the philosophies of India and China *in totum*, for being “only philosophies in themselves” which, like “the Pyramids of Egypt, must be overcome” (Merleau-Ponty, 217). Examined closely, with patience and respect, we will see that the “different systems of India” *do not* “vary little,” as James put it just now, but a lot. Besides having a *materialist system* (Cārvakā), there are, in fact, six Indian *system*, that can be divided into *Orthodox* – those which ‘follow’ the *Vedas* - and *Unorthodox*. Among the Orthodox ones, there are the Dualist and the Non-dualist ones. The six Orthodox systems [*darśana* (points of view)] are: *Sāṅkhya* founded by Kapila⁴¹, *Yoga*, codified by Patañjali⁴², *Mimāṃsā* founded by Jaimini,⁴³ *Vedānta* founded by Vyāsa⁴⁴, *Vaiśeṣika* founded by Gautama (not the Buddha)⁴⁵ and *Nyāya* founded by Kanāda.⁴⁶ and the three main non-orthodox schools are, Buddhism⁴⁷, Jainism⁴⁸ and Tantra⁴⁹.

⁴⁰ See Merleau-Ponty. São Paulo: Victor Civita Press, 1984 (pp. 215-221). Merleau-Ponty wraps up his essays by saying: “The philosophies of India and China sought, more than to dominate existence, to be the echo or the resonant of our relation to being. Western philosophy can learn with them to find again the contact with being, initial option whence it came, and to measure the possibilities which, when we became ‘Western’, we shut up for ourselves and, perhaps, reopen them.” (p. 221).

⁴¹ *Sāṅkhya* (number; knowledge) is a dualist school. It enumerates the “ultimate objects of knowledge” (Grimes, p. 282-3). Apparently “dualist”, for it starts by discriminating – and to mediate means to be in Time and, therefore, in duality – between the *Purusa* (roughly, *Spirit*) and *Prakṛti* (roughly, *Matter*). I said roughly because, in fact, the *Purusa* is the *Absolute Spirit itself* in whose Reality we realize we “share” – in *mystical contemplation* – while *Prakṛti* is its ‘manifestation’ – itself divided into Nature (Macrocosm; Object of the Senses) and Man (Microcosm; Subject made up of ‘sheaths’: Mind, Emotions, Sensations, which generates the Ego sense). *Prakṛti*, in turn, possesses three attributes or qualities (*Gunās*): *Rajas* (activity, passion), *Tamas* (inertia, ignorance) and *Sattva* (purity, harmony). This concept is so important that it supports the whole *Āyur-veda* (medicine). While in a state of ignorance (*avidyā*), man lives “centered in himself” (*tamas x rajas*). Gradually, he may awaken to a healthier existence (*sattva*), through which he may come to realize his contingency and impermanence and, “awaken” to the fact that he is, in fact, the *Purusa*. Curious enough, this name refers to (true) Man or, to speak schellinguanly, to that Man who realizes that he is Divine i.e., the genius. But that, as Alberto Caeiro (Fernando Pessoa, 151) says, “demands a learning that is an unlearning” or, as Emerson put it, “Authenticity [...] is not automatic. It is the hardest thing to conquer” (Jacobson, 11); it demands that we found ourselves in the “radical identity of the ‘I’ as ‘eye.’” (Jacobson, 41).

⁴² We will have the chance to study him farther ahead.

⁴³ Short for *Pūrva-Mimāṃsā* (Grimes, 191), a system of “inquiry,” which examines the Vedic rites with the aim of establishing the authority of the *Vedas*. It would be, roughly, equivalent to our theology.

⁴⁴ Also known as *Uttara-Mimāṃsā* (Grimes, 340), it means the end of the *Vedas* or Wisdom. This which is the better known of the Indian schools of philosophy has as its basic texts the *Upanishads*, the *Bhagavad Gītā* and the *Brahma-sūtra*. It is, in turn, divided in *Dvaita* (Dualist) and *Advaita* (Non-dualist) schools – whose major representative is *Śaṅkarācārya* (788-820) – and their main preoccupation is the nature of the Absolute (*Brahman*). For the *Advaita Vedānta*, Brahman, the Absolute, is the sole reality. However, when we are not “fully awakened,” we take our private contingency as real – when it is based on false premises (“māyā”) and suffer. The influence *Theravāda Buddhism* has had upon *Śaṅkarācārya* as not been duly appreciated..

