

**THE BOOK WAS
DRENCHED**

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OU_166385

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OSMANIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Call No. 172.4/P265 Accession No. 28429

Author Das, Bhagvan.

Title Science of peace 1948

This book should be returned on or before the date
last marked below.

THE SCIENCE OF PEACE

**There will be no copyright in this book after 1957 A. C. Translations
into other languages may be made freely from this very
time. There will be no copyright against them ; but
neither must there be any copyright reserved
in those translations.**

THE SCIENCE OF PEACE

AN ATTEMPT AT AN EXPOSITION OF THE FIRST
PRINCIPLES OF THE SCIENCE OF THE SELF, I.E.,

Adhyātma-Vidyā

BY

BHAGAVAN DAS

M.A., (Calcutta), LL. D. *hon. causa* (Benares and Allahabad)

Author of "The Science of the Emotions,"

"The Science of the Sacred Word,"

"The Science of the Self,"

"The Essential Unity of All Religions," etc.

(Third Edition)

1948

The Theosophical Publishing House
Adyar, Madras, India

First Edition, 1904
Second „ 1921
Third „ 1948

शास्त्राणि अभ्यस्य मेधावी, ज्ञानविज्ञानतत्परः
पलालमिव धान्यार्थी त्यजेद् ग्रंथान् अशेषतः ।

—*Brahma-bindu Upanishat*

‘Words strung together in compilations, serve only to protect and hide knowledge, as husk and chaff the grain ; let the wise look for the grain and cast away the chaff of words when that grain of truth has been found.’

‘Wouldst thou enclasp the beauty of the True ?
Let pass the word ; the thought, the thought pursue !’

—*Maulānā Rūm*

“Live neither in the present, nor the future, but in the Eternal, . . . because nothing that is embodied, nothing that is conscious of separation, nothing that is out of the Eternal, can aid you ; . . . within you is the light of the world
‘Read the larger word of life.’”

—*Light on the Path*

“There is a peace that passeth and yet passeth not the pure understanding. It abides everlastingly in the hearts of those that live in the Eternal.”

यस्तु सर्वाणि भूतानि आत्मन्येव ऽनुपश्यति,
सर्वभूतेषु चा आत्मानं, ततो न विचिकित्सते ।
यस्मिन् सर्वाणि भूतानि आत्मा एव अवाभूद्विज्ञानतः,
तत्र को मोहः, कः शोकः एकत्वं अनुपश्यतः ।

—*Īsha Upanishat*, 6, 7

‘He that seeth all things in the Self, and the Self in all things, he thenceforth doubteth and sorroweth no more.’

seekers after a final solution of the ultimate problems of life, who are not content with the solutions now extant. I believe that such an endeavour deserves sympathy; I believe that it will be more successful if I have the help and co-operation of sympathetic friends than if it were left to my own unaided resources; and I believe that you can and will give such help effectively. This help from you is the more needed as the many distractions of a life, which past karma has thrown along the lines of office and the business of the householder, rather than those of literary pursuits and the studious leisure of the scholar, have prevented me from making this work anything more than the merest outlines of the all-embracing subject of metaphysic, well defined as 'completely unified knowledge,' treated therein—and those outlines too, full of immaturity of thought, possible extravagance of expression, and a certain lack of the finish of scholarship.

"I therefore pray that you will look through this little book and, unless you think it wholly useless for the purpose mentioned, will send it back to me after having noted on the blank pages all obscure or doubtful and debatable or positively inaccurate and inconsistent statements of fact, falseness or exaggeration of sentiment, and confusion or illogic of arguments and marshalling of ideas, that you may notice."

Suggestions for improvement were received in chronological order from: Pt. Gangānāth Jhā, Professor of Saṃskṛt, Muir Central College, Allahabad; Bābu Govinda Dās, of Benares (my elder brother);

Dr. Hübbe-Schleiden, of Döhren bei Hannover, Germany ; Dr. J. H. Stirling, of Edinburgh ; Prof. J. E. McTaggart, of Trinity College, Cambridge ; Pt. M. S. Tripathi, Author of *A Sketch of Vedānta Philosophy*, of Nadiad ; P. T. Shrinivāsa Iyengar Esq., M.A., Principal, Narsingh Row College, Vizagapatam ; J. Scott Esq., M.A., Principal, Bahāuddin College, Junāgadh. Ayodhya Dās Esq., B.A., Barrister-at-Law, Gorakhpur ; Pt. Sākhāram G. Pandit, Branch Inspector, Theosophical Society, Benares ; Pt. Bhavānī Shankar, Branch Inspector, Theosophical Society, Benares ; M. André Chevrillon, of Paris ; B. Keightley Esq., M.A., Barrister-at-Law, of London.

I gratefully record the names of these friends, personally known or not known, but most truly friends in the spirit and helpers in a common cause.

But far more than to all these friends are this book and I under obligations to Mrs. Annie Besant, who first saw the rough draft of the work in manuscript, encouraged me to persevere with it, then carefully went over every line of the printed proof-copy, suggested innumerable improvements, and finally saw it through the press.

BHAGAVĀN DĀS

Benares, 1904.

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION

THE work has been out of print for nearly four years. But the demand for it has continued. Hence this second edition. The text has been altered but little, though revised carefully. Further considerations, explanations, solutions of difficulties, answers to objections, have been supplied in additional notes.

Some friends have queried, Why the name, The Science of Peace ?

It is only a rendering of a recognised and significant Samskr̥t word for the Vedānta, viz., Moksha-shāstra, which means, literally, the Science of Deliverance, Freedom.

Science is organised knowledge, knowledge which recognises similarities in diversities and arranges groups of facts in specified relations with each other. Such sciences, of the finite, are pursued because they, in some way or other, minister to finite human needs. This ministration is their function. All organisation is for a purpose, towards the fulfilment of which the function of each organ in that organisation helps.

The most comprehensive Science is the most completely organised, unified knowledge, which sees not merely similarities in diversities, but, co-ordinating and

summing up all sciences in itself as Brahma-vidya the 'great science' and the 'Science of the Infinite,' sees the Absolute Unity of Life in and through all the many-ness of forms, whereof what has been called the organic unity of Nature is the expression; it sees the One Self at the central heart of all things, and all things radiating from that central heart; and the purpose of this great and 'true vision,' this *samyag-darshana*, is the fulfilment of that deepest, that infinite need of the human being, *viz.*, the Peace of mind that arises out of freedom from all doubts and consequent sorrows, out of the eternal assurance of deathless self-dependence.

Hence Moksha-shāstra, of which The Science of Peace is an equivalent, and of the conclusions of which this work constitutes one way of presentation.

The Science of the Sacred Word, or the Praṇava-vāda of Gārgyāyana may be regarded as a continuation of this work. Other compilations of the writer illustrate the same underlying principles in different aspects. *The Science of the Emotions* deals with the nature and culture of the feelings in the light thereof, in the same terms of Self and Not-Self and the desire-aspect of the Relation between them. *The Science of Social Organisation, or the Laws of Manu*, and *The Science of Religion or Sanātana Vaidika Dharma*, show the application of those same principles (in terms of the three aspects of the Relation and consequent three temperaments and psycho-physical types of human beings, *viz.*, intellectual, active, and emotional) to the planning out and

administration of the affairs of individual, as well as communal, human life ; to civics, politics, and law-religion, in other words ; and various pamphlets endeavour to show their bearings on current problems.

To help, however feebly and haltingly, in the interpretation of the ancient and the modern, the Eastern and the Western, to each other ; in the restoration of spiritual insight to material science ; in the passing of this revived spirituality into the new forms of Science and Art, ideals and aspirations, laws and conventions, that the turning of the wheel of time makes inevitable ; in dealing with modern problems in the light of the Ancient Spirit and bringing about a true synthesis of the many components of the human race and an effective and lasting 'balance of power' between the many interests, classes and factors of human society, 'clerical,' political, financial and industrial—this is the general purpose of all these compilations, in continuation of the immediate and obvious special purpose of each.

The great quality of the purpose is the only redeemer of the little quality of the compilations.

Benares

BHAGAVĀN DĀS

28th February, 1919.

PREFACE TO THIRD EDITION

ALL the matter of the previous edition, text and notes, has been retained in this. But verbal improvement has been attempted. Long sentences have been cut into short. There has also been endeavour to make the meaning clearer where it was obscure. Considerable additions have been made to text as well as notes, by incorporation of material which had gathered, in the twenty-six years elapsed since the last edition, as manuscript notes on the margins of my personal copy, suggested by books read during this period.

A reason for the name, *The Science of Peace*, was mentioned in the preface to the second edition. Another is that the book endeavours to make *Peace* between all possible views and opinions which *seem* to conflict, but cannot *really* do so, since they all are *in* the Same Consciousness. The principle of reconciliation, stated repeatedly in text and notes, is, 'Vision Changes with angle of vision', 'Difference of viewpoint makes difference of view', 'Duty differs with circumstance', "New occasions make new duties", "The old order changes, yielding place to new". Also, head, heart, and limbs, knowledge, desire, and action, are reconciled, Rationalism, the philosophy of the head, mysticism, the aspiration

and longing of the heart, Practicalism, the activity of the limbs, all are unified here. (Spirituo-Material) Science-Devotion-Action, Jñāna-Bhakti-Karma, are all shown to be inseparable aspects of One and the same Life; Conflict is only Apparent, Eternal Unity and Peace is Real. This reason is only subsidiary to the first-mentioned, because without peace between head, heart, and limbs, there is no peace for the soul.

Yet another reason is that this book essays to make Peace between ancient eastern Védānta and modern western science. The former tells us that the moving Universe is a Mirage, Illusion, Myth, Miṭhyā, Māyā. The latter tells us that Law reigns in Nature. *Upanishats* speak of niyaṭi, 'fixed law, fate, destiny, ḍishta, and also of Yaḍrchchhā, chance. But current Védānta has forgotten it all. A New Age, of "The Federation of the World and the Parliament of Man" requires a new statement of the Ancient-most Philosophy as Foundation, Inspiration, Ideal, Guide and Director. This Philosophy must be one which reconciles the Yaḍrchchhā - Wilfulness-Self-will of Dream-Play with the Indefeasible Rule of Law. That Meta-Physic is not Meta-Physic which does not include all Physics within itself. That Self is not In-finite which does not include all finite selves and all not-selves within It. That Freedom is not Supreme Freedom which does not include all bonds, all law-and-order. This reason, again, is also only subsidiary to the first; for western Science and eastern Philosophy represent age and youth, Pursuit and

Renunciation; and without Peace between the two, younger generation and older, there cannot be Peace within the home. Also, it is patent that both states come to each soul, one after another, in succession. As a western writer has well said:

“ For a scientific theory to be final, the mind would have to embrace the totality of things in block, and place each thing in its exact relation to every other thing ”.

Reconciliation of all religions particularly has been attempted in another book by this writer, *The Essential Unity of All Religions*. Reconciliation of all sorts of views, as well as of all religions, has been attempted in Hindī, in *Samanvaya*, by him.

From one standpoint, this whole book may be regarded as a feeble endeavour to expound more fully some aspects of “ the fundamental propositions ” and “ the basic conceptions ” stated on pp. 79-85 of Vol. I of H. P. Blavatsky's *The Secret Doctrine*, (Adyar Edition),

‘ Print-order ’ for the first forme of the present edition was sent to Adyar on 1-1-1945, three years ago. Conditions created by the second World War, paper-famine, enormous increase of all costs, going away of press-workers to other occupations, are responsible for spreading over three years, work which, normally, should have been completed in three months or at most six. In the meantime, the writer has grown older (from seventy-six to seventy-nine years of age), his eyes weaker, and

memory more slippery. Consequently, his proof-correction has not been efficient ; and there are many repetitions, some of which were not necessary ; though, probably, each repetition, in its new setting, discloses a new aspect, or exposes more fully an old one, of the subject ; and this is Nature's way too ; also of *Iṭihāsa-Purāṇa*. Such mistakes as are likely to cause doubt and perplexity to the reader, have been noted in the Corrigenda which are placed *before* the text, (not *after*, as is usually done), to enable the reader to make the corrections *before* he begins reading. To come at them *after* he has finished the book, with doubts and perplexities unsolved, is too late, and of no use.

My gratitude is due, in the first place, to Mr. K. S. Krishnamurti, Manager of the Theosophical Publishing House, who decided to take up the work of a new edition, despite the immense difficulties created by the conditions above referred to ; in consequence of which some projected appendices have been dropped also. My thanks are also due to the Press as a whole for bearing patiently with my bad habit of making many additions and alterations in the second galley-proof, and, very rarely though, in the page-proofs also. My gratitude to Miss Preston and Mr. Henry van Zeijst, who have revised the Indices, is more fully stated in the note prefixed to them.

BHAGAVAN DAS

MEND, O Master !, with Thy perfectness, Thy servant's
imperfection, lest any earnest seeker after Truth be led
astray by error of his. Subtile is that utter Truth,
though all so simple, very difficult to set on high so it
shall shine out strong and clear and steady, and very
feeble for such purpose is the hand that would now do
so. Guide Thou that hand aright.

CORRIGENDA

(Only such errors are noted and corrected below, as are likely to cause perplexity or misunderstanding. These corrigenda are placed *before* the text begins—instead of *after* it ends, as is usually done—in order that the corrections may be made *before* the reader begins perusal).

PAGE	LINE	FOR	READ
9	heading	First	Second
14	3 from bottom	on	an
15	6 " "	on	or
32	18	विर् उरुत्तमाः	विदुर् उत्तमाः
68	14	Carried	endeavoured to carry
83	heading	Examination	explanation
122	19	h a r v a ṭ i	h a r a ṭ i
129	7 from bottom	seets	sects
149	15	विद्यादाऽयो	विद्यादयो
157	11		
161	f.n. 3, 1. 3	27	72
165	heading	IX	VIII
170	19	spirits	spirits, Dhyan Chohans
191	22	as in	as also in
"	23	also <i>Gītā</i>	<i>Gītā</i>

CONTENTS

(Headings, placed on top of every page, supplement
this Table of Contents abundantly.)

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	THE GREAT QUESTIONING	
	Vairāgya, world-surfeit, of Nachikēṭā and his question to Yama, ruler of the Prēṭa-worlds -- Vairāgya of Maitrēyī and her question to Yājñavalkya -- Vairāgya of Rāma and his question of Vasishtha.—Quest of the soul after immortality and self-dependence, its shrinking from annihilation and from dependence on the mercy of another.—NOTE : Psychical Autobiography	1
II	THE FIRST AND SECOND ANSWERS :	
	Craving of the jiva for a synthesising unity -- Its first finding, viz, creation by a Personal First Cause, and its worship thereof.—Failure of this finding to bring permanent peace —The jiva's further search and second finding, viz., evolution by the interplay of two co-eternal factors, a philosophy without a religion — Failure of this second finding.—NOTE : Three theories of Causation	6
III.	UNCERTAINTIES .	
	The main quest.—Many subordinate questions.—Correspondence between answers to the main and subordinate questions —NOTE : The sempiternal longing	11
IV.	PRELIMINARIES OF THE THIRD AND LAST ANSWER.—SELF AND NOT-SELF :	
	Existence of Self.—Nature of Self.—Its immortality.—Self not compound or multiplex, but the sole source, substrate, refuge, of the compound and multiplex.—Universal solipsism —Self not definable in terms of anything limited and particular.—Self not commonplace nor yet anything mysterious or mystical.—Meaning of enquiry.—Direct and indirect knowledge.—The nature of the Not-Self.—The partial peace of Praṭyag-ātmā, the Self	21

V. MUTUAL RELATION OF SELF AND NOT-SELF :

The kind of relation desired between Self and Not-Self, viz., such as will make Not-Self wholly dependent on Self.—No enquiry needed as to origin of Self.—The only need of thought is to free Self from dependence on Not-Self, to derive the changeful from the changeless.—Attempts to formulate the relation.—Dvaita Vedānta, only another form of the theory of creation, hence also a failure.—Viśiṣṭa-Ādvaita Vedānta, only another form of the theory of evolution by the interaction of two factors, hence also a failure

43

VI. MUTUAL RELATION OF SELF AND NOT-SELF (*Continued*) :

The same results in terms of European philosophies.—The inspiration of Indian thought, ethico-religious : knowledge for the sake of happiness —That of modern European thought, mostly intellectual and epistemological : knowledge for the sake of knowledge. Locke's finding : there is nothing in the intellect which was not previously in the senses.—Leibnitz's addition : 'except intellect itself'.—Berkeley's finding, the *esse* of matter is its *percipi*.—Hume's finding ; the converse —Consequent restoration of the problem to the *status quo*, but on a higher level.—Kant's finding a mental thing-in-itself projecting 'forms' and a material thing-in-itself projecting 'matter,' 'sensations' —Consequent aggravation of the problem.—Subsequent attempts of Fichte and others to unify two things-in-themselves of Kant.—Schelling's inference of the Absolute from the Relative —Hegel's work.—Its defects —Fichte's explanation of World-Process in terms of Ego and Non-Ego.—Its general similarity with the views of Ādvaita Vedānta : Determination of nature of Ego by the method of ādhyāropa-apavāda, *abscissio infiniti*, postulation-negation.—The last difficulty.—Need to justify the very fact and nature of change at all, and to combine both change and changelessness in the Absolute.—Attempts of Rosicrucians in this behalf.—Logia, great sentences, of Vēda, as employed by Ādvaita Vedānta.—NOTE I : Pantheon of Philosophers.—NOTE II : Comparison of Hegel, Fichte, and Vēdānta

52

VII. THE LAST ANSWER :

Eulogy, in Scripture, of AUM as last answer.—A hypothesis as to real meaning of Aum as thus eulogised.—The logion, 'Ego Non-Ego Non,' as real

CHAPTER

PAGE

meaning of the three-lettered Aum, and as final explanation of World-Process.—Approaches to this logion in current *Upamśhats* and *Purānas*.—Most significant form of this logion, 'Aham Eṣaṭ Na,' 'I-This-Not'.—Joy of the finding.—NOTE I : No appeals to Scripture.—NOTE II : Some more ancient texts . . . 108

VIII. BRAHMA OR THE ABSOLUTE—THE DVANḌVĀTĪTAM :

Changelessness in the logion.—Change within it.—Method of World-Process, and of all thought, the same, viz., *abscissio infiniti*.—Presence of all that is needed, of all contradictions as well as of their reconciliation by mutual abolition, within the Absolute.—So-called indescribability of the Absolute due not to powerlessness but to completion of thought.—Correction of Hegel by Vēḍāṇṭa.—Many names of the Absolute.—Reason for the name Param-ātmā given to Brahma.—NOTE : A few more ancient texts, Vēḍic and Buddhist . . . 138

IX. DVANḌVAM—THE RELATIVE :

(A) PRAṬYAG-ĀTMĀ—SELF

Nature of Praṭyag-ātmā and its identity with all jivas.—Distinction between It and Brahma.—Nature of Self with reference to Time, Space, and Motion.—An illustration, by 'Sound Sleep'.—Genesis of the three attributes of Praṭyag-ātmā, viz., Saṭ-Chiṭ-Ānanda, Being-Consciousness-Bliss, corresponding to Kriyā-Jñāna-Ichchhā. Action-Cognition-Desire.—Tri-une-ness of the Absolute reflected in these three attributes.—Worship of the Self . . . 158

X. DVANḌVAM—THE RELATIVE (*Continued*) :

(B) MŪLA-PRAKṚṬI—NOT-SELF, MATTER

Various significant names of Mūla-prakṛṭi.—Its essential nature and characteristic.—Consequences ensuing from that nature.—Birth of the world's endless diversity (a) of pseudo-infinite particulars, (b) in pairs, (c) mutually and positively opposed, and so always abolishing each other.—Meaning of arbitrariness; its absence from the World-Process taken as a whole. Continuum of the World-Process, in consequence of indivisibility of the Absolute, appearing in the fact that everything is everywhere and always.—False assumption by Not-Self of the characteristics of Self, infinity, eternity, etc.—Explanation of why two or rather three parts are distinguishable in the Partless Logion.—Meaning of 'Illusion'.—Safeguards present in the Logion itself against all possible impeachments.

—Why Matter is Uncreatable and Indestructible.—Mutual balancing of increase and decrease, action and reaction.—Some suggested lines of thought.—How Three Moments are distinguishable in the partless Absolute.—Their simultaneousness despite succession.—World-Process a device for reconciliation of antinomies of the reason.—Distinction between ideal and real, thought and thing, abstract and concrete.—Special attributes of Mūla-Prakṛti, *viz.*, Saṭṭva-Rajas-Tamas, Cognisability-Mobility-Desirability, corresponding to Guṇa-Karma-Dravya, Quality-Movement-Substance.—Universal presence of all, with predominance of one of these three.—Worship of Not-Self.—NOTE: How Metaphysic illuminates all

172

XI. DVANḌVAM—THE RELATIVE (*Continued*) :

(C.—i.) SHAKṬI-ENERGY AND NEGATION—AS THE RELATION AND THE CAUSE OF INTERPLAY BETWEEN SELF AND NOT-SELF.

Significance of Negation, in permutations of the logion.—Various facts and beliefs corresponding to the permutations.—Affirmation and Negation involved in Not.—Consequences in shape of laws of alternation and rhythm.—Chakra, wheel, of Pravṛtti and Nivṛtti, Pursuit and Renunciation.—Pseudo-infinite cycles.—Law and breaches of law subsumed under ever wider law.—Necessity of the Changeless Nature of the Absolute, as embodied and described in the logion, the one Cause of all causes.—Meaning of Cause.—The Whole the Cause of each Part.—Metaphysic of Free-will.—Necessity as Māyā.—Etymology of Māyā.—Correspondence between evolution of a language and a whole world-system.—Connection between Māyā-Shakti and Negation.—Shakti as *might*, power, energy, etc.—Its three attributes, *viz.*, Avaraṇa-Vikṣhēpa-Sāmya; attraction, repulsion, balanced alternation, Sṛṣhti-Sṭhiṭi-Sambhāra, creation-preservation-destruction—Vidyā, Avidyā, Mahāvīdyā, Science, Nescience, Wisdom.—Worship of Shakti.—Confusion as regards Shakti and Prakṛti in current Samskrṭ works—Parā, Aparā, and Daivi Prakṛtis.—NOTE: Real meaning and correspondence of Saṭṭva-Rajas-Tamas and other triads

199

XII. DVANḌVAM—THE RELATIVE (*Continued*) :

(C.—ii.) SHAKṬI-ENERGY AND NEGATION—AS CONDITION OF INTERPLAY BETWEEN SELF AND NOT-SELF.

Cause and Condition.—Distinction between them.—Various kinds of causes.—Their common characteristic.—

Shakti as cause and Negation as condition.—Three attributes or aspects of Negation, *viz.*, Space-Time-Motion—Their genesis and correspondence with the primal trinity. Variability of such correspondence.

(a) *Space*.—Space as coexistence.—Triple aspects of Space. *viz.*, (1) Side-beside-between, (2) inner-outer-through, (3) point-radii-sphere, etc.—Pseudo-infinite dimensions of space.—Worlds within worlds.—Symbology

(b) *Time*.—Time as succession—Its triplicities, *viz.*, (1) beginning-end-middle, (2) Past-future-present, (3) Moment-period-cycle—Personal immortality.—Variations of correspondence.—Symbology.—Interchange of aspects between the Purāṇic Gods.

(c) *Motion*.—Motion as interweaving of co-existence and succession.—Its triplets, *viz.*, (1) Mergence-emergence-recurrence, (2) approach-recess-revolution, (3) linear-rotatory-spiral, etc.—Various aspects of motion.—Various significant ways of describing motion.—Symbology.—Unresolvable mutual immanence and synchronousness of all trinities and triplets.—Co-inherence of all such trinities, that is to say, of the whole of Samsāra, in each jīva-atom, each composite of Self and Not-Self.—Solution of the riddle that all is everywhere and always—NOTE I. The World-Drama needs Tragedy as well as Comedy. NOTE II. Meaning of Immortality, all jīvas are equal, nay, the same.

297

XIII. JĪVA-ATOMS—(A) GENERALLY

A résumé.—Genesis of the jīva-atom.—Its general negational attributes, *viz.*, Size-Life-Vibration.—Definition of atom.—Of jīva.—Aḍhyāsa, mutual reflection or superimposition of each other's characteristics.—Universals, singulars, and particulars-individuals.—Animate, inanimate, all un-inanimate—Organic, inorganic, all-organic.—Chemico-physical affinities, psychic sympathies, psycho-physical parallelism.—Significance of distinction between animate and inanimate—Life, death, necrobiosis.—Meaning of death.—Soul, body, and causal envelope; Sthūla-Sūkshma-Kāraṇa, gross-subtle-causal; inner-outer-relational.—Nucleus-protoplasm-causal-network.—Pseudo-infinite planes within planes and sheaths within sheaths.—Birth, death, rebirth.—Patence, latence, development.—The Absolute.—Animate nature, inanimate nature, Virāt-Purusha—Individuals within individuals.—Various theories of physical science tending towards the same view.—Need of judging things by their mutual proportion.—Birth of facts from laws.—NOTE: Support of Metaphysic by Physical Science

333

XIV. JĪVA-ATOMS—(B) OBJECTIVELY, *i.e.*, ATOMS :

Other aspects and sub-divisions of Size-Life-Activity. —Volume, form, measure : large-small-average, long-round-ovoid, linear-square-spherical, etc. —Primary form, sphere, including all possible other forms.—Figure-symbolology —Period, filling, rate : long-short-average, well-filled-ill-filled-occupied, fast-slow-even, etc.—Extent, rate, degree : great-little-mean, high-low-even, intense-sluggish-equable, etc.—Reason of these triple subdivisions.—Their simultaneity and nothingness.—Undisturbedness of the Absolute.—Other triplets under Mind and Matter ; increase-decrease-equality and liberality-narrowness-tolerance ; growth-decay-continuance and pursuit-renunciation-equanimity ; expansion-contraction-rhythm and pleasure-pain-peace. Characteristic attributes of atom, *i.e.*, of matter, *viz.*, Dravya-Guṇa-Karma.—Correspondences with other triplets.—Nature of Guṇa, and its correspondence with Chit.—Subdivisions of Guṇa.—Proprium, accident, attribute.—Concrete instances of essential properties.—Of accidental qualities.—Of attributes generally.—Psychological nature of sensations. —Pseudo-infinity of senses and sensuous qualities.—All attributes present everywhere and always. Nature of Karma.—Why it corresponds with Saṅg—Its subdivisions. —Expansion, contraction, vibration.—Karmic guṇas, guṇic karmas, etc., *e.g.*, velocity, dullness, movement, etc.—Nature of Dravya, mere 'this-ness'.—Its correspondence with Ānanda.—Utter inseparability of the three aspects of matter, Dravya, Guṇa, and Karma, or 'This, Such, and Thus'.—Subdivisions of Dravya.—Positive weight, negative weight, dead weight, heavy, buoyant, resistant, etc.—Why Dravya corresponds with Ānanda and Tamas.—Reason of variations in correspondence. —Simultaneousness as well as succession of all these subdivisions —Concomitance of the three aspects helpful in reconciling many conflicting theories of physical science. —Appearance of qualities, apparently exclusively cognisable by one sense only, in the objects of all the senses, —Vedāntic doctrine of quintuplication of all sense-elements.—Parallel changes of aspects.—Pseudo-infinite varieties of Guṇa.—Of Karma.—Of Dravya.—Pseudo-infinite variety of dimension, duration, and vibration of atoms.—Reconciled by existence of planes within
 * planes

XV. JĪVA-ATOMS—(C) SUBJECTIVELY, *i.e.*, JĪVAS.

Subjective aspects of Size, Life, and Vibration, *viz.*, range, intensity, calibre, etc., as appearing in inner

life of Consciousness.—Nature of Consciousness.—In what sense the word Consciousness describes Brahma.—A re-statement of genesis of three aspects of individual consciousness, *viz.*, cognition, desire, and action.—Their subdivisions.—Cognition and action in terms of each other.—Multifarious triplets arising under each.—Mutual superimposition of attributes between Self and Not-Self.—Pseudo-infinite multiplications, radiations, and cognitions between selves and not-selves.—Metaphysical nature and genesis of organs of sense and action.—Metaphysic of sense-media, ether, air, etc.—Significance of concentric involucra, sheaths, *upādhis*, bodies, of *jiva*, with special reference to cognition.—Nucleus and nucleolus.—Synthesis of pseudo-infinity of planes.—Method of the synthesis, by triplets of planes or worlds.—Interpretation of *Tri-bhuvanam*.—Why scriptural statements are capable of many interpretations, all equally true —“As above so below”.—Distinction between Inner and Outer, Ideal and Real, Thought and Thing.—Illustration.—How and Why this distinction.—Metaphysical meaning of Memory.—Self or Self-consciousness as reason, and reason or *buddhi*, as *sūtra*, thread, network of laws of the World-Process, and web of life of individual organisms.—Individual participation in Universal Omniscience.—An illustration—Latent and Patent.—Meaning of ‘Ideality’—Illustrations.—Individuality, a ‘present’ which includes a ‘before’ and an ‘after’—Metaphysical significance of *Sūkshma-Sharira*.—Relation of subtler to denser planes of matter, *e.g.*, of ether to gas, gas to water, etc., similar to relation of *Pratyag-ātmā* to *Mūla-prakṛti*.—Words having universal as well as special and local significance.—Illustrations.—Corollaries.—Apparently disconnected planes found to be graded together from higher standpoints.—Dimensions of space.—Expansion of Consciousness.—Meaning of Yoga . . .

XVI. SUMMATION :

The Universal, the Singular, and the Relation between them.—Certain difficulties of ambiguity—Suggested restrictions of connotation—Reconciliation between Nominalism and Realism, etc.—Manifestation of Self in language.—Synthesis of discrete facts by the principle of Individuality.—Definitions of *jiva-atom* and *brahm-ānda* in terms of the Absolute.—Illustrations.—Essential and complete sameness of all *jivas*.—Apparent difference and separateness made by mere variation of order of experiences.—Why order of experiences varies.—Balancing of pleasure and pain.—*Bhartṛ-hari*'s

CHAPTER	PAGE
saying.—Real significance of sameness of all jivas — The converse 'reality' of appearance of difference and evolution of jivas from so-called lower to so-called higher stages and involution <i>vice-versa</i> .—The wonder of the diversity of the world and the Peace of Sameness amidst the Turmoil of Change.—Conclusion	466
DEDICATION	496
INDEX OF WORKS REFERRED TO	499
INDEX OF PROPER NAMES	505
GLOSSARY OF SAMSKṚT WORDS	511



CHAPTER I

THE GREAT QUESTIONING

येयं प्रेते विचिकित्सा मनुष्ये, ऽस्तीत्येके नायमस्तीति चान्ये—
एतद् विद्यामनुशिष्टस्त्वयाऽहम् , वराणामेष वरस्तृतीयः ।

“THE dread doubt that seizeth the beholders when a man passeth away, so that one sayeth, ‘He still is,’ and another, ‘No, he is no more’—I would know the truth of this, taught by thee, O Death ! This I crave as the third of the three boons thou promised !”¹

This is the boon that Nachikeṭā asked of Yama, Master of Death, Judge of departed souls. And Yama shrank from the great task imposed on him and answered : “Even the gods have suffered from this doubt, and very subtle is the science that resolveth it. Ask thou another boon ! Besiege me not with this. Take all the pleasures that the earth can give ; take undivided sovereignty of it !” But Nachikeṭā : “Where shall all these pleasures be when the end comes ! The pleasures are no pleasures, poisoned by the constant fear of Thee !

¹ *Katha-Upanishat*, I, i. For the full story of Nachikeṭā, his seeking and his finding, see the *Upanishat*.

The gods too suffer from the doubt, for they are only longer-lived and not eternal; and that they suffer is but reason why I would not be as they. I crave my boon alone. Nachikeṭā asks not for another."

"If all this earth with all its gems and jewels were mine without dispute, should I become immortal?" So Maitrēyī questioned Yājñā-valkya when he offered wealth to her at parting. And Yājñā-valkya answered: "No, thou couldst only live as the wealthy live, and die as they. Wealth brings not immortality!" Then Maitrēyī: "What shall I do with that which makes me not immortal? Tell me what thou knowest brings assurance of eternity."¹

So Rāma also asks Vasishtha: "The books that say that Brahmā, Viṣṇu, and Maheśha are the three highest gods that rule our solar system, say also that they die. Brahmā, the highest-seated, falls; the unborn Hari disappears; and Bhava, source of the existence of this world, himself goes into non-existence! How then may feeble souls like mine find peace and rest from fear of death and change and ending?"²

"To be dependent on another (to be at the mercy of another, to be subject to the relentlessness of death)—this is misery. To be Self-dependent—this, this is happiness."³

Thus, instinctively in the beginning, consciously and deliberately at the stage when self-consciousness and

¹ *Bṛhad-Āraṇyaka-Upaniṣad*, II, iv.

² *Yoga-Vāsishtha*, Vairāgya Prakaraṇa, xxvi, 29. For the full story, see the present writer's *Mystic Experiences*, (*Tales from the Yoga-Vāsishtha*).

³ *Manu*, iv, 160.

intelligence are developed, the jīva¹ feels the terror of annihilation, and struggles to escape from it, into the refuge of some faith or other, low or high. And in such struggles only, and always, begin religion and philosophy, each shade of these according, step by step, with the stage and grade of evolution and intelligence of the jīva concerned.

But when this fear of death of soul and body, this fear of loss and change and ending, pervades the intelligent and self-conscious jīva; when it destroys his joy in the things that pass, makes him withdraw from all the old accustomed objects of enjoyment, and fills him, for that time, with sadness and disgust and loathing for all the possible means of pleasure that ever hide within their lying hearts the means of pain; when it leaves him naked and alone, intensely conscious of his solitude and sorrow, shrinking violently from the false and fleeting show of the world, desolate with his own misery and the misery of others, longing, yearning, pining, for the Permanent, the Eternal, the Restful, for a lasting explanation of the use and purpose, origin and end, of this vast slaughter-house, as the whole world then seems to him to be—then is that searching soul passing through the fires of burning thought, reflection

¹ Jīva means a separate self, a spirit or soul, a living thing, an individual unit, vortex, point, focus or centre of latent or evolved consciousness, a single part, so to say, of the Universal Self, a dew-drop image of the Sun, passing from the mineral through the vegetable and animal into the human and superhuman kingdoms; here of course a human soul or spirit. See quotation from *Yoga-Vasishtha*, II, xix, in ch. iv, f.n., p. 29, *infra*.

and discrimination between the Transient and the Permanent; of passionate rejection of all personal and selfish pleasures and attachments in himself as well as others; of the self-suppression, the intense quiescence and compassionate sadness, of utter renunciation; and of a consuming, ever-present, craving and travelling for the means of liberation, from that seeming slaughter-house, for himself *and for all others*; then is he passing through the fires that shall purify him and make him worthy of Vēḍ-āṇṭa, of that 'final knowledge' which he craves, and which alone can bring him peace and fit him for the work that lies before him. Then is his consciousness, his individuality, his personal self, focussed into an infinitesimal point, and, thus oppressed with the feeling of its own extreme littleness, is it ready for the supreme reaction, ready to lose itself and merge into and realize the All-Consciousness of the Infinite and Universal Self.