⁴⁵ This school is intimately connected to *Nyāya*. The term *Vaiśeṣika* means “excellence” or “distinction.” It is a school of Logic (Grimes, 335).

⁴⁶ This is a realist school of reasoning [Logic] (Grimes, 215).

⁴⁷ Buddhism is, in turn, divided (*roughly*) into *Mahāyāna* and *Theravāda* [the members of *Mahāyāna* branded the latter, pejoratively, as *Hinayāna*, i.e., Little Vehicle, for their is to become a *Arhat* (Saint), the one who seeks personal salvation in Nirvāna (State of no-desire or fire, *banna*)]. The two main divisions of *Mahāyāna* are *Mādhyamika* and *Yogācāra*, two idealist schools whose great goal is to become a *Bodhisattva*, the one that gives up Nirvāna and “comes back until the last brother becomes enlightened.”

Two points might be clarifying in relation to the *Philosophies of India*,⁵⁰ in a broader sense (socio-historically) and in a narrower sense (epistemic-ontologically). With the former we want to offer a panoramic view of the whole Indian cultural system, with its structures (*stages* and *goals* of life). The first stage of the life of the Hindu is *Artha* – when the boy studies and the young man seeks for the material possessions; the second one is *Kāma* – in which the young adult marries and seeks sexual pleasure, and reproduces; the third stage of life, *Dharma* – which covers the greatest part of one's life – is devoted to the individual's insertion into the social context, with its moral, social and (exoterical) religious practices; the fourth and last stage of life of the Hindu is *Moksa* – in which the elderly, having finished his duties toward society, leave (usually with the spouse) and seeks *Spiritual Freedom*, through what Zimmer defined as being "the philosophies of eternity:" *Sāṅkhya*, *Vedānta*, *Buddhism*, *Jainism* and *Tantra*, besides the science of *Yoga* (generally taken up by all the schools).

As for the latter – in the epistemic-ontological sense – we may say that the *Science of Yoga* -, as Taimni brands it -, and which has the *Sāṅkhya* system as its ancillary philosophical system – it is, in turn, divided in four main schools, which are somehow related to Jung's *psychic functions*⁵¹: (i) sensation (*Hatha Yoga*); (ii) feeling (*Bhakti Yoga*); (iii) thought (*Jñāna Yoga*); and, (iv) will (*Raja Yoga*), which is in the root of Jung's *Transcendental Function*, when one can *sublimate* the fire of blind desire -, as Siddhartha, and later, Schopenhauer, define well - into *Light*.⁵² The former called it "unborn" and the latter "pure subject of knowledge"⁵³ -, referring, of course, to a "non-dual" "state of consciousness." What exactly are these?

To *Vedānta* – heir of the *Upanishads* -, which Schelling asked Orientalist Max Müller (1823-1900) to translate for him, when this was his student in 1844 – and whose major exponent in India was *Śaṅkarācārya* (788-820)⁵⁴ – there are Four States of

(Grimes, 94). Within the *Mahāyāna* we find *Ch'an* (Chinese) and *Zen* (Japanese) Buddhism. In Japan Buddhism has thrived and penetrated in all spheres of society, mainly in the Arts, from the *Tea Ceremony* to *Ikebana* and from *Aikido* to *HaiKu*.

⁴⁸ The follower of Jainism believes that every being is a monad – which is dipped in the Wheel of existence, which the Buddhists name *Samsāra* – until a hero (*vira*, thus master Mahāvira) – Who is a boatman (*Tirthankara*) teaches him/her "to cross to the other margin" – which is, in fact, the Center of the wheel (always "here-now"), which means to purify oneself until one becomes a "digambara" ("that whose clothes are the element that fills the four regions of space;" infinity).

⁴⁹ Tantra ("warp"; Grimes, 314) is a non-orthodox school that is ill-understood in the West, where it is seen as "sexual path." In fact, the Tantra path demands great discipline because, for the *Śakti* (which is the "energy" that lies "dormant" within the *Mūladhara cakra* – the center or 'wheel' of vital energy at the base of the subtle body, located on the base of the spine) – to be "awakened" and to be, afterward, "led" to its "spouse," *Śiva*, in the *Ajñā cakra*, between the eyebrows -, another way of expressing the *mystical experience* or *mystical marriage* – one needs years of hard *practice* under the guidance of a worthy master, who possesses this (esoterical) knowledge. It is difficult not to recommend the reading of Fernando Pessoa's poem *Eros e Psiquê* ("Eros and Psyche;" p. 115) to show how a mystical poet sees this Journey of the Soul.

⁵⁰ For a better understanding of the Philosophies of India, see Zimmer, Dasgupta and Radhakrishnan.

⁵¹ For a panoramic view of Jung's works -, and a minute analysis of the Functions – see *The Portable Jung* (edited by Joseph Campbell). New York: Penguin Books, 1976. For a better appraisal of the *Process of Individuation* in Jung and how it is founded on his *Theory of the Archetypes* – from a philosophical point of view - see Marilyn Nagy. *Questões Filosóficas na Psicologia de C. G. Jung* (Philosophical Issues in the Psychology of C. G. Jung; University of New York Press). Petrópolis: Vozes Press, 2004.

⁵² Eckhart: "As soon as man converts from temporal things and turns within, He perceives therein a celestial light, come from heaven." (*Sermons*, 185).

⁵³ For a better understanding of this concept, see "The World..." especially pp. 245-247.

⁵⁴ To Śaṅkarā -, as for Patañjali (Sutra IV.18: "The modifications of the mind are always known to its lord on account of the changelessness of the Purusa") - the (practical) proof that our Real Nature is *beyond the*

Consciousness: (i) State of Sleep without Dreams (*Vaiśvānara*); (ii) State of Sleep with Dreams (*Taijasa*); (iii) (Pseudo) Awakened State (*Prajñā*); and (iv) Fully Awakened State (*Turīya*). The First and Last States have something in common: they are “non-dual” states, whereas the Second and the Third ones are “dual” ones.” All the effort of *Yoga* – and of the other schools of Wisdom such as Buddhism, Jainism and Tantra –, is to lead man to “experiment” this “fourth state of consciousness” which is “non-dual.”⁵⁵

To show how one arrives gradually – i.e., slowly, but surely – to this “non-dual state of consciousness” (awakened) is the reason why *Sri Patañjali* codified *Raja Yoga* (Royal, Fire or Willful Path), around 147 BCE, in a master-piece called “*Yoga Sūtras*” (“Aphorisms of Yoga”) – divided in “Four Books” (*Pāda*).⁵⁶ What we are interested in, here, is in the “cu(o)re” (heart) of this synthetic *magnum opus* of Indian mystical literature, “*Astanga-yoga*” or the “Eight-step Method that leads to the Integrated or Unitive State” -, which appears between aphorism number 27 in Book II and aphorism number 3 in Book III. It is this *method* that I intend to look into from now on, once it promises – already in aphorisms number 2, 3 and 12 in Book I – that such state (*Yoga*) is attained when one is able to appease completely (*nirodah*) the fluctuations of consciousness⁵⁷ (*citta vrtti*) through *unattachment* (*vairāgya*) and *unwavering practice* (*abhyāsa*) in eight stages (II.27). Which are they?

‘Self-restrictions, observances, posture, breath control, abstraction, concentration, contemplation and ecstasy are the eight parts of the discipline’. “*Yama-niyamāsana-prānāyāma-pratyāhāra-dhāranā-dhyāna-samādhayo ’stāv aṅgāni*” (II.29).

The two first stages – *Yama* (self-restrictions) and *Niyama* (observances) – make up the *Ethics of Yoga*.⁵⁸ “The vows of self-restrictions encompass abstinence from violence, falsehood, theft, sex and greed” (II.30) and “Purity, contentment, austerity, self-study and devotion constitute the observances” (II.32). The third stage, the practice of “postures” (*Āsana*), is the best known kind of *yoga* in the West, *Hatha Yoga*,⁵⁹ through which one keeps the physical body fit and cleansed and commences the taming

mind resides in the fact that “the eternal observer” (our Consciousness) sees the thoughts (as well as other phenomena) as ‘external.’ See his *The Supreme Jewel of Discernment* (Viveka-Chudamani), published in São Paulo by Pensamento Press.