Why, and at what stage of his evolution, this most fearful and most fruitful mood comes necessarily on every soul, will appear of itself, when, later on, the mystery of the World-Process has been grasped and understood.¹

NOTE.—The first six chapters of this work constitute, in a way, the psychological autobiography of the writer. They describe the stages of thought through which he passed to the finding embodied in the seventh chapter. And they have been written down only as a possible guide-book to travellers along

¹ Many western mystics, poets, philosophers, have experienced and described this mood; to name one, Tolstoy, in *How I came to Believe*, gives a very vivid picture of his own *v a i r ā g y a*, passionate disgust with the world, and *v i - v é k a*, search for the Eternal as distinguished from the Fleeting.

the same path. All the opinions and beliefs criticised in them and, for the time, left behind, in order to pass further on, have served as staging-places to the writer himself, have been held by him closely for a longer or a shorter time, and then, failing to bring lasting satisfaction of the particular kind that he was seeking, have been passed by. But this does not mean that the staging-places and the rest-houses have been abolished, or are of no use. They continue to exist, will always exist, and will always be of use to future travellers. No depreciation of any opinion whatsoever is ever seriously intended by the writer. Indeed, it is a necessary corollary of the view embodied in the seventh and subsequent chapters of the work, that every opinion, every *darśhāna*, every 'view,' catches and embodies one part of truth; and he himself now holds each and every one and all of the opinions that appear to be refuted in these preliminary six chapters—but he holds them *in a transmuted form*. Each form of faith, each rite of religion, each way of worship, has its own justification. If the writer has unwittingly used, in the passion of his own struggle onwards, any words that are harsh and offend, he earnestly begs the forgiveness of every reader really interested in the subject, and assures him that if he does think it worth while to read this book through systematically, he will realize that it verily endeavours, not to depreciate any, but to appreciate all thoughts, and put each into its proper place in the whole world-scheme. The 'well-established conclusion,' the *siddhānta*, of Indian thought is that as *अधिकारिभेदाद् धर्मभेदः*, so *प्रस्थानभेदाद् दर्शनभेदः*, as 'duty varies with the individual's position,' so 'the view, the opinion, varies with the angle of vision, the situation, the point of departure'; but the 'final view,' of *Vēd-ānta*, from the 'universal' standpoint, includes all views.

The italicised words, 'and for all others', p. 4 l. 8 above, make *mumukshā* equivalent with *bodhi-chitta* of Buddhist philosophy. Spirit of holiness, holiness of spirit, is love for all, compassion for all who are suffering. The objection that some persons feel tired of life, do not fear death, indeed welcome it, is answered in ch. ii of *The Science of the Self*, and pp. 51-52 of *The Essential Unity of All Religions*. If any persons really do not want any philosophy, or

6 CRAVING FOR FREEDOM FROM FEAR [SCIENCE OF

religion, surely none need be, none ought to be, *none* verily *can be*, forced on them. From the point of view of this work, the impelling motive, *pra-yojana*, 'final cause', of the search for philosophical Truth, is not intellectual curiosity, but profound heart-craving for Freedom, Freedom from Fear, the essence of which Fear is Fear of Privation and Death at the hands of Another than Self. To rise in triumph above this Fear, sensitive and steadfast souls seek That which is beyond all Death, ततो हि एनं प्रविचिन्वन्ति धीराः, ब्रह्मचर्येण, तपसा, अनाशकेन, (*Upan.*), "with abstinence from sense-indulgences, ascetic ways, and intense meditations that make them forget even the need for nourishment of body."

CHAPTER II

THE FIRST AND SECOND ANSWERS

THUS we find that the *jīva* doubts and asks for immortality alone, and in the doubting and the asking, he ever instinctively feels that the answer lies in a basic 'Unity' of some sort or other, and that peace can never be found in an unreconciled and conflicting 'Many'. This feeling conditions his search throughout, for reasons inherent in him-Self and in the World-Process, as will appear later. As the *Gītā* (xiii. 27) says: "Only when the soul sees the Many rooted in the One and also branching out from that One, does knowledge become complete and perfect, does the Infinite become fulfilled and realized in that soul, does the soul identify itself with the All-Self, Brahman."

The first answer that the soul shapes for itself to the great question, the first tentative solution of this overpowering doubt, is embodied in the view which is called the *āraṁbhā-vāda*,¹ the theory of a beginning, an origination, a "creation of the world by an agency external to the questioner and to the World". From so-called fetish-worship to highest deism and theism, all may be grouped under this first class of answer.

Instinctively or intelligently, the *jīva* sees that effects do not arise without causes; that what is not effected by himself must be caused by another; that he himself (as he then regards himself) is an effect, and that his cause must be another; that whatever is the more permanent, the older, is the cause of the temporary, the younger; and he finally infers and believes that his well-being, permanence, immortality, lies in, is dependent on, his cause, his Creator. From such working of the mind arise the multifarious forms of faith, beginning with belief in, and worship of, stone and plant and animal, and ending in belief in, and worship of, a personal First Cause. The general form and meaning of worship is the same throughout, *i.e.*, prayer for some benefit or grace. The accompanying condition of worship is the same also, *viz.*, giving

¹ *Pañcha-ḍashī*, xiii, 7.

आरंभवादिनो ऽन्यस्माद् अन्यस्य उत्पत्तिम् ऊचिरे ।

Hoffding's statement, "according to the popular conception of the causal relation, one thing is the cause, another thing the effect," is an almost literal translation of this verse; (*Outlines of Psychology*, p. 209.)

assurance of humility in order to evoke benevolence in the object of worship, by prostration and obeisance and sacrifice of objects held most dear, to prove (sometimes, with cruellest immolation of others or of self, though at others with a most beautiful and most noble self-surrender) that they are not held dearer than that worshipped object.

This first answer is a religion as well as a philosophy, but the *jīva* finds not rest for long therein.

The concrete material idols fail again and again, and so does the mental idol. The incompatibility of evil and suffering with a being who is at once omnipotent, omniscient, and all-good ;¹ the unsatisfied need for an explanation why a personal being who is perfect should create a world at all,² and how he can create it out of nothing—as he must, if it is not to be coexistent with and so at least to some extent independent of him—these distressing doubts, insoluble on ‘the theory of a beginning,’ that have always shaken faith, first in the power and goodness of the creator, and then in his very existence. Inevitably, earlier or later, they wrench the earnestly-enquiring *jīva* away from his anchorage in that theory, and set him adrift again, again a-searching.

The truth that underlies this first answer, in all its forms, he will discern again when he has obtained what he now wants so urgently.

¹ वैषम्यनैर्घृण्यप्रसंगात् । Shankara, *Shariraka-bhāṣya*, II, i, 34.

² *Ibid.*, II, i, 33.

His next haven of rest, the second answer, is the *pariṇāma-vāda*,¹ or *vikāra-vāda*,² the theory of change, transformation, evolution and dissolution, by the interaction of two factors. By a great generalisation he reduces all the phenomena of the universe to two permanent elements, present always, universally, under all circumstances, throughout all the changes that he sees and feels.

The materialism and agnosticism which believe in 'Matter and Force', and declare all else unknown; the ordinary Sāṅkhya doctrine of 'Purusha and Prakṛti,' (or, rather, an infinite number of Purushas and one Prakṛti), 'Ego and non-Ego,' 'Self and not-Self,' 'Subject and Object', 'Spirit and Matter'—all fall under this second category. Most of the philosophies of the world are here; the variations as to detail are endless, but the view that the universe is due to two finals, is common to them all.

At this stage, if the duality be made the basis of a religion at all, the believer proclaims the factor of Good as superior to the factor of Evil, and assigns to it a final triumph, regarding God as prevailing over Satan. Hormuzd over Ahriman, Purusha over Prakṛti, Spirit over Matter, in a vague undefined way, sacrificing strict logic

¹ *Pañcha-dashī*, xiii, 8. अवस्थांतरतापत्तिरेकस्य परिणामिता, स्यात् क्षीरं दधि, मृत् कुम्भः, सुवर्णं कुण्डलं तथा । "One and the same thing passing into a new state, as milk becoming curds; clay, pots, gold, earrings—this is *pariṇāma*." Compare Hoffding, *loc. cit.*, p. 212, "Cause and effect are members of one and the same process".

² *Vedānta-sāra*.

to the instinctive need for Unity, which, as said before, conditions the search throughout. But where the two are seen as equal, as in the Sāṅkhya, religion vanishes, no practice corresponds to the theory. Thus, the Sāṅkhya system describes Purusha as 'lame,' and Prakṛti as 'blind,' *helping* each other, apparently, for the purpose of (each feeling it-'self' alive, existing, in) the Play of the World-Process, but in reality *opposed* in nature. The struggle between the two weakens both; each factor neutralises the other. There is no worship in the absence of a One Supreme to worship. Only philosophy remains, a belief, wavering and satisfactionless. An explanation by two eternals, a plurality of infinites, each unlimited and yet not interfering with the unlimitedness of the other, though existing *out of* and independently of it; with, furthermore, their interplay governed by Chance—such an explanation is no explanation at all. If it is said that these many eternals and infinites exist, not out of but, *within* each other, that they pervade and permeate each other, then the 'explanation' becomes yet more unintelligible. It is all a contradiction in terms; it is mere arbitrariness; there is no order, no certainty, no law, no reason in it. However correct it may be as a generalised statement of indubitable facts, *viz.*, an endlessness of Spirit and an endlessness of Matter, those facts themselves remain unexplained, unreconciled, impossible to understand.

The truth that underlies this belief also will appear when the final answer is found.

NOTE.—The *ārambha-vāda* corresponds to what in modern psychology has been called “the *popular* conception of causality”; (Hoffding’s *Outlines of Psychology*, V—D). Hoffding’s own view may be described as the *scientific* notion of causality, corresponding to the *pariṇāma-vāda*. The final or Vēdāntic notion, including, yet transcending, the other two, known in Samskr̥t as *vivar̥ta-vāda*, *aḍhyāsa-vāda*, and also as *ābhāsa-vāda*, may be described in modern terms as the *metaphysical* notion of causation, not yet recognised and accepted in the west; though some thinkers approximate. Fichte, Hegel, Schopenhauer, Bradley, Royce, Green, Caird and others, catch different aspects of it. *Vivar̥ta-vāda* is the ‘doctrine of reversal, opposition,’ because the Changing World-Effect is the illusory *opposite* of the Changeless Consciousness-Cause; also, perhaps, because, while the Sāṅkhya concludes that Nature-Matter-Prakṛti is One, and Souls-Forces-Purushas infinitely Many, the Vēdānta *reverses* the conclusion, and holds that the Spirit is One, and Matter Many; *aḍhy-āsa* is ‘baseless im-post-ure, super-im-position, or sup-position,’ ‘false imputation,’ of attributes and qualities which do not exist; *ā-bhāsa* is ‘*illusory* appearance’. The full significance of this third and last answer will appear later on. See ch. xi, *infra*.

CHAPTER III

UNCERTAINTIES

TENTATIVE, temporary, full of uncertainty and full of questioning is this stage. Baffled in his efforts to understand the World-Process completely; barred out from a perfect religion-philosophy, a system of knowledge which would consistently and directly unify and guide his thought, desire, and action, head, heart, and limbs, in

this life and all lives to come ; unable to rest peacefully in a mere incomplete knowledge. in a mere belief which remains outside of his daily life and is often coming into conflict with it ; the *jīva* goes back again and again to that earlier answer, which, if only belief, only incomplete knowledge, is yet a religion also, a religion-philosophy, however imperfect. But each such going back is only the preliminary to a still stronger going forward. The *jīva* is now in the grasp of an indefeasible reflectiveness, of a craving of the intellect that may not be repressed.¹ He has attained his majority and must now stand on his own feet ; his parents may not fondle him in their lap any longer. And so he progresses onwards through and from the second stage, driven by doubts, harassed by heart-oppressing questions.

What is really sought by the soul, is the supremacy of a One, and that One, My-Self ; for so alone can My immortality be assured. But the *jīva* has only *begun* seeking. It is full of the sense of its own weakness. It cannot at once leap to the knowledge and certainty of its own supremacy. In the *āraṃbhā*, the beginning, of its search, it can reach only the *āraṃbhā-vāḍā*, viz.,

¹ विवेक, *vivēka*, ever-present discrimination between the Transient and the Permanent ; and विचार, *vichāra*, ever-present reflection on the Why and Wherefore of things, whence arise the शम, *śama*, दम, *ḍama*, etc., which are part of the traditional qualifications of the seeker after truth, the student of *Vēdānta*, the aspirant for the final knowledge (or, illumination, experience, including knowledge, emotion, will) and for मोक्षा, freedom (from doubt and error and all ills ; for all ills, wants and pains and restlessness, are but the consequences of Primal Error, as will appear later on.)

that there is a Supreme One, who is other than me, yet is so identified with me by His *karuṇā*, compassion, that He will ensure me a share of His own Immortality ultimately, and that present miseries are only tests and trials. In such belief, the *jīva* instinctively feels that Love is the comparatively outer expression of the Fundamental Inner Unity. But this 'first' answer is not only intellectually illogical; it is also emotionally full of insecurity. It satisfies neither head nor heart. Where is the ground for unshakeable Eternal Faith? How can I trust that this God, outside of me, different from me, will *never* be other than benevolent to me? His present conduct to all His creatures, all around—is it not very cruel, very non-benevolent? Nay, the answer leaves me worse off than before. I am longing for 'freedom' from 'fear of another'. This answer makes me utterly dependent on the mercy of another. It completes my servitude. I have been created out of Nothing by Another, at His Will. I can be annihilated into Nothing by that Other, at His Will-full Caprice. "Better to reign (be Self-dependent) in hell, than (be Other-dependent) slave in heaven". The *pari-ṇāma*, transmuted result of such critical scrutiny of the 'first answer', is the second, the *pari-ṇāma-vāḍa*; but that also turns out, on similar close examination, to be no less devoid of certainty of knowledge and assurance of feeling. Two even finite things cannot occupy the same space; much more, two Infinites; they would be constantly limiting, finit-ising, struggling to oust and abolish, each, the other.

The main object of the soul's quest is but this : " How shall I make sure of my Eternity ? " " How shall I be freed from fear of death ? " " How shall I obtain salvation, ab-solu-tion, from all ills ? " Yet in the searching, he has trodden many paths which have allured him with promise of profit ; have sometimes made him forget for the time being the goal of his enquiry ; and have even, now and then, led him to a short-lived peace and confidence in blind unreasoning or ill-reasoning faith, or in agnosticism, assertion of the impossibility of final knowledge and the futility of all search. And all these paths he has discovered again and again to be blind alleys. Each only leads to a new question and a new wall of difficulty. All the questions await solution by means of the one supreme solution only. The whole labyrinthine maze leads him back, again and yet again, to the same starting-point. The whole can be mastered and traversed in confidence by means of only a single clue.¹

¹ Many-ness is patent, all around. One-ness is not so evident. But the craving for a Unity which would enmesh all Multiplicity without destroying it, is inherent in the human soul—because it is Itself the Final Unity, and yearns to regain what it feels it has lost. Search for assurance of this Final Unity is Meta-physics, 'beyond-physics'. This same craving and search for unity, on limited, but ever larger and larger, scales, is manifest in all departments of human life, political, economical, social, educational, scientific, religious. Humanity is obviously travelling, with the agony of world-wars, to give birth to a Unified World-Federation, World Order, World Organisation of the whole Human Race—a Universal Scientific Religion, a World Economy, a Universal Culturo-Vocational Education, a Universally intelligible Language and readable Script, *not to abolish* particularity, variety, individuality ; but only to *co-ordinate* and reconcile all such, by only *sub-ordinating* them all to Unity ; only to introduce a well-recognised and well-earned minimum of uniformity amidst an equally well-recognised and well-earned multi-formity. Detailed illustration of this travail, in respect of all life-aspects, is not possible here ; but any thoughtful observer can see for himself, how

The many doubts and questions which the jīva gathers and which all lead up to and merge in the one great question, are mainly these¹:

What am I? and Whence? and Whither bound? and Why? what is Spirit, Self, Ego, Subject? what are these other selves, jīvas, like and unlike myself? what is Matter, the World, Not-Self, Not-I, non-Ego, Object? what is Life? what is Death? what is Motion? what are Space and Time? what is Rest? what are Being and

larger and larger concepts, combines, mergers, have been and are subsuming under themselves, smaller units, of all sorts, in all these aspects of life. That the results achieved, from time to time, have always been breaking down, with regresses, is due to the fact that the seeking of unity has been mostly governed by the *false* self of separatist egoist individualism, whence periodical revolts and rebellions by the units sought to be forcibly absorbed, perpetual conflict, and recurring great wars between larger and larger groups headed by stronger and stronger 'individuals'. Only Metaphysics, which is Spiritual Philosophy, Psychology, Science, Religion, all in one, can lead to the desired result, by teaching to Mankind at large, how the desired Unity should and can come willingly and eagerly from *within*, peacefully, creating world-wide Concord, instead of being imposed from *without* violently, whence world-wide Discord.

¹ For crowds of such questionings, see, e.g., *Sarva-sāra* and *Nirālamba Upanishats* also *Shvētāshvatāra Upanishat*, *Rg-vēda* X. 121, and *Atharva-vēda* X. 11. Why refer to so many other questions, when the one that has to be directly dealt with, is—"How can the jīva avoid sorrow and secure happiness?" Because whole and parts are interdependent; no part can be fully understood until all other parts are understood, and the relation of all to each and each to all, and of each and all to the whole and the whole to each and all, is understood, generally. In other words, until the whole is understood, nothing is understood, really. To secure my happiness, I must find out the causes and conditions of my joys and sorrows, these are connected with 'objects, the objective world', and with other jīvas and their joys and sorrows. It becomes indispensable, therefore, for me to find out the exact nature of all these (which may all be classified under the three categories of the I or 'Subject', the not-I or 'Object', and the Relation between them, in order to secure my essential happiness. To prescribe properly for the disease of any one organ, the physician must have knowledge about all organs of the body, and their inter-workings), generally. Compare the current saying, "to know every thing about some one thing, and something about every other thing, is culture".

Non-Being? what is Consciousness? what is Unconsciousness? what is Pleasure? Pain? Mind? Body?

What are Knowledge, Knower, Known? Sensation? Senses? what are the objects sensed, the various elements of Matter? what is the meaning, use, necessity, of *media* of sensation? what is an Idea? what are perception, conception, memory, imagination, expectation, design, judgment, reason, intuition? what are Dreams, Wakings, and Sleepings? what are Abstract and Concrete? what are archetype, genus, and species? what are universals, particulars, and singulars? what is Truth? Reality? Illusion? Error?

What is Desire? what are the subjects and the objects of desire? what are Attraction and Repulsion, harmony, and discord? what is an Emotion? what are Love and Hate, pity and scorn, humility and fear? what is Will? what, if any, is Free-will?

What are Action, acted on, and actor? what are Organs? Organism? what is the meaning of stimulus and response, Action and Reaction? what is the real meaning and significance of power, might, ability, force, or Energy? what is Change, creation, transformation, evolution, dissolution? what are Cause and Effect, Accident and Chance, Necessity and Destiny, Law and Breach of Law, Possible and Impossible?

What is a Thing? what are Noumena and Phenomena? what are essence, substance, attribute, quality, quantity, number? what are One and Many, some and all, Identity and Difference? What is Thought? are thought

and thing, ideal and real—are they same or different, and how and why ?

What are Speech and Language, command, request, and narration, Social life and organisation ? what is Art ? what is the Relation between things and *jīvas* ? individualities and group-souls ?

What is Good and what is Evil ? what are Sin and Virtue ? Right and Wrong ? Right and Duty ? what is Conscience ? what is Liberty ? what are Order, Evolution, the World-Process ? are *jīvas* bound and helpless, or are they free, and if not free, *mukṭa*, ‘liberated,’ how may they become so ? how may sin and sorrow cease ? what is the Cause of sin and sorrow ? Why and How has this sinful and sorrowful world come into existence ? how may, and why may not, joy, happiness, bliss, love, and beauty only pervade the universe ? how may Salva-tion, Ab-solu-tion, be won ? who can bestow it ? is it any Other, or the Self itself ?

Such are, the harassing questions ‘concerning every moment, every aspect, of his life, that follow on the heels of the searcher. Small blame to him if he despair of mastering them ! Well may he give up the task again and again as hopeless, and try to climb out of their way with the help of the weakling plants that rise up here and there before him, growths of temporary belief and uncertain knowledge, naturally belonging only to the first stage of his journey. But the branches which he clings to, fail him at the last, after having served their purpose of giving him rest and strength for a greater effort, and he

is shaken down from them by his pursuers, and compelled to press forward again.

Let him not despair. The intensity and stress of his *vairāgya*¹ will soon break up the shell of selfishness that limits consciousness in him into a personal-self-consciousness, and will transform it into the All-Self-Consciousness. Then that Inmost Mystery of the Universe, that is now hidden from his sight, shall stand revealed. The energy of that *vairāgya* will transform his hurrying feet into wings, on which he will rise high above the labyrinth of doubts and questions; and from that height he will be able to master all the foes that harried and pursued him so relentlessly.²

¹वैराग्य, *vairāgya*, is the passionate revolt from all limitation of the Self, from all selfishness, all selfish and personal attachments in himself as well as others, which constitutes the indispensable pre-requisite to a true, earnest, and fruitful enquiry into the origin and end of things, and is the counterpart of मुमुक्षा, *mumukshā*, the yearning for liberation from pain, the essential pain of bonds, limitations, doubts and fears and lack of the supreme and final Self-dependence. The mystics' "Dark Night of the Soul", before it attains final certainty, the "Slough of Despond," are allied to, though they may not be quite the same as, *vairāgya*. In order to lead successfully to the great realisation, the *vairāgya* must be *sāttvika*, benevolent, philanthropic, not *rājasa* a mere cynicism, or *tāmāsa*, mere indifference, sloth. To see others in pain should be the greatest pain.

²The expression employed here may appear a little too impassioned. This has been done purposely to show that metaphysic deals, not only with the single cold and sober department of intellect in life, but with the whole of life as manifesting in cognition, desire, and action, and has to pass through the travail of a rebirth that would encompass all these. The whole life of the true and earnest enquirer is put into such search, hence the mixture of science and emotion. Prof. Patrick Geddes has well said, in his report on *The Proposed University at Indore*, "...To stir ourselves to a higher and broader level of thinking than the everyday one...involves a certain warmth; it requires activity and ardour as of the climber, beyond our habitual alternation of pedestrian's pavement and sedentary's chair. With all real thought-problems, it is as with the forging of iron, which, to be strongly or subtly fashioned,

It should be noted here that each of the first two answers to the great question carries with it its own corresponding set of answers to all these questions. But, like those two, these also are unsatisfactory, external and superficial. The earnest enquirer must search deeper. How to answer them in terms of Consciousness, of the Self, which is the nearest to him and therefore after all the most intelligible? He must interpret all things in their deepest connection with and origin from the Self; otherwise doubt will remain and satisfaction not be gained. For as the answer to the one Great Question is to disclose the answer to all these, so in turn the good answering of these will be the test that that one answer itself is good.

NOTE.—Who am I, whence, how, whither, why?, this has been asked in the very same words, so to say, by Shankara of India and Bergson of France, to mention only two out of innumerable seekers. Omar Khayyam of Persia has put the question in the very same words also, in beautiful setting,

Into this Universe, and *Why* not knowing,
Nor *Whence*, like water willy-nilly flowing;
And out of it, as Wind along the Waste,
I know not *Whither*, willy nilly blowing.

But he was not a *seeker* for the answer, but had satisfied himself that answer was impossible, and was content to taste

must be hammered red-hot. The eagle rises to his height through the psych-organic stress of life and effort, which heats his blood...and so gives him wider and clearer vision, albeit at a temperature far above that of fever."

"It is the heart and not the brain that to the Highest doth attain"; (Longfellow). Moksha is not mere vision, but ex-tasis also, a mystic communion, union, of the Individual with the Universal. "All great things—and the great philosophies are among them—come from the heart and from great passion" Riehl's *Nietzsche*, quoted at p. 113 of A. Herzberg's *The Psychology of Philosophers*. Bergson's stress on the *vital* element, on intuition, on life, indirectly expresses instinctive realisation of the inseparability of thought-emotion-volition.

the savour of inveighing with refined poetic unction against the transiency of this world's glories, and of singing the praises of love and wine as the only substantial joys that can give such consolation as is possible for its sorrows—unless we assign mystic interpretations to his words, *i.e.*, 'love' is 'love divine and universal', 'wine' is 'hormones' secreted by special glands, under the stimulus of yoga-exercises, etc. But the Indian questioners put *before* this question, the other question "how may pain be abolished," as the main motive for all philosophico-religious enquiry, and then take up the other as a consequent, abolition of pain ensuing ultimately on realisation of the true Nature of the Self, which Nature includes Relation with the Not-Self. All the many questions stated in this chapter are only either the metaphysical, or the logical, or the psychological, or the ethical, pragmatistical, practical, or the religious, aspects, forms, and derivatives, of this ultimate problem of all problems. Many of them are answered, from the standpoint of what is regarded here as the final answer to the main question, in the course of the present work; others are dealt with in the other works of the writer.

"Life is rational. It has a clear aim and purpose, discernible by the aid of reason and conscience. And no human activity can be fully understood or rightly appreciated until *the purpose of life* is perceived. You cannot piece together a puzzle-map as long as you keep one bit in a wrong place. *When the pieces all fit together*, then you have a demonstration that *they are all in their right places*. Given the clue supplied by true religious perception, you can place Art so that it shall fit in with a right understanding of politics, economics, sex-relationships, science, and all other phases of human activity": Tolstoy, quoted by Aylmer Maude, in his Introduction to *What is Art* by Tolstoy (English translation, Scott Library Series).

CHAPTER IV

THE PRELIMINARIES OF THE THIRD AND
LAST ANSWER—THE SELF AND
THE NOT-SELF

THE second answer remains, as said before, wavering and satisfactionless. Explanation of the world, which is the sole purpose of philosophy, by means of two factors, can only be a tentative, and not a final, solution. It is a great advance to have reduced the multifariousness of the world to a duality. But what the searcher wants is a Unity, and in this respect, the first answer was indeed even better than the second, for it reduced all things to a unity, the will of an omnipotent being.¹ That unity was, however, a false unity. It had no elements of permanence in it. The will, by itself, of an individual, carries

¹ As a fact, some earnest seekers, having arrived at the second answer, but not satisfied, and unable to advance to the third, deliberately go back to the first, and take up the *bhakti-mārga*, 'the path of devotion' to a Personal God. The case of those who have advanced to the third answer, yet also, deliberately, revive the touch of personal *bhakti*, is different; as that of Vyāsa composing the *Bhagavata* after having compiled the *Mahā-bhārata* and written the *Brahma Sūtras*, or of Shankara, singing hymns to Viṣṇu, Shiva, Dēvi and establishing *mathas* (celibate-Sannyāsi-convents) and temples. In such cases the *bhakti* is consciously directed to a very high *mukta* soul, acting as a spiritual administrator of a department, globe, system, of the visible world.

देहबुद्ध्या तु दासोऽहं, जीवबुद्ध्या त्वदंशकः,

आत्मबुद्ध्या त्वमेवाहं, इति भक्तिस्त्रिधा मता ।

"*Bhakti* is threefold : 'As a physical body, I am Thy servant ; as a soul, I am a piece of Thee ; as Spirit, I am Thy-Self.'" Compare the loyalty of a citizen or a subordinate official to the State as a whole, and to a particular higher official with whom he has to deal with immediately. For further considerations on this subject, the reader may see pp. 197-244 of *Kṛṣṇa, a Study in the Theory of Avatāras*.

within it no true and satisfactory explanation of the contradictions that make up the world ; it embodies no reason and no safeguard against caprice. Tenure of immortality at the will of another is a mockery and a contradiction in terms. Therefore the *jīva*, however reluctantly, however painfully, has to give up that first unity, and search for a higher one. In this search, his next step leads him, by means of a close examination of the multiplicity which presses on him from all sides, to a duality which seems to him, and indeed is, at the time, the nearest approach to that higher unity that he is seeking.

The forms of this duality, wherein he is centred for the time being, beginning with rough general conceptions of Spirit (or Force) and Matter, end in the subtlest and most refined ideas of Self and Not-Self.

These, the Self and the Not-Self, are the last two irreducible facts and factors of all Consciousness. They cannot be analysed any further. All concrete life, in cognition-desire-action, and substance-attribute-movement, begins and ends with these. They are the two simplest constituents of the last result of all philosophical research.

None doubts "Am I or am I not".¹ This has been said over and over again by thinkers of all ages and of all countries. The *existence* of the Self is certain and

¹ नहि कश्चित् संदिग्धे, अहं वा नाहं वेति । *Bhamaṭi*, p. 2. (Bibliotheca Indica series, published by the Asiatic Society of Bengal.) Descartes' famous maxim, *Cogito, ergo sum*, 'I think, therefore I am,' reverses cause and effect. It would be truer to say, *Sum, ergo cogito*. The Bible logion, "I am that I am...I am hath sent me to you" (*Exodus*), should be noted, see pp. 109-110 of *The Essential Unity of All Religions* by the present writer

indubitable. It proves the existence of everything else that is provable. It is not and cannot be proven by anything else. The very instinct of language, in East and West, past and present, bears eloquent, insistent, irrefrangible evidence to the fact, in the words *sva - ṭa h - pramāṇa*, *self-evident*, *sva - ya m - siḍḍha*, *self-proven* (the technical Samskr̥t name for the geometrical axiom), evident and proven in, by, and to it-Self, the finality of all testimony, on which alone the purely 'imaginary assumptions,' 'metaphysical concepts,' of even that so-called exactest and most certain of sciences, mathematics, in all its departments, are veritably and utterly founded.¹

The next question about it is: *What* is it? Is it black? is it white? is it flesh and blood and bone, or nerve and brain, or rocks and rivers, mountains, heavenly orbs, or light or heat or force invisible, or time or space? is it identical or coextensive with the living body, or is it centred in one limb, organ, or point or spot thereof? The single answer to all this questioning is that "That which varies not, nor changes, in the midst of things that change and vary, is different from them";² therefore the I Consciousness, which persists unchanged and one, throughout all the many changes of the material body and its surroundings, is different from them all. 'I' who played and leapt and slept as an infant in my parent's lap so many years ago, have now infants in mine own. What unchanged and persistent particle of matter continues

¹ See pp. 80-6 of *The Science of the Self*, for full comment on this.

व्यावर्तमानेषु यद् अनुवर्तते, तत् तेभ्यो भिन्नम् । *Ibid.*

throughout these years in my physical organism ? ¹ What identity is there between that infantine body and this aged one of mine ? But the 'I' has not changed. It is the same. Talking of myself, I always name myself 'I,' and nothing more nor less. The sheaths in which I am always enwrapping the 'I'—thus : I am happy, I am miserable, I am rich, I am poor, I am sick, I am strong, I am young, I am old, I am black, I am white, I am a god in dreams, a very helpless human creature on waking—these are accidents and incidents in the continuity of the 'I'. They are ever passing and varying. The 'I' remains the same. Conditions change, but they always surround the same 'I,' the unchanging amid the changing ; and anything that changes is, at first instinctively, and later deliberately, rejected from the 'I,' as no part of itself. And as it remains unchanged through the changes of one organism, so it remains unchanged through the changes and multiplicity of all organisms. Ask anyone and everyone in the dark, behind a screen, through closed door-leaves : " Who is it ? " The first impulsive answer is : " It is I. " ² Thus potent is the stamped impress, the unchecked outrush, the irresistible manifestation of the Universal Common 'I' in all beings. The special naming and description : " I am so and so, " follows only afterwards,

¹ What truth there is in the view, that some one or more particles of matter persist with persistent consciousness (two forms of which view are the theosophical doctrine of the auric egg, jiva-kosha, and Weismann's theory of cell-continuity) may appear later. (See the chapter on Jiva-atoms, *infra*.)

² आमंत्रितो, इहम् अयम् इत्येव अग्रे उक्त्वा, इय अन्यनाम प्रब्रूते, यदस्य भवति । *Bṛhad-Āraṇyaka*, I, iv, 1.

on second thought. So real is the 'I' to the 'I', that it expects others (who really are not 'others') to recognise it as surely as it recognises it-Self. Again, what is true of the 'I' with regard to the body, is also true of it with regard to all other things. The house, the town, the country, the earth, the solar system, which 'I' live in and identify and connect with myself, are all changing momentarily; but 'I' feel myself persisting, unchanged through all their changes. 'I' am never, and can never be, conscious of myself having ever been born or of dying, of experiencing a beginning or an end.' "In all the endless months, years, and small and great cycles, past and to come, this Self-luminous Consciousness alone ariseth never, nor ever setteth." ¹ But as regards all the things other than 'I,' that 'I' am conscious of, 'I' am or can become conscious also of their beginnings and endings, their changes. "Never has the cessation—either in *time* or in *space*—of consciousness

¹ Births and deaths of 'others' are always felt as only 'incidents' in our life, 'my' life, which is always felt as *permanent*, impossible to begin or end. 'I' never *realise*(s) that 'I' was born or shall die. 'I' can only 'see' in 'imagination', a tiny infant body being born, and a grown up one dying, and, in *thought*, connect the two with 'my-self', 'me', 'I'. So I can, and do, *see*, with physical eyes, the bodies of 'others' being born or dying. We cannot *realise* that 'I' shall die. That we 'fear death' is really only fearing the loss of enjoyment of our possessions, especially of our body, through which we enjoy the possessions, with which 'I' have identified my-self, by means of which I feel my separate individual 'self'-existence. We do not fear sleep, nay, we welcome it, in its due time, and stand in terror of insomnia, because, and only so long as, our body and possessions are not menaced by or during sleep.

² *Pañcha-dashī*, 1, 7.

मासाब्दयुगकल्पेषु, गतागामिष्वनेकधा,

न उदेति, न अस्तम् एति, एका संविद् एषा स्वयंप्रभा ।

been *experienced*, been witnessed directly ; or if it has been, then the witness, the experiencer, himself still remains behind as the continued embodiment of that same consciousness." ¹ *When-so-ever* and *where-so-ever* I imagine

¹ *Devī-Bhagavatā*, III, xxxii, 15-16.