⁵⁵ “The truth cannot be determined *a priori*, but depends on the test of experience” in Surendranath Dasgupta, p. 209. Dasgupta, is generally considered the greatest Indian philosopher of the XX century/ it was he who guided Mircea Eliade (1907-86) through his Ph.D. on Yoga. Eliade later became the first Professor of Comparative Religions in America, in the University of Chicago.

⁵⁶ The work I have resorted to was I. K. Taimni’s *Science of Yoga*. Taimni was, for many years, Professor of Chemistry – Peirce’s major – at the University of Allahbad and member of the Theosophical Society in Madras (Chennai), India.

⁵⁷ Eckhart says: “One only thought hides being” and “to repose completely is to be free from all movement.” (*Sermons*, 196-7).

⁵⁸ Besides the fact that all religions give equal value to Ethical issues, it is patent the *axial status* that Ethics has in the Peircean *architectonic*: it is the *second* of the Normative Sciences which, in turn, belongs to the *second* member of Philosophy, which is the *second* of the Heuristic Sciences (between Mathematics and the Special Sciences), where the Object (second, *existence*) has primacy over the *Sign* and the *Interpretant*, thus his Realism and anti-Cartesianism.

⁵⁹ *Ha* = sun; *Tha* = moon; therefore, the union (*Yoga*) of Sun and Moon. There is no room here to deal with this interesting question in depth, suffice it to say that the *Hatha Yoga Pradīpika* by Svatmarama Yogi, the great text on *Hatha Yoga*, shows the importance of making the *prāṇa* (vital energy) circulate through the 72.000 *nāḍīs* (vital canals; similar to those of Chinese acupuncture) and to eliminate all the *apāna* (‘energy that goes down,’ related to excretion). We could, peirceanly, see this practice as the union of Interiority [*Firstness* (Feeling) and *Thirdness* (Thought)] with Exteriority (*Secondness*; Conduct). Jung – once James was an inaugural psychologist – would see this union as the marriage of *Anima* (Feeling) and *Animus* (Reason). Blake (1757-1827), as “the Marriage of Heaven (Reason) and Hell (Feeling).”

of the mind. This taming (*yoga* derives from the Sanskrit root *yug*, from which stems the English Word *yoke* and the Portuguese one *jugo*) of the mind – through the Will – improves considerably in the fourth stage, *Prāṇayāma*, with the control of *prāṇa* (vital energy, absorbed through breathing) (II.49).⁶⁰ In the fifth stage, *Pratyāhāra*, one masters the *power of introversion* (II.54) – “the senses recoil from the objects”.⁶¹ The sixth stage, *Dhāraṇā*, refers to the acquisition of the outstanding *power of concentration* (III.1); the seventh stage, *Dhyāna*, refers to the “continuous” *power of contemplation* (III.2).⁶² Lastly, the eight and last stage, *Samādhi*, refers to the *Totally Integrated State* [*sam*, completely together; *dha*, to keep and *adhi*, one; (III.3)] in which there is no longer Subject or Object, only *Plain and Interested Attention*, as Jiddu Krishnamurti (1895-1986)⁶³ used to put it.

What does James say about this “state of consciousness”? James begins by stating that “personal religious experience has its root and centre in mystical states of consciousness” (p. 370) and proposes “four marks which [...] may justify us in calling it mystical” (p. 371):

1. Ineffability – The handiest of the marks by which I classify a state of mind as mystical is negative. The subject of it immediately says that it defies expression, that no adequate report of its contents can be given in words. It follows from this that its quality must be directly experienced; it cannot be imparted or transferred to others. In this peculiarity mystical states are more like states of feeling than like states of intellect. (p. 371)

Notice how Peirce, in his essay *Trichotomic* (1888),⁶⁴ describes the *First* of the three elements of consciousness:

Single or simple consciousness is consciousness as it can exist in a single instant, the consciousness of all that is immediately present, for which all that is not immediately present is an absolute blank. This is a pure Feeling which forms the warp and woof of consciousness, or in Kant’s phrase, its matter. In this kind of consciousness subject and object are nowise discriminated, in fact, there is no discrimination, no parts, no analysis, there is no considering a thing for anything else, no relation, no representation, but just a

⁶⁰ This is because there is a strict relation between the *mental flow* and one’s *breathing frequency*. An advanced yogi, who has gained perfect control over his mind, breaths, at the most, two times per minute. The *Hatha Yoga Pradīpika* says: “Anyone who practices *prāṇayāma* for twelve years will reach Spiritual realization.” In an era such as ours, a *Fast Tutti* one, people are noticing more and more that it is important to take good care of oneself, for example, through Yoga. Our school in São Paulo, Núcleo de Yoga Ganesha, commemorated 25 years on May 7, 2007.

⁶¹ This step can be associated to the saying of Jesus, “Strive to enter in at the strait gate” (Luke 13, 24) because “the kingdom of God is *within* you” (Lucas 17, 20-21; our italics).

⁶² *Dhyāna* is the Sanskrit term from which the Chinese Buddhist term *Ch’an* and the Japanese Buddhist term *Zen* derive. [See D. T. Suzuki (First Series), p. 79]. Suzuki, the great divulgator of Zen Buddhism in the West, gives, on page 176 of this first of three volumes, the definition that *Bodhidharma* (c. 520 CE) – who took this kind of *Knowledge* from India to China (c. 520 CE) – gave of Zen Buddhism: “A special transmission outside the scriptures; // No dependence on words or letters; // Pointing directly at the soul of man; // Seeing one’s own (empty) nature; // reaching Buddhahood (awakened state; without thoughts)”. That this *Knowledge* has no relation to intellectual erudition one finds in many passages of this first volume of Suzuki, especially the one about the ‘*disputatio*’ for the becoming the Sixth Patriarch of *Ch’an* Buddhism, between the intellectual Shên-hsiu (d. 706) and the cook Hui-nêng (638-713) (p. 207).

⁶³ Jiddu Krishnamurti was ‘discovered’ by the Theosophists at 17 and ‘prepared’ to be a ‘planetary master’; soon he realized the trap and became, in fact, a great lecturer, talking in European and American universities, always recommending the continuous cultivation of Interested and Unattached Attention on the Present Moment. One of his most translated books is “The First and Last Liberty”, prefaced by Aldous Huxley. It has been translated into Portuguese by Pensamento Press.

⁶⁴ *Trichotomic* in *The Essential Peirce I*, pp. 282-283.

pure indescribable quale which is gone in the twinkling of an eye and which bears no resemblance to any memory of it. It is just the quality of the immediately present, which is continually pouring through us, always here, but never stopping to be examined, It is always fresh, always new, sporting in unbounded manifoldness.

Let us then move on to the second mystical characteristic, according to James:

2. Noetic quality – Although so similar to states of feeling, mystical states seem to those who experience them to be also states of knowledge. They are states of insight into depths of truth unplumbed by the discursive intellect. They are illuminations, revelations, full of significance and importance, all inarticulate though they remain; and, as a rule they carry with them a curious sense of authority for aftertime. (p. 371)

Although the Schelling's notion of "intellectual intuition" (*System of Transcendental Idealism*, 1800; pp. 22-23), as well as Schopenhauer's "pure subject of knowledge" (*The World...*; pp. 245-247) supply interesting *keys* toward a better philosophical understanding of the "noetic quality" of the mystical experience, I prefer that Peircean (and Schellingian) Idea -, which grounds their Objective-idealism -, the one that "matter is effete mind" (EP I, xxii). Thus, each particular (the 'object' man, for instance) would also be effete mind; therefore, he would bring in himself -, like the stones! -, the history of his evolutionary course and this "diagram" is ideal in nature, thus, it possesses a gnosiological status.⁶⁵

3. Transiency – Mystical states cannot be sustained for long. [...] Often, when faded, their quality can but imperfectly be reproduced in memory; [...] what is felt [is an] inner richness and importance. (p. 372)

As for *transiency*, we can say, today, supported by Transpersonal psychologists like Franco-Brazilian Pierre Weil (b. 1926) and American Ken Wilber (b. 1949), who have mapped the issue in greater depth, that such *transiency* is today called "peak experience." We know today that it is possible to reach "plateau states of consciousness," especially through years of practice of *Yoga* or *Zazen*. Let us go on to the fourth and last characteristic of the mystical experience:

4. Passivity – Although the oncoming of mystical states may be facilitated by preliminary voluntary operations, as by fixing the attention, or going through certain bodily performances [...] yet when the characteristic sort of consciousness has once set in, the mystic feels as if his own will were grasped and held by a superior power.⁶⁶ [...] Mystical states [...] are never merely interruptive. Some memory of their content always remains, and a profound sense of their importance. They modify the inner life of the subject between the times of their recurrence (p. 372).

⁶⁵ Since Peirce is so concerned with the *Ethics of Terminology*, maybe we ought to refer to Objects as being made of "mindatter" (mind & matter; "mentéria" in Portuguese).

⁶⁶ Jung explains the phenomenon as a process of the *shifting* of the personal-horizontal (ego) sphere to the transpersonal-vertical axis (Self), which he labeled *Process of Individuation*. This, Jung fetched in Duns Scotus – "individuality depends on matter, on form and on its composition" ("haecity" or "thatness" or "positive entity") – implies the articulation of two complementary subprocesses: (i) *differentiation* (*Differenzierung*); and, (ii) *integration* (*Integration*). That is why he says: "we may translate "individuation" as "becoming oneself" (*Verselbstung*) or "the realization of the Self" (*Selbstverwirklichung*) (Jung. *The Ego and the Unconscious*, §266, 1928) in Jungian Dictionary (PP. 255-264). Through Peircean lenses maybe we could associate this "differentiation" to *Alterity* (*Secondness* in *Phenomenology* and the three *Normative Sciences*, especially *Ethics*) and "integration" to *Mediation* (i.e. *Thirdness* in *Phenomenology*, to *Logic* in the Normative Sciences and, especially to Metaphysics).

It is in this sense that the mystical experience is important to James' *pragmatism*. Peirce certainly did not have time to explore this phenomenon - (we are not sure, though, for we do not yet know of everything he has written), though Joseph Brent states that he began to appreciate Buddhism in the end of his life⁶⁷ - as he had no time to devote himself to the esthetic question⁶⁸ - but he bequeathed us an extraordinary set of *tools* through which we may explore it; after all, we are here before an ideal - or end - which is truly "admirable."

What else can we say about the *mystical experience*? Talvez que há vários graus de profundidade da mesma. James quotes innumerable episodes about individuals who went through them, the most impressive - and trustworthy - of which is the one described by Canadian psychiatrist Richard Maurice Bucke (1837-1902; p. 389), who actually dubbed it "cosmic consciousness:"

Directly afterward there came upon me a sense of exultation, of immense joyousness accompanied or immediately followed by an intellectual illumination impossible to describe. Among other things, I did not merely come to believe, but I saw that the universe is not composed of dead matter, but is, on the contrary, a living Presence; I became conscious in myself of eternal life. It was not a conviction that I would have eternal life, but a consciousness that I possessed eternal life then; I saw that all men are immortal; that the cosmic order is such that without any peradventure all things work together for the good of each and all; that the foundation principle of the world, of all the worlds, is what we call love and that the happiness of each and all is in the long run absolutely certain. The vision lasted a few seconds and was gone; but the memory of it and the sense of the reality of what it taught has remained during the quarter of a century which has since elapsed. I knew that what the vision showed was true. I had attained to a point of view from which I saw that it must be true. That view, that conviction, I may say that consciousness, has never, even during periods of the deepest depression, been lost. (pp. 390-391)

Curious enough, this mystical experience described by Bucke resembles the famous passage by Emerson in "Nature" (1836):