संविदो व्यभिचारस्तु नानुभूतोऽस्ति कर्हिचित् ;

यदि तस्याप्यनुभवः, तर्ह्ययं येन साक्षिणा

अनुभूतः, स एवात्र शिष्टः संविद्वपुः स्वयम् ।

It may be objected "But this is only negative proof, show me positive proof, that the 'I'-Consciousness stretches through all time" the answer is: "First; it is not negative proof that is advanced here, but negation of negation of Consciousness, and two negatives make a positive. Second, in order that you may have positive proof of the kind you have in mind, *i.e.*, witnessing the *everlastingness* of the 'I', you must *watch it everlastingly*, you can scarcely have direct positive proof of *everlastingness* compressed into a few seconds or a few minutes of answer to your query, can you? Direct positive proof of your, 'I's', self's *eternity* and *infinity*, you have, *here* and *now*, in one instant and at one point, in your, 'I's', self's, Self-Consciousness. Direct positive proof of the self's *ever-lastingness* and *all-pervadingness*, *immortality* and *omni-presence*, is being given to It-Self, by the Self, through endless rebirths and measureless wanderings riding in and on the orbs of space. Remember that 'ever-lastingness', the *meaning* of the word, the *whole* of it, is *all in* your mind, your consciousness, the Self's consciousness, now and here, at this moment

Lack of memory of past births is no disproof of rebirth. Far the larger part of daily knowings, feelings, actings, is completely forgotten. Yet nothing of them is wholly annihilated, it all remains buried in the sub- or supra-conscious; and is revivable under special conditions; as is proved by the work of hypnotists and psycho-analysts. How and why—the scientists admit they have no satisfactory purely physical or physiological explanation. The *superphysical* explanation, given by Indian and other yoga and mystic traditions, is that all, the minutest, details of experience are 'photographed' and 'phonographed' in the *sūkshma-sharira*, subtle body, on which the successive physical bodies of the same soul are strung. The complete explanation is to be found in the *metaphysical* aphorism, *sarvam sarvaत्र sarvaदā*, 'all is every where, every when, everyway or all-ways'. The nature of separate 'individuality' has to be carefully understood in this connection, see Chapters XV and XVI *infra*, and pp. 411-413 of *World War and Its Only Cure—World Order and World Religion*; and 'Note on Karma and Rebirths', pp. 190-199 of *Essential Unity of All Religions*." The difference between 'ever-lasting-ness' and 'eternity' will appear later.

myself, my consciousness, *i.e.*, all Consciousness (for *consciousness* is always and only *My* consciousness), as *ceasing*, in that same act of imagination *I see* the subsequent time and the further space as devoid of *Me*—a contradiction in terms. Every when and where, every then and there, every instant of time and point of space, at which I may try to imagine myself (*i.e.*, the 'My-consciousness,' the consciousness which is *Me*, which is *I*, the *subject*, and not the *body* which is an *object*) as ending, is itself *within* me, in my imagination; I am all around and about and beyond it always and already. Thus may we determine what the 'I' is. *Omnis determinatio est negatio*, "all determination is negation," is a well-known and well-established maxim. We determine, define, delimit, recognise, by change, by contrast, by means of opposites; so much so that even a physical sensation disappears entirely if endeavoured to be continued too long without change; thus we cease to feel the touch of the clothes we put on, after a few minutes. Scrutinising closely, the enquirer will find that everything particular, limited, changing, must be negated of the 'I'; and yet the 'I,' as proved by the direct experience of all, cannot at all be denied altogether. It is indeed the very foundation of all existence. 'Existence,' 'being', (using the two words

Modern Western psychology is also approaching this view in the doctrine of the continuum of consciousness. "We cannot imagine the beginning of life, but only life begun," James Ward, "Psychology" (*Encyclo. Brit.*, p. 7). Hoffding, Stout, etc., all recognise the unity and continuity of consciousness, though in the individualistic sense. Green and others seem willing to recognise it not only "lengthwise" but also "breadthwise," *i.e.*, universalistically, not only along the line of each individual, but as sweeping over and including all individuals at once.

roughly as synonymous at this stage), means nothing more than 'presence in our consciousness,' 'presence within the cognition of the I, of the Self, of Me'. What a thing is, or may be, or must be, entirely apart from us, from the consciousness which is 'I,' of this we simply cannot speak. It may not be within our consciousness in detail, with its specifications; but generally, in some sort or other, it must be so within consciousness, if we are to speak of it at all.

The third step, the immortality of the 'I,' necessarily follows from, is part of, the very nature of the 'I'. What does not change, what is not anything limited, of which we know neither beginning nor end, in space or time, that is necessarily immortal and infinite, *niṭya*, and *vibhu*; it cannot be created by and dependent on anything or anyone else.¹

Let us dwell upon these considerations; let us pause on them till it is perfectly clear to us that 'our' consciousness is the one witness to, the sole evidence and the only possible support and substratum of, all that we regard as real, of all 'our' world. Let us make sure, further, that by eliminating the common factor—'our'—from both sides

¹ As the *Charaka*, one of the principal works on Samskr̥t medicine, says.

अनादेः चेतनाधातोर् न इष्यते परनिर्भितिः ;

परः आत्मा, स चेद् हेतुर् इष्टाऽस्तु परनिर्मितिः । I. xi.

"The notion cannot be entertained that the beginningless 'Substance of Consciousness,' 'Conscious-stuff' has been created by another. If such another be said to be *Ātmā*, the Self, i.e., Consciousness itself again, then we are willing to agree."

of the equation, the proposition stands, and stands confidently, that "Consciousness is the only basis and support of the world". For how can we distinguish between 'our' consciousness and 'another's' consciousness, between 'our' world and 'another's' world? That another has a consciousness, that another has a world, that there is 'another' at all, is still only 'our' consciousness.¹ And as this holds true for every one, at every point, does it not follow that all these 'every ones' are only *One*, that all these 'our' consciousnesses are only one Universal Consciousness, which makes all this *appearance* of *mutual* intelligence and converse possible? For it is *really* only the *One* talking to itself in different guises.

More may be said on this, later on, in dealing with Consciousness from the standpoint of the final explanation of the World-Process.

¹ See the story of Rbhu and Nidāgha in the *Vishṇu Purāṇa* (a version of which, by the writer, appeared in *The Theosophist* for March, 1909), and was reprinted in *The Dream Problem*, a symposium, by Dr. Ram Narayan (Delhi); there is also a similar story in the *Yoga Vāsishtha*. "I am a character in *your* dream, and *you* are a character in *my* dream." Here, 'I' and 'your' and 'you' and 'my' are all in 'each' consciousness, and 'each'—the notion of 'many single ones' that is implied by 'each'—is also *One and the Same* consciousness. The vicious circle is solved by adding, "and I and you both are creatures of the dream of the Universal Self". A real, final, distinction between 'I' and 'you' is impossible and 'unreal,' 'illusory'—for *both* are in the *I* which is speaking. That *both* are there, at the same time, in the same consciousness, negates the cruder forms of individualistic solipsism, but supports the Universalistic Solipsism which says, not that I, the individual self, know only my own modifications, or states, but that the Universal Self experiences Its own (sup-posed and negated) modifications or states in an infinite number of individual-seeming selves. Berkeley explained, in his later writings, that the 'idealism' of his earlier writing was not 'individual' idealism, but (God's) 'universal' idealism.

In the meanwhile, we need not be disturbed by any random statements that "thought (or the 'I'-consciousness) is the product of the brain as much as the bile is the product of the liver".¹ If any earnest-minded student feel himself disturbed by any such, then let him ask himself and the maker of the statement, by what laws of deductive or inductive logic is such statement justified? If there are many points in common between the liver and the brain, what similarity is there between 'bile' and 'thought' to justify an inference as to the similarity of their causes? And, again, how do we know that such things as liver and bile and brain *are*? Because we see and feel them! But how are we sure that we see and

¹ How philosophical beliefs govern great public movements, ideas and ideologies move the world, theory guides practice, for good or for ill—the latest instance of this, still operating on a vast scale, is the current tremendous history of the first half of the 20th Century A. C. For a succinct account of the share in it, of the views of Hegel and Feurbach the philosophers, and Marx and Engels, the communist-socialists, of Germany, and Lenin and Stalin, the statesmen-makers, of Soviet Russia, see Engels' pamphlet, *Socialism, utopian and scientific*, and ch. iv. (and therein too, specially the section, 'Dialectical and Historical Materialism') of *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks)* written by a special Commission of that Party (Second Indian edition, 1944, People's Publishing House, Bombay). Great importance of course belongs to the material side and needs of human life; but even greater importance belongs to the spiritual side and needs. The ignoring of the latter fact introduced an element of grave error into the great truths of the Marxian system, and has been the cause of serious tribulations and setbacks in the life and work of Soviet Russia. From these she has been extricating itself by recognising its mistakes, quickly and frankly, from time to time, in respect of human psychology and spiritual requirements, and endeavouring to correct them. But she is still working more or less in the dark, for she is without the full light of India's ancient scheme of V a r ṇ a - Ā s h r a m a - Dharma (now utterly corrupted), which is, indeed, Vēdānta (Philosophy and Psychology) *Applied*, as Social Organisation of the Human Race. The whole subject is discussed in the present writer's *World War and Its only Cure—World Order and World Religion*, and *Ancient versus Modern Scientific Socialism*.

feel? Do we see our eyes that see, and touch our hands that touch? If our senses prove their objects, what is the evidence, the proof, of our *having* the senses, ear, skin, eye, tongue, nose—the *senses*, mind, not the reflected images in a mirror which are sense-less—and of our having corresponding sensations through them? Is it not that we are sure of our seeings and feelings, of our having the senses wherewith we do so, of our existence at all, only because we are *conscious* of such things? It is far easier to walk on the head comfortably without the aid of arms or legs, than to live and breathe and move and speak without the incessant *pre-supposition* that Consciousness is behind and beyond and around everything.¹ Argue as we may, we are always driven back, again and again, inexorably, to the position that Consciousness is verily our all in all, the one thing of which we are absolutely sure, which cannot be explained away; and that the Universal Self, the one common 'I' of all creatures (or the Universal, all-including 'We,' if that word is more significant to us, but it is One We, We as the *Unified many* I's) is our last and only refuge.²

¹ The word 'Consciousness' is used for brevity, it should be understood to mean 'the Principle of Consciousness', the 'Self's Awareness', which includes all States or kinds or degrees of Consciousness, waking, sleeping, slumbering, and all those varieties which psycho-analyst and other writers on psychology endeavour to distinguish minutely, as pre-, fore-, co-, sub-, supra-consciousness, hypno-pompic and hypnagogic consciousness, etc. All these fall within the main three, waking etc., in Skt terms, *jāgrat-svapna-sushupti*, or in Yoga technique, *uḍāra-ṭānu-prasupta*, from a different point of view.

² यानि प्रमाणानि अवलम्ब्य बहुलं वाग्यबहारास्तेषामेव प्रमाणानां किं प्रमाणम्? "What is the proof of our proofs?", "Shri-harsha, *Khandana-Khadya*, 1,

Perhaps, in our long-practised love of the concrete, we like to tell ourselves that the 'I' is only a *series* of separate experiences, separate acts of consciousness. We have then only explained the more intelligible by the less

यैर एव तावद् इन्द्रियैः प्रत्यक्षम् उपलभ्यते, तानि एव संति च अप्रत्यक्षाणि ;
 "the senses which sense, are themselves unsensed"; (pratyaksha is here used in the limited sense of 'sensation,' not the essential one of 'direct cognition'); *Charaka*, I, xi.

श्रोत्रस्य श्रोत्रं . . . चक्षुषश्चक्षुः . . . ; "the Hearer of the ear, . . . the Seer of the eye . . . is the Self"; *Kēna Upanishat*.

प्रत्यक्षपरा प्रमितिः ; *Nyaya-Bhāṣya*, I, i, 3. "All proofs, all evidence, ultimately depends upon, all mental processes work back to, pratyaksha, or sensation," in the narrow sense; all experiences ultimately base upon experience, direct cognition, consciousness, in the larger sense, as in the following :

सर्वप्रमाणसत्तानां पदम्, अब्धिर् अपामिव,

प्रमाणमेकमेवेह प्रत्यक्षं तद् ; अतः, शृणु,

सर्वाक्षसारमध्यक्षं वेदनं विर उरुत्तमाः ;

नूनं तत्प्रतिपत्तिर्द्ध ; तत्प्रत्यक्षम् उदाहृतम् ।

अनुभूतेर्वेदनस्य प्रतिपत्तेर्यथाविधम्,

प्रत्यक्षमिति नामेह कृतं ; जीवः स एव नः ।

स एव संवित्, स पुमान्, अहंताप्रत्ययाऽत्मकः ;

स यया उदेति संवित्पया, सा पदार्थ इति स्मृता । *Yoga-Vāsistha*, II, xix.

"As the ocean is the abiding place of all waters, so the proof of all proofs is pratyaksha, direct cognition—the *ādhiaksha* or overlord of each and all the senses, *prāṭi-aksha*—*véḍana*, feeling, *anubhūti*, experience, *prāṭipatti*, awareness, *samvit*, consciousness; *it* is the *jīva*, *it* is the *pumān* or *purusha*, the 'person,' personality, of the nature of the I-feeling; and its *samvit*-s, cognisings, modifications, states (which always involve the notion of 'another-than-I,' though that notion is also *within* the I, and so a 'modification' of it), are *padārthas*, 'things,' 'meant by words'.

See pp. 18-26 of *The Essential Unity of All Religions*, for the opinions of over twenty famous scientists, leaders in their respective sciences, all to the effect that the universe has to be interpreted in terms of 'mind', not of 'matter'.

intelligible. The separate experiences, or acts of consciousness, are intelligible as a *series*, only by pre-supposing a one continuous Consciousness, a Self. The acts or modifications are of and belong to the Self, not the Self to the former. Wherever we see unity, continuity, similarity, there we see the impress of the Self, the One. The concrete is held together only by the abstract, the two being always inseparable, though always distinguishable. "The Self-born pierced the senses outwards, hence the Jīva seeth the outward and the concrete 'many'; not the inner Self. One seeker, here and there, turneth his gaze inwards, desirous of immortality, and then beholdeth the Praṭyag-ātmā, the abstract Self."¹

¹ परां चि खानि व्यतृणत् स्वयंभूस्तस्मात्पराद् पश्यति, नांतरात्मन् ;
कश्चिद् धीरः प्रत्यगात्मानमैक्षद् आवृत्तचक्षुरमृतत्वमिच्छन् ।

Katha, iv, 1.

This word Praṭyag-ātmā, significant as it is, and made classical besides, by use in one of the most famous of the Upanishads, is somehow, notwithstanding, not much used in current Védānta works. But it occurs often in the *Bhāgavata*. See also *Yoga-bhāṣya*, i, 29, and, further, ii, 20, and iv, 21, as regards द्रष्टा प्रत्ययानुपश्यः and बुद्धिबुद्धेरतिप्रसंगः, "The Seer Ego is 'aware' of all mental functionings," and "To say that ideas cognise one another, is to say too much". Shankara Mishra, in the *Upas-kara* on *Vaisheshika Sūtra*, also very effectively disposes of the theory, revived by William James, in *The Principles of Psychology*, of "the stream of thought" being self-cognisant, thus : नहि पूर्वबुद्ध्या उत्तरासु बुद्धिषु कश्चित् संस्कारः आधीयते, स्थिरस्य तस्य त्वयाऽनभ्युपगमात्, क्षणिकबुद्धिधारारूपस्य च कालान्तरस्मृतौ प्रतिसंधाने वाऽसामर्थ्यात् । आलयविज्ञानसंतानः, प्रवृत्तिविज्ञानसंतानादन्यः एव, स्मर्त्ता च प्रतिसंधाता च, इति चेत्, स यदि स्थिरः, तदा सिद्धं नः समीहितम् ; क्षणिकबुद्धिधारारूपश्चेत्, तदा, पूर्वबोधानतिवृत्तेः, नहि तत्रास्ति स्थिरः कश्चित् संस्कारः ।

The school of 'the New Psychology,' of psychoanalysis, speaks of the 'ego-complex'; it regards the notion of 'self' (as a concrete 'personality') as a 'complex' of many thoughts, feelings, sentiments, etc. But it fails to recognize that there must be a contrasting Simplex (the abstract 'I') also, to serve as background for the Complex, which background makes the complex possible.

We feel impatient, we exclaim: "What is this 'I' that is neither this nor that?" Let us define it, if we can, by any particular 'this' or 'that'. The whole of the World-Process has been now endeavouring so to define it, for the whole past half of all time, and by the whole half of all countless possible 'this-es'; and it has not succeeded. It will go on similarly endeavouring to define it, in the whole future half of all time, and by the remaining half of endless possible ways; and it will not succeed.¹ It has not succeeded, and will not succeed, because

"The preceding psychosis cannot impregnate the succeeding with a *samskāra*, an 'impression,' a 'seed,' a 'germ,' a 'tendency'; for the latter would have to be 'stationary,' lasting from one moment into another—and this you do not admit. And a psychosis, dying with its own moment of time, cannot look backwards and forwards, in memory or expectation. If you say, there is a latent, subliminal or supraliminal, series of psychoses of the nature of apperception, which is different from the manifest series, and which remembers and expects and connects past and future, the same difficulty is repeated over again. If it has any element of persistence in it, why, that is our Self; if not, there is no possibility of memory and expectation and impression and tendency and seed and germ, etc."

Shankara's *Shārīraka-Bhāṣya*, II, ii, 31, is to the same effect.

¹ The full significance of this statement will appear later, when the distinction between Eternity and Time, true Infinity and the mere boundlessness of Space, totality and countlessness, the indivisible whole and innumerable parts, कूटस्थसत्ता, *kūta-sṭha-satṭā*, 'rock-seated being,' and अनादिप्रवाहसत्ता, *a-nādi-pravāha-satṭā*, 'endless-flow existence', is understood.

the very being of the 'I' is the negation, the opposite, of all 'not-I's,' all that is 'object,' all that can be known as a knowable object by the knower subject 'I', all that is particular, limited, defined, all that can be pointed to as a 'This'.' Do we think that we will evade this inevitable conclusion by denying the 'I' altogether? We cannot do that, as already said. We will only stultify ourselves. 'I' is not nothing, but it is not any-one-thing. Let us ponder deeply on this for days and days, and weeks and months and years if necessary; as Indra did (for a hundred years and one), when trying to learn the secret of the Self from Prajā-paṭi, in the *Upaniṣaṭ*-story, till we see the pure, unique, universal, and abstract being of the 'I'. We will do so if we are in earnest with our search; and when we have done so, more than half the battle is won. We have attained to the Praṭyag-ātmā, the 'inward,' abstract and universal, Ego, and are now in sight of the Param-ātmā, the 'Supreme,' the 'Ab-sol-ute' Self, the Self 'solved,' loosed, freed, from all conditions, limitations, relations. This Param-ātmā is the 'whole', 'full', significance and Nature of the Self, so named for special reasons.² It is the Brahman, final goal, and ultimate place of Peace.

Or perhaps we feel another difficulty. Perhaps we feel a sudden revulsion at this stage and cry: "This commonplace 'I', that everyone is glibly talking about and relishing acutely every moment of his life, from

¹ इदं बुद्धिस्तु बाह्यार्थे, सः बुद्धिस्तु तथावात्मनि । *Sūta-Samhitā*.

² Explained at the end of ch. viii *infra*.

babbling baby to garrulous old man in dotage—is this the mysterious, marvellous, and mystic vision of beatitude and perfection that we hoped for? I that am so small, so weak, how can I be the unreachable, all-glorious, Supreme!” Let us be patient if we would understand. Let us go back to our question; re-formulate it to ourselves. Have we been, at the bottom of our heart, seeking so long for *immortality*; or only for a ‘glorious vision’ of something which is *graded on* to our present experiences; for an enlargement of our powers and our worldly possessions, transformed and glorified into subtler *material*, but the same in *kind*? If we have longed for such, then let us seek for them by all means; but the way is different; and the result is limited and poor by comparison. Nachikéṭā refused such glorious states. He wanted *immortality*. If the emmet were to sigh for sovereignty of a world-wide human empire, it would be a ‘glorious’ consummation indeed, as compared with its present condition, when it attained thereto, as it surely would if it desired persistently and ardently enough. But would that glorious consummation be a final consummation? And are the lives of such grand and glorious beings, full of joys only? Are they not full of miseries, as much, as many, if not more? Do we wish for only such an elevation and expansion? What if one were ruler of a solar system, omniscient and omnipotent—but omniscient and omnipotent within the poor limits of a solar system only! One solar system may be, nay, must be, to another solar system—circumscribed in a sufficiently

greater breadth of space and length of time—even as a small molecule is to the whole earth-globe; and such comparative smallnesses and greatnesses are endless. The ruler of a solar system, of a hundred, of a thousand, of a million solar systems rolled into one, must die, *as such ruler*. His life, as such ruler, had a beginning and must have an end. This fact is almost plain to the physical senses, to say nothing of logical inferences. Physical science *sees* stars and systems beginning and ending. Whatever tenure of true immortality such a ruler has, he has it because of the identity of his self with the Pratyag-ātmā, the Universal Self, even as much as, and no more and no less than, the meanest worm whose form exists within his system. We do not, at present, seek for anything that is only comparative and circumscribed and limited by death at both ends. We want an immortality that is unlimited and uncomparative. Such can be found only in the Universal 'I'. Thoughtlessness says, "This thing is commonplace and unimportant," only because it is familiar. Serious thought, on the other hand, perceives, in that same ever-and-everywhere-presence of the 'I'; in that familiar nearness and pervasion, by the 'I', of all life and all consciousness and all universal processes; the conclusive evidence of the Self's unlimitedness and true immortality and everlastingness. This Pratyag-ātmā declares its utter purity, transparency, transcendence of all limitations whatsoever, gross and glorious, through the mouth of Kṛṣṇa: "The 'I' is the origin, the middle, and the end of all the worlds.

It is the womb, also the tomb, of all of them. There is nothing higher than the 'I,' O thou who wouldst win the wealth of wisdom ! All this multitude of worlds is strung together on the 'I', even as jewels on a thread." ¹

We may think again, with lurking doubt as to the value of our finding : " I knew this 'I' indeed before I started on my quest ! " That we did so is no detracting from the value of our finding now. We knew it then, it is true, but how vaguely, how doubtingly, bandying it about between a hundred different and conflicting hypotheses. Compare that knowledge with the utter all-embracing fullness of the knowledge of the nature of the 'I' that we have now attained to. Indeed it is the law of all enquiry about anything and everything, that we begin with a partial knowledge, and end with a fuller one. None can turn attention to that of which he knows nothing at all ; none needs to enquire about that of which he knows all already. ² To start on the quest of the North Pole we must have at least heard of it as existing and in a certain direction. This knowledge is very different in fullness from the knowledge we should acquire if we actually stood on the North Pole ; still it is partial knowledge of it. The reconciliation of the antitheses, involved in the paradox, that we cannot talk about what we *do not* know, and need not talk about what we *do* know, will be seen, later on, to lie in this : As everything in the universe is connected with everything else therein,

¹ *Bhagavad-Gītā*, vii, 6, 7.

² नात्यंतमहो, नोत ह्योऽपि अधिकारी प्रशस्यते ; *Yoga-vāsishtha*.

so every single piece of knowledge is connected with every other ; and therefore every *jīva* possessing any piece of knowledge is potentially in possession of all knowledge ; and enquiry and finding, in the individual life, mean only the passing from the less full to the fuller, from the potential to the actual knowledge. In other words, the *unfolding* of the knowledge existing, but concealed *within* the *jīva*, appears as *enquiry and finding*. Thus, then, we *can* talk about all things, because we know a *little* of them *all* ; and *need* to talk about them, because we wish to know *more*. Let us not look, then, with slight upon this simple 'I'. "The heedless ones condemn the 'I' embodied in the human frame, unwitting of the supreme status of that 'I,' as the Great Lord of all that hath come forth." ¹

There is one point here which should be borne in mind. The full knowledge, obtained by the traveller when he has attained his goal, may be set down by him exhaustively in a book, reading which, another may acquire that knowledge. Yet there will be a difference of degree, the difference between direct and indirect, between the knowledge of the two. Such difference will always hold good as regards things material, whether gross or subtle (even those loosely but not accurately called spiritual). But as regards abstract principles, the universal 'I', and the abstract laws and subordinate principles that flow from the Nature of that 'I', directly, and are imposed by Its being as laws on the World-Process

¹ *Bhagavad-Gītā*, ix, 11.

—in their case, knowledge and finding are one; there is no distinction between direct and indirect knowledge, intellectual cognition and realisation. In this respect, metaphysic is on the same level as arithmetic and geometry.¹ What the true significance is of the

¹ Indeed the level of metaphysics may well be said to be higher than that of mathematics. All the root-conceptions of the latter are essentially metaphysical. In arithmetic, the mathematics of time, the only one that is not-a-many at the same time, which we know of, is my-Self : every *sens-able* one, is a many too ; the only *ratio*, relation, that really comes home to us, is that of memory, expectation, reason, in which the principle of oneness or identity, working in the many, assumes the forms of relativity, causality, generalised law, invariable succession, proportion, etc. In geometry, the mathematics of space, the only *point* that we really know of as having position, posit-ing, but no definable magnitude, is again this same my-Self ; all *sens-able* points have magnitude ; the only length without breadth is the *line* of memory-expectation ; the only *surface* without depth is imagination's ; the only perfect *sphere* is the infinite One of the All-Consciousness, indicated by the logion which embodies the final answer to our questionings ; the only perfectly equal *radii* are the number-less individual selves or souls ; the only intelligible *postulate* is the free feel of the will. The first proposition of the first book of Euclid may well be interpreted as Purusha and Prakṛti interlacing, to give birth to the triple-functioned, triune-minded, 'equi-lateral' man ; and other propositions similarly. In dynamics, the mathematics of *force* or energy, the only force or energy that we understand is that of 'my-will'. It is in this sense that the Vēḍas, and their climax and essence, Vēḍānta, Brahma-vidyā, are svaṭaḥ-pramāṇa, 'self-evident,' and a-pauruṣheya, 'not the inventions of any particular persons,' puruṣaś-but universal (or, as they may be poetically called, divine) truths. In this sense also are the Vēḍas, in their entirety, said to be infinite, anantaḥ vai Vēḍāḥ. Science must be as infinite as the world-objects with which it deals. The comparatively small texts, currently known as the four Vēḍas, are only an infinitesimal fragment of this Universal Science ; but they apparently contain the fundamental laws and facts of the world-process, and at the same time constitute, it would seem, a manual of *super-physical* science and art of a special kind, all ultimately based on *meta-physics* and psychology, and intended to give access to the more or less individualised forces, dēvas or śakṭis, of the subtler worlds, particularly by means of 'sound' and 'fire' ; either for the sake of the immediate joy of communion and intercourse with them ; or for the sake of helping human life on earth, in respect of the elemental requirements of timely sun and rain, abundance of corn and cattle, physical and mental health and vigour, knowledge and long life, etc. *The Science of the Sacred Word*, or *The Praṇava-Vaḍa of Gargyāyana* should be perused by those interested in this line of thought ; also H.P.B.'s *The Secret Doctrine*.

distinction currently made, between so-called 'mere intellectual cognition' of Brahman, and 'realisation' thereof; between knowledge which is *par-oksha*, 'beyond sight,' and that which is *a-par-oksha*, 'not beyond sight'; will appear later.¹

Having thus necessarily abstracted and separated out from the World-Process, the true, universal, and unlimited One, out of which all so-called universals borrow their pseudo-universality, we equally necessarily find left behind a mass of particulars. And just as it is not possible to define the 'I' any further than by naming it the 'I,' so is it not possible to define this mass of particulars otherwise than by naming it the 'Not-I,' 'Not-Self,' 'Non-Ego,' 'This,' *Mūla-prakṛti*, 'Root-Nature,' 'Root-Matter'.² Take it at any point of space and moment of time, it is always a particular *something* which can be cognised as *Object* in contrast with the cognising *Subject*. As the characteristics of the 'I' are universality and abstractness, so are the characteristics of the 'Not-I' particularity and concreteness. It is always a 'This,'³ a particular something that is always, in ultimate analysis,

¹ See the last pages of this book.

² *Saṅkhya-Kārika*, 11.

³ 'This' is the name for the object, the objective world, as 'I' is the name for the subject. In Sanskrit, the word is *iḍa m* or *éṭa t*. See, e.g., *Manu*, vi, 82. According to grammarians, *éṭa t* is the nearest 'this'; *iḍa m*, the slightly less near; *aḍa s*, the distant but yet 'this', (and hence, it is the technical name for the next world); and *ṭa t*, 'that,' is what is 'beyond immediate sense', 'out of sight':

इदमस्तु सन्निकृष्टं, समीपतरवर्ति नैतदो रूपम्,

अदसस्तु विप्रकृष्टं, तदिति परोक्षे विजानीयात् ।

limited and definable in terms of the senses. Its special name is the Many, *Nānā*, *An-ékam*, as that of the Self is the One, *Ékam*. That it is generalised under the word 'Not-Self' is only a pseudo-generalisation, by reflection of the universality of the 'I'. The word 'pseudo' is used to distinguish the universality of the One from that of the Other. It does not mean false in the sense of 'non-existent,' but only in the sense of 'apparent,' 'not real,' 'borrowed,' 'reflected'. The physical fact of the continuance and indestructibility of matter illustrates this distinction. Because the 'I' and the 'Not-I' always imply each other and can never be actually separated, they are always imposing on each other, one another's attributes. The 'I' is always becoming particularised into individuals, and the 'Not-I' is always becoming generalised into the elements and classes and kinds of matter, because of this juxtaposition of the two, because of their immanence within each other.

Further treatment of this point belongs to a later stage of the discussion. It is enough to show here that the searcher necessarily comes, at the last stage before the final finding, to these two, the Self and the Not-Self.

It should be added that, at this stage, having traced his ego into the universal Ego, the *jīva* finds a partial satisfaction and peace. Seeing that the universal Ego is unlimited by space and time, he feels sure of his immortality, and does not yet feel any great care and anxiety precisely to define the nature of that immortality. He is, for the time being, content to take it as a universal

immortality, in which all egos are merged into one, without any clear distinction and specialisation ; for he feels that such specialisation is part of the limited and perishing, and so incapable of such immortality as belongs to the Praṭyag-ātmā. Later on, he will begin to ask whether there is any such thing as 'personal immortality' also ; he will find that in the constitution of the material sheaths which make of him an individual ego out of the universal Ego, there is a craving for such personal immortality,¹ for a continuance of existence as separate ; and he will also find that such is possible, nay certain, in its own special sense and manner. Just now, there is but one last remaining doubt that makes him feel that he has found but a partial peace and satisfaction in the finding of the universal Ego.

CHAPTER V

THE MUTUAL RELATION OF THE SELF AND THE NOT-SELF

SEEING the unvarying continuity of the 'universal' Ego, the Praṭyag-ātmā, through and amidst the endless flux of 'particulars,' of not-selves, we have 'abs-tract-ed,' separated, it out and identified ourselves with it, and so derived a certain sense of absence of limitation, of

¹ See Stirling's *Secret of Hegel*, 2nd ed., pp. 213, 214, and his *Schwiegler*, pp. 435, 436.

immortality. But the separation now begins to seem to us to be merely 'mental' and not 'real'. For while we see, without doubt, that 'I' continues unchanged through changing things, we also see that it continues to do so only *in* these things, and never apart from them; and if it must do so, is it not, after all, limited by some inherent want and defect, so that it is dependent for its manifestation, its existence in fact, upon these things, just as much as these things may depend upon it? So we come back to the old difficulties of two eternals-infinities. We must reconcile these two eternals-infinities: indeed we must derive the one from the other; and also maintain, all the while, their coevalness, their simultaneity; for it is not in our power to deny the beginninglessness and endlessness of either. How to perform this most impossible task, to combine all the statements of the first and the second answers, and also obviate all the possible objections to them? How relate Self and Not-Self so that Self—'my-Self'—shall no longer feel bound, small, dependent, helpless, at the mercy of any Other-than-Self?

We do not want to know how and why and whence the Self. When we come to a true eternal infinite One, further search for causes ceases. To ask for a cause of that which is unlimited and changeless is meaningless.¹

¹ 'Whence' is asked for the limited in space; 'when,' for that in time; 'how', for that in condition (motion); 'why,' for that which is limited by and in purpose, design, desire. We have found, by the thinking done so far, that the Self is *not* limited in or by space, time, condition, desire, change. Why is appropriate only when there is a change, a new event, concerned. 'Why has this happened?' 'Why do you wish this to happen?' Where there is no change, there can be no 'why'.

None really and sincerely does or can do so. All enquiry starts with a certain standard ; when we have found such and such a One, we shall toil and seek no further and no longer ; and Uncausedness, Self-existence, is, on the very face of it, part of the standard of the enquiry after the Unlimited. We do not want to engage in an endless pastime of asking " Why " after every answer, without considering whether the answer is, or is not, complete and final. What we want is to derive all and everything from One True, unchanging and unlimited something, which something shall be *my-Self, our-Self*. But we must do this and nothing less. We must prove conclusively to ourselves that our Self is the true eternal and unlimited, that it is not based in any way on the Not-Self ; but that from it is derived the Not-Self ; and a countless,

Sāṅkhya declares that the concrete-seeing, ' intelligence ' and its ' argumentation ' can never come to a finality, *ṭarka-a-praṭi-shthānāḥ*. The reason is plain. All such argument starts with a *limited* datum ; and with a limited datum, there must be an endless regressus and progressus of why's and how's, and because's and thus's, and why's and how's to these last two again. But with an *unlimited* datum, unlimited in time and space, motionless, there is no further how and why ; we have finality. The Self is such an unlimited finality ; it is absolutely certain ; it is the Absolute It-Self. The difference between intellectuality and spirituality—various aspects of which are *maṇas* and *buḍḍhi-mahāḥ* of Sāṅkhya, *buḍḍhi* and *chitta* of Vēdānta, present cognition and memory, conscious and sub-and-supra-conscious, intelligence and intuition, patence and latence, willed attention and dormant tendency, knowledge and wisdom, individual and universal, understanding and reason, discrete and continuous, (personal) I and (all-personal) We or the ' I '—that difference is but this : that the former deals with the Limited and the latter with the Unlimited. The same *jīva*, in one mood, is intellectual and limited, in another, Spiritual and Unlimited. It may be said that it is not impossible to ask : " Why does the Self exist ? " But on scrutiny, it will be found that, if the questioner has any meaning behind his words, it is only this : " Why has the Self come to be *here*, or why has it *begun* to exist. " And the *changes* involved in these interpretations are obviously out of place in connection with the Self, motionless, spaceless, timeless, including all times, spaces, and motions within Itself, within Consciousness.

boundless, endless series too of not-selves. We have to create everything, all things, out of the 'I,' and not only everything and all things but an endless series of such. We have to create, in a rational and intelligible manner, not only something but an infinite something, *viz.*, the second of two co-infinites, and create it out of nothing; or, which is the same thing, out of the first co-infinite, without changing this first infinite in the very minutest; for then, its unlimitedness is lost; it is subject to finiteness, to change, to beginning and end.¹ Impossible, truly, to all appearance! Yet until this so impossible task is done, there is no final peace, no final satisfaction. Amass worldly wealth and glories, amass endless particulars upon particulars of science, amass occult knowledge and powers of high and low degree, for a thousand years, for a thousand thousand years, and do not this, set not at rest this doubt—and there will be no peace for you. Secure this, and all else will follow in its proper time, serenely, certainly, and peacefully. The gods have suffered from this doubt, as Yama said. Indra, king of the gods, found no pleasure in his heavenly kingdom, and, forsaking it, studied the Science of this Peace,

¹ The words infinite and eternal have been used, so far, from the standpoint of the enquirer who has not yet made the technical and profoundly significant distinction between the true eternal and infinite, on the one hand, and the merely in-numer-able, count-less, endless, on the other, which distinction will appear later on. This false or pseudo-infinite has been called 'spurious' and 'bastard' infinite, by Hegel; see *The Secret of Hegel*, by Dr. J. H. Stirling, who delights in an exuberantly vigorous, aggressive, pugnacious style, and imports dramatic phrasing into philosophical discussion, thereby making it more 'interesting' and 'arresting', if, perhaps, less serious, less reposefully anxious, less earnestly wistful.

Aḍhyāṭma-vidyā, the Science of the Self, for a hundred years and one, in all humility, at the feet of Prajāpati.¹ Even Viṣṇu had to master it before he could become the ruler of a system.² Let us then set our hearts on mastering it.

The first result of this last effort is a return to the first answer on a higher level. The universal Self, the One-without-a-Second, by its own inherent power of Will-Desire, creates the Not-Self, at the same time dividing it-Self into many selves, assuming names and forms by combination with the Not-Self. "It willed: May I become many, may I be born forth;" "Having created all this it entered thereinto itself." Such are the first of the scripture-texts which seek to sum up the World-Process in one single act of consciousness, and bring it all within the Self.³

This first result, corresponding to the Dvaita or dualistic form of the Vedānta, is only the theory of creation on a higher level, with a new, added, and important significance. Instead of a personal, extra-cosmical, separate God, the universal Self, immanent in the

¹ *Chhāṇḍogya-Upaniṣaṭ*, VIII. ² *Dēvi-Bhagavaṭa*, I, xv.