"Crossing a bare common, in snow puddles, at twilight, under a clouded sky, without having in my thoughts any occurrence of special good fortune, I have enjoyed a perfect exhilaration. I am glad to the brink of fear. [...] Standing on the bare ground - my head bathed by the blithe air and uplifted into infinite space - all mean egotism vanishes. I become a transparent eyeball; I AM nothing; I see all; the currents of the Universal Being circulate through me; I am part or parcel of God." (p. 6)⁶⁹

Conclusion

What can we say as to conclude? Perhaps that - since we "all have a germ of mysticism in us all" (James *in* Gale, p. 185) -, it is important that each of us adopts a

⁶⁷ Seer Brent (pp. 260, 261 and 314); Peirce: "Buddhism is superior to our religion"

⁶⁸ See Santaella. *Estética - de Platão a Peirce (Esthetics - From Plato to Peirce)* by Experimento Press (São Paulo, 2000).

⁶⁹ The *corpus* of mystical literature - and I do not refer solely to *prose*, but also to *poetry* - is immense: from Salomon to Celan; from Rumi to Khalil Gibran; from Camões to Fernando Pessoa; from Calderon de la Barca to Borges and Octavio Paz; from Villon to Mallarmé; from Goethe to Rilke; from Milton to T. S. Eliot and Yates; from Kabir to Tagore; from Chuang Tzu to Lin Yutang; from Matsuo Basho to Takuboku Ishikawa; from Tomás Antônio Gonzaga to Manuel Bandeira, Cecília Meireles, Drummond and Guimarães Rosa.

practice like *Yoga*, *Tai Chi Chuan* or *Zazen* – curious enough, all of them Oriental⁷⁰ – until one day we have the *grace* of getting the *Unitive Experience*. As I said a while ago, there are various degrees of this experience, from the ones described by Emerson and Bucke [*Bīja* or *Samprajñāta Samādhi* (ecstasy with objects)], until the deeper ones, described by Zen Buddhist masters like Bodhidharma (fl. 526/527 CE) and Hui-nêng (638-713 CE) as being “Empty” in nature (*Śūnyatā*) and by Tantra master and poet Tilopa (988-1069) as “Grounded upon Nothing.”⁷¹

From a *Pragmatic* point of view, we can only hope that more and more people *have* such an *experience* for, coming out of such a state he or she will, firstly, “feel amazed” by the unbelievable fact that “there is something instead of nothing,”⁷² secondly, we hope that such amazement will lead him or her to *reflection* – for wasn’t it old yet ever bright Aristotle who said that “Philosophy begins with wonder”? Thirdly, we hope that he or she – guided by the thread of *Feeling* and the thread of *Thought* – is able to improve his or her *Conduct* – and others’ – by genuinely caring about each and every *individuum* who, miraculously makes up this *Kosmos*. Only by so doing may we one day have a much more loving, *ecological* and saner *Global Community*.

Bibliography

BACHELAR, Gaston. *A Intuição do Instante* (L’*intuition de l’instant*; *The Intuition of the Instant*). Campinas: Verus Press, 2007.

BEACH, Edward Allen. *The Potencies of God(s) – Schelling’s Philosophy of Mythology*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1994.

BRENT, Joseph. *Charles Sanders Peirce – A Life*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1993.

DASGUPTA, Surendranath. *A History of Indian Philosophy* (5 vols.). Delhi: Motilal Barnarsidass, 1997.

ECKHART, Mestre. *Sermões Alemães I* (German Sermons 1). Petrópolis: Vozes Press, 2006.

EMERSON, Ralph Waldo. *The Selected Writings of Ralph Waldo Emerson*. New York: The Modern Library, 1968.

FICHTE. *A Doutrina da Ciência de 1794* (The Doctrine of Science of 1794). São Paulo: Victor Civita Press, 1984.

⁷⁰ What, naturally, does not exclude a practice within the religious tradition one was born in. However, I believe that the study of other traditions may help us see “the religiosity beyond religions.”

⁷¹ “Very close to be recognized, // Very deep to be caught, // Very easy to be believed, // Too marvelous to be understood intellectually.” – this is “Mahāmudrā,” (“The Great Stance”), acquired by the practice of meditation, especially by the Kagyu school of Tibetan Buddhism, founded by Tilopa. This kind of *Samādhi* is known in *Yoga*, as *nirbīja* or *asamprajñāta* (without object; therefore, without subject). Maybe it is not too daring to relate this kind of experience to Jesus’ phrase, “Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free.” (John 8:32) or to Schopenhauer’s advice that we watch out for the fallacious game of “Representation,” “for here,” as Ibrī always says, “reason, for its utter incompetence, must humbly, leave he stage.”

⁷² I don’t know which philosopher really said it, Leibniz or Heidegger. However, do I happen to know that glorious William Blake said: “Eternity is in love with the productions of time.” (Proverbs of Hell).

GALE, Richard M. *The Philosophy of William James – An Introduction*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

GRIMES, John. *A Concise Dictionary of Indian Philosophy*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1996.

JACOBSON, David. *Emerson's Pragmatic Vision*. University Park, Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1993.

JAMES, William. *The Varieties of Religious Experience*. New York: The Modern Library, 1902.

JUNG, Carl G. *Dicionário Junguiano* (Jungian Dictionary). São Paulo & Petrópolis, RJ: Editora Paulus & Vozes, 2002.

_____. *The Portable Jung* (Editado by Joseph Campbell). New York: Penguin Books, 1976.

KANT. *Crítica da Razão Pura* (Critique of Pure Reason). São Paulo: Editor Victor Civita, 1983.

_____. *Textos Selecionados* (Selected Texts). São Paulo: Editor Victor Civita, 1984.

MORA, J. Ferrater. *Dicionário de Filosofia* (4 vols.; Dictionary of Philosophy). São Paulo: Edições Loyola, 2001.

O NOVO TESTAMENTO (The New Testament). *Os Gideões Internacionais* (The Gideons International), 1976.

PEIRCE, Charles S. *The Essential Peirce I*. Edited by Nathan Houser & Christian Kloesel. Bloomington & Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1992.

_____. *The Essential Peirce II*. Edited by The Peirce Edition Project. Bloomington & Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1998.

PESSOA, Fernando. *Obra Poética* (Poetic Works). Rio de Janeiro: Editora Nova Aguilar, 1986.

PUENTE, Fernando Rey & VIEIRA, Leonardo Alves (Organizadores). *As Filosofias de Schelling* (The Philosophies of Schelling). Belo Horizonte (Minas Gerais, Brasil): Editora UFMG, 2005.

RADHAKRISHNAN, S. *Indian Philosophy* (2 vols.). Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.

SUZUKI, D. T. *Essays in Zen Buddhism* (3 vols.). York Beach, Maine: Samuel Weiser, Inc., 1985.

SHELLING. *Idéias para uma filosofia da Natureza* (Ideas for a Philosophy of Nature). Lisboa: Imprensa Nacional - Casa da Moeda. 2001.

_____. *Investigações Filosóficas sobre a Essência da Liberdade Humana* (Philosophical Investigations on the Essence of Human Freedom). Lisboa: Edições 70, s/d.

_____. *Obras Escolhidas* (Selected Works). São Paulo: Editor Victor Civita, 1980.

_____. *System of Transcendental Idealism*, 1800 (Transl. by Peter Heath). Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1978.

SCHOPENHAUER, Arthur. *O Mundo como vontade e como representação* (The World as Will and as Representation). São Paulo: UNESP, 2005.

SCHUBACK, Márcia de Sá Cavalcante. *O Começo de Deus*. Petrópolis: Vozes, 1998.

TAIMNI, I. K. *The Science of Yoga*. Adhyar, Chennai, India & Wheaton, IL, USA: The Theosophical Publishing House, 1999.

THE HATHA YOGA PRADIPIKA. Svatmarana (Transl. by Brian Dana Akers). New York: YogaVidya.com, 2002.

WEIL, Pierre. *As Fronteiras da Evolução e da Morte* (The Frontiers of Evolution and of Death). Petrópolis: editora Vozes, 1989.

WHITMAN, Walt em Perkins et al. *The American Tradition in Literature* (A Tradição Norte-americana em Literatura). New York: Random House, 1985.

WILBER, Ken. *The Essential Ken Wilber*. Boston & London: Shambhala, 1998.

ZIMMER, Heinrich. *Philosophies of India*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969.