³ तद् ऐशत, बहु स्याम्, प्रजायेय, इति; *Chhāṇḍogya-Upaniṣaṭ*, VI, ii. सोऽकामयत, बहु स्याम्, प्रजायेय, इति; सः इदं सर्वं असृजत्; तत् सृष्ट्वा, तद् एव अनुप्राविशत्; *Taitṭirīya-Upaniṣaṭ*, II, vi. Cf. Karl Pearson, *Grammar of Science* (1st edn.): "There is an insatiable desire in the human breast to resume in some short formula, some brief statement, the facts of human experience," (p. 44). If he had added, "in such a manner as to derive these all from the Self," he would have explained the why of the insatiable desire at the same time. Fichte only, of western philosophers, seems to have attempted to do so, but has not satisfactorily deduced the concrete 'this-es' from the abstract universal Ego.

universe, has been reached. Instead of craftsman and knick-knacks, potter and pots, builder and houses, we have en-Soul-ing Life and Organisms. The world is, though vaguely, included in the being of the One ; the sense of Unity is greater, and that of irreconcilable difference and opposition less. The universe, made up of countless world-systems, with their endlessly repeated beginnings and endings, is without beginning and without end, as much as the Self, and individual selves ; and the karma of the latter is without beginning, but may have an end by " the grace of God ". As to what is the exact relation between that universal Self and the individual selves and living material organisms and so-called dead inanimate matter, there is, as yet, no really satisfactory idea.¹ It appears in a general way, at this stage, that the three—God, individual spirits or ' Man,' and ' Nature '—are all eternal, and ever distinct from each other, but yet that the latter two are entirely subordinate to the first, and that the relation between God and j ī v a is that of an indivisible conjunction, the individual j ī v a being unable to exist without the energising support of the universal Spirit, as the tree cannot live and subsist without its sap.

But this transmuted form of the theory of creation fails and falls short of final satisfaction, for reasons the

¹ The five kinds of separateness and relationship, referred to in the *Ādvaita-Védānta*, are :

जीव-जीवभेद, जीव-ईश्वरभेद, जीव-जगद्भेद, जगद्-ईश्वरभेद, जड़-जड़भेद. i.e., difference between jīva and jīva, between jīva and Ishvara, between jīva and the world (or inanimate matter), between the world and Ishvara, and between inanimate matter and inanimate matter.

same as those that demolish that theory. It explains the beginning of the World-Process as being dependent on, and the result of, the desire, the will, of the Self. It thus explains motion, change. But it does this by means of a mysterious Power which itself requires rational explanation. Also, there is no reason assigned for the exercise of such power. Finally, it does not explain and contain Changelessness. The Perfect, the Supreme, must be Changeless. What changes, desires, feels want, is imperfect, is limited, is less than the Supreme.¹ Our final search is for that which shall be Changeless, and yet shall explain and contain all the multiplicity of endless Change within itself.

The next step, the second result of the last effort, is the Vishisht-ādvaita form of the Vēdānta : One substance, eternal, infinite, changeless, 'Ishvara,' has two aspects, is animate and inanimate, *chit* and *achit*, conscious and unconscious, Self and Not-Self ; and by its power, *Māyā*, *Shakti*, this 'sovereign Lord' causes interplay of the two, for its own high pleasure which there is none other to question, without any compulsion from without. "It has two natures ; one, Formless, the other Form ; . . . It became husband and wife ; . . . It is Being, also No-thing."² Such is the second series of scripture texts that correspond to this stage.

¹ न परमात्मा जगद् विरचयितुं अर्हति ; . . . परितृप्तत्वं परमात्मनः बाध्येत ; *Sharīraka-bhāṣya*, II, i. 32.

² द्वे वाव ब्रह्मणो रूपे, मूर्त्तौ चैव, अमूर्त्तौ च ; स वै नैव रेमे, . . . एकाकी न रमते, स द्वितीयं ऐच्छत्, . . . आत्मानं द्वेषा अपातयत्, पतिश्च पत्नी च अभवतां ; एषः

This second result, it is clear, is again only the second answer, the theory of transformation, on a higher level. Two factors are recognised, but subordinated to, made parts and aspects of, a third, which is not a third, however; and the two are thus rather forcibly reduced to a pseudo-unity. Instead of the complete separateness of seer and seen, instead of the Sāṅkhya doctrine of Puruṣa and Prakṛti, Subject and Object, as commonly understood, we have a complete pantheism of ensouling life and organism. The two are not only seer and seen, subject and object, desirer and desired, actor and acted on, but also soul (*i.e.*, jīva or mind) and body, force and 'receiver,' cause and instrument, knowledge and organ of knowing, desire and tool of desire, actor and means of action. But the objections to the original form of the transformation theory hold good, with only the slightest modifications, against this subtler form of it also. Why the need for, the want of, amusement and manifestation and interplay? Why so सद् असच् च; *Bṛhad-Āraṇyaka-Upaniṣat*, II, iii, 1; *Ibid.*, I, iv, 3; *Prashna-Upaniṣat*, ii, 5. सद् असत् च अहं, अर्जुन; *Gīta*, ix, 19.

१ ब्रह्मन् !, कथं भगवतः, चिन्मात्रस्य, अविकारिणः, लीलया चापि युज्ये-
रत्न, निर्गुणस्य, गुणाः, क्रियाः ? क्रीडायां उद्यमोऽर्भस्य, कामः, चिक्रीडिषाऽन्यतः ;
स्वतस् तृप्तस्य च, कथं, निवृत्तस्य सदाऽन्यतः ? *Bhagavaṭa*. III, vii, 3.

'Sir! Revered Teacher! how can specific qualities, attributes, actions, touch, appear in, the Supreme, Which is Changeless, Pure Consciousness, even in sport? Sport, Play, is the activity of children, who wish to play with another or others, (for 'play' means playing with another or others); how can there be the action, the motion, of Play, in the Supreme, Which is always ever Self-Contained, Self-Content, Motionless, Actionless, eternally turned-away-from (negative, repudiative, of) An-Other? How the answer is hidden in the words of the question itself, how the Sport, Līlā, of the Supreme, is motionless, actionless, will appear later.

much evil and misery instead of happiness in the course of the manifestation? And what, after all, is the duality? Are there two, or are there not two? If two, and there must be two if there is interplay, as there self-evidently is, nothing has really been explained. Prove that one of the two is Not, Naught, Nothing, and then you will have said something! What is this mysterious Māyā, Shakti, 'Might,' which brings about the interplay? What is this unexplained secret? How am I, the individual enquirer, to feel the satisfaction of being the owner, possessor, master, not the slave, of that Power? How does this explanation assure *me* of *my* own freedom? Where is the law, the regular method, the reliable process, in all this manifestation and interplay and unrestrained power, which may assure me of orderliness and sequence, assure me against caprice, *i.e.*, at least against all caprice other than *My* own, and also be in accord with what I see in the world around? I, as an individual, do not feel my assonance with this explanation. It does not yet lead me to the heart of the World-Process. It does not explain my life, in reference to and in connection with the world around me, systematically, satisfactorily. The laws of Karma and compensation, the law of rebirth, do not fit into it quite plainly. To say that I am (*i.e.*, the 'I' is) feeling happy in a billion forms, and also feeling miserable in another billion, does not assimilate readily with the constitution of *my* being. I feel the statement as something external to *me*. In order to be satisfied, I must see the identity of the countless individual 'I's,' including

my 'I', not only in essence but in every detail and particular.

Such are the doubts and difficulties that vitiate the second result, and show it as of no avail. Such is the final Crux of philosophy—to reconcile the Changeless One, Self, Subject, with the Changeful Many, Not-selves, 'This-es', Objects; to explain the Relation between the Two; and in such a manner that the Two shall be One only. He who will mount and surmount the Crux, the Cross, on which is sacrificed the 'small self', of egoism, to the 'Great Self, the Universal Self', of altruism and Universalism, shall win 'Christ'-hood, the full understanding that belongs to him who is 'anointed with wisdom.'

CHAPTER VI

THE MUTUAL RELATION OF THE SELF AND THE NOT-SELF (*Cont.*)

It may perhaps be useful to the reader, especially the Western reader, if a rapid sketch of modern European thought on the subject is given here, showing how its developments stand at the same level, though necessarily with very great differences of method and details, as the second form of Vēdānta above given in essence, and the current third form thereof also, *viz.*, the A-ḍvaita, *non-dual-istic* (incorrectly understood as *mon-istic*). The nature of that A-ḍvaita view will also appear, comparatively, in the course of this sketch.

Indian thought—in all departments of research, in which we possess tangible results of it, in the shape of Samskr̥t and Prākṛt works—has seldom lost sight of the fact that the end and aim of knowledge is, directly or indirectly, the alleviation of pain and the promotion of happiness.¹ The end, aim, and sure and certain result, of the supreme knowledge, is expressly declared to be the alleviation of the supreme pain of the fear of an-other and of annihilation, and the promotion of the supreme pleasure of the assurance of Immortality and Self-dependence. The dominant motive of that thought, therefore, is ethico-religious.² Even works on grammar and mathematics do not forget to state, at the outset, that they subserve the attainment of muktī, liberation, salvation, in some way or other. “What is the human need it will subserve?”, “What is its prayojana, aim, motive?” “Who is its aḍhikārī, i.e., for what manner and quality of student, for person of what qualifications,

¹ दुःखत्रयाभिघातात् जिज्ञासा तदपघातके हेतौ ;

दृष्टे साऽपार्था चेत्, न, एकान्तात्यन्ततोऽभावात् ;

ज्ञानेन च अपवर्गो . . . व्यक्त-अव्यक्त-ज्ञ-विज्ञानात् ; *Sāṅkhya-karika*, 1, 2, 44.

¹ Because triple pains of many kinds assail human beings, therefore is there search for cause and remedy thereof ; final remedy is knowledge of the real nature of the Subject and the Object, the Unmanifest and the Manifest, (and of the Relation between them, which inheres in that real nature)'. Upanishads, Buddhist, and Jaina, books, *Sāṅkhya*, *Yoga*, *Nyāya*, *Vaishēshika*, *Pūrva-Mimāṃsā*, and pre-eminently, *Veḍānta Sūtras*, *Aphorisms*, and earlier works, all have sentences to the same effect ; at their beginnings, (व्यक्त, Manifest ; अव्यक्त, Unmanifest ; ज्ञ, Knowledge).

² Or “pragmatical” in the highest and most comprehensive sense as it would perhaps be now called, in the West. See William James, *Pragmatism*.

needs and requirements, is it intended ? ”—these questions are answered at the outset of every recognised ancient classical work in Samskr̥t in every department of its literature. Since it recognises the organic wholeness and unity of life and nature, the unbreakable connection between all departments of ‘nature’ and all aspects (corresponding to them) of ‘man,’ soul, mind ; therefore, Samskr̥t philosophy deals with all other questions as subordinate to the main question of the supreme need of the soul—“ How may the soul be freed from pain, how may misery be abolished, how may happiness be expanded and perpetuated infinitely ? ”—the central motive which governs the whole of life. Its answer, as will appear later, is, “ By realisation of the true Nature of the soul as the Supreme Self.” The exposition, of the essential features of that Nature of the Self, contains within itself, answers to all other and minor but connected questions.

Modern western thought, on the other hand, has, for various reasons, historical and evolutionary, become, during, and since, the nineteenth century, more and more disconnected with Dharma, Religion-Law, which, in its perfection and completeness, is the one Science of all sciences, *knowledge* pre-eminently directed to the achievement of *desired happiness* here and hereafter by means of appropriate *action* ;¹ Vēda-Science, as it is named in Samskr̥t. The mainspring of this modern western knowledge is mainly intellectual, knowledge for the sake of knowledge—at least as that mainspring is described by

¹ यतो अभ्युदय-निःश्रेयस-सिद्धिः सः धर्मः ; *Vaishēshika-Sūtra*, I, i, 2.

some of those 'in whose hands it has made progress, especially in science. This fallacy—as it is, despite its brilliant results in science, including psychology also—has its own good reasons for coming into existence, as may be understood later. That it is fallacy may be inferred, in passing, even from the one single and simple fact that public common sense, public instinct, public need, have always declined to rest content with a mere subjective and poetical admiration of the scientific discoveries registered in bulky tomes and journals, but have assiduously applied them, and continue to apply them, with an ever-increasing eagerness and demand, to the purposes of daily life, for the assuagement of its pains and the enhancement of its pleasures; and this, with a success in the mechanical arts and appliances of peace and commerce, which makes modern western civilisation, the wonder, the envy, the exemplar to be copied, of the eastern peoples.¹

¹ Unhappily, by the Law of Duality, Polarity, Action-and-Reaction, Thesis-and-Antithesis, which Law is inherent in (the) Nature (of the Supreme Self), Good, by Excess, has become Evil, Extreme has sprung to Counter-Extreme; mechanical arts and appliances have been converted into monstrous implements of internecine destruction, and science has been prostituted into the slave of horrible war, instead of being made the mother of peace and prosperity for mankind; especially since the beginning of the twentieth century after Christ; and the western races, instead of becoming the friendly helpers and uplifters of weaker races, have first become the rulers and oppressors, and now the devastators, of those weaker races, and of themselves also by internecine war, out of excessive greed for lands, serf-labor, markets (called 'colonies' and 'dependencies' and 'mandated territories' in hypocritical diplomatic language). If the scientists of the world had borne in mind, always, the awful dangers of misuse of science, they would, long ago, have taken due precautionary measures, and insisted on properly guaranteed international pacts, between Scientists and Statesmen, before publishing their discoveries; as *Manu-Smṛiti* enjoins, ch. ii, verse 114; see the present writer's *World-War and Its Only Cure—World Order and World*

In the meanwhile, that Western thought has approached metaphysic proper, too, from the side of psychology or rather epistemology, the theory of knowledge, almost exclusively.¹ It examines the nature of the Self and the Not-Self in their relation to each other as cogniser and cognised, subject and object, knower and known, rather than in their other relations to each other, of desirer and desired, and actor and acted on.² In other words, it at first confined itself, in metaphysic, mainly to one relation, that of *jñāna*, cognition, and did not take much more than incidental account of *ichchhā*, *i.e.*, desire, and *kriyā*, *i.e.*, action. These, in their

Religion, ch. xii: 'Scientists of the World ! Unite !' The hope of Humanity today, is in a Re-re-action, a higher Synthesis after the Antithesis, a return of *satya-yuga*, 'age of Dharma', 'age of Truth and Concord', and a better *satya-yuga* than the previous one, after the present *kali-yuga*, 'age of Discord and A-dharma', has run its appointed unavoidable course. Efforts to prevent the World-Wars were inevitable, the failure of those efforts, and the occurrence of the wars was inevitable; the return of World-peace, on a higher level, sooner or later, is also inevitable. So we hope, for such is the promise of Metaphysic, the Science of Peace.

¹ Gr. *logos*, word, logic, putting into words, of *ēpi-steme*, understanding; the science of the origin, nature, and validity, of knowledge.

² This predominantly 'intellectual' outlook upon life has, as concomitants or consequences, the great development of the physico-material sciences as against spiritual science; the predominance given to the law of competition, of individualism, of *struggle* for existence, over the law of co-operation, of universalism, of *alliance* for existence; the increase of egoism, a *h a m-k ā r a*—'I am superior' and 'I am at least as good as you'—as against mutual fraternal serviceability of elder and younger; the greater insistence upon one's rights rather than duties; and the whole development of the mechanico-industrial civilisation 'of the titans' of the modern west, with its endeavour to *control* 'nature' by means of external machinery, as distinguished from the pastoral-agricultural civilisation 'of the gods' of the ancient world, with its endeavour to *commune* with 'nature' by means of internal living and subtler senses. In the comprehensive theosophical phraseology, all these issue from the great development of 'the fifth principle' or *manas*, in 'the fifth race': 'titans' and 'gods' being the same *jīva*s, taking turns, in different moods, and ages.

metaphysical bearing, it left for long entirely to theology, though, of course, the later thinkers have not been able to avoid a survey of the whole field of life from the standpoint they ultimately reached.

Thus it has happened that Locke (born, 1632, in Britain) decided that what was called 'mind' was a *tabula rasa*, a clean slate, had no 'innate ideas', and that all its contents were written on it by experience of the outer world of 'matter'; *nihil est in intellectu quod non fuerit in sensu*, there is nothing in the intellect which is not given to it by the senses. Leibnitz (b. 1646, in Germany) swung back towards idealism, and pithily criticised Locke by adding these words *nisi ipse intellectus*, except intellect itself. The periodic cyclical duel, or rather duet, was repeated by Berkeley and Hume. Berkeley, (b. 1685), enquiring into the relation of knower and known, under the names of mind and matter, came to the conclusion that the very being of matter is its perceptibility by mind. Its *esse* is its *percipi*. What matter is, apart from its cognisability by mind, we cannot say; indeed, we may well say, it is nothing apart from mind. Thus, that which we have regarded so long as out of us, apart from us, independent of us, is in reality dependent on us, is within us; '*without is within*'.¹

Hume (b. 1711) came after Berkeley. He may be said to have shown with equal cogency that, if the being of matter is perceptibility, the being of mind is percipience;

¹ J. H. Stirling's English translation of Schweglar's *History of Philosophy*, p. 419 (Annotations).

that if we do not know matter except as it is known—almost an Irishism, (Bishop Berkeley was an Irish Bishop !), but with a special fullness of significance—we also do not know mind except as it knows, and apart from what it knows. What is mind but something cognising something? Vacant mind, empty of all cognition, we know nothing about; therefore '*within* is *without*.'

Thus, then, between Berkeley and Hume, the *status quo* of the problem was restored, and the shopkeeper in his shop and the ploughman at his plough might well feel delighted that these two philosophers in combination were no wiser than they, though each taken separately might have appeared something very fearfully profound; that the net product of these mountains in labour was that mind was that which knew matter, and that matter was that which was known by mind. Yet something seemed to have been added to general knowledge. A very close and intimate tie, an unbreakable nexus, of complete interdependence between mind and matter—now clearly distinguished, even as 'opposites'—had been made apparent, as was not before apparent, to those who had not travelled along the paths of enquiry trodden by Berkeley and Hume, in their company, or in that of their elders and predecessors in the race of thinkers, or, it may be, by themselves and alone. The problem was therefore the richer for the labours of these philosophers, and had now a newer and deeper significance.

Kant (b. 1724) took it up at this stage. The tug-of-war between materialism (or 'sensism,' which tends to

pass into 'sensualism' on the ethical side), and idealism (or 'mentalism', which tends to grow, ethically and practically, into 'unpractical mysticism'), went on. What is the nature, what are the laws, of this unbreakable bond between mind and matter? What are the two? How do they affect each other? 'Within is without' and 'without is within'—is all right enough: but this mutual absorption shows independence as well as interdependence. Two men may appear to be standing on each other's shoulders by bending, bowlike, in opposite directions; but even this can be only appearance; each, or at least one, must have a separate, open or secret, fulcrum, standing-ground. After many years' hard thinking, Kant came to the conclusion that each did have such a separate standing-ground. Behind mind was a 'thing-in-itself,' and behind matter was a 'thing-in-itself'; and from these two noumena there

¹ Compare the स्वलक्षण, *sva-lakṣhaṇa*, 'own-mark,' of the Sāṅkhya and the Bauddhas. The Samskr̥t words, *ṭaṭ-ṭva*, 'that-ness,' and *ṭan-māṭra*, 'that alone' or 'the nature, maker, measure, essential characteristic, of that,' convey the same idea as 'thing-in-itself,' but with a fuller and more real and substantial significance. स्वात्मक, *sv-ātmaka*, would be a literal translation of 'thing-in-itself,' but is not justified by usage; and it is only a variation of *sva-lakṣhaṇa*.

These words do not vaguely imply any such elusive will-o'-the-wisp as Kant's 'thing-in-itself'; e.g., in Sāṅkhya, the eight forms of Prakṛti are all *ṭaṭ-ṭva*-s, and the five sens-able qualities are all *ṭan-māṭra*-s. In the Vedānta, the expression *Ātma-ṭaṭṭva*, 'Self-fact, Self-essence,' is frequent. A 'fact,' 'essence' 'substance', having a specific, defining, demarcating, unique characteristic, is a 'that' or 'that-ness,' *ṭāṭ-ṭva*; and the characteristic quality, in the case of the five sens-able substances or true 'elements,' is the *ṭan-māṭra*, i.e., the sens-able qualities known as sound, touch, colour-form, taste, and smell. *Bhagavaṭa*, III. xxvi, uses the expressions *śabdā-māṭra*, 'sound only, pure sound, sound-continuum', also *spārśha-rūpa-rasa-gaṇḍha-māṭram*, 'pure tact, color-shape, taste, odour only,' i.e., continua, highest genera, of these.

irradiated and coruscated, spontaneously and by inherent nature, phenomena which entangled themselves with each other and produced what we know as mind and matter. But, Kant added, the phenomena that issued from the

Some further observations ré western 'epistemologists'.

It may be noted here that the Indian philosophies, Darshanas, 'Views' (of the Universe), 'Outlooks' (upon Life), do not approach the problem that occupied the above-mentioned western thinkers, in the manner of the latter. Indeed it may be said that they do not discuss that particular problem, in that particular form, at all. They all, more or less, with slight variations, take it for granted, as undisputed and indisputable, and not needing discussion or enquiry, that the 'mind'-subject, *jīva*, *chīṭṭa*, *vishayī*, has three aspects or functions, is triune, knower-desirer-actor; and that 'matter'-object, *jada*, *chēṭṭya*, *vishaya*, has also three aspects, is tri-une, known-desired-manipulated, or cognisability-desirability-movability. *Jīva-chīṭṭa*, as a whole, is said to possess the faculty or function of 'memory', whence its name *chīṭṭa*, from *chi*, to gather, to store up. The Sāṅkhya treatment of Purusha-subject and Prakṛti-object, may be said perhaps to be like the western philosophers' treatment of knower and known; yet is different; 'psycho-physical parallelism' is nearer to it. 'So many men, (bodies, faces), so many minds'; yet there is something in common, too, *uni*-ting them all; making some understanding possible amidst much misunderstanding; Unity in Multiplicity.

In Sāṅkhya, Purusha-Spirit is Pure Consciousness, *Chin-māṭra*; and *all* the *details* and *particulars*, that are commonly ascribed, some to 'mind', intelligence, understanding, reason, (as the words are ordinarily understood and used), *f.i.*, the Kantian 'forms' and 'categories', and the rest to 'matter', *i.e.*, the multifarious congeries of countless sensations and sense-objects, the Kantian 'matter' or 'material', which the 'forms' are supposed to sort out and arrange—*all* these are assigned to Prakṛti-Nature (-Matter-Energy); and relational laws-and-facts, 'forms-and-material', genera-and-species (from *summa genera* to *in-fima species*, individuals, singulars), universals-(generals)-and- particulars, all arise *together*; all are 'objects', seen in unbreakable, indivisible, connection; though they are distinguishable, while inseparable, and though the seeing, the discerning, of the inseparability-with-distinctness, of both series, of facts and of relations, becomes clearer and clearer with the evolutionary growth of 'mind-body'; which evolutionary growth, in cycles, is fully recognised and declared at length in the Purāṇa-History, and also, much more briefly, of course, in the *Upanishads* and *Vēdānta*-works.

The 'categories' of Kant are dealt with as *pad-ārthas* in *Vaishēshika-Darshana*; six are the main, *dravya* (substance or substantiality), *gūṇa* (quality, attribute, specificate, determinative), *karma* (motility,

mental thing-in-itself were few in number and took the shape of 'universal' laws and 'forms,' 'categories', into which the far more numerous 'particular' phenomena that streamed from the material thing-in-itself as

activity) as one triplet, and as another triad, *sāmānya* (universality or generality), *viśeṣa* (particularity, or singularity, or individuality), and (this is specially noteworthy, for it seems to be absent from the list of Kant, and subsequent German philosophers have, apparently, not named it specifically as a distinct category) *saṁavāya* (inseparability), mutual inherence, togetherness. Later, 'modern' adherents and exponents of the system have added a seventh to the six, *viś.*, *a-bhāva* (non-being, non-existence), distinguished into four sorts, *aṭyanāta-abhāva* (eternal, utter, non-being), *prāg-abhāva* (absence or non-existence *before* coming into existence and manifestation), *pra-dhvamsa-abhāva* (non-existence *after* destruction and disappearance), and *any-onya-abhāva* (mutual non-existence, each being-not, not-being, what the other is; Hegel's 'reciprocal negation', 'mutual determination', Spinoza's *omnis negatio est determinatio*, 'all determination is negation', seem to embody much the same idea). Under each of the other six, also, are grouped many subordinate ones (some of which are equivalents of those mentioned by Fichte, Schelling, Hegel, but not by Kant).

The 'laws of thought', the subject-matter of western 'logic' (in the common sense of the word, not Hegel's), and the triad of term-proposition-reasoning, or concept-(or notion)-judgment-syllogism, or (Hegelian) apprehension-judgment-reason (or notion), *paḍa-vākya-māna*, together with their subsidiaries, major premiss, minor premiss, conclusion, various forms of syllogism, etc., are dealt with in the *Nyāya*; which is the science-and-art of correct thinking; as *Vyākaraṇa*, Grammar, is that of correct speaking-and-writing, correct expression of thought. But note that *Nyāya* is not mere and wholly sterile *deductive* logic, as that logic, in strictness, must be; (as Hegel too recognises, see Wallace, *The Logic of Hegel*, p. 184, edn. of 1874); but is induction-deduction in combination; first induction, by the method of concomitant variations, agreement-and-difference, *anvaya-vyatīrēka*, and then deduction.

Psychology, pure and applied, is the subject-matter of *Sāṅkhya* and *Yoga*; Ethics, sin-and-merit, vice-and-virtue, right-and-wrong, good-and-evil, exertion-and-destiny, freewill-and-fate, self-dependence-and-other-dependence, are the Subject-matter of *Mīmāṃsā*; Metaphysic, the ultimate problems of Being-and-Nothing, Unchanging-and-Becoming, Truth-and-Untruth, Reality-and-Illusion, God-and-Nature, Spirit-and-Matter, Subject-and-Object, God-and-Man, Universal-Self-and-Individual-self, *Param-Ātmā*-and-*Jiv-Ātmā*, Universal-and-Singular, Self-and-Not-self, and the Relation between these Pairs of Opposites, *dvam-dvam*—these are dealt with by *Vēdānta*.

'sensations'—the 'matter' of knowledge, as opposed to its 'form,' in technical language—fitted in exactly and helplessly; and so an organic whole of systematised knowledge was produced.

The other systems too have something to say on these ultimate questions; and, in this reference, Vaishéshika and Nyāya are thought to favor what has been described before (pp. 7-11) as āraṃbha-vāda; Sāṅkhya and Yoga, paripāma-vāda; Mīmāṃsā and Védānta, ātma-vāda (as sva-karma-vāda, the supremacy of the Self's will-and-action), and vivarta-vāda; but they are so thought, generally and popularly, not quite precisely and accurately; though 'popular' impressions and broad views are seldom wholly wrong, and often more correct and more useful than specialist's and expertist's minutiae and 'exactitudes'. Subtle differences on minor points, mostly verbal, due to use of the same words in several, sometimes even opposite, senses, and consequent misunderstandings; due frequently to even mere controversial and quarrelsome 'cussedness'; or craving to pose as 'original' and 'superior'—such differences, for the pleasure of differing, are without end, in the *later* exponents of the six systems; also of the several schools of thought into which the original Buddhist and Jaina philosophies broke up. The primal vāsanā-s, 'sub-supra-conscious urges of ego-ism, are active in would-be philosophers also, in east and west alike. The earlier Sūtra-and-Bhāṣya writers of 'Aphorism-and-Commentary' differ seldom; and then they indicate that whatever difference there is, is due to difference of viewpoint and naming.

A few abridged sentences from Wallace's *The Logic of Hegel*, 'Prolegomena', pp. lviii-lxi, may help to elucidate further what has been said above in this note, and also in the preceding and the succeeding text of this chapter. "Locke as well as Kant began with an assumption based upon abstraction. This assumption led to a *fatal flaw* in their conclusions. Both took the understanding or reason to be some sort of thing or entity, however much they differed as to the peculiar nature of its constitution, or the amount of its original contents. Both confronted the mind to an external world, an object of knowledge existing *apart by itself*, and coming in certain ways and under certain forms into connection with the subject-mind, likewise existing *apart by itself*. In this state of *absolute* disruption, with two *independent* centres in subject and object, how was it possible to get from the one to the other? This was the common puzzle from Descartes to Schelling, Locke and Kant included." ('but,' the present writer would add, 'Fichte excluded'). "For its solution, all sorts of incredible devices have been suggested, such as pre-established harmony, divine interposition, and impressions with ideas. It has given rise to two opposite views, sometimes known as Idealism vs. Realism, sometimes as Spiritualism vs. Materialism." (Medieval Conceptualism, Nominalism, Realism, etc., ring changes on the same theme). "But every true philosophy must be

But this was worse and worse. The shopkeeper and the ploughman might be excused for staring aghast. We had two difficulties to deal with before, *viz.*, mind and matter; now we have four, *viz.*, two (or, one for each

both idealist and realist. Realism asserts the rights of the several and particular existences; Idealism asserts the thorough inter-dependence of all that exists." (The former exhibits the Many; the latter, the One which includes and interweaves the Many). "Neither mind nor so-called external world, 'subject' and 'object', are, either of them, self-subsistent existences. The objective world and the subject are really one; they spring from a common source, which Kant called the 'original synthetic unity of apperception' . . ." (In plain language, the original Unity of Self-Consciousness, which synthesises, interlinks, Self and Not-Self, against which Not-Self, by contrast to which Not-Self, by negation of which Not-Self, the Self eternally realises It-Self. Kant seems to have only glimpsed, very late, that the Self was the one and on(e)ly Thing-in-it-Self, behind both outer and inner). "The subjective world, the Mind of Man, is really constituted by the same force as the objective World of Nature. Hegel came to prove that God is the 'original synthetic Unity,' from which the external world and the Ego have issued by differentiation, and in which they return to Unity." (Again, in plain words, 'God is the Supreme Universal Self, whose Unity synthesises, posits-and-negates, creates-(maintains)-destroys, all Multiplicity'). "The deepest craving of thought, the fundamental problem of philosophy, is to discover the Nature and Law of that Totality or primeval Unity, which appears in the double aspect of matter and mind."

It will have been noted by the reader that the *fatal flaw*, referred to in the extract, is the flaw of extremism, as usual; by omitting the italicised words 'apart by itself', 'absolute', 'independent', the flaw disappears. As will be expounded in the subsequent chapters, Védānta tells us that the Ab-sol-ute, solved, salved, from all limitations, Param-Ātmā, the supreme Self, is Praṭyag-ātmā, abstract Self, *plus* Mūla-prakṛti, abstract Not-Self, which appear as mind-*plus*-matter, man-*plus*-nature, inner-*plus*-outer, Jivātmā-*plus*-Jada.

Yet, the occurrence of the 'fatal flaw' has not been useless. It was inevitable, even desirable, that the 'philosophic mind' should have erred away for a while from the 'thesis' of Unity of Subject-Object, into the 'anti-thesis' of the 'disruption into two or Many', in order to re-cover, with fuller knowledge, the 'syn-thesis' of that primal Unity; in the terms of the Gīṭā, Ēkaṭā, One-ness, thence Pṛthag-bhāva (visṭāra), Separateness (Multiplication), then again Ēka-sṭha-ṭā (re-establishment in One-ness), according to the Law of Duality, of contradictory opposites, appearing, and also balancing, neutralising, cancelling, each other. *in* the One. By Error and Correction, an enrichment of thought is achieved.

mind ?, and one for each material object, therefore countless), things-in-themselves, and two (or rather an endless number) of things-in-other-than-themselves ! What are these things-in-themselves ? Some ran away with the idea that they were the unknowable ultimates of the universe ; and whenever that which it most concerns us to know, that which is most necessary for us to know, that which is a matter of life or of death for us to be intimate with or strangers to—whenever that comes up before us, then, these people declared, we must shut our eyes and turn away and say : “ We cannot know you ; the limits of human knowledge have been already reached and circumscribed.” Others, impressed by the stately technical harness and trappings, big unusual words, of the philosophy, but not caring to examine beneath those externals, took to themselves the belief that these things-in-themselves were knowable in some mystic state ; unmindful that the very definition of ‘ thing-in-itself ’ excluded any such possibility of cognition ; that, as soon as anything is cognised, it ceases, by that very fact, to be a thing-in-itself ; that its thing-in-itself retires inwards, beneath and behind that which has been cognised and has therefore become an attribute and a phenomenon veiling the now deeper thing-in-itself. Thus many theories and schools arose on the basis of the labours of Kant and under the shadow of his “ critical philosophy,” as it was called. But the plain and patent objection to the conclusions of Kant was that instead of an explanation he had given us only an increase of confusion. There

was no superior law provided by Kant,¹ as was most imperatively needed, to regulate and govern the fitting of sense-phenomena (the matter) into the so-called laws, (the forms) of mind, the mind-phenomena. If there was something inherent in the sense-phenomena which guided them instinctively to close with the right laws, then that same instinct might well enable them to marshal themselves out into systematic knowledge too without the help of any of such mental laws. On the other hand, if the mind-phenomena had something in them which would enable them to select the right sense-phenomena for operation, then they might also very well have in themselves the power to create such phenomena without the aid of any material thing-in-itself. Kant himself seems to have felt these difficulties in his later days, and to have begun to see that the mental thing-in-itself was nothing else than the Ego, and that this Ego was the law and the source of all laws. Perhaps he had also begun to see that the Ego was not only thing-in-itself to mind, but also, in some way or other, thing-in-itself to matter too. Perhaps, also

¹ Ueberweg, *History of Philosophy* (English translation), II, 216, (Art. "Schelling"), and Stirling's *Text-book to Kant*, and Translation of Schwegler's *History of Philosophy*, (Annotations, Art. "Kant").

Another difficulty which seems to have been left unsolved by Kant is as to the number of these things-in-themselves. Is there only one thing-in-itself for all minds (or mind?) on the one hand, and all matters (or matter?) on the other; or one each for each person and each thing; and if the latter, how to define person and thing respectively?

Such objections to Kant's views have been taken by Fichte, Schelling, Hegel, Schopenhauer, Stirling, Wallace, Caird, and other thinkers.

that all individual ego-s were somehow unified in the Supreme Universal Ego. But it was not given to him to work out and attain those last results in that life of his; and Fichte took up and onward the work left unfinished by Kant.

Fichte clearly saw the necessity, in the interests of mental satisfaction, true internal liberty, and respite from restless doubt, of deducing the whole mass and detail of the universe from a single principle with which the human *jīva* could find the inviolable refuge of identity; and he also saw therefore that this principle must be the Ego. Fichte is the western thinker, who, of all western thinkers, ancient and modern, known to the present writer, appears to have come nearest the final truth, attained closest to the ultimate explanation of the universe. He divides with Schelling and Hegel, in current public judgment, the high honour of leading a large number of thinkers in the West, away from the deadly pits of blind belief on the one hand and blind scepticism on the other, towards the magnificent health-giving mountain heights of a reasoned knowledge of the boundlessness and unsurpassable dignity of the *jīva*'s life. Some incline to place Hegel's work higher than Fichte's; especially Stirling, who spent a whole lifetime on the study of German thinkers, and whose opinion on any matter connected with them is therefore entitled to great respect. Yet it may be said that, though Hegel's work was fuller in detail and more encyclopædic in its comprehension of the sciences than Fichte's, the latter's enunciation of the basic

principle of the World-Process is more centre-reaching, more luminous—one would almost say wholly luminous, were it not for a last remaining unexplained difficulty—than Hegel's. And, therefore, it may also be said that Fichte has gone a step further than Hegel. The man's noble and transparent personal life deserved too, that he should see more closely and clearly the nobility and transparency of the truth. Hegel's life does not seem to have been so selfless as Fichte's, according to the biographers of the two; therefore he probably saw the truth under a thicker veil.¹ It may be that if Fichte had lived longer he would have explained the last difficulty that remains behind at the end of his work; he would then have applied a master-key to all the problems and the sciences that Hegel has dealt with, and opened up their hearts with a surer touch. It may also be that if Hegel had lived longer, and not been suddenly cut off by an epidemic, he might have completed his system, (as Stirling suggests) which also suffers from a single but very vital, pervasive, and perpetual want, by means of Fichte's single principle, and so have done the same work that

¹ To western philosophy and science, such considerations may seem irrelevant. Ancient metaphysic says that without *ethical* qualification of *vairāgya*, *vivēka*, etc., *Vēdānta* cannot be successfully studied; other sciences may be. The reason is: *Vēdānta* is the Science of the Infinite; all others are sciences of the Finite. To enter on this realisation of the Infinite, the 'individual' must have begun to turn from 'individualism' in its triple form of *aviḍyā-kāma-karma*, clinging to the Finite, intellectually, emotionally, and practically, i.e., in thought, feeling, and action; and turn towards 'universalism' in its corresponding threefold form of *jñāna-bhakti-virakti*, i.e., recognition of the small self's identity with the Great Self, philanthropic altruism, and asceticism. Taint of selfish ego-ism dims vision of the True Self.

might have been done by Fichte. In the combination of the two lies great promise of satisfaction. On the whole, then, because of the view that Fichte has gone further than Hegel, what has to be said here about Hegel will be said first and Fichte taken up afterwards.

But before taking up Hegel, a word should be given to Schelling, who has very much in common with Hegel. The two were contemporaries and associates of each other and partly of Fichte's also, both being greatly influenced by Fichte. But Schelling failed to make such a lasting impression on European philosophy as did Hegel, because of repeated radical changes in his views, and lack of such consistency, stringency, and rigour of thought and genetic construction as Hegel ^{endeavoured to carry} ~~carried~~ into effect. The net addition made by Schelling to the stock of Western philosophy may be said to be a deeper and fuller view of the Law of Relativity, *viz.*, the law that two Opposites imply each other. The point which Hegel emphasised so much does not seem to have occurred to him, that such opposites further inhere in a third something, which is not exclusively and wholly either the one or the other, but somehow includes and contains both, and is itself the summation of the two. What Hamilton and Mansel of England derived from Schelling, and Herbert Spencer from them, is that as everything implies its opposite, so the whole of the world, the whole mass of relatives, of opposites, being taken together as one term—which may be called the Relative—this whole would necessarily imply its opposite, the

Absolute. Hamilton and Mansel vaguely called this Absolute, God; Herbert Spencer called it the Unknowable. In one sense this conclusion is true; in another it is only a verbal quibble, so that critics have not been wanting to point out that the Absolute and the Relative make a new relation, a new pair of opposites, which also requires an opposite in a higher absolute, and so on endlessly.¹

Hegel put a stop to this unfruitful and fatuous endlessness of higher and higher absolutes, which really explains nothing and is a contradiction in terms, by showing that when all opposites had been once heaped together under the Relative, no further opposite could be left outside of this mass in the shape of an Absolute; that if such a train of reasoning was to be followed at all, the logical conclusion should be that the Absolute was immanent in the mass of the Relative; that every thing contained its opposite within itself, and that the true Absolute would be complete when opposites had been resolved into each other, so that no further search for a higher Absolute was left to make. Hegel's most important contribution to metaphysic accordingly seems to be a full development and application of the law that two opposites, two extremes, always find their reconciliation in a third something, a mean, which, as said before, is neither the one nor the other exclusively but both taken together. Applying this principle to the World-Process

¹ For various criticisms of Spencer's view on this subject, see Caird, *Introduction to the Philosophy of Religion*, ch. i; and also Spencer's own *Replies to Criticisms*, published in his collected Essays.

in the mass, he first analyses it into two 'pure' opposites, 'pure' Being and 'pure' Nothing, and then proceeds to state that the collapse of these two into each other is 'Becoming,' is the World-Process. The fact that 'Becoming' is the conjunction of Being and Nothing, and that every particular combines and reconciles within itself two opposites; and the consequent law that the reconciliation of two extremes should be always sought for in the mean, and that extremes should always be regarded as a violent and unnatural disruption of the mean—this fact and this law are profoundly significant and very helpful to bear in mind in all departments of life. But yet the mere statement of them, which is practically all that Hegel has done, leaves behind a sense of dissatisfaction. The why and the how are not explained; and the why and the how necessarily come up when we begin with two and not with one. If we begin with One and can maintain it Changeless, then none may ask why and how. Merely to say that every change implies a falling of Being into Nothing and of Nothing into Being is perfectly true; but is true only as breaking down some old preconceived notions obstructive to further progress, true as a stimulus to further enquiry; it is not at all satisfactory in itself or helpful towards the solution of the final doubt. It was declared long before Hegel, and declared a thousand times, and the fact is indeed so patent that he who runs may read and even with the eyes of the flesh, that the world of things is Being, saṭ, as well as Non-Being, a saṭ; that it is both

and that it is neither ; but the statement remains dark, unlighted ; the fact remains unintelligible. Where is the lamp to light it up and to make all clear at once ?

Then this speaking in the third person, Being and Nothing, instead of in the first and second person, Self and Not-Self (' I ' and ' you '),¹ re-invests the whole problem with the old strangeness which we were at so much pains to transform into the home-feeling that goes with the words Self and Not-Self. Being means Self to us ; and Nothing is nothing else than Not-Self (in the sense of a denial of the Self), if it is anything at all. To talk of Being and Nothing, after Fichte has spoken of Ego and Non-Ego, is to take a regressive rather than a progressive step. Indeed, this may be said, in a sense, to be the greatest defect of Hegel's system. To speak in terms of '*pure* universal notions,' of Being and Nothing, etc., instead of Self and Not-Self and their derivatives ; to imply that ' Spirit ' (in the sense of Self) is subsequent to ' pure immaterial thought ' ; this is to walk on the head instead of the feet. Perhaps a little ' progress ' may be made even in that way. But the falls, the lapses of intelligence, must be very frequent ; and the whole process is invested with an immense and most unnatural strain. Of course, it is clear that, if we would deal with psychology and metaphysic, we must *intro-spect* ; we must look inwards, more or less ; we must turn our eyes in a direction opposite to that in which we usually employ them in ordinary life ; we must become ' introvert ', rather than ' extravert ',

¹ Shaṅkara, *Shariraka-Bhashya*, the very first paragraph.

for the time. But, while our eyes are 'in-turned', or even closed, our hands have to be kept, however lightly, on the 'outer' also; we should not lose touch of and with the 'outer' world altogether; for, then, the 'inner' will vanish from consciousness also; 'inner and outer', 'abstract and concrete', both will fall asleep in Chaos, slumber.'

'As regards the difficulty of Védānta, Metaphysic-Philosophy, the Science of the Infinite, and of the introspection needed for the study thereof, *Katha Upanishat* (II. i. 1) tells us,

न सुविज्ञेयः, अगुणेष धर्मः ।

परां चि खानि व्यतृणत् स्वयम्भूः, तस्मात् पराङ्मुख्यति, न अन्तरात्मनः ;

कश्चिद् धीरः प्रत्यग्-आत्मानं ऐक्षद् आवृत्तचक्षुर्, अमृतत्वं इच्छन् ।

'Very subtle, not easy to be understood, is this highest 'Duty', (of achieving this highest Knowledge of the Self. The Self-born (appearing, illusorily, to be born in a body, a not-Self) pierced the senses *out-wards*; therefore the individualised self looketh *out-wards*, not *in-wards*, not to and at it-Self. One here, one there, desirous of Immortality, resolutely turning vision *in-wards*, saw him-Self, *the Self*.' Ré difficulty of Hegel, Wallace, in *The Logic of Hegel*, 'Prolegomena' (p. civ; first edition) says: "There are two degrees in the hindrances against mastering Hegelianism. The first difficulty is to reach the point of view from which the system starts. It is, says Hegel himself, 'like learning to walk upon our heads'. The second demand—to move in the ether of this absolute thought—is even harder than the first." Stirling also, in *The Secret of Hegel* (p. 81) writes, "Hegel himself allows us to say—'We feel as if we were standing on our heads' . . ." One gets the impression, from the English translations of Hegel, and also from various facts of his life, as regards his relations with Schelling and others, that he was *too* desirous to be 'original'—a common weakness of 'thinkers', but excusable within narrow limits only, *i.e.*, while confined to joyous, boyish 'self'-tasting, 'self'-delight, and play. We may therefore decline Hegel's invitation to stand on our heads; and may suggest to those of his way of thinking, that, instead, they may practice, what is known in Yoga as, the *shāmbhavi* or *vaishṇavi mudrā*, eyes nearly but not quite closed; attention turned *in-ward* to the Great Self behind the small self's workings; but not wholly oblivious of the *out-ward*, the Not-Self. Védānta does not recognise 'absolute *thought*'—an expression of frequent recurrence in the English expositions of Hegel; it recognises the 'Absolute Self', behind and around all 'thought'; it is the same as Absolute Self-Consciousness, including all Not-Self, all not-selves, all 'this-es'; so that, ultimately, and eternally, Abstract and Concrete, Inner and Outer, all merge into the One which is Number-less.

Moreover, while *pure* Being and *pure* Nothing might well be allowed to combine into *pure* Becoming, whence comes this endless multiplicity of *particular* becomings, or rather 'becomes,' *i.e.*, of special things that have become? Hegel does not seem to have explained this; although it seems necessary and even quite easy to do so from the standpoint of a true definition of the Absolute. A single word explains it. Has Hegel said that word? It does not appear that he has. If he has, then there is nothing more to be said against him on this score. Yet the story goes that Krug once asked Hegel to deduce his particular writing quill from the general principle that Being and Nothing make Becoming, and that Hegel could reply with a smile only. Stirling talks of Krug's 'ridiculous expectation'; it seems to others that Krug's request was perfectly fair and legitimate. The *arbitrariness* of Krug's particular quill does require to be explained away. Wallace (*op. cit.*, p. clxxi) says, "Hegel's system . . . can only unveil *what is*, . . . it has no vocation to say *why* it is, or how it can be so"; and Hegel himself says (*op. cit.* p. 20), "The idea of Nature, when it is individualised, loses itself in a maze of chance . . . points of existence, kinds, distinctions, which are determined by sport and adventitious incidents; . . . phenomena are regulated by no law, but depend upon arbitrary influences". Yet the *why* is vitally important to us, lest *we* become such *chance*-phenomena.

Again, Hegel's fundamental proposition, the very base and foundation of his system—*viz.*, that Being and

Nothing are the same and yet opposite, and that their mutual mergence makes Becoming, which, he says, is the true Absolute—is wholly unsatisfactory. It may be true, nay, it is true, in a certain sense, that Being and Nothing are the same and yet opposed; but it is not Hegel who tells us what that certain sense is. It may be true, nay, it is true, in a certain sense, that Becoming is the Absolute; but it is not Hegel who tells us what that sense is. On the contrary, the general impression is that Hegel began with a violent *petitio principii* when he assumed that Being and Nothing, though opposite are the same, and so took for granted the very reconciliation of opposites which it was his business to prove. After assuming that the two most opposed of all opposites are identical with each other, it is truly easy to reconcile all other opposites that may come up for treatment later.

Then, what is meant by saying or implying that Becoming is the Absolute? If the word Becoming is taken to mean the totality of the World-Process from the beginning to the end of beginningless and endless time, then of course an absolute may be meant, but such an absolute remains absolutely unilluminative and useless. Hegel says (as summarised by Schwegeler): "The absolute is, firstly, *pure* immaterial thought; secondly, *heter*-isation of *pure* thought, disruption of thought into the infinite atomism of time and space—Nature; thirdly, it returns, out of this its self-externalisation and self-alienation, back into its own self, it resolves the heterisation of nature, and only in this way becomes at last actual,

self-cognisant, thought, Spirit.”¹ Perhaps, then, he means, not the totality of the world-process, but, a growing, maturing, absolute; in the course of the growth of which, the cropping up of anything, of countless things, *hetera*, ‘others’, *im-pure*, concrete, out of the *pure*, abstract, remains a mystery, unexplained as ever. But the absoluteness of an evolving, changing, thing or thought is a very doubtful thing and thought. Indeed, there should be no distinction of thing and thought in the Absolute; and this distinction is one of the very hardest and subtlest tasks of metaphysic to explain away.² The general impression left by Hegel is that the Absolute is an idea, which finds its gradual expression and manifestation and realisation in the things, the becomings, of the world-process; and that, consequently, there is a difference of nature between the idea and the things. But if there is any such difference, then the things fall outside of the idea and have to be explained, and the whole task begins again. But even apart from this difficulty, which constitutes a separate doubt by itself, is the main difficulty of a changing absolute. The elementary Vêda-texts, which helped as temporary guides at an earlier stage of the journey, and which said that the Self multiplied it-Self into Many, had to be abandoned (for the time being at least) for want of sufficient reason and justification.

¹ Note the thrice-repeated ‘self’ here! Thought *cannot* be, without the *prius* of Self as basis.

² The thirty-two thousand shlokas or two-line stanzas of the *Yoga-Vasishtha* constitute the great and unique Epic, in Samskr̥t literature, of this particular Herculean labour.

for the changing moods of a Supreme. We have been pining all along for changelessness, for rest and peace amidst this fearful turmoil. Hegel gives us an endlessness of change. He says the Absolute-Universal realises itself, through Nature-Particular, in and into the Individual-Singular; *i.e.*, the already supreme and perfect God developes into and finds himself in perfected man, self-conscious man, (typified by Jesus).¹ A doctrine unsatisfactory enough in the mouth of anyone, and much more so in the mouth of Hegel—who knows nothing, or at least indicates nothing of the knowledge, of the vast evolution and involution of worlds upon worlds, material elements and *jīvas*, of the incessant descent of Spirit into Matter and Its re-ascent into it-Self, which is outlined in the *Purāṇas*. What does Hegel say as to where and when the Absolute began its evolution and when it will complete and end it? Has he anywhere entered into the question whether this actual self-cognisant spirit, this perfected individual, this perfected man, who has achieved that combination of reason with desire or will which makes the true freedom, the true internal liberty, *mokṣha* as altruistic synthesis and balancing of *jñāna*, *bhakti*, and *karṇa*, knowledge, selfless desire, selfless action—whether such an individual is completed in and arises at a definite point of time, or is only an infinitely receding possibility of the endless future? Also, whether many

¹ The element of truth in this view is to be found in the Vedānta doctrine of the *Jīvan-mukṭa*, the Sūfi's *insān-ul-kamil*, the Biblical phrase 'Sons of God', (Sons, in the plural, not only one 'Son' Jesus, who is only a typical *Jīva-n-mukṭa* of high quality, 'freed from egoism while still in the body').

such are possible at one time or not ? There were millions of individualised human jīvas upon earth in the time of Hegel. Had the Absolute finished evolution in them or any of them, and if not, as it clearly had not, then why not ? Such are the legitimate questions that may in all fairness be put to Hegel. He does not seem to have answered them. Yet each and every one of them should and can be answered from the standpoint of a complete metaphysic.

It is not probable that Hegel in this birth, and in the life and surroundings of the period he lived and worked in, (1770-1831 A.C.), knew all the even partial and one-sided details about kosmic evolution, which have since then become accessible to the human race in the West, not to speak of the complete outlines (though lacking in detail) which are sketched in the Purāṇas (and now in theosophical literature). He ridicules the doctrine of rebirth,¹ (which Fichte, Schelling, Goethe, and many others, poets, writers, thinkers, even physical scientists, famous in the west, have believed in); and shows thereby, that he did not realise the full significance and extensive application of some of the metaphysical laws which he himself, or Fichte and Schelling before him, stated. Yet these particulars of endlessly recurring cosmic evolution and dissolution, in smaller and larger cycles, as ascertained by masters of y o g a, and embodied, in broad outlines, in the extant Purāṇas and other

¹ Hegel, *History of Philosophy*, English Translation, Vol. I, Art. "Pythagoras".

Saṃskṛt and Prākṛt writings (and in theosophical literature), are alone capable of providing a basis for a true and comprehensive metaphysic; for they, in the very act of pointing out the way to the final goal, explain how they themselves are inseparately connected with and derived from that goal. And if Hegel was not acquainted with such details, it is no wonder that his metaphysic remains incomplete. It is, indeed, a wonder, on the contrary, that it is so full as it is. It may, on the other hand, be that it was given to a man who saw so much and so deeply, to see more also, and that he did not say all he knew for special internal or external reasons. This is the view that Stirling takes, in pointing out Hegel's shortcomings, especially in his work entitled, *What is Thought?* Stirling probably had not in mind, when stating such a view, anything about information derivable by means of a higher development of human faculties through yoga. What most concerns us here to know, is that such a lifelong student of Hegel as Stirling declares, with all the weight and authority of such study, that there is a radical defect in the system, and that a key is wanted which perhaps Hegel *might* have given if he had lived longer, that is to say, assuming that he himself had it.²

² See *infra*, the close of ch. viii, for the needed rectification of Hegel by Vedānta. Here, we may quote what Stirling says, *Schwegler's History of Philosophy*, pp. 445, 475: "Whether Hegel's Notion be really the pulse of thought—that is what is still to be verified—that is what I still doubt. So long as that doubt remains, I am not properly an Hegelian . . . Hegel's *Logic*, though containing much that is of *material* importance, is still principally *formal*. Its first note after all is said, will never ring quite true; *existence of some kind* and *existence of no kind* are not the same."

We see thus that, while Schelling and Hegel made a very close approach to the final explanation, they do not seem to have quite grasped it. Let us now examine what appears to have been in some respects a closer approach than theirs.

Fichte, as said before, realised and stated that the Ego is the only true universal, perfectly unconditioned in and by (sensuous) matter as well as in and by (intellectual) form (in the technical language of German thinkers); the certainty of which can not possibly be ruffled by any doubt. And from this universal, he endeavoured to deduce the whole of the world-process. His deduction is usually summed up in three steps: Ego = Ego; Non-Ego is not = Ego; Ego in part = Non-Ego, and Non-Ego in part = Ego.¹ There is first the thesis, the position of identity, 'I' is 'I'; secondly, there is the antithesis, the op-position of contradiction, 'I' is not 'Not-I'; lastly, there is the synthesis, the com-position, *i.e.*, a reconciliation, of the opposites, by mutual limitation, mutual yielding, a compromise in which the 'I' becomes, *i.e.*, takes on the characteristics of, the 'Not-I,' and the 'Not-I' of the 'I'. And this is entirely and irrefutably in accordance with the facts of the world-process as they are there under our very eyes. No western thinker has improved upon this summary of the essential nature of the world-process; and it is difficult to understand how Stirling has failed to give

¹ See Adamson, *Fichte* (Blackwood's Philosophical Classics), p. 172, for explanation of the third proposition.

due meed to this great work. He says regarding Fichte : "What is said about the universal Ego . . . is not satisfactory. Let us generalise as much as we please, we still know no Ego but the empirical Ego, and can refer to none other."¹ Now, with the respect one has for Stirling's metaphysical acumen, one can only say that this statement of his is very difficult to understand. For it is exactly equivalent to the entire denial of the possibility of an 'abstract,' simply because we can never definitely cognise anything but a 'concrete' with our physical senses. As said before, in dealing with the process by which the nature of the universal Self is established, the mere fact of a diversity, of the 'many', of concretes and particulars, necessarily requires for its existence, for its being brought into relief, the support and background of a continuity, a 'unity', an abstract and universal. The two, abstract and concrete, universal and particular, are just as inseparable as back and front ; though, of course, it is not only possible, but is what we always actually do, *viz.*, that we distinguish between the two, and attend *more* to the *one*, now, and *more* to the *other*, at another time. But looking for a highest universal and a lowest particular, we find that the extremes meet. The highest universal, (Self It-Self as) Being, saṭṭā-sāmānya, is also the most irreducible point, charama-vishésha, the 'singular' (Jīva or atom). The universal Ego is also (the essence of) the individual ego (the so-called empirical ego) ; the universal Being

¹ Stirling's *Schwegler's History of Philosophy*, p. 428.

and the aṇū, atom, of the Vaisheshika system of philosophy, correspond to the Praṭyag-ātmā and the ideal atom which, enshrining a self, is the jīv-ātmā. Between these two limits, which are not two but one, the all-comprehending substratum of all the world-process, the Infinite which is also the Infinitesimal, "greatest of the great and also smallest of the small," there fall and flow all other pseudo-universals and pseudo-particulars; pseudo, because each falls as a particular under a higher universal (or general) and at the same time covers some lower particulars (specials). The universal Ego is thus the only true, absolutely certain and final, universal. "Hegel, in opposition to Fichte, . . . held that it is . . . not the Ego that is the prius of all reality, but, on the contrary, something universal, a universal which comprehends within it every individual."¹ This is where the deviation from the straight path began. It began with Hegel. And the results were: (1) that dissatisfaction with Hegel which Stirling confesses to again and again; and (2) a tacit reversion, by Stirling himself, to that impregnable position of Fichte (as shown throughout Stirling's work, *What is Thought?* in which he endeavours to make out that the double subject-object, 'I-me,' is the true Absolute).² For if "we know no ego but the empirical ego,"

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 315.

² Compare the *Saṅkshepa-Shāriraka*,

आश्रयत्वविषयत्वभागिनी निर्विभागचित्तिरेव केवला ।

"Only this partless, indivisible, Consciousness is both subject and object at once."

how much more do we know no 'being' but empirical and particular beings, no 'nothing' but empirical and particular non-commencements or destructions. Ego and non-Ego we understand; they are directly and primarily in our constitution; nay, they are the whole of our constitution, essence and accident, core and crust, inside and outside, the very whole of it. But Being and Nothing we understand only *through* Ego and Non-Ego; otherwise they are entirely strange and unfamiliar. Being is nothing else than pro-position, pre-positing, affirmation, by consciousness, by the 'I'; Non-Being is nothing else than op-position, contra-position, denial, by that same 'I'. Stirling practically admits as much in *What is Thought?* Fichte's approach, then, is the closer and not Hegel's; and Stirling's opinion that "the historical value of the method of Fichte will shrink, in the end, to its influence on Hegel"¹ is annulled by his own latest research and finding. The probability indeed, on the contrary, is that Hegel's work will come to take its proper place in the appreciation of students as only an attempt at a filling and completion of the outlines traced out by the earnest, intense, noble, and therefore truth-seeing spirit of Fichte.²

¹ Stirling's *Schwegler*, p. 427.

² Dr. J. H. Stirling, in a very kind letter to the present writer, said: "Dr. Hutchinson Stirling would beg to remark only that he is not sure that Mr. Bhagavān Dās has quite correctly followed the distinction between Fichte's and Hegel's use of the Ego in deduction of the categories—the distinction at least that is proper to *Stirling's interpretation* of both; Stirling holding, namely, that Fichte, while without provision for an external world, has only an external motive or movement in his Dialectic, and is withal in his deduction itself incomplete; whereas Hegel, *with* provision for externality, is *inside* of his principle, and in his deduction infinitely deeper, fuller, and at least completer."

Hegel's work is a supplementation, by mere *description*, not at all a *deduction* or *explanation*, of the successive steps in mind-development, from simple sensuous perceptions to complex intellectual thinking or comprehending, in terms of abstract ideas and relations. Darwinian evolutionism is similar; it is a *description*, not an *explanation*, of body-development; it *assumes* countless perpetual variations of environments, and corresponding ones in organisms, at every step; *power of variation* is *assumed* at every step.

By sheer force of intense gaze towards the Truth, Fichte has reached, even amidst the storm and stress of a life cast in times when empires were rising and falling around him, conclusions which were generally reached in India only with the help of a yoga-vision developed by long practice amidst the contemplative calm of forest-solitudes and mountain-heights.¹ (Perhaps he had been a disciple in the home of an Indian sage, in a previous life, and done all the preliminary thinking there!) Page after page of his work reads like translations from Védānta works. Schweglar, apparently unmindful of their value and even disagreeing with them, sums up the conclusions

I give this extract from Dr. Stirling's letter with the view that it may help readers to check and correct any errors made in this chapter, in the comparative appreciation of Hegel and Fichte.

Professor J. E. McTaggart, of Trinity College, Cambridge, also said, in a letter to the present writer: "... I still maintain that Hegel has got nearer the truth than Fichte."

¹ Fichte's lecture on *The Dignity of Man* (pp. 331-336 of the *Science of Knowledge*, translated by A. Kroeger) is full of statements which might be read as meaning, on Fichte's part, a belief in the evolution of the jīva-ātman of the kind described in védāntic and theosophical literature, in direct contrast to Hegel's statements.

of Fichte in words which simply reproduce the conclusions of A-ḍvaiṭa-Vēdānta as now current in India. Fichte's statement, quoted above, as to the transference of their characteristics to each other by the Ego and the Non-Ego, is the language of Shaṅkara.¹ His distinction between the absolute Ego and the individual or empirical ego is the distinction between the higher Ātman and the jīva. The words 'higher Ātman' are used here, because one of the last defects and difficulties of the current A-ḍvaiṭa-Vēdānta turns exactly, as it does in Fichte, on the confusion (of the distinction without a difference) between Praṭyaḡ-ātmā and Param-ātmā, the *abstract universal* Ego and the true Absolute ego. Again, Fichte's view is thus stated by Schwegler: "The business of the theoretical part was to conciliate Ego and Non-Ego. To this end, middle term after middle term was intercalated without success. Then came reason with the absolute decision—'Inasmuch as the Non-Ego is incapable of union with the Ego, Non-Ego there shall be none.' " This is to all appearance exactly the Vēdānta method,² whereby predicate after predicate is superimposed upon the Supreme, and then refuted, negated and struck away, as inappropriate, till the naked Ego remains as the Unlimited which is the Negation of all that is

¹ The opening lines of his commentary, the *Shāriraka-Bhāṣya*, on the *Brahma-sūtras*.

² And the method of the world-process. The spirit is ions, electrons, atoms? No. It is gases, metals, minerals? No. Vegetables? No. Animals? No. Humans? No. Upa-ḍēvas, ḍēvas, Vishva-sṛjas? No. And so on.

Not-Unlimited, and the searcher exclaims: "I am (is) Brahman,"¹ and "the Many is not at all,"² as the two most famous Vêda-texts, great sentences (in the Samskr̥t phrase, mahā-vākyas) or logia, the foundation of the A-ḍvaiṭa-Vêdāṇṭa, describe it. The opposition between the specification-less Brahman or Ātmā or Ego, on the one hand, and the Non-Ego, on the other, is stated by the Vêdāṇṭa thus: (The Ātmā is) That of which ākāsha (ether), air, fire, water, and earth, are the vi-varṭa-s, opposites, perversions.³ The relation between them is indicated in a manner which comes home to the reader more closely than Fichte's: "Brahman dreams all this universe, and its waking is the reduction of it all to illusion."⁴

Thus we see that some of the most important conclusions of the current A-ḍvaiṭa-Vêdāṇṭa have been independently reached by this truly great German thinker. And in seeing this, we have ourselves taken a step further than we had done, when we left the Viśiṣṭa-aḍvaiṭa system as the second result of the last endeavour to solve the supreme question of questions. We have seen that the current A-ḍvaiṭa-Vêdāṇṭa is an advance upon the Viśiṣṭāḍvaiṭa. We have also seen that Fichte and Hegel are supplementary to each other. For, while Fichte's dialectic is the more internal, starting with

¹ *Bṛhad-Āraṇyaka*, I, iv, 10.

² *Ibid.*, IV, iv, 19.

³ *Bhamaṭi*, p. 1.

⁴ Maḍhusūdana Sarasvatī's *San̄kṣhepa-Shāriraka-Tika*, iii, shloka 240.

the Ego, and therefore the truer and less artificial, it follows out the world-process up to the end of two stages only, as it were, those of origination and preservation, *i.e.*, the present existing order of things, a commingling of the Ego and the Non-Ego ; whereas Hegel's dialectic—though external, starting with Being (returning however to thought and Self afterwards), and therefore the more artificial—completes, in a way, the circuit of the world-process to the last stage, that of destruction, dissolution, or return to the original condition. (The words ' in a way ' have been used for want of the certainty that the full significance of this cyclic law and triple succession of origin, preservation, and dissolution of the kosmic systems which make up the world-process, and which law is reiterated over and over again in all Saṃskṛt literature, was present to the minds of Fichte and Hegel.) We feel now that Hegel, Fichte, and current A-d v a i ṭ a -Védānta have come close to the very heart of the secret ; we feel that it cannot now be very far off ; we are face to face with the lock that closes the whole treasure-house of explanations of all possible mysteries and secrets and confusions ; we also hold in our hands the key which we feel is the only key to the lock ; and not only do we hold the key, but in our struggles with the key and the lock we have, in the good company of the Indian védāntīs and the German idealists, broken through panes of the door leaves and almost moved the door away from its hinges, and obtained many a glimpse and even plain view of many of those treasures and secrets. Yet

the key will not quite turn in the lock. Some rust-stain somewhere, some defect of construction, prevents this.

The defect, some features of which have been already pointed out in treating of Hegel, is that we cannot deny altogether this Non-Ego. We cannot quite convince ourselves that it is 'pure' Non-being, *aṭyaṇṭa-asat*. It seems both existent and non-existent, *saḍ-asat*. Whence this appearance of existence in it? The last unexplained crux of the current A-ḍvaiṭa-Védānta is the connection between Brahman, the Absolute, and Māyā, the Illusion of the World-Process. As with Fichte's Non-Ego, so with the védāntī's Māyā, there remains behind an appearance of artificiality, of a *deus ex machina*, a lack of organic connection and spontaneity, in the working of the world-process into and out of the Ego, in the arrangement between Māyā, on the one hand, and Brahman, on the other. *Why* should Brahman dream? A hundred different ways of enunciation and illustration are tried by the ordinary védāntī. None is satisfactory. And therefore the *current* A-ḍvaiṭa does not reach to the final stage of a *true* A-ḍvaiṭa. When pressed, it, like Fichte, falls back upon the position that Māyā (Non-Ego, with Fichte) is wholly Non-being, instead of both existent and non-existent, and this we cannot quite bring home to ourselves. Besides this difficulty, there is the *process of change*: the 'I' opposes to itself the 'Not-I', and reverts again to an original condition. *Why?* Our Absolute must be above change. Again, there seems to be an artificiality and arbitrariness

about the 'Not-I' in another way. Why any one particular 'Not-I'? Fichte's deduction of the world-process is effected in a syllogism of three steps, three propositions, and even then it does not quite complete the process, but leaves it half-finished. It ought to be complete in one proposition, *one single act of consciousness*; otherwise the difficulty of *change* in the Absolute remains unsolved.

There are expressions and indications that to the mind of Fichte and other German thinkers, as to the mind of the védāntī, there is present the distinction or rather opposition between Eternity, succession-less Timelessness, *kāla-aṭīṭa-ṭā*, transcendence of time, on the one hand, and successive time, *kāla*, even though endless, on the other. In this opposition lies the clue to the whole of the 'secret'; but it does not seem to have been utilised. It is not properly utilised in the extant books on *A-dvaita-Védānta*, although the fact that Brahman is beyond space and time, is reiterated incessantly. Nor does it seem to have been put to effective use by Fichte or any other Western thinker, though it has been recognised by even such a non-metaphysical but extremely acute reasoner as J. S. Mill¹, as the distinction between the *true* and the *false* Infinite. One hesitates to say positively that Fichte has left this last work unperformed; but from the accounts and translations of his writings available in English, this seems to be the case. Yet the secret is there, all the time, among the ideas expressed in his writings, as much as in the better works of current

¹ In his *Examination of Sir William Hamilton's Philosophy*.

A-ḍvaiṭa-Vēdāṇṭa. Just the one rust-stain has to be removed from the key, then it will turn, and will finally unclothe the lock, and lay open before us what we want.

We want, as said before, That Which combines within itself Change as well as Changelessness, and will also be our own inmost Self. An infinity of change, even though it be a change of progress—a progress that has no self-contained and consistent meaning; that is without a definite *final* goal *towards which* it is a progress; an increasing progress which, there is reason to believe, may also be alternating with an ever-increasing regress; a progress in a convolved spiral, which, if it turns upwards to ever greater glories of higher and subtler life, may also, by necessary correspondence, in accordance with the law of balance, compensation, action-reaction, thesis-antithesis, pass downwards too, through ever-increasing miseries of lower and grosser densities of matter—such ceaseless, aimless, dual process, swing to-and-fro, or progress even, means not satisfaction, brings not happiness, but rather a desolate weariness. Fichte has said (to quote again the words of Schwegler): “It is our duty at once, and an impossibility to reach the infinite; nevertheless, just this striving, united to this impossibility, is the stamp of our eternity.”¹ Schelling has said the same thing.² To the principle of this metaphysical ‘deduction,’ corresponds the actual fact, ascertained by Yoga and occult science, and stated in the Purāṇas and other theosophical

¹ Schwegler's *History of Philosophy*, p. 270.

² J. H. Stirling, *What is Thought?*, pp. 397-398.

and Yoga-Vēdānta literature, that there is endless evolution of *jīva*-s, by birth after birth, in body after body and world after world. But this fact is not the whole truth; it does not stand by itself. If it did, then such a mere infinity of change, without a constant and permanent basis of changelessness and peace, would only add the horrors of Sisyphus to the agonies of Tantalus. No soul, however patiently it now accepts—as many do—the doctrine of an endless progress, will long feel peace in it by itself. The longing, yearning, resistless and quenchless craving for Changelessness and Peace and Rest, for something final, will come upon it sooner or later.

Besides this emotional difficulty, this surfeit with unrest, which is now upon us, there is the intellectual difficulty, the impossibility of *understanding* the very fact of *change*. The instinct of the intellect cries out, as the very first words of all logic, as the primary laws of all thought, that A is A, that it is not not-A, that Being is Being only, and never Nothing. “The non-existent cannot be, and the existent cannot not-be.”¹ Yet every mortal moment of our lives, all around and above and below us, these much-vaunted laws of logic are being violated incessantly.² Every infinitesimal instant,

¹ *Gīṭā*, ii, 16; otherwise, I might become non-est also! The intellectual instinct too is emotional rebellion against that possibility.

² And in these textbooks of deductive logic themselves, most barefacedly! Solemnly declaring that A is A only and B is B only, they at once also say, A is B, B is C, therefore A is C! If A is A, B is B, and C is C, only, how can A ever be B, or B be C, or C be A? If A really is B, i.e., *identical* with B, then why two names for the same thing? Call it either A, or B. Samskr̥t *Nyāya* does not misapply these laws of Universal Thought, as if they were laws of individual and concrete thinking, for which the distinction between thing and thought, idea and

something, some *existent* thing, is becoming *non-existent*, and some *non-existent* thing is coming into being, is becoming *existent*. We may say that it is only the form that behaves like this. But what is the good of saying so? All that the world really means to us—sounds and sights, tastes, touches, and scents—all is included in the 'form' that changes. Even weight, it is being attempted to prove by mathematical computations, will 'change, with change of position, from planet to planet.' And, finally, those mathematical laws themselves, on which such computations are based, can no longer boast permanence; they, too, are being changed by mathematicians, and it is endeavoured to be shown that parallel lines can meet and two things occupy the same space; though, on these points, it seems likely that exuberance of originality has led to exaggerations, and that the 'old order' will be restored. We have an 'indestructible faith that matter is indestructible; this faith is not due to any limited facts we know, for limited data can never justify limitless inductions' and inferences; it is only the unavoidable assignment by us,

reality, holds good. It does not say *A is B*, and *B is C*, therefore *A is C*, but that *A has C*, because *C goes with B*, and *A has B*. It does not artificially separate out an utterly sterile *deductive* or *formal* logic from the wholly useful *inductive* or *real* logic, but combines both, as is inevitable and natural. The true and full significance of these laws of thought appears only in metaphysic, as laws of Being, *i.e.*, *Universal Thought*, as will appear later on.

¹ See Scripture, *The New Psychology*; but Ostwald in his *Hand-book of Chemistry* seems to think otherwise.

² The real secret of the unlimitedness of inductions and generalisations, as made, is that every *single* instance, every *one*, has in it the principle of *infinity*. *Many* cases, a number of cases, are not necessary to justify an induction. *One* case, but it must be a clear and unmistakeable

by the 'I,' of a conjugal share in our own indefeasible eternity, to our undivorceable partner in life, the 'Not-I,' matter. Such being the case, it does not help us in any way to say that only the form changes. The form is practically everything; and even if it were not so, even then it is something, it is an existent something at one moment. And what is existent *once*, should be existent *ever*. *How, why*, does it pass into non-existence? We *do not* understand change. We *do not* understand the world-process. If you would have us understand it, you must show that this world-process is not a *process* at all, but a *rock-like fixity*; that *procession* is *illusion*, and *fixity* the *truth*. Then only shall we be able to bring it into accord with the primary laws of thought. Such is the difficulty of the exaggerated, yet also legitimate, demand of the reason, on the one hand.

On the other hand stands the difficulty of what may be called the demand of the senses. A doctrine of mere changelessness is incomplete; a mere assertion of it perfectly unconvincing. It explains nothing and is not a case, is enough. Because in *one*, therefore in all *ones* which are the *same*; because once, therefore always, in the *same* conditions.

One school of Nyāya puts the 'matter in a simple way; we have *praṭyakṣha*, direct perception, of a *vyākṣi*, a particular, and of its *jāti*, species or genus, both, together, simultaneously; because particular-and-general are inseparably bound together by a *mavāya*, co-inherence, mutual 'together-ness'. No 'induction' by elaborate observation and comparison of many instances would be necessary, and 'generalisation' could be arrived at straight off, from the very first observation, if it be sufficiently precise, accurate, unmixed; but, in practice, observation and comparison of many instances are needed, to eliminate irrelevant circumstances. In short, particular-perception and the connected general-perception (Kantian 'matter' and 'form') arise together in the observer's consciousness.

fact. It is, as just said, denied by every wink of our eyes, by every breath of our lungs, by every beat of our hearts. We want that which will combine and harmonise both change and changelessness. We want to reduce each into terms of the other.

Many have been the efforts to shut up the world-process into something which can be held in a single hand ; which shall be but one single act of consciousness. Kant says, in his *Kritik of Practical Reason*, " to deduce all from a single principle, is the inevitable demand of human reason ; we can find full satisfaction only in a complete systematic Unity of all the possessions of our reason " ; but he himself failed badly to satisfy that demand. Fichte could not do it in less than three successive, unsimultaneous, and therefore change-involving steps, and then too but incompletely. The great mystic school of Rosicrucians has endeavoured to do so in one thought and Bible-text : " I am that I am " ; but this propounds mere changelessness, and makes no provision for change. The Vēda-texts belonging to the penultimate stage have exclaimed separately, as said before : "(The) I am (is) Brahman," and then : " The Many is not at all " ; but these too are insufficient for our purpose ; they too establish changelessness alone and explain not change ; while others embody change only and not changelessness, as thus : " May I who am One become Many ; may I be born forth and multiply," " It created that, and entered into that also."²

¹ *Chhāndogya*, VI, ii, 3, and *Taittīriya*, II, vi, 1.

² *Taittīriya*, II, vi, 1.

What we seek shall be obtained by compressing the three steps of Fichte into one ; by combining the first two separate scripture-utterances into a unity—a small change perhaps, at first sight, but almost as radical and important in result as an alteration of the mere order of letters composing a word, an alteration which makes a completely new word with an entirely new meaning.

NOTE I.—It may be mentioned here that the western philosophers especially selected in the text to serve as landmarks on the path of enquiry, have been so selected because their special way of thought, arising out of modern conditions, seemed most suited to the modern student and best fitted for the purpose in hand. Otherwise, indeed, the same subjects of enquiry have been and are being investigated by hundreds of the finest intellects of the human race, from the most ancient times up to the present day ; and different aspects of the same truths and propositions and solutions may be found in the works of the ancient Greek philosophers, Plato, Aristotle, and the Neo-Platonists especially, of Descartes, Spinoza, Leibnitz, of the mystics, Scheffler, Eckhart, Albrecht, and Böhme, of Bruno and Bacon, and, again, Schopenhauer and Spencer, and many others. Each philosopher worthy of the name, and to whom the name has been given by public recognition, has undoubtedly left the world's stock of philosophical knowledge richer, by at least some definite piece of work, a fuller and deeper view of some law, or a new application and use of it, a new aspect of a question, or fact, or law, or a fresh presentation, in a new re-arrangement, of the same time-old world-facts, as of the same glass-pieces of a kaleidoscope re-arranged by every new turn. Indeed, as may appear later on, the most erroneous-seeming opinion ever held by any thinker will be seen, from an all-embracing standpoint, and in a certain sense, to be a not inaccurate description of one aspect of a world-fact, one greater or lesser portion of the truth. But some of the latest German thinkers seem to have succeeded better than any of their precursors in Europe in the attempt to systematise and unify. And even amongst these,

from such accounts and translations of his writings into English as are available, Fichte appears to be an almost indispensable help to the modern students of true Védānta and the higher metaphysic—the metaphysic which would enclose so-called occult and superphysical science within its principles, as well as physical science; which claims to be a science because it offers to be tested in the same way as every particular science is tested, *viz.*, by endeavouring to show that its hypotheses agree with present facts, and also enable prediction to be made correctly, of results in the future; which, indeed, claims to be the very science of sciences by providing a great system, a great hypothesis, which, while special sciences systematise and unify limited groups of facts, would deal with and synthesise the root-concepts of all these special sciences, and so co-ordinate all sciences, would systematise and unify all possible world-facts, past, present, and to come.

It may be objected that this claim is rather large, seeing that many thinkers have put forward many systems of metaphysic; and all differ from each other more or less; so that metaphysic has been even described as the most contentious of sciences. The reply is that there is, *at bottom*, as substantial an agreement, though much less obvious, between these different systems as between different textbooks of, say, arithmetic or geometry, which differ in language, phrasing, order of presentation, of the subject-matter, method of calculation or proof, examples, corollaries, etc. A similar substantial agreement there must be, *at bottom*, ultimately, between all the changing expositions of all the physical sciences too; for each endeavours to expound, obviously, one aspect of Nature, all aspects of which make up a mutually-agreeing consistent whole; and scientists are sensing, and trying to grasp and express, that underlying agreement and unity. In countries where metaphysic is almost as much in vogue as arithmetic, *e.g.*, India, this substantial agreement between philosophies is no longer un-obvious either; thus the learned in India are all, on the whole, tacitly agreed that the Védānta is the final philosophy, that the five or more other schools represent but stages or aspects, and that changing times require and bring forth only fresh presentations, in more or less suitably modified

forms, of the same 'final truth'. When and where metaphysic comes to be really as much in vogue as mathematics, then and there *its* numeration and notation, its four fundamental rules and Rule of Three, its definitions, postulates, and axioms, its points, lines, surfaces, and solids, its essential concepts of force, fulcrum, and lever, its compositions, resolutions, and parallelograms of forces, its equations, permutations, combinations, and probabilities—all these will be recognised and agreed upon even more widely and deeply; for what is or can be nearer than the Self, the Not-Self, and the Relation between them? And then there will be, even obviously, as little difference between books on metaphysic, as between those on mathematics. What the traditional feeling and conviction on this point is in India, may be inferred from the fact that while the Védas—and, of course, the Upanishats which are the Védānta, the 'final' and crowning part of them—are insistently declared to be *svaṭaḥ-pramāṇa*, self-evident (see footnote at p. 40, *supra*), the technical Samskr̥t name for the geometrical axioms is *svayam-siddha*, 'self-proven,' the same thought, and practically the same word.

Sometimes it is said that philosophy is a matter of 'personal equation'. Alexander Herzberg has written an informing and entertaining book, *The Psychology of Philosophers*, in which he has tried to connect the views, of some thirty of the most famous western thinkers, with their personal characters, temperaments, physical health and features, life-experiences, and circumstances. There is an element of truth, no doubt, in this; it is even proverbial that views change with the situation, the point of view. But that element of truth must not be pressed too far. The proverb suggests its own supplement. Circumambulate the problem concerned; view it from all standpoints; and you will see the way to agreement. Differences are mostly of emphasis, on this or that other aspect; and of taste. Even in mathematics, one person studies and writes on arithmetic; another, geometry: another, algebra, or trigonometry, or mensuration, conic sections, calculus, etc. But there is no contradiction between them. So too, there would not be any, there is no, contradiction between philosophers and philosophies, if the latter only

restrained egoism properly, and were more desirous to understand than eager to differ and claim originality. The present writer has endeavoured to show the *Essential Unity of All Religions*, in a compilation bearing that name, by parallel texts from the scriptures of eleven ; and philosophies are at least one aspect of religions, as religions are of philosophies.

NOTE II.—For readers interested in the linking up of eastern and western thought, some further observations are subjoined. They may perhaps be usefully read once again, after reading the next chapter. The two will cast light on each other.

Schwegler, in *History of Philosophy*, articles on Fichte, Schelling, Hegel ; J. H. Stirling, in *The Secret of Hegel* ; Wallace, in *The Logic of Hegel*, 'Prolegomena' ; Caird, in *Hegel*—all speak unfavourably of certain traits and acts of Hegel, his grudging and very insufficient acknowledgment of his great debt to Fichte, his jealousy of Schelling and making use of him as a stepping-stone in various ways, his flattery of his Government and exaltation of the Monarchical State. He had his great good points also. All human beings—including 'philosophers' (!), of East and West, ancient as well as modern—are 'bundles of contradictions', of 'opposites', as is all Nature. A *soul* wearing a *body*, is necessarily such a compound ; it is matter for deep thanksgiving, if the factor of soul-altruism happens to predominate over that of body-egoism.

Hegel says (Wallace, op. cit., pp. 101-102) : " It was only formally that the Kantian system established the principle that thought acted spontaneously in forming its constitution. Into the details of the manner and the extent of this self-determination of thought, Kant never went. It was *Fichte* who first noticed the omission, called attention to the want of a deduction of the categories, and endeavoured to supply something of the kind. With *Fichte*, the *Ego is the starting point* in the philosophical development, and the outcome of its action is supposed to be visible in the categories ".

Broadly, 'categories', here, may be understood to correspond with the *m ā h ā - v ā k y a s*, 'great logia', Primal Laws of Nature, God's Nature, Self's Nature, on which Laws

the World-Process is framed, by which it is shaped, governed, carried on; this sense is much broader than that of the word as used by Kant and also Hegel. In the Vaishéshika system, as we have seen (f.n. to pp. 60-61 *supra*), the 'categories' are implicitly inherent in God's Nature. Fichte and Schelling have their own sets of categories, though perhaps less full, and less systematically concatenated, than those of Hegel.

Hegel goes on to criticise Fichte: "But in Fichte, the Ego is not really presented as a free, spontaneous energy; it is supposed to receive its first impulse from without . . . The nature of the impulse remains a stranger beyond our pale".

Hegel's objections are false, and apply to his own work forcibly; not to Fichte's. When Hegel begins with the sensationalist paradox, that Being is Nothing, and Nothing is Being, and Becoming is the passing of each into the other, does he present the three as three free and spontaneous energies, and endow any or all of them with impulses from within, impulses which are not strangers beyond our pale, but familiars within our home? He tries to see a non-existent mote in Fichte's eyes, and fails to see the beam in his own! Fichte says clearly that the Ego itself positively posits, contra-poses, Non-Ego, over against it-Self, in order to realise it-Self. The Ego is obviously, as comes home to every one of us in our feeling of free-will, a free and spontaneous energy, and the impulse is its own. The following extracts from Schwegler (op. cit., 'Fichte') will illustrate: "The Ego is manifest in consciousness; but the thing-in-itself is a mere fiction . . . (Fichte) would make the Ego the (first) principle, and from the Ego would derive all the rest . . . We are to understand by this Ego, not the particular individual, but the *universal* Ego . . . Egoity and individuality, the pure (abstract) and the empirical ego, are entirely different ideas. . . . *Fichte is the first to deduce all fundamental notions from a single point*, and to bring them into connection, instead of taking them only empirically, like Kant, and setting them down in mere juxtaposition. . . . Ego=Ego, the Ego is, *I am*. . . .

Before anything can be given in the Ego, the Ego itself must be given. . . . This is pure, inherent, independent activity. . . . *I am* is the expression of the only possible original act. . . . The Ego is the *prîus* of all judgment, and is the *foundation of the nexus* (relation) of subject and predicate . . . We obtain from it, the category of *reality*. All categories are deduced from the Ego as absolute subject. . . . The second fundamental principle is, . . . Ego is not=non-Ego. . . . Whatever belongs to the Ego, the counterpart of that must, by virtue of simple contraposition, belong to the non-Ego. The category (idea, general notion, law, of) determination or limitation follows; thence follow . . . divisibility, substantiality, causality, cause-and-effect, reciprocal relation (etc.) . . . The Ego itself is absolutely self-determination. . . . Originally, there is only a single substance, the Ego; *it alone is the absolute Infinite*. . . . But the Ego supposes a Non-Ego. . . ." And so on. That there are some minute, subtle, even important, differences between Fichte's thinking and VĒdānṭa, may be granted. The VĒdānṭa way is preferred in the present work, compiled in view of the Indian reader's requirements as well as those of the western reader, who may be interested in Indian thought. The seeker, goaded by inner questionings, must, of course, decide for himself, which satisfies him most. But Hegel's fault-finding with Fichte does not seem justified in any case. He says (op. cit.): "What Kant calls *thing-in-itself*, Fichte calls *impulse from without* . . . (i.e.) non-Ego in general. The 'I' is thus looked at as standing in relation with the 'not-I' through which its act of self-determination is first awakened."

Hegel had access to the original German of Fichte, which the present writer has not; and Fichte may have employed words equivalent, in English, to 'impulse from without'. But, seeing how words are perpetually changing their meanings in the hands of philosophers, and even the same philosopher, (Hegel himself is an outstanding example of this sin), the present writer would interpret Fichte as meaning 'impulse from non-Ego, contraposed, ideated, *as if without*, by the Ego it-self', and 'first awakened' as *eternally realised, once for all*, as well as realised throughout all

time in unending succession'. This interpretation is supported by Schwegler's whole account of Fichte; and that account seems to be fair and correct as against Hegel's cavillings and carpings, which seem to be almost 'malice prepense' (!), in order to set off his own originality. To prick the big bubble of Hegel's big claim, it is enough to observe that Fichte begins with a Living One, and that One, the Heart's Desire of the whole Universe of living beings, the Self, 'for the sake of which is dear, whatever else happens to be dear,' (as the *Upanishat* says); while Hegel begins with *three*, and three life-less, soul-less, ghosts, Being-Nothing-Becoming, outside of *Me*, there, in front of *Me*. Even Kant, from whom, according to Stirling, Hegel's industrious exponent, Hegel borrowed very much—even Kant craved for, and could not find, a Single Principle from which all could be deduced; but he did come to have an inkling that the Self is that Single Principle, the 'thing-in-itself' behind both Mind and Matter. Thus: "The 'I think' must be *capable* of accompanying all my ideas; otherwise, there would be presented to my mind an idea of something which could not be thought, and this means that the thought would be impossible, or, at least, that it would be nothing at all *for me*; . . . the proposition that all the various elements of our empirical consciousness must be bound together in *one self-consciousness*, is absolutely the first principle of all our thinking"—quoted from Kant, by Edward Caird, in *The Critical Philosophy of Kant*, I, 353.

Why so much dissertation about the Self? Because It is the One Central Fact of Védānta and of all Indian thought, the one sure and certain Single Reality of the Universe; One, yet all-enveloping, all-regulating, all-deducing-producing-inducing. Ātmā, as Param-Ātmā, Praṇyag-Ātmā, Jiv-Ātmā, Sūtr-Ātmā, Bhūt-Ātmā, Jagat-Ātmā, pervades Samskr̥t literature. And Hegel and Stirling cannot avoid sensing Its light, even through closed eyelids. Stirling (op. cit.), pp. 28-29, earnestly exhorts, in the very spirit of the *Upanishats* and the *Yoga-Vāsishtha*, the would-be student of Hegel to practise meditation on "Abstract or Pure Being, Abstract or Pure Existentiality, the Hegelian *Sein* . . . Let there be no stone, no plant, no sea, no earth, no sun, no idea,

no space, no time, no God—let the universe disappear—we have not yet got rid of *Is*. *Is* will not, cannot, disappear."

But, please, let the Self, you, your-self, who are exhorting others to meditate thus—let your-Self disappear. Does *Is* remain after that? If it does, how do you know that it does?! Stirling again says: "Ask yourself, What would there be, if there were just nothing at all, and if there never had been anything—neither God, nor a world, nor an existence at all? Ask yourself this and listen! Then look at the question itself, and observe how it contains its own dialectic and contradiction, in *pre*-supposing the Being it is actually supposing not to be!" But, please, add to the question 'Neither a Self, your-Self', and listen! *Who* is left to listen?! The question as worded by Stirling, when it says 'nor an existence at all', does *not* mean, 'not even *your own* existence', but surreptitiously implies that your *own i.e.*, your-Self's existence is left; for indeed it is *impossible* for any one to *imagine* his own existence abolished, (see p. 22 *supra*). We do not know if Stirling ever tried to perform that feat. His question *pre*-supposes Being, truly; but *what* Being, *whose* Being? Whatever Being he meant, that Being inevitably *pre*-supposes Self, *whose* Being, or which *as* Being, is the only Being that is absolutely, unshakeably, unabolishably sure and certain.

Stirling cannot help contradicting himself on this point. At p. 24 of his book, he says: "Hegel as it were swoons himself back into infancy, trances himself through all childhood, and awakes when the child awakes, that is, with reflection, but retaining a consciousness of the process, which the child does not. It is a realisation of the wish that we could know the series of development in the mind of the child". Incidentally, this is one of the exercises suggested in Yoga; and a simpler form of it is—do not get out of bed in the morning too quickly, but practise *awaking slowly*, and intro-specting the gradual stages from dim to clear consciousness; for, speaking very broadly, by the Law or Fact of Analogy, *viz.*, that the small is as the large, the microcosm as the macrocosm, a complete day of an individual life is like the whole of that life, and this latter again is like the whole of the life of a whole Human race or nation, and that, again, like the

Cosmos-Chaos, Evolution-Dissolution of a whole globe, or a whole Solar System ; and so on.

Now, Stirling goes on to say that when the child awakes, "conceivably there is a sense of being—or the vague wide idea, Being ; there is *no I* in it ; I is the product of reflexion." This at p. 24. But at p. 67, he contradicts himself crassly : "The notion then as being, as *is*, as the *absolutely first* crude, dim, dull, opaque, chaotic consciousness, brute *I am*, the first flutter of life, . . . is only in *it-self*—latent, undeveloped ;" and again, at p. 99, "that which lives, and all that lives, is thought ; *I* find my *I* to be a constituent moment," (better say, locus, focus, centre, basis) "of that all of thought." Here, Stirling, unwittingly, helplessly, admits the primacy of the Self. At the end of his Annotations to Schweglar, he claims for himself only the role of a "humble Christian philosopher", and on the last but one page (p. 750) of *The Secret of Hegel*, he claims for Hegel that he "has no object but once again to restore to us—and in the new light of the new thought—Immortality and Free-Will, Christianity and God". But he forgets that in the Bible, "God said unto Moses, I AM THAT I AM ; and he said, Thus shalt thou say to the children of Israel, I AM hath sent me unto you" ; and again, repeatedly, "*I am* the Alpha and the Omega, the first and the last." The Rg-Vēda, in the magnificent Nāsa-ḍīya hymn, says : "Neither non-Being was, nor Being. Only the Self breathed, without air. It breathed Its own Self-affirmation, Self-positing, Sva-ḍhā. Death was not, nor deathlessness, nor day, nor night, nor space, nor any orbs therein. Deep darkness lay in the embrace of deep darkness. Nothing-Else-than-It was, Tasmāḍ-Anyat-Na param kinchid āsa. And in it moved Primal Desire, Kāma, seed of Universal Mind. Who knows It ? Perhaps It knows It-Self, perhaps not !" (For texts from other scriptures, of other religions, to the same or similar effect, the reader may see the present writer's *The Essential Unity of All Religions*, Index-references, 'Self', 'God', 'I').

Let us now observe the plight of Hegel himself. In Stirling's book (op. cit.), in section II, 'Quality translated', pp. 253-259, the word 'Self' occurs 118 times ; the word

'Other', 64 times; and the word 'This', as equivalent to 'Other', also, a few times. On p. 255, 'Self' occurs 29 times; on p. 256, 18 times; on p. 257, 20 times. Please note, this is Hegel's own writing, only translated. The word 'Self' occurs, in greater or less abundance, on many other pages, generally in peculiar combinations with other words. *An sich* (in, at, or by Self), *fur sich* (for, by, or with Self), *An und fur sich* (in and for Self)—this triad is the very skeleton, the frame, on which are moulded all the tissues and the flesh of Hegel's system. Following compounds are found all over the place; it-self, for-self, in-and-for-self, self-diremption, self-union, self-conservation, self-retention, self-reference, self-separation, self-duplication, self-mediation, self-consciousness, being-in-it-self, being-for-self, being-within-it-self, being-in-it-self-ness, be-ent-in-it-self, self-identical-within-it-self, self-to-self-referent, in-it-self-ness; and so on and so forth. Yet to give precedence to Being-Nothing-Becoming over Self (and It's included Not-Self *i.e.*, This Other, and Not)—this, to the Vēdānta view, is a very grave, very misleading, error; though, of course, every error has its use, if it act as incentive to further trial, until finding. 'Self', 'Other' (Skṭ. *iṭaṛa*, Gr. *heteron*) 'This' (Skṭ. *éṭaṭ*, *iḍam*)—these words are in the very spirit of Vēdānta, which uses equivalents pointedly; but Hegel fails to describe the Relation between the Three, satisfactorily, or even at all. Fichte, as said, makes a much nearer approach, without quite grasping, it seems.

Stirling (in whose own expositions of Hegel, the word 'self,' or its equivalent 'ego' or 'sich' occurs, *e.g.*, 27 times on p. 51, and 29 times on pp. 121-122, to take instances at random) says at p. 53: "Hegel's secret is very much the translating of the concrete individual into the abstract general or universal. He is always intelligible when we keep before us the particular individual he is engaged translating; but let us lose the object, the translation becomes hopeless." But why write thus abstractly? Indian seers and sages enjoin the study of Vēda-Vēdānta and Itihāsa-Purāṇa, Philosophy and History, Abstract and Concrete, side by side, in the light of each other. So only are both lighted up. To teach a secret code without explaining the meaning simultaneously; a shorthand system without the longhand

equivalents; geometry without the figures: is futile. When Hegel 'descends' into concrete illustrations, rarely, he is not only intelligible but interesting and informing. But he, "in general, vouchsafes abundantly, dry, abstract allusion, but never one word of plain, straightforward, concrete explanation. Information in Hegel is, for the most part, but a disdainful abstruse *riling* of us': (Stirling op. cit. p. 355). There are instances of such deliberate mystification, abstruse abstractness, code-language, 'riddling rhymes' and even 'scornful riling,' in Samskr̥ṭ literature too, as, f.i., that of the mysterious 8800 verses' of *Mahā-bhārata*, by tradition, of 'Raikva of the car' and Yajña-valkya in the *Upanishats*, of Dharma-kīrti (Buddhist author), of Shri Harsha (poet and a-ḍva iṭi casuist-sophist). But these are not regarded as models; and the 8800 so-thought 'mysterious' verses of Vēda-Vyāsa are explained by some scholar's, very simply, as being only the first draft, which Vyāsa himself, later, expanded to 24,000, and his disciples and grand-disciples, subsequently, to a hundred thousand verses, by successive additions, somewhat as the successive editions of an encyclopedia 'grow from more to more'. Mystery-mongering is a very old trade; it attracts many customers, though it repels others.

Particularly surprising in a person of Hegel's great reputation is his shallow, supercilious, self-conceited criticism of the Vēdānta of *Bhagavad-Gīṭā*, and of Sūfism; (pp. 188-192, Wallace's translation of Hegel's *Philosophy of Mind*). It is obvious to anyone who has studied *Gīṭā* and the better known Sūfi writings with any care, that that criticism is based, not on knowledge, but on ignorance. He says, "They are systems which apprehend the Absolute only as substance . . . The fault of all these modes of thought is that they stop short of defining" (*i.e.*, they do not define) "substance as subject and as mind". To us, in view of what has been said above, regarding Hegel's treatment of Being and Self, this criticism is like 'the thief shouting—Stop thief'; is imputing to another the fault which is his own. No system of thought, no philosophy, has so expressly and emphatically declared the only real substance to be the Supreme Self and Subject, as the Vēdānta. The case of 'mind' is different; it is the Self's Nature; about which, later on.

The substantial value of Hegel seems to be what the 'popular' or 'general' mind has decided; and the 'popular' mind (because it reflects the element of Truth in the Universal Mind, at least as often as that of its Opposite, Untruth or Falsehood or Error, which also is present in the Universal Mind, by inevitable Duality-within-Unity), has concluded that the things of permanent use in Hegel are, a fuller working out of the method of thesis-antithesis-synthesis which he borrowed from Fichte; that the process of the world means that the Spirit goes out into Nature, as into something other than itself, and then returns to itself with a fuller content of knowledge, and fuller self-consciousness, as in a 'perfected man'; and that every individual, as much as the universe, is a whole, a whole of wholes, a circle of circles. But all this has been said by many others also, in other and sometimes better words, and needs completion by Védānta.

Hegel says (Wallace, *The Logic of Hegel*, 1st edn., p. 62): "When the notion of God is apprehended only as that of abstract or most positive being ['most real being' in the new edn., of 1892], God is, as it were, relegated to another world beyond; and to speak of a knowledge of him would be meaningless. Where there is no distinction of elements ['no definite quality', in the new edn.] knowledge is impossible. Mere light is mere darkness". This is not unintelligible, though '*I am*' is knowledge of a sort, and without any definite quality. And the last two sentences show that the sensationally and paradoxically worded proposition, 'Pure Being is pure Nothing', is capable of being understood into 'pure' common sense; as thus, when we are day-dreaming, or twiddling our thumbs, and a person asks 'What are you doing?', and we answer 'Oh nothing', we mean 'Nothing particular, nothing that matters, nothing worth while noting or remembering'. So, Hegel's 'Beginning' means the passing of that factor of Being which belongs to Something, of some particular Being, into Nothing; and vice versa; otherwise, abstract Being and abstract Nothing would be "relegated to another world beyond," like "abstract God", and "to speak of a knowledge of them would be meaningless". And it is, necessarily, with some such particular specificate determinate Beginning, with some object that has 'begun',

(and is also ending, is passing from birth to death and death to birth, in the metabolism of a perpetual round of anabolism-katabolism, necro-biosis, incessant integration-disintegration, existence-non-existence), that ordinary thinking (Hegelian Perception-Conception-Understanding) as well as philosophical thinking (those three plus Hegelian Reason) also begin. This thinking, of course, pre-supposes the consciousness of the 'thinker-I'; which consciousness is vague in ordinary thinking, and clear in philosophical; and becomes full (All-) Self-Consciousness, as the very climax of Reason (or 'Speculation', in Hegelian terminology).

As Hegel himself says (*ibid.*): "God must be simply and solely the ground of every thing, and in so far, not dependent on anything. . . . The demonstration of reason no doubt *starts* from some thing which is not God. But, as it advances, it does not leave the starting-point a mere unexplained fact, which is what it was. On the contrary, it exhibits that point as derivative, and called into being, and *then*, God is seen to be primary and self-(Self-) subsisting, with the means of derivation wrapped up and absorbed in himself (.Self) . . . The original antecedent is reduced to a consequence". By such interpretation, and by bearing in mind the implicit perpetual *assumption* of Self by Hegel, (the failure to announce which, clearly, at the very beginning, can only be counted as a disastrous omission), removes much obscurity. It will be noticed by the careful reader, however, that Hegel is only quietly copying Fichte here, and very uncouthly too, by substituting the much less intelligible third-person term 'God' (somewhere in "another world beyond"), for Fichte's sun-clear first-person term 'I', ever-near, ever-dear, here, there, everywhere. This is a theme capable of much expansion, requiring a sentence or more for every sentence of Hegel; and cannot be pursued here any further.

Hegel's own language, summarised by Schwegler, and quoted above, (pp. 74-75, *supra*) is "The absolute . . . returns out of self-externalisation, self-alienation, back into its own self, resolves the heterisation of nature, and becomes, at last,

actual self-cognisant spirit." This seems to be the "*the* notion," "the notion of *the* notion," "the absolute," "the Idea", "the Reciprocity which is the notion" which Stirling repeats *ad nauseam*, without once 'defining' it 'definitively', to the accompaniment of much dramatic exuberance, effervescence, exclamation, exultation, and attempt at exposition.

Elsewhere, Hegel says, (Wallace, op. cit., p. 289): "As Fichte was one of the earliest among modern philosophers to remark, the theory which regards the Absolute or God as the *Object* and nothing more, expresses the point of view taken by superstition and slavish fear. . . . The salvation and the happiness of men are effected by bringing them to feel themselves *at one with God* . . . God in the Christian religion is also known as Love. In *his Son*, who is *one with him*, he has revealed himself to men as a man amongst men, and thereby redeemed them. This religious dogma is only another way of saying that the antithesis of subjective and objective, has been already overcome, and that on us lies the obligation of participating in this redemption, by laying aside our immediate subjectivity, putting off the old Adam, and *learning to know God as our true and essential Self*. And as it is the aim of religion and religious worship to win *victory over this antithesis of subjectivity and objectivity*, so *science and philosophy* too have no other task than to overcome this antithesis by the medium of thought. The aim of knowledge is to . . . trace the objective world back to the notion, *back to our innermost Self*."

Now, all this is good sound Védānta, Gnostic Mysticism, Sūfism, and the right way to interpret religious dogmas and myths. And many passages in Hegel, and many more in Fichte, read almost like translations from the old Indian books; especially does page after page of Fichte's "The Vocation of Man", breathe the very spirit of *Gītā*, *Upanishats*, *Yoga-Vāsishtha*. But something more is wanted than German or other Western thinkers have said. So we will take leave of them now, and pass to the original ancient Védānta, where the keystone, the crown of them all, is to be found.

CHAPTER VII

THE LAST ANSWER

सर्वे वेदाः यत् पदम् आमनन्ति, तपांसि सर्वाणि च यद्वदन्ति,
यद् इच्छन्तो ब्रह्मचर्यं चरन्ति, तत् ते पदं संप्रहेण ब्रवीमि—
ओम् इति एतत् ।

YAMA, Lord of Death, Ruler of the next world into which souls are 'born' after 'dying' out of this ; than whom, as Nachikēṭā said, there could be no better giver of assurance against mortality, no truer teacher of the truth of life and death ; gives this last answer : " That which all the scriptures ponder and repeat ; that which all the shining, glowing, burning, lights (ascetic holy souls) declare ; that for which the pure ones follow Brahmacharya, life of virtue, study, sacrifice to Brahman ; that do I declare to thee in brief—it is AUM."¹

What is the meaning of this mysterious statement, repeated over and over again in a hundred ways, in all Samskr̥t literature, sacred and secular ? Thus :

The *Prashna-Upanishat* says : " This, O Saṭya-kāma, desirer of truth, is the higher and the lower

¹ *Katha-Upanishat*, I, ii, 15. Besides the special significance of AUM, (pronounced as OM) expounded here, one of its ordinary meanings, as of its Arabic and English transformations, ĀMĪN and AMEN, respectively, is 'yes,' 'be it so'. In *Gīṭā*, the first line of the verse is replaced by,

यद् अक्षरं वेदविदो वदन्ति, विशन्ति यद् यतयो वीतरागाः,

' the Imperishable One Whom the knowers of the Vēda declare, Whom the passionless sinless self-controllers merge themselves into.'

Brahman—this that is known as the AUM. Therefore, strong-based in this as his home and central refuge, the knower may reach out to anything that he deems fit to follow after, and he shall surely obtain it.”¹

The *Chhāṇḍogya* says: “The AUM is all this; the AUM is all this.”²

The *Taittirīya* says: “AUM is Brahma(n); AUM is all this.”³

The *Māṇḍūkya* says: “This, the imperishable AUM, is all this; the unfolding thereof is the past, the present, and the future; all is AUM.”⁴

The *Tāra-sāra* repeats these words of the *Māṇḍūkya*, and says again: “The AUM—this is the imperishable, the supreme, Brahma(n); it alone should be worshipped.”⁵

Paṭañjali says: “The declarer of It is the Praṇava; japa-litany of it is (not mere mechanical repetition of the sound, but) exploring, discovering, realising, its full significance.”⁶

¹ एतद्वै, सत्यकाम ! परं चापरं च ब्रह्म यदोकारः, तस्माद्विद्वानेतेनेवायतने-
नैकतरमन्वेति । v, 2.

² ओंकार एवेदं सर्वमोकार एवेदं सर्वं । II, xxiii, 3.

³ ओमिति ब्रह्म, ओमितीदं सर्वं । I, viii.

⁴ & ⁵ ओमित्येदक्षरमिदं सर्वं, तस्योपव्याख्यानं, भूतं भवद्भविष्यदिति सर्व-
मोकार एव ; i. । ओमित्येदक्षरं परं ब्रह्म तदेवोपासितव्यम् । ii, 1.

⁶ तस्य वाचकः प्रणवः ; तज्जपः तदर्थभावनम् । *Yoga-sūtras*, i, 25, 72.

The word *Pra-ṇava* is a name for the sound AUM; it means, etymologically, ‘that which re-nov-ates, makes new, rejuvenates’ every-thing, including the mind’s outlook. It is the life-breath of the

Such quotations may be multiplied a hundredfold. What is the meaning of these very fanciful-sounding utterances? Many profound and occult interpretations of this triune sound have been given expressly in the *Upanishats* themselves, also in *Gopātha Brāhmaṇa*, and in the books on *Tantra*; but the deepest and most luminous of all remains implicit only.¹ For if the above seemingly exaggerated statements are to be justified in all their fullness, then, in view of all that has gone before, AUM must include within itself, the Self, the Not-Self, and the mysterious Relation between them which has not

universe. It has many names in Samskr̥t *ṭāra*ka or *ṭāra*, *udgiṭha*, *sarva-vin-maṭi*, *sarva-jñā-tābija*, *prātibha*, etc. Many of these have been collected, and the special etymological significance of each indicated, in my Samskr̥t compilation, *Manava-Dharma-Sara*.

¹ The reader may feel inconsistency between the decr̥ial of 'mystery-mongering' at p. 104 *supra*, and the reverence shown for riddle-like scripture-texts here. The differentiating test is in the motive. Where there is wish to swindle, to gain money, or 'kudos' and blind worship, or both, from gullible followers, there we have the 'charlatan'. (It arouses mixed feelings to remember that the 'great philosopher' Schopenhauer calls the 'great philosopher' Hegel a 'charlatan'!). Where there is affectionate wish to arouse only deeper, more earnest, genuine curiosity and search for the highest and most consoling Truth, as in the case of loving parents and teachers, there the temporary mysteriousness is justified, nay, desirable, or even necessary; for the too easily gained is often not appreciated, is even equally easily thrown away; easy come, easy go'. In the case of the Logion, here endeavoured to be expounded, this risk is really serious. Some will think, 'Mere tautology, truism, trash!'; others 'Only an ingenious juggle with words'. Few will ponder sufficiently deeply to realise its very great significance. Therefore Yama wished to avoid the subject, when questioned by Nachik̥tā (p. 1, *supra*), and told him, 'Earnest seeker is even rarer than wise teacher; very subtle and evasive, difficult to seize, because so very simple, is the Truth; marvellous it is, therefore the speaker of it wouders, and the listener wonders more'. But times and circumstances change; as explained in *The Mahatma Letters* and H.P. Blavatsky's writings, Spiritual Wisdom has itself to go out, at special junctures in human history, which recur periodically and cyclically, seeking worthy 'vessels', receptacles for itself, facing ridicule and rebuffs.

yet been discovered in any of the preceding answers—that mysterious Relation, which, being discovered, the whole darkness will be lighted up as by the Sun ; the Relation wherein will be combined Changelessness and Change. If it does this, then truly is the Indian tradition justified—that all knowledge, all science, is summed up in the Véḍas, all the Véḍas in the Gāyaṭrī, and the Gāyaṭrī in the AUM ; then truly are all the Véḍas and all possible knowledge there, for all the World-Process is there. The Self, the Not-Self, and their mutual Relation—these three, the Primal Trinity, the root-base of all possible trinities, exhaust the whole of thought, the whole of knowledge, the whole of the World-Process. There is nothing left that is beyond and outside of this Primal Trinity, which, in its Unity, its tri-une-ness, constitutes the Absolute which is, and wherein is, the Totality of the World-Process—the World-Process, which is nothing else than the Self or *Pratyag-ātmā*, the Not-Self or *Mūla-prakṛti*, and their *Līlā* or Interplay ; the Three-in-One constituting *Param-Ātmā*.

But how can these three be said to be expressed by a single word ? The immemorial custom of summing up a series, or of expressing a fact, in a single letter, and then of joining letters, thus significant, into a single word—of which many examples are to be found in the Upaniṣaṭs—gives the clue here.¹ Each letter of this word

¹ This ancient method of expressing a profound truth by assigning to each of its factors a letter, and then writing down the letters as a word, meaningless, a mere sound, except for the meanings thus indicated, is perhaps not familiar to, and therefore may not commend itself to,

must be the expression of a fact, and the juxtaposition of the letters must signify the relation between the facts.

The first letter of the sacred word, A, signifies the *Self*; the second letter, U, signifies the *Not-Self*; and the third letter, M, signifies the *everlasting Relation, the unbreakable nexus—of Negation, by the Self, of the Not-Self—between them.*

According to this interpretation of the AUM, the full meaning of it, would be the proposition, Ego—Non-Ego—Non (*est*), or I—Not-I—Not (*am*), which sums up all the three factors of the World-Process into a single proposition and a Single Act of Consciousness.

A plain example of this method occurs in the *Chhāṇḍogya*¹: “The name of Brahman is Truth, or the True, *saṭyam*, which consists of three letters, *sa*, *ṭi*, and *yam*. *Sa* is the Unperishing; *ṭi* is the Perishing; *Yam* holds, binds, Relates the two together.” The

modern thought. These ‘mystic words,’ of which so many are found in ancient writings, and, later, in Gnostic and Kabbalistic works, are regarded as jargon by the modern mind. Yet in these same words, ancient wisdom has imbedded its profoundest conceptions, and AUM is just such a word. The method is known as *akshara-mushti* or *akshara-mudrā*, ‘handful’ or ‘diagram-seal’ of letters. (World-War II began in Sept. 1939 in Europe, and closed there in May 1945, with the surrender of Germany; it began in Asia in Dec. 1941, and closed in Aug.-Sep. 1945, with the surrender of Japan; it has created scores of such code-words, temporarily; thus, USOWI means United States Office of War Information). But OM as pure humming sound also, has deep significance; it is the primal sound-continuum of Nature, the first garment of God, the first sensuous manifestation of the Self; it is probably what is meant by ‘the Word’, in the Christian Bible, where it says that “In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God”.

¹ एतस्य ब्रह्मणो नाम सत्यमिति । तानि ह वा एतानि त्रीणि अक्षराणि, स, ति, य इति । तथत्स तदमृतम्, अथ यत्ति तन्मर्त्यम्, अथ यद्यं तेन उमे यच्छति ।

‘unperishing’ here means nothing else than the unlimited universal Self, *Pratyag-ātmā*; the ‘perishing’ is the endlessly perishing, ever-renewed and ever-dying, ever-limited Not-Self or *Mūla-prakṛti*; the nexus, that which holds and binds the two together, is the unending relation of Negation by the One of the Many-Other, in which Relation, the two are constantly and inseparably tied to each other, in such a way that the two together make only the ‘number-less’ Absolute, in which the three, two, and even one, all disappear in the number-transcending and all-number-containing circle of the cipher.

A similar statement, again using almost the same words, is made in the *Bṛhad-Āraṇyaka*.¹ “Truth, *saṭyam*, verily is Brahman. . . . The gods contemplate and worship the truth, *saṭyam*, only. Three-lettered is this *saṭyam*; *sa* is one letter, *ṭi* is one letter, and *yam* is one letter. The first and the last letters, imperishables, are true; in the middle is the false and fleeting. The False is encompassed round on both sides by the True. The True is the more, the greater, the prevailing. He that knoweth this—he may not be overpowered by the False.” Here *sa*, the first truth, is Being; and *yam*, the second truth, is Nothing, for both are

¹ सत्यं ब्रह्मेति सत्यं ह्येव ब्रह्म । ते देवाः सत्यमेवोपासते । तदेतत् त्र्यक्षरं सत्यमिति । स इत्येकमक्षरं । ति इत्येकमक्षरं, यमित्येकमक्षरं । प्रथमोत्तमे अक्षरे सत्यं, मध्यतोऽनृतं । तद् ‘एतद्’ अनृतम्, उभयतः सत्येन परिगृहीतं, सत्यभूयमेव भवति । ननं विद्वांसमनृतं हिनस्ति । V, v, 1.

imperishable ; the middle is Becoming, the ever-fleeting and ever-false. In other words, the Self is reality ; the Negation, of the Not-Self by the Self, is also reality ; the Not-Self is not reality, it is only appearance, illusion.

The *Devī-Bhāgavata* says ¹ : “ Why, by what means, from what substance, has all this world arisen ? How

¹ किमर्थं, केन द्रव्येण, कथं जानामि चाखिलम् ?—

इत्थेवं चिंत्यमानाय मुकुदाय महात्मने,

श्लोकार्धेन तया प्रोक्तं भगवत्याऽखिलार्थदम्—

सर्वं खल्विदमेव ‘ अहं न-अन्यद् ’ अस्ति सनातनम् । I, xv, 51-52.

And again :

‘ अहम् ’ एव आस पूर्वं तु, ‘ न अन्यत् ’ किंचिन्, नगाधिप ! ,

तद् आत्मरूपं, तत् संवित्, परब्रह्मैकनामकम् । VII, xxxii, 2.

“ ‘ I-(alone was, in the beginning)-Not-Another (i.e., no-thing-else, O Lord of Mountains !) ’—such is the form or nature of the Self, which is called Consciousness or Para-Brahma.”

The *Vishnu-Bhāgavata* (commonly known as *Shrimad Bhagavata*, or simply as *Bhagavata*) also has some verses in almost the same words :

‘ अहम् ’ एव आसम् एवाग्रे ‘ न-अन्यद् ’, यत् सदसत्परम्,

पश्चाद् अहं, यद् ‘ एतत् ’ च, योऽवशिष्येत सोऽस्म्यहम् । II, ix, 32.

The orthodox commentator, it is true, explains this as meaning : ‘ I alone was in the prime of time, and nothing else, neither the existent, nor the non-existent, nor even Prakṛti which is beyond both ; I was afterwards also, and I am all this, and what remains behind, that also am I.’ But the preceding and succeeding verses, saying : “ This is the deepest and the highest secret, g u h y a and r a h a s y a ; knowing it you will not fail in spirit throughout the ages,” seem to permit of a more ‘ secret ’ meaning and unusual interpretation, thus : ‘ I-(alone was in the beginning)-not-another (which might be existent or non-existent or other than both) ; in the end also I ; i.e., after that which is known as

may I know all at once, by a single act of knowledge?— Thus Mukunḍa-Vishṇu pondered within himself, in the beginning. Unto him that sovereign Deity, Bhagavaṭī, uttered that which giveth all explanations in a single half-verse, *viz.*: 'I, Not Another, is (*i.e.*, am) alone verily this eternal all.' This, it seems, is the plainest statement available in the Purāṇa literature, after the Vēḍa, in which an endeavour is expressly made to sum up the World-Process in a single sentence.

The *Yoga Vāsishṭha* says¹: "I, pure consciousness, subtler than space, am not anything limited—such is the

This has been negated, that which remains, that am I." Elsewhere, the work repeats;

अहमेवासमेवाग्रे नान्यत् किंचांतरं बहिः । VI, iv, 47. The same *Purāṇa* repeatedly describes the Supreme in phrases or by epithets which find their full significance only in the Logion expounded here, thus: आत्माऽनाना-मत्युपलक्षणः, 'the Self whose character is 'the not-many consciousness'.' III, v, 23; or तद् ब्रह्म तद् हेतुः अनन्यद् एकम् । 'It is Brahma(n), It is the Supreme Cause, the One, the Not-Another,' VI, iv, 30; or पुरुषं यद्रूपमनिदं यथा, 'the Supreme whose form is not-This,' X, ii, 42: or त्वं ब्रह्म पूर्णम् . . . अविकारम् अनन्यद् अन्यत्, 'Thou art the ever wantless, changeless Brahma(n), Not-Another, Other-than-all-This,' VIII, xii, 7,

¹ अकिंचिन्मात्र-चिन्मात्र-रूपोऽस्मि गगनाद् अणुः—

इति या शाश्वती बुद्धिः सा न संसारबंधनी ।

Nirvāṇa-prakaraṇa, Purvārdha, cxviii, 9.

The *Anubhūti-prakasha-sar-odāhāra* has also a shloka (157) which describes Brahman as a n - i ḍ a m, Not-This :

इत्येवम् अन्-इदं रूपं ब्रह्मणः प्रतिपादितम् ।

निर्नामस्तस्य नाम 'एतत्', सत्यं सत्यमिति श्रुतम् ।

eternal buḍḍhi (idea) that freeth from the bonds of saṃsāra, the World-Process."

The Yoga and Sāṅkhya systems describe the supreme consciousness of Kévala-ṭā, Kaivalyam, Soleness, One-ness, L-one-(li)-ness, On(e)li-ness, (their word for moksha), as being of the nature of the awareness that Purusha (the Self) is other-than-saṭṭva (i.e., Prakṛti, saṭṭva being the finest representative thereof).¹

The 'great hymn' addresses the Supreme thus :²

'Thou whom the dazzled scripture doth describe
As being Negation of what Thou art Not.'

Gītā also has a verse which may be literally translated : 'Than the *I* anything *Other* is *Not* ; in the *I* is all *This* woven, as gems are strung on a thread.'³

Put into one sentence, such descriptions can take no other form than that of the logion, Ego-Non-Ego-Non (*sum*).⁴

Such are a few of the utterances of sacred literature that at once become lighted up when the light of this

'An-Idā m, Not-This, has been declared to be the form, the nature, of Brahman. Such is the name of that which is Nameless. Such is verily the truth. So have we heard.'

¹ विवेकख्यातिः or सत्त्वपुरुषान्यताख्यातिः ।

² अतश्चात्त्या यं चकितमभिधत्ते श्रुतिरपि । *Mahima-stuṭi*, verse 2.

³ मत्तः परतरं नान्यत् किंचिदस्ति, धनंजय !

मयि सर्वमिदं प्रोतं, सूत्रे मणिगणा इव । vii. 7.

⁴ More texts are gathered together in a Note at the end of this chapter.

summation is brought to bear on them. Thus does the Praṇava, the AUM, the sacred word, embody in itself the universe; thus does it include all previous tentative summations; thus is it the very heart and essence of the scriptures; so only is the tradition justified that all the universe is in the Praṇava. Herein we find that what before were the parts of a machine, apart and dead, are now assembled, powerful, and active as an organism. Herein we find the two great scripture-texts combined into one statement, that gives a new and all-satisfying significance to them. Herein we see all Hegel, and far more; and the three propositions of Fichte compressed into one, which is a re-arrangement of his second.¹

¹See p. 85, *supra*. अहं ब्रह्म अस्मि, *Bṛhad Up.* 1-4-10; न इह नाना अस्ति किञ्चन, 4.4.19; *Katha.* 4.11. See also p. 47 *supra*. "It is difficult to find a single speculation in western metaphysics which has not been anticipated by archaic eastern philosophy. From Kant to Herbert Spencer, it is all a more or less distorted echo of the Dvaita, Advaita, and Vēdāntic doctrines generally"; H.P.B. *The Secret Doctrine*, I. 49.

A western writer says that Hegel was "the first who succeeded in making the history of philosophy intelligible, by showing that it is not a mere succession of conflicting opinions, but a gradual unfolding of more and more comprehensive interpretations of reality". "First in the west—we should add; in the east, the Purāṇas, several thousand years before Hegel, (and now *The Secret Doctrine*), have made the history of philosophy, and the philosophy of history also, intelligible, and far more intelligible. But Hegel's eloquent, and true, sentences, on the subject, deserve to be quoted, as pertinent to the text. "Firstly every philosophy that deserves the name, always has the Idea" (we may say, 'the Divine Plan', 'the Logion', *Mahāvākya*, the Scheme of the World-Process in the Universal Mind) "for its subject-matter or contents; and secondly, every system should represent to us one particular factor or particular stage in the evolution" (manifestation) "of the Idea. The refutation of a philosophy, therefore, only means that its limits are passed and that the fixed principles in it have been reduced in it to an

And it is not only a re-arrangement of it, though that is important enough, but more. If the statement that "Being is Nothing" is not only external to us but unintelligible and self-contradictory, the statement that "Ego is not Non-Ego" is not yet quite internal, though certainly consistent and intelligible. It does not yet quite come home to us. The verb 'is,' and the order of the words in the sentence, make us feel that the statement embodies a cut-and-dried fact in which there is no movement, and which is there, *before* us, but *away* from us, not *in* us. The negative 'not' entirely overpowers the affirmative 'is,' and appropriates all the possibility of significance to itself, so that the rhythmic swing between the Ego and the Non-Ego, between us and our surroundings, which would be gained by emphasising and bringing out the force of the affirmative 'is' also, is entirely

organic element in the completer principle that follows. Thus the history of philosophy, in its true meaning, deals, not with the past, but with the eternal and the veritable present; and in its results, resembles not a museum of the aberrations of the human intellect, but a pantheon of god-like figures. These figures are the various stages " (factors) " of the Idea, as they come forward one after another in dialectical development " (cyclic manifestation): Wallace, *Logic of Hegel*, 1st. edn., pp. 136-137. We have only to add that all these 'interpretations of reality', 'philosophies' 'god-like figures' fall under one or another of the *three* main ones: *ārambha*, *pariṇāma*, *aḥyāsa* or *vivarta*, corresponding to *Dvaita*, *Vishisht-ādvaita*, *Ādvaita*; or theism (deism), dualism, (monistic) non-dualism; or the theories of popular, scientific, metaphysical causation; or (substantial) realism, (materio-energetic) transformationism, (ideational or imaginative) illusionism. 'Aberrations of the intellect' also, have their necessary place among these as 'self-alienating' materialism, *a-vidyā*. And philosophy—in correspondence with the World-Process, Universal Mind, Cosmic History—is always treading the cyclic round of the same three, in ever new words and settings and surroundings, ever fresh morning-noon-evening, simple childhood, complex middle age, and sage eld. *All* Evolution is such, biological as well as psychological; forward, then backward, then further forward. .

hidden out of sight, and only a bare, dead, negation is left. But now we change the order of the words ; and the spirit of the old languages, the natural law underlying their construction, comes to our help. We place the Ego and the Non-Ego in juxtaposition, and an *affirmative* Relation *appears* between them *first*, to be *followed afterwards* by the development of the *negative* Relation, in consequence of the negative particle. And, more than this, we replace the 'is' by 'am,' the '*est*' by '*sum*,' as we have every right to do ; for, in connection with the Self, with I, A h a m , 'is' has no other sense than 'am' ; and in place of Non-Ego, A n - a h a m , we substitute 'This,' Êtaṭ, for we have seen their equivalence before¹ and will do so again later, in the section on Mūla-Prakṛti. Our logion therefore now runs as "Aham Êtaṭ Na,"² "I This Not (am)". In the Samskr̥t form the word corresponding to 'am,' viz., a s m i , is not needed at all, for it is thoroughly implied and understood. But as soon as we have the logion in this new form, "Aham Êtaṭ Na," we see that there is a whole world more of significance in it than the dry statement of the logical law of contradiction, "A is not not-A," "Ego is not Non-Ego". It is no longer a mere formal logical law of thought ; it is Transcendental Log-ic, Supreme all-comprehending Law of all Being ; Thought which is identical with All Reality. The one law of all laws, the pulse of

¹ Ch. IV, p. 38, *Supra*.

² अहं-एतत्-न.

the World-Process, the very heart-beat of all life is here, now. The rhythm between the Self and the Not-Self, their coming together and going apart, the essence of all Change, is expressed by it, when we take it in two parts; and yet, when we take the three constituents of it at once, it expresses Changelessness also.

As a man seeking for the vale of happiness, may toil for days and nights through a maze of mountain-ranges, and come at last to a dead wall of rock, and find himself despairing, and a sudden casual push of the arm may move aside a bush, or a slab of stone, and disclose a passage through which he may rush eagerly to the top of the highest peak, wondering how he had failed to see it all this while—it looks so unmistakable now—and may behold, spread clear and still before him, the panorama of the scenes of his toilsome journey, on the one side, completed and finished by the scenes of that happy vale of smiling flowers and fruits and crystal waters, on the other—such is the finding of this great summation. All the problems that bewildered him before, now receive easy solution, and many statements that puzzled him formerly, in the scriptural literature of the nations, begin to become intelligible.

After finding the truth of this great logion for himself, the enquirer will find *confirmation* of it everywhere in the old books, as well as in the world around him.

NOTE I.—It should be noted here that the references to the Upanishats, Purāṇas, etc., are not made with any idea of supporting the logion by 'appeals to scripture'. Rather, the

intention is to suggest a new way of working with the sacred books, which may be of use to some readers; for few will doubt that it is a great joy to find that what is dear to us has been and is dear to others too. Whether any definite proofs will or will not be found by experts and scholars, that the logion was really meant by the AUM, to the ancients, does not affect its importance as an explanation and summation of the World-Process. The logion came to the present writer first in 1887, as the needed explanation of the universe, in the course of his studies in Indian and Western philosophy. He then endeavoured to find confirmation of it in Samskr̥t works, but vainly, for thirteen years. Till the summer of 1900, when these chapters were first drafted, it remained for him only a guess and a possibility that the AUM meant the logion. This guess was justified, for him, in the autumn of 1900, in a most remarkable manner, the story of which has now been told in the Preface to *The Science of the Sacred Word*, a summarised English version of the *Praṇava-Vāda of Gārgyāyana*, the three volumes of which were published respectively in 1910, 1911 and 1913, while the first edition of *The Science of Peace* was published in 1904. As to whether that 'remarkable manner' will prove convincing to others, is for the future to decide. In the meanwhile, it should be repeated here that the logion should be judged on its own merits, and that the main purpose of quoting from the Upanishats, etc., is to help on the thought of the reader, by placing before him the thought, embodied in those quotations, as at least working in the direction of the logion. To those interested in the method of thinking outlined here, the work will serve as an introduction to the *Praṇava-vāda*, where they will find many illuminative details.

NOTE II.—In view of the vital importance of the Logion as well as the strange-ness of it, some more texts are recorded below, in support.

अहं हरिः सर्वं इदं जनार्दनो न-अन्यत् ततः कारण-कार्य-जातं—

ईदृक् मनो यस्य न तस्य भूयो भवोद्भवाः द्वंद्व-गदाः भवन्ति ।

Vishṇu Purāṇa, 1. 22. 86.

Literal translation would be : ' *I*, Hari, all, *this*, Janār-dana, *not*, *other*, from which, cause-effect-product, (mass, multitude)—such, mind, whose, not, his, (*i.e.*, to him), any more, Becoming-born (*i.e.*, world-born), pair-ills, happen '. The current commentary by Raṭna-garbha summarily explains this as, ' From the understanding that Viṣṇu (Hari, Janār-dana) is all the world, there results cessation of *samsāra* (process of births and deaths) '. If the reader is satisfied with this, well and good ; if not, then he may give special attention to the words ' *I* ', ' *This* ', ' *Not Other* ', and arrange the sentence (as he can, without any violation of Skṭ. grammar) thus : ' *I not this-Other* (is the Supreme Consciousness or Idea), from which (and in which, arises and proceeds all) the mass and multitude of causes and effects (which constitutes the World-Process)—he whose mind is (become identified with) such (Consciousness), for him there are no more any (mental) ills produced by the countless pairs of opposites that are born from (and make up the World-Process of) Becoming ; (such) *I* (is) Hari (*h a r a ṭ i ḍ u h k h a m i ṭ i H a r i h*, who destroys all sorrow), and Jan-ārdana (*j a n a m a r ḍ a y a t i*, ends all rebirth). ' Opposites conflict ; conflict distresses ; as Buddha said in his first sermon, on the Four Great Truths, " To meet what we dislike, causes misery ; to lose what we like causes misery ". Conflict of dual, polar pairs, is the root of all misery, *Kleśha*.

... अनानात्वं आत्मनः । ... अहं एव न मत्तोऽन्यः—इति बुद्धयध्वं अजसा । *Bhāgavata*, 11. 13. 22-24.

न तत्र शोको न जरा न मृत्युः . . . यच्चित्तोऽदःकृपया अन्-इदं-विदां ।

Op. cit. 2. 2. 27 ; also *Chhāndogya*, 8. 4. 1.

(' The Self is Not-Many ') Not-Many-ness is the Self's . . . Only *I-Not-Other-than-I*—understand this well. . . . There is no sorrow, no age-ing decay, no death, (*i.e.*, no fear of these), in the heart, *chittā*, of those who, by the blessing of the Self, have realised (the Self as) Not-This '.

न अल्पे सुखं अस्ति, भूमा एव सुखं । यत्र न-अन्यत् पश्यति, न-अन्यत् शृणोति, न-अन्यद् विजानाति, सः भूमा । यत्र अन्यत् पश्यति, अन्यत् शृणोति,

अन्यद् विजानाति, तद् अल्पं । यो वै भूमा, तद् अमृतं । यद् अल्पं,
तत् मर्त्यं । *Chhāṇḍogya*, 7. 23. 1 ; 7. 24. 1.

‘ There is no Joy in the (or in being and feeling) small : only (the feel of) Utmost Greatness, B h ū m ā , is Bliss. Where (and when, the Self) sees Not-Another, hears Not-Another, knows No-Other (than It-Self), that is B h ū m ā , Maximus Ultimus, (In-fini-ty beyond compare). Where (the small individualised personalised Self) sees, hears, knows, An-Other, (feels that there is An-Other, that there are Others, than it-Self, which is and are independent of it and limit it, hem it in, on all sides), that is (the feeling of being) small, (the finite). In-fini-tude, B h ū m ā , is Im-mortality ; the small (the limited) is mortal.’

आत्मा वा इदं अग्रे आसीद्, पुरुषविधः । सः अनु-वीक्ष्य न-अन्यद्
आत्मनो ऽपश्यत् । सो ऽहं अस्मि इति अग्रे व्याहरत् । ततो ऽहं-नामा ऽभवत् ।
मद्-अन्यन् न अस्ति । *Bṛhad*, 1. 4. 1-2.

‘ The Self al-one was, (and was aware of It-Self even) as a man, p u r u - s h a ; person (is, and is aware). It looked round. It saw None-Other-than-Self. It said *I am* ; Its name therefore became Ah-am. It thought Non-Else-than-I (is there).’

Let the reader carefully consider the meaning in the *Gītā*, of अन्-अन्य-चेताः (8. 14), अनन्यया (8. 22 ; 11. 54), अनन्य-मनसः (9. 13), अनन्याः (9. 22), अनन्य-भाक् (9. 30), अनन्येन (12. 6), अनन्य-योगेन (13. 10). Of course there is the *prima facie* simple devotional meaning, ‘whole-hearted devotion to Kṛṣṇa only and no other’. For the temperaments which are content with this, and seek no further, there is nothing more to say. For the unsatisfied and further-enquiring spirits, there is the other meaning *also*, beneath the surface, implying the Logion. Let the reader reflect carefully whether this latter brings any special comfort to his questioning, arguing, *intellect*, his *head*, as well as to his (partly selfish and partly unselfish) *heart*.

Let the reader similarly dwell upon the puzzle-words of the *Katha Upanishat*,

अनन्यप्रोक्ते अगतिर् अत्र नास्ति । 2. 8, and

कस्तं मदामदं देवं मद-अन्यो ज्ञातुं अर्हति । 2. 20.

Shankarāchārya, in his *Bhāshya*, gives three or even four alternative and doubting explanations of the first sentence ; he reads it with गतिः, and again with अगतिः. After pondering on those, let the reader endeavour to see if the following interpretation throws any light into the obscurity : 'It is not unapproachable, not inapprehensible—that Supreme Mystery, subtler than the subtlest atom ; if It be described by (or as) *Not-Another*'. Our-Self must apprehend the Self ; It must be seen with one's own eyes, not-with-another's ; and It must be apprehended as I-Not-Another. Shankara's plain, simple, straightforward explanation of the second sentence is, 'Who other than I (Yama, who am instructing you, Nachikéṭā) is of sufficiently subtle intelligence, to know that God, Déva, who is the reservoir of all contradictions, who is Maḍa, Elation, Pride, Joy, as well as a-Maḍa, Non-elation, Depression, Sorrow, both at once ? !' Such a claim, such a challenge, seems to imply lack of due modesty, and plenitude of undue aggressiveness, which are not worthy of a teacher of Védaṇṭa ! One expects such to be benevolent and reverend ! Yama could scarcely have been so conceited when dealing with such a solemn subject ! (It must be admitted, though, that some of the teachers of Brahma-vidyā, in the Upanishats, behave very vulgarly and rudely, e.g., Raikva of the cart ; and Yājñā-alkya, in particular—by the descriptions of his doings in the Upanishats as well as the Purāṇas, which descriptions cannot be explained 'mystically'—was a very aggressive and now and there even criminal person, though, no doubt, of great intellectual power and influence. *Yoga-Bhāshya* and *Bhāgavata* and other Purāṇas tell us that remnants of rajas-tamas persist for some time even after the vision of the all-embracing Self. Even after the supply of fuel has been cut off, embers continue to smoulder for some time. This is plain psychology ; nothing mysterious ; so long as the body lasts, the wisest and most self-controlled

sage remains liable to fits of passion). Let us translate this second sentence as follows: 'Who Else-than-I can know *that* God who is Maṭ (I)—A-(Not)—A-Maṭ (Not-I); how otherwise than as *I-Not-Another* can that God be known?' The very out-of-place pugnacious challenge becomes transformed into the declaration of a profound truth.

H. P. Blavatsky's *The Secret Doctrine* throws precious light into the dense darkness of many 'allegories' and 'blinds' of the Védas and Purāṇas, and also of the scriptures of other dead and living religions. She has indicated (op. cit. I, 314-315; V, 371, etc., and in her other great work, *Isis Unveiled*, and other writings also) that the works now going under the name of Shankara are not all written by the original first or Āḍi Shankara-āchārya¹; that much 'sacred writing' on 'occult' subjects has been withdrawn and hidden away, for historical reasons, by the custodians of matha-s (abbeys, convents); that new compositions have been substituted by later Shankar-āchāryas (the name has become the official designation of all the successive heads of a number of matha-s, like 'Pope'); and that even in the genuine writings, 'blinds' are often used to mystify the in-alert student, who is not in deadly earnest, is therefore easily thrown off the scent, does not question persistently, and even gives up the study in disgust as worthless twaddle.

Let us pass on to other texts.

अहं एव सुखं न-अन्यत् । *Varāha Upanishat*, ii, 7.

'I al-one (am and is) bliss, *Not-Another*'.

सो अहं एव न मे अन्यो अस्ति । *Mahā-bhārata*, Anu-shāśana-parva, ch. 168.

'That I on(e)-ly (is and am), there is *Not-Another* than I'.

In terms of अन्यत्, there is a very curious and remarkable, riddling, jingling, alliterative, abracadabra-like aphorism, in the *Nyāya-Sūtra-s*:

अन्यद् अन्यस्माद् अनन्यत्वाद् अनन्यद् इत्यन्यताऽभावः । 2. 2. 30.

¹ The *Secret Doctrine* says that the first Shankar-āchārya appeared eighty years after Buddha's disappearance. The list of successors maintained at the Shāradā-Pītham matha of Dvārakā (Gujarat) supports this.

The context, in which this is set down, is a discussion as to whether 'sound' is *niṭya*, eternal, or *a-niṭya*, non-eternal, temporal; and the authoritative commentary, Vātsyāyana's *Bhāṣya*, tries to explain it very briefly in relevance to the context; but the obscurity is not lighted up, at least for the present writer. Another interpretation is therefore suggested here, after putting a semi-colon after the first two words, and another after the next two: '(The Self is) Other-Than-Other, (*i.e.*, the Self is Self alone, is not anything other than It-Self); because there is No-Other-Than-It, therefore is It (describable as) Not-Another; thus, there is Negation of Otherness (*i.e.*, the Self is Negation of all Other-than-Self)'. In other words, the Self is 'I-this-Not'. Compare this with a literal word for word translation: 'Another, than another, because of not-other-ness, Not-another, such, absence of other-ness'; or, if we read the last word as, not *a-bhāva* but, *bhāva*, then, in the translation, the last three words would read 'presence or being or existence of other-ness'.

The *Māndukya-kārikā*-s are 100 verses by Gauda-pāḍa. They expound the meaning of the *Māndūkya Upaniṣat*. Gauda-pāḍa was the guru of Govinda, who was the guru of the Shankarā-charya, (seventh or eighth century A. C.) whose *Bhāṣyas* on the *Kārikā*-s etc. are current. The last two verses belong, it seems, to the same class of 'mystical' utterances as the texts above dealt with. They are

क्रमते नहि बुद्धस्य ज्ञानं धर्मेषु तप्यिनः

सर्वे धर्मास्तथा ज्ञानं न-एतद् बुद्धेन भाषितं ।

दुर्दर्शं अतिगम्भीरं अजं साम्यं विशारदं,

बुद्ध्वा पदं अ-नानाखं नमस्कुर्मो यथाबलं । 99-100.

Word-for-word translation is: 'Steps (proceeds, moves successively step after step), not, Buddha's knowledge, in (or amidst) *ḍ h a r m a*-s (functions, attributes, properties, qualities), Tāyī's, all, *ḍ h a r m a*-s, also, knowledge, *Not, this*, by Buddha, said, Difficult to see, very profound, unborn, same, skilful (proficient.

or famous), having known, the condition (state, status, pāḍa), Not-Many-ness, salutation, we make, as our strength (is or allows)'. Shankara puts in supplementary words to fill up gaps, and construes the verses in his own way, which is not clear and satisfactory to the present writer. He winds up by saying that 'Buddha has *not said this*, which has been expounded here (by Gauda-pāda, and which is the genuine Védānta), which Buddha has only come near but did not quite attain'. Shankara avoids the fact that one technical designation of Buddha, in Mahāyāna Buddhism, is Tāyī. The word is explained by Prajñā-kara-maṭi, in his commentary, *Panjikā*, on Shānti-dēva's *Boḍhi-charyā-vatāra* (3. 2). It means 'Spreader of knowledge (from Skt. ṭāy, to spread, protect, preserve), who does not actually enter into the Nirvāṇa or Pari-nirvāṇa state, though able to do so, but continues to keep in touch with the human world in order unremittingly to help souls and guide them on the Upward Path.' The Mahā-yāna tradition is that, for this purpose, Buddha wears a body of subtle ethereal matter, formed by his own will-and-ideation, nirmāṇa-kāya; (*Secret Doctrine*, V. 364 *et seq.*); and gives the needed help mostly by spiritual thought-force, shubha-anu-dhyāna; sometimes by overshadowing and inspiring a specially qualified human being, ā-vésha, and 'spreading knowledge' through him; rarely, by actually taking birth in a human body, a vaṭāra.

Gauda-pāda may well have had access to some of the lore subsequently lost, in the turmoil of foreign invasions, and by changes in the public's tastes and interests. One school of Védāntins says that Tāyī means 'thief', and Buddha is called so because he stole the esoteric knowledge from his brāhmaṇa guru-s and published it to the world; (*Secret Doctrine, ibid.*). The word ṭāy occurs in the Vēda in the sense of thief. It will be remembered that the word 'Buddha' means 'enlightened with spiritual wisdom', 'wise', 'he who has known', generally; and also Gauṭama, 'the wise one', 'the enlightened one', specially. Shankara explains 'Buḍḍhasya ṭāyinaḥ', of the first line, in the general sense: 'The knowledge of the wise man who has seen the Highest, does not move to other dharma-s, but remains fixed in its own dharma,

as light in the sun'; (the man in the street would think that the light of the sun does nothing else than spread to all quarters and to far distances!); 'it is $\ddot{t}\ddot{a}y\ddot{i}$, continuous, like $\ddot{a}k\ddot{a}sha$, space. $\ddot{T}\ddot{a}y\ddot{i}na\ddot{h}$, which means $sa\ddot{n}\ddot{t}\ddot{a}na\ddot{v}\ddot{a}\ddot{t}\ddot{a}h$, may also means $p\ddot{u}j\ddot{a}\ddot{v}\ddot{a}\ddot{t}\ddot{a}h$, or it may mean $pra\ddot{j}\ddot{n}\ddot{a}\ddot{v}\ddot{a}\ddot{t}\ddot{a}h$; *i.e.* it may mean 'spreading', or receiving or giving honor and worship, or possessing subtle intelligence and insight or intuition'. Such are Shankara's explanations of the first line, various, alternative, doubtful. But he cannot avoid taking 'Buddhena' of the second line in the special sense.

To the present writer, the 'mystical' and real and consistent sense of the verses seems clear, if attention is fixed on the words 'Na-Ēṭaṭ' and 'A-Nāna-ṭvam', 'Not-This' and 'Not-Many-ness': 'The Awareness, the Consciousness, of the enlightened soul, as of Buddha the $\ddot{T}\ddot{a}y\ddot{i}$, is moveless, un-moving, does not move in *successive* functionings, $na\ddot{d}ha\ddot{r}m\ddot{e}shu\ k\ddot{r}ama\ddot{t}\ddot{e}$, (as the personal mind does, experiencing cognitions, emotions, volitions or actions, one *after* another). Buddha declared that (the Consciousness, 'I-Am-) *Not-This*' includes, *once for all*, all functioning, all knowing. Such is the very subtle, very profound, Truth, very difficult to see—the Truth of the Unborn, Undying, Self-luminous, Ever-the-Same-ness. It is the High State of Being whose sole all-comprehending characteristic is the Consciousness " (the One *I* is and am) *Not-Many* (*i.e.* not these countless *This-es*)". Unto that Supreme State of Consciousness, we make reverent salutation, and we direct and open our minds to It with all our power of concentration and devotion'.

Mme. H. P. Blavatsky does not appear to have made anything like a specific mention of the Logion, but hints of the Idea are to be found scattered here and there in *The Secret Doctrine*. Thus she quotes (IV, 197) a reference made in a Hebrew mystic book, to "the Negatively Existent One". The only way to bring home to ourselves, the sense of this sense-less-seeming expression, seems to be to interpret it as 'the One Self, I, who exists, *i.e.*, realises Self-Existence, by Negating Not-Self'. It has been repeatedly indicated

before, that the firm and clear apprehension of the nature of, and of the distinction between, succession-less Eternity and succession-full Time (past-present-future), is utterly indispensable for the comprehension of the Logion. H. P. B. has some very significant sentences which clearly suggest this : "It must not be supposed that anything can go into Nirvāṇa which is not *eternally* there; but human intellect, in *conceiving* the Absolute, must put it as the *highest* term in an *indefinite* series. . . . Those who search for that highest) must go to the right source of study, the teachings of the Upanishads, and must go in the right spirit", (V, 533.) As the Upanishads say ब्रह्म एव सन् ब्रह्म भवति । 'Being already Brahma, he becomes Brahma. To become Brahma, to attain mokṣha, is only to remember what had been forgotten, that one is *Eternally* Brahma, is *Eternally* Free; or, in terms of Time, that one has always *been*, is now, *will* always be, 'Naught-Else than Brahma', Free from all limitations. Incidentally, H. P. B. writes (V, 395): "He (a Brahm-Ātma) alone could explain the meaning of the sacred word AUM. . . . But there existed, and still exists to this day, a Word for surpassing the mysterious monosyllable, and which renders him who comes into possession of its key, nearly the equal of Brāhman." It is difficult to make sure whether this is to be taken literally; and what the last word 'Brāhman' means, whether Brahmā or Brahma. It is well known that H. P. B. was fond of quizzing, mystifying, testing, her followers and questioners. It is not impossible that she casually threw out the idea of "a Word far surpassing" etc., to see whether her readers had steadiness enough to secure and make sure of what was within reach, and would study the Upanishats to find 'the highest'; or would fickle-mindedly run off after a 'far surpassing' will-o'-the-wisp. There are sects in India today which teach their followers that their deity is fourteen degrees higher than the Vēdānta's Para-Brahma. The Upanishats make no mention of any such word 'far surpassing AUM'. Of course, as merely *sound* (an intensification, modulation, of this same primal 'seed'-sound, so to say), there *may* be another sound, more 'powerful' for purposes of producing practical effects, as the roar of a steam-siren is

more powerful than the hum of a bee. But so far as *meta-physical* significance is concerned, Tri-Une AUM is exhaustive and Supreme, once for all. Outside the Infinite Eternal Changeless sole Subject, the pseudo-infinite ever-continuingly temporal changeeful multitudinous Object, and the affirmative-negative Relation between them—outside these, there is nothing left to know. But, of course, the *details of particular* subjects and objects and relations are endless, exhaustless; they require the totality of in-numer-able physical and super-physical (both Material-and-Psychical) sciences and un-count-able Time and im-measur-able Space, to master and exhaust.

Buddha, shortly before passing, said to Ānanda: "I have preached the truth without making distinction of exoteric and esoteric. In respect of truths, I have no such thing as the closed fist (*baḍḍha-mushti*) of those teachers who keep something back"; *Mahā-pari-nibbāna Sutta*, 32. But, on an earlier occasion, "While staying at Kosāmbī in a grove of trees, he asked his disciples: Which are the more, these leaves which I hold in my hand, or those on the trees in the whole of the grove? They answered: Of course, those on the trees are immensely more. Then he said: So too is that much more which I have learned and not told you, than that which I have told you. And I have not told you because it would not profit you; would not increase your moral purity, self-control, self-effacing philanthropy; would not conduct you to Nirvāṇa, extinction of selfishness"; *Samyutta*, v. 437.

The reconciliation is that what Buddha taught openly was the fundamental principles of Metaphysics and of the Ethics issuing out of that Metaphysics—Unselfishness *because* of the Universality of the Self—the principles most indispensably and vitally needed for righteous individual and social life; he did not thus publicly teach the details of any 'occult' sciences and arts of *yoga-siddhis*, which were taught only to these few who had been tried and tested and perfected in virtue.

Should the ethico-philosophical principles and practices of good citizenship be taught broadcast, or the methods of making 'atom-bombs'?

As to why an air of 'mystery' hangs round even the *metaphysical* explanation of AUM. see fn. on p. 110. *supra*.

Let us now examine another old text—this time an utterly plain and direct statement of the Logion. It occurs in the great work of Āyur-Vēḍa Medicine, *Charaka*, so named after its author. The current tradition, (much disputed by orientlists), is that Pāṭanjali (born in the north-west of India, in 2nd century B. C.), began as a brāhmaṇa follower of the Vēḍa-dharma; and, as such, wrote his *Mahā-Bhāṣya*, 'Great Commentary', on Pāṇini's *Aphorisms of Grammar*, and also re-arranged and renovated the old *Yoga-Sūtra-s*, *Aphorisms of Yoga*; and then, discarding Vēdic ritualism, became a follower of Buddha, and, under the name of Charaka, 'the wanderer', wrote the great work on medicine, largely utilising pre-existing material. ('Charaka' has other meanings also). In *Charaka*, as also in the equally famous, equally classical, equally honored and studied, but much older work on Medicine, *Sushruta*, the *principles* of Sāṅkhya-Yoga (almost a synonym for Vēḍānta in those days, *vide Gītā*) are made the *basis* of the principles and practice of Medicine; because mind and body, psyche and physique, are inseparable, and act and react on each other constantly. Charaka utilises the psychological and metaphysical principles of Sāṅkhya-Yoga-Vēḍānta, which were only refreshed by Buddha, who had studied Sāṅkhya with Ālāra Kālāma, and Yoga with Ruḍraka or Uḍḍaka Rāmapuṭra. We find these two very remarkable verses in *Charaka*:

सर्वं कारणवद् दुःखं, अ-स्वं, च अ-नित्यं एव च ;

न च आत्म-कृतकं तद् हि ; तत्र च उत्पद्यते स्व-ता,

यावन् न उत्पद्यते सत्या बुद्धिर्, 'न-एतद्-अहं,' यया,

'न-एतन्-मम' इति विज्ञाय, ज्ञः सर्वं अधितिष्ठते ।

Shārira-sṭhāna, ch. i, 152-153.

Translation, in accord with the standard commentary of Chakra-pāṇi, is: "All this world, which appears and disappears, which is born and dies, all this is a perpetual series of causes and effects. All that results from a cause has a beginning and therefore an ending; being limited at one end, it has a limit at the other end also; and, being transient, is painful, is inseparable from misery; it is Not-Self, a-sva-m; it is non-Eternal: it has not been created by the Self, which is only

a Spectator and not an actor, which is only a Witness of the Show. A feeling of identification with this phantas-magoria, a feeling of its being 'I' and 'Mine', *sva-tā*, arises through *A-viḍyā*, Primal Error; and it (the feeling) persists only so long as the *buḍḍhi*, the *Viḍyā*, the right knowledge, does not arise, *viz.*, the Consciousness 'I-am-Not-This', *Na-Eṣaṭ-Aham*, and 'This-is-Not-Mine', *Na-Eṣat-Mama*, by means of which Consciousness, *i.e.*, *havṛ* recovered which Consciousness, the Knower, *Jñāh*, *Ḍpṭ*. transcends, rises superior to, becomes sovereign overcount-This'. In other words, his Inner Peace cannot be exhaust. any more by the turmoil of the 'world', the ever-*wh* have a-midst which his body lives; in his mind, heart, se and has become free, emancipated, from all doubts and he *Jīvan-mukṭa*, and is no longer enchained, bound by, subject to, the 'This,' *i.e.*, this 'object'-world, or anything in it.

The first of the two verses above quoted, is only a version in slightly varied words, of aphorism 2. 5, of *Yoga-Sūtra*.

अनित्य-अशुचि-दुःख-अनात्मसु नित्य-शुचि-सुख-आत्मस्यातिर अविद्या ।

'The *khyāṭi* (awareness, feeling, sense, notion, thought, idea, consciousness), belief, that the perishing-impure-miseryful-Non-Self (body) is the Eternal-Pure-Blessed-Self—this is *A-Viḍyā*, *Ne-Science*, Primal Error, Original Sin'.

Another aphorism, very germane to the subject under treatment, is,

तारकं सर्व-विषयं सर्वथा-विषयं अक्रमं च इति विवेक-जं ज्ञानं । 3. 54.

The authentic comment can be studied in Vyāsa's *Bhāṣya*. Without contradicting it, the following rendering may perhaps be found to throw some more light upon it: 'The Awareness, the knowledge, that results from *Discrimination*, *vi-véka*, (between *Purusha* and *Prakṛti*, I and This, *i.e.*, from *negation* of the latter by the former), is *devoid of succession* is a *-krama*, and comprehends *at once*, all objects and all ways (*i.e.*, manners, methods, of the workings of all objects)—that knowledge is *Tāra-ka*, deliverer, emancipator, which carries the soul across (the ocean of doubts and fears and miseries)'. *Tāra-ka* is one of the many names of the

Praṇava, AUM ; (see fn., p. 109 *supra*). There are a fair number of quite *technical words* (and, of course, ideas) which are common to *Yoga-Sūtra* and *Bhāṣya* and books of Mahāyāna Buddhism, and some of these latter throw much light upon the obscure sentences of the former. That it is so, is natural, after Buddha's studies, mentioned before, of Sāṅkhya and Yoga.

Yoga Vāsishtha repeats again and again,

न अहं देहो, न मे देहः ।

'Not-I-(This-) Body, Not-Mine, (This) Body.'

Finally, we find, in Buddha's own words, the origin of the *Charaka*-verses.¹ In a discourse to his Bhikshu-s, in the town of Shrāvastī, Buddha says :

रूपं, भिक्खवे, अनिच्चं ; यद् अनिच्चं तं दुःखं ; यं दुःखं तद्

अनत्ता ; यद् अनत्ता तं नेतं मम, नेसोहमस्मि, न मेसो अत्ताति ।

Samyutta Nikāya, Pt. III, Khandha-Vagga, pp. 22-23 ; repeated in the same words at pp. 44-45.

The Samskr̥t form of these Pāli words is :

रूपं, भिक्षवः !, अनित्यं ; यद् अनित्यं तद् दुःखं ; यद् दुःखं तद् अनात्मा ;

यद् अनात्मा तत् न एतन्मम, न-एषः-अहं² अस्मि, न मे सः आत्मा इति ।

'Bhikshus !, form is not-eternal ; the not-eternal is the painful ; the painful is the Not-Self ; the Not-Self is Not-This-Mine, I-This-Not ; This-is-Not-My-Self'.

Buddha has, for some centuries now, in his own homeland, and therefore naturally in the west, been debited with the absurd view that the Self is *only* a stream of sensations, etc. ; that there is no Supreme Eternal Self ; and that Nirvāṇa

¹ I had noted down long ago, on the margins of my personal copy of *The Science of Peace*, 2nd edn., p. 110, the English translation from some book ; but had inadvertently omitted to note down the name of the book and the pages. My very worthy friend, Āchārya Narēṇḍra Dēva, very learned in Buddhist Pāli and Sanskr̥t literature (Principal of the non-official National College, Kāshi Viḍyā-Pīṭha, of Benares, and member of the Legislative Assembly of the United Provinces, who has spent many years in jail as political prisoner, and has been released only in June, 1945), has very kindly hunted up, at very short notice, and supplied me with, the original Pāli texts and Sk̥t. translations.

² एषः is the masculine, एतत् is the neuter, form of the same word.

means complete annihilation; (see fn. pp. 33-34, *supra*). William James seems to have propounded the same view, in modern times, *viz.*, that the Self is only a stream, as a challenging *jeu d'esprit*, rather than seriously; his own firm belief in a permanent ultimate Self has been proved above by his own words; (pp. 122-3, *supra*). Careful orientalists are now beginning to see the light, and to understand that what Buddha 'denied,' even as Vedānta 'negates', is the small self, the ever-changing personality. Mrs. Rhys Davids, in the new edition of her *Buddhism* (1934, H. U. L. series), has candidly admitted the mistake of her earlier view; has well explained the causes which gave rise to the extraordinary misunderstanding in India and passed thence to the west; has shown that Buddha always tacitly assumed, as undeniable and indisputable, the Being of the Universal Self, Brahma of the Upanishats; and has ably propounded the right view, that, to Buddha, Nirvāṇa meant only the annihilation of the small selfish-self, *i.e.*, of selfishness; (see especially, her pp. 198-210). What element of truth there is in the very human craving for, and belief in, '*personal* immortality', will be discussed in a later chapter.

Besides these causes there was another and far worse cause. This was the wicked and wilful perversion of Buddha's teachings, under the stress of bestially sensualist appetites, by some sects of his followers. The worst and most infamous of these is the Vajra-yāna sect; its professions, *i.e.*, theories, are much the same as those of the Chārvāka-materialists, 'there is no soul, no life after death, no right and no wrong, no sin and no merit, therefore eat, drink, and be merry as you best can, while you are alive'. Such a theory is obviously indispensable to justify the sect's practice, which is the same as that of the Vāma-mārga Tāntrikas, the 'Black Magicians of the Left-hand Path'; *vide* the *Guhya-Samāja-Tāntra* or *Tathā-gaṭa-guhyaka*, Baroda Oriental Series). Such sects have grown up within the pale of every religion, dead or living, even as darkness gathers under the lamp. Accumulation of immense wealth in the viḥāra-s, matha-s, (Christian) abbeys, 'Vatican'-s, (Muslim) *Khāniqāh*-s, *ḍargāh*-s, etc., has always led to such foul consequences in religious 'palaces', even as in secular.

As to the Self, which his later sensualist followers denied, Buddha is reported to have said, on one occasion : ' The material form is not your-Self, not the Self ; sensations are not the Self ; conformations and predispositions are not the Self ; the consciousness is not the Self ' ; (*Vinaya*, 1. 23). The word Self, repeated so often, is specially noteworthy ; the word ' consciousness ' here means particular consciousness of particular things. Elsewhere, again, Buddha says, न....पियतरं अत्तना क्वचि ; *Samyutta Nikāya*, 1. 75, (*Uddāna*, 47). In Skt., न प्रियतरं आत्मना (आत्मनः) क्वचित् (क्वचित्) ; ' there is nothing anywhere which is dearer than the Self '. This is only what the Upanishad said much earlier,

आत्मनस्तु कामाय सर्वं वै प्रियं भवति ; आत्मैव श्रेष्ठश्च प्रेष्ठश्च ।

' All that is dear, is dear for the sake of the Self ; the Self is the Best and the Dearest '.

George Grimm, in his book, *The Doctrine of the Buddha-The Religion of Reason* (pub : 1926, by Offizin W. Drugulin, Leipzig) describes Sāriputta as saying to Yamaka (pp. 166, 167) : " All corporeal form what-soever,...all sensation,...all perception,...all activities of the mind whatsoever,...all consciousness, is not Ātmā, the Self ; the correct view, the *highest knowledge*, is : ' *This is not mine ; this am I not ; this is not my Ego, Ātmā* '..." Grimm does not mention references ; but the first part of the translation seems to be of a text of *Samyutta Nikāya*, Pt. III, *op. cit.*, from the Dialogue of Sāriputta and Yamaka, p. 115 ; and the second part is a translation of the Buddha's words, quoted before.¹ The two seem to have been mixed up by Grimm ; not surprising, since the first part is also only a repetition by Sāriputta of what he had heard from Buddha. The vital words (italicised by me) ' This I am Not ' are there ; so too ' the highest knowledge ' ; but did Grimm realise the Infinite

¹ सो, रूपं न उपैति, न उपादियति, नाधिष्ठति, अत्ता मे, इति, वेदनं. . .

संज्ञं . . . संखारे . . . विज्झाणं. . . . न उपैति . . . , अत्तामे, इति ।

Skt. version : सः (विद्वान्)—आत्तामे रूपं, वेदना, संज्ञा, संस्काराः, विज्ञानं (वा), इति न उपैति, न उपादयति, न अधिष्ठति ।

significance that blazes up in those very same words if we read them with capital initials and arranged as 'I-This-Not (am)' ?

On pp. 500-502 of his book, Grimm writes: "The Buddha has not become untrue to Indian thinking ; rather is his doctrine the flower of Indian thought. He is 'the true Brahmin' (brāhmaṇa) who has completely realised the Upanishads . . . What would it mean to deny the *Ātā* (*Ātmā*), to deny thereby my-self, me (My-Self, Me), the primary fact which alone I cannot doubt ? For am I not *the* most real thing of all for my-self (My-Self), so real that the whole world may perish, if only I, this all and one (All-and-One, All-One, Al-One) for every single individual, remains unaffected by the general ruin ? " This is all good and sound. It indicates the new trend towards the true interpretation of Buddha's 'view,' *darśana*, as identical with that of the Upanishads.

The battle between *Viḍyā* and *A-Viḍyā*, Truth and Error, gods and titans, angels and devils, cor-rect-ors and per-vert-ors, is ever-lasting. When the Not-Self threatens to black out the Light of the Self altogether, the Self shines out strongly in *Kṛṣṇa*-s and Buddha-s and Shankara-s, and Negates and brushes aside the Not-Self.

Many verses of the *Dhamma-paḍa*, relating to the *Ātmā*, read almost like translations of *Gītā*-verses. One famous counsel to his Bhikshus, uttered on other occasions

Other Pali sentences, in the same context, rendered in Skt., are : (विद्वान्), न रूपं, संज्ञां, संस्कारान्, विज्ञानं, आत्मतः समनुपश्यति ; न आत्मनि वा रूपं etc. ; न रूपे, वेदनायां etc. आत्मानं ; न रूपवन्तं, . . . विज्ञानवन्तं वा, आत्मानं समनुपश्यति । *Samyutta Pt. III, pp. 113-115.*

Elsewhere (*Uḍāna, Vagga 8. p. 80*), Buddha says :

Skt. version) अस्ति, भिक्षवः !, अजातं, अभूतं, असंस्कृतं ; नो चेत् तद् अभविष्यत् अजातं etc., न इह जातस्य . . . संस्कृतस्य निस्सरणं प्राप्तास्यत् ।

'Bhikshus !, there *is* That (Self) Which is Un-born, Un-begun, Un-create, Un-compounded. Were there not Such, emanation of all that is born, begun, created, compounded, would not be known ; nor escape from this all and re-mergence back into It '. Thus is the Eternal Changeless Partless Self, *Ātmā*, asserted by Buddha over and over again.

also, is said by tradition to have been repeated by him, as his last words, just before his Immortal Ātmā cast away Its mortal frame, to those who gathered round him at that time. With that great laudation of the glory of the Supreme Self, and also, repudiation of the Not-Self, of all Other-Than-Self, this note may properly be closed.

अत्तदीपा, भिक्खवे !, विहरथ, अत्तसरणा, अनञ्ज-सरणा, धम्मदीपा,
धम्मसरणा, अनञ्ज-सरणा । *Samyutta Nikāya, ibid., p. 42; Mahā-
pari-nibbāna Sutta, 2. 26.*

In Skt: आत्म-दीपाः, भिक्षवः !, विहरथ, आत्म-शरणाः, अन्-अन्य-
शरणाः ; धर्म-दीपाः, धर्म-शरणाः, अन्-अन्य-शरणाः ।

‘Go to the peoples of the earth, my mendicant missionaries !, doing the duty of your mission, gently persuading men and women into the blessed eightfold Path of Virtue ! Be your One Light, the Self ; be your Sole Refuge, the Self ; let No-Other than the Self be your Refuge. Be Dharma, which is Brahma-in-Practice, Theory-at-Work, Principle-in-Application, be such Dharma your Lamp ; be such Dharma, your Refuge ; be Naught-Else your Refuge. Be ye Self-reliant ; Not-Other-dependent.’ Nirvāṇa is the extinction of selfishness, and of all doubts and fears, all evil thoughts and passions, which all inevitably spring from selfishness, from clinging to the body, only. It is the extinction of all restlessness and discontent of mind. It is attainment of inner reposefulness, equ-animity, equ-ability, serenity, undisturbable calm. In the living Emancipate, still wearing a body, it has degrees ; it grows more and more towards perfection ; therefore the books speak of Brahma-vid, Brahma-vid-vara, Brahma-vid-varishtha, ‘knower of Brahma’, ‘better knower of Brahma’, ‘best knower of Brahma’. Nirvāṇa is not power to perform any so-called miracles, to ‘see’ what is going on in Sirius or Canopus, or make a continent sink beneath the ocean by a mere fiat, any more than it is to make an aeroplane rush 500 miles per hour, or blast a whole town with a single atom-bomb. Nirvāṇa is recognition of, realisation of, reliance on, the Universal Self, Brahma, Param-Ātmā, which pervades

and includes all selves; and the consequent or rather simultaneous recognition of, reliance on, and steady pursuit of the Dharma which is the 'active' aspect of the 're-cognition', viz., the constant endeavour to serve all, and help all to the same realisation of Brahma and Dharma. Hence, 'Be Ātmā and Dharma your Light and your Refuge; and Naught-Else'.

CHAPTER VIII

BRAHMA' OR THE ABSOLUTE—THE DVANDV-ĀTĪTAM²

LET us see now if this summation will give us all we want, if it will withstand and resolve all doubts and

¹ The distinction between Brahma (ending with an unaccented short 'a'), and Brahṃā (ending with an accented long 'ā') should be borne in mind. The former (in the neuter gender, nominative singular) is the same as Param-Ātmā, Supreme Universal Self (including Not-Self and Negation). It is also often named Para-Brahma; to make unmistakable its distinction from Brahṃā; and also to indicate that It is para, Ultimate, Highest, or rather Beyond compare, Transcendent. Brahṃā (masculine, nominative singular) means the *Individualised* Ideating and Regulating Mind, the Personal God, of a world, a globe, a solar system, etc. Brahṃā is to Brahma as individual to Universal. particular to General, singular to Total, part to Whole, whirlpool to Ocean; one focus, among pseudo-infinite foci, of space-filling Boundless Energy. The un-inflected base of both words is Brahman. In Skt. script, Brahma is ब्रह्म; Brahṃā, ब्रह्मा; Brahman, ब्रह्मन्.

The word Brahma has other meanings also, (a) Vēda, knowledge, science, learning, (b) the class-caste of brāhmaṇa-s, the clergy, the learned profession, the men of learning, (c) the vital seed with potency of infinite multiplication; etc. There will be no occasion to use the word in these senses in this work. They are dealt with in *The Science of Social Organisation*.

² द्वंद्वतीतं, beyond the pairs, i.e. transcending the Relative.

queries and objections, even as the rod of power wielded by Vasishtha swallowed up and made nought of all the weapons of Vishvāmītra. Let us test it with questions the most wild and weird and fanciful. If it fails to answer one, it fails to answer all, and we must seek again for another summing up.¹

Aham Ētaṭ Na—this logion, in its entirety, represents with the greatest accuracy that it is possible for words to attain, the nature of the Absolute, the Absolute which so many names and words endeavour to describe—the Unlimited; the Unconditioned; the Transcendent; Consciousness that includes Unconsciousness; the compactness, solidity, Plenum of Cognition (knowledge or thought), of Being, and

¹ The splendid chapter on 'The Perception of Reality', pp. 283-324, of William James' *Principles of Psychology*, II, may be read in this connection; and the claims made for the Logion, here, may be tested by the requirements of "the perfect object of belief" laid down there. The rest of the present book should be open to the same test, since the writer has essayed to build it all upon the basis of the Logion, to derive and deduce it all therefrom. Two quotations from James are subjoined. "Our own reality, that sense of our own life, which we at every moment possess, is the *ultimate of ultimates* for our belief"; p. 297. (Cf. pp. 22-23 *supra*; Shankara, *Shariraka Bhāshya*, on which Vāchaspaṭi Mishra's *Bhāmaṭī* is the most respected commentary, says: सर्वो हि आत्माऽस्तित्वं प्रत्येति; न नाहम् इति, I. i. I; 'Everyone believes—I am; none—I am not'). At p. 317, James says: "The perfect object of belief would be a God or Soul of the World, represented both optimistically and moralistically—if such a combination could be—and withal so definitely conceived as to show us why our phenomenal experiences should be sent to us by Him in just the very way in which they come". In other words, the perfect object of belief should satisfy our logical and intellectual requirements, our emotional cravings for happiness achievable in morally virtuous ways, and our volitional urges for activity which would not harm others.

of Bliss; the Supreme; the Indescribable; the Unknowable.¹

This timeless thought, this spaceless idea, taken *as a whole*, changelessly constitutes and is the nature of Brahman. So taken, it is one thought, one knowledge, one omnisciently rounded *cognition* of all 'this' that is possible to know, one omnipotently fulfilled and surfeited *desire* for all 'this', one omnipresently completed *action* of self-assertion and 'this'-(other)-denial, *one single psychosis or mood or act of Consciousness*, in which there is no particular content, but which yet contains the totality of all possible particulars; it is unbroken, pieceless; there is no motion in it, no space, no time, no change, no shifting, no unevenness, but all equality, an all-complete condition of balance and repose, pure, stainless and formless.² We can call it Unconsciousness also, the absence of thought or cognition or desire or action or any mood at all. For where the This is the *whole* of the Not-Self, and even that is negated, the consciousness that is left may well be called Unconsciousness, as that of the state of sound slumber; it is clearly not any particular consciousness, such as that wherein the particularity of *the* This, as *a* this, *a* that, defines both the subject Self and the object Not-Self. And yet it includes the totality of all such

¹ अनवच्छिन्नं, अतीतं, परा संवित्, ज्ञानघनं, चिद्धनं, सद्घनं, आनन्दघनं, परं, अनिर्वक्ष्यं, अनिर्वचनीयं, अविज्ञेयं ।

² एकाकारं or अनवरतं ज्ञानं, निर्विशेषं, अखंडं, निष्क्रियं, कालातीतं, देशातीतं, निर्विकारं, समं, साम्यं, शान्तं, नीरूपं, निरंजनं, etc., are the descriptive words used in Samskr̥t.

particular consciousnesses, for the Not-Self includes all particular this-es.

Taken *in two parts*, the same thought gives : (1) Aham Ētaṭ, I-This, *i.e.*, I *am* this something other than I, a piece of matter, a material or physical body ; and (2) (Aham) Ētaṭ-Na, (I *am*) *not* this thing which is other than I, this piece of matter, this material or physical body.¹ Here, in these two sub-propositions, inseparable parts and constituents of the one logion, we have, as we shall see later in details, the whole process of Sa ṃ s ā r a. Sa ṃ s ā r a means a *process*, (Skt. sṛ, to slide on, move on) a movement, of rotation, for it is made up of the alternation of opposites : birth and death ; growth and decay ; inbreathing and outbreathing ; waking and sleeping ; acceptance and rejection ; greed and surfeit ; pursuit and renunciation ; evolution and involution ; formation and dissolution ; integration and disintegration ; differentiation and re-identification ; emergence and re-mergence. Such is the essence and the whole of the World-Process, at whatever point of space or time we examine it, in whatever aspect we look at it, animate or so-called inanimate, chemical, or mechanical, physical, biological, psychological, or sociological, in the birth and death of an insect and also each rhythmic wing-beat of that insect, or the birth and death of a solar system and also each vast cyclic

¹ See foot-note 2, p. 84. The incessant Līlā, Pastime, of the Self is the playful endeavour to define the undefinable It-Self ; ' *Am I this*' mineral ? ' Well, I *am* this mineral. But *no*, I *am not* this mineral, And so with all possible pseudo-infinite kinds of minerals, vegetables, animals, humans, sub-and-super-humans, and *all* other kinds of things and beings.

sweep in space and time of that system.' *Why* the logion has to be taken in parts and also as a whole, will appear when we study further the nature of the 'This.'

¹ Indeed every science and every school of philosophy deals with one important aspect of, and gives its own characteristic names to, the alternately predominating terms of the 'pairs' of the World-Process. Thus: physics speaks of action and reaction; chemistry of composition and decomposition; biology of anabolism and katabolism; physiology of secretions and excretions; medicine of growth and atrophy, health and disease; mathematics of addition and subtraction, multiplication and division, prolongation and bisection, composition and resolution, the static and the kinetic; civics of competition and co-operation, or individualism and socialism; law of right and duty; politics of autocracy and democracy; poetry of optimism and pessimism, *l'allegro* and *il penseroso*; history, of 'war' (between human beings), abnormality, greater and greater differentiation, excess of love-hate born of primal aberration (out of which proceeds the bulk of the multifarious events and complications which make up the subject-matter of history), and of 'peace,' normality, greater and greater approach to the 'perfectness' and 'completeness' of homogeneity, serenity, restfulness (which has no history, for 'no news is good news'; since the arts of peace are mostly arts of war with 'nature'; 'war' and 'peace' being used here in the usual comparative sense, with a hint of the ultimate metaphysical sense in which every *śṛṣṭi*, every *manifestation* in the World-Process, is by a disturbance of the primal equilibrium of the Three); psychology, of reminiscence and obliviscence, waking and sleeping, aroused and focussed attention and dormant and diffused sub-consciousness, *mānasa*-presentation and *buddhi*-memory; philosophy, too, of (progressive and regressive) change and absolutist changelessness; and finally, religion, of the worship of *Shakti*-Power and of *Shiva*-Peace. For the 'pair' names used by various *Saṃskṛt* philosophies and sciences, see *The Science of Religion, or Sanaṭana Vaidika Dharma*, pp. 64—67, and *The Science of Social Organisation, or The Laws of Manu*, I, 32-35. A work like Roget's *Thesaurus* shows how the whole mental life of man, and all the corresponding vocabulary that he uses, is made up of thousands upon thousands of such antithetic pairs.

The principle, law, or fact of *Dvā-m-Dvā-m*, 'Two-and-Two' is so fundamental, so pervasive of all departments, all aspects, of Nature, is, indeed, so essentially the very 'nature' of Nature, that some more examples of the more important 'pairs of opposites' may not be unwelcome to the student. They all arise, of course, from the Primal Opposition of 'I' and 'Not-I', 'This' and 'Not-This'.

Temperamental types are, first and foremost, of which all others may be regarded as varieties, feminine and masculine, *prakṛti*-(*śṛi*) and *puruṣa*; then, tender-minded and tough-minded (William James); romantics and classics (Ostwald); introverts and extroverts (Jung);

This single logion thus includes within itself both Changelessness and Change. It includes the fullness of

anṭar-mukha and bahir-mukha, in Skt., i.e., in-faced and out-faced, in-turned and out-turned, intro-spective and extro-spective, (Yoga-Védānta); inhibitive and exhibitiv, nirodha-chiṭṭa and vyutthāna-chiṭṭa (ditto); precocious dement and hysteric (psycho-analysis), abstractionist artist and sympathetic artist (Warringer); Dionysius and Apollo (Nietzsche), sentimental and naive (Schiller), passive voice and active voice, in language (Finch); centripetal and centrifugal (Jung), abstract and concrete; con-centric and ec-centric; steady and unstable, equilibrated and unbalanced; credulous and sceptical; habit-ruled and inventive; agricultural and nomadic; peace-loving and warlike, realist and nominalist (reconciled in the conceptualist); spiritualist-idealist and materialist-realist (reconciled in the pantheist), jñāni-gnostic and bhakṭa-pietist (reconciled in the 'practical mystic'); severe (style of writing) and flowery; synthetic and analytic, general and special, poetic and scientific; causalistic (dwelling on past causes as explanatory) and finalistic (emphasizing the final cause or end, aim, future purpose), determinist and vitalist, i.e., necessitarian or predestinarian and libertarian, or fatalist and free-will-ist (reconciled in the 'illusionist'); Will-to-live (Freud, Jung) and will-to-power (Adler). It will be seen that the two terms of each of these pairs often and readily change places, with difference of situation and standpoint; because non-Ego has borrowed the qualities of the Ego, and *vice versa*, Man is part Woman, and Woman is part Man.

Fuller understanding of the cult of Shakti-Power (as distinguished from the cult of Shiva-Peace) in India and Thibet, is likely to be helped by psychoanalytic literature, and vice versa; (see, e.g., ch. xxxiii, 'Psycho-pathic Consequences', of *The Sexual Crisis*, by Grete Meisel Hess, translated by Eden and Cedar Paul; pub. 1917, by the Critic and Guide Company, New York). Cerebral energy and sex energy go together; as the two poles of the one magnet Energy. The complete exhaustion or suppression of either one of the two, means complete loss of the other also; whence the aphrodisiac quality of Ayur-védic and other tonics for the cure of neurasthenia. But the two energies are as the ends of a see-saw; physically reproductive energy, (generated primarily by food, which stands for primal Vital Energy, whence both sexual and cerebral energies), has to be continually sublimated into mentally and superphysically reproductive energy, by the person who would become ūrdhva-réṭas yogi, 'whose seminal energy always streams upwards'. In connection with socialism, G. M. Hess notes the simultaneous rise of two opposed pairs, "(1) the woman emancipated from sex, i.e., the de-sexed, versus the woman emancipated for sex i.e., the very highly sexed who yet wants to be free; and (2) Ascetics versus Aesthetes," (among men). Amazon and hetaira were the correspondents in old Greece. Renunciants of the world and pursuants of it, among men as well as women, are to be found everywhere, throughout history. The many

the Absolute-Consciousness or Un-Consciousness, from the all-embracing timeless and spaceless standpoint of which, the Self is seen to have eternally negated, abolished, annihilated the Not-Self, in its totality, without remainder, and so has left behind a pure strifelessness of complete

aspects of *Ḍurgā-Annapūrṇā*, destructive martial power and constructive food-and-life-giving power, and of *Kālī-Gaurī*, 'Dark'-and-'White,' 'Hate'-and-'Love,' blood-thirsty sadism and meek masochism, are similar pairs of opposites. J. Langdon Davies' *A Short History of Women* is full of illustrations of how, age after age, country after country, 'Woman' has been alternately worshipped as supreme goddess, (*Ishtar*, *Astarte*, seems to be only another form of the Skt. word *sṛī*, woman), and maltreated as slave; how every step forward in her emancipation has been followed by a step backward in the shape of some corresponding bond of disability. Such is the case with the freedom and the bondage of men also. So, J. M. Robertson's *A Short History of Christianity* shows, principally in the case of the Christian religion, of course, but incidentally in that of others also, how growth and spread, and then decline and decay, are marked throughout, period after period, phase after phase, sect after sect, by one gain and one pain, one advantage and one disadvantage. It comes as a great surprise, now and then, and is very informing, to see how Christian priests and rulers made converts, and suppressed pagans and heathens, and even mere dissidents belonging to other sects of Christianity than their own, with the help of the Bible as well as of 'fire and sword', at one time, under the stress of one kind of fanatical motive; and, at another time, under the stress of another kind of motive, political or economic or both, deliberately avoided making converts and positively checked the spread of Christianity. Similar has been the history of the spread of *Āryan Védism*, and of *Islam* and other religions. It is patent that the consequences of every important scientific discovery and invention are similarly dual, good as well as evil, because of the two-fold nature of the human being; witness, the two World Wars of the first half of the 20th Century A. C., and the chain of their causes and consequences; *viz.*, awful *misuse* of science by the greed, pride, lust, jealousy, mutual fear, and hate, of the leaders, teachers, rulers, and propagandist-hypnotisers of the nations; thence, vast destruction of life and property and enormous *mis-employment* and waste of labor; and, again, more virulent *la revanche*. Emerson's classical 'Essay on *Compensations*' is only a very brief study of the 'balancings' of Nature. The vast and ever-growing literature of science in every department of it, including that of Sex, provides instances at every step. Many very striking illustrations are to be found in H. G. Wells' *The Science of Life* and *Outline of History*, of the Law of Polarity, Duality, Two-and-Two, which pervades the World-Process and constitutes its very heart-beat.

balance, utmost repose, Perfect Peace. It also includes the pseudo-eternal, the pseudo-infinite, the in-de-finite, and, technically, the illusive, *māyāvic*, endlessness of incessant identifications and separations, on the smallest and the largest scales, of the Self and the Not-Self; each identification being immediately balanced up by a separation; each separation at once neutralised by an identification; *sarga*, creation, and *pralaya*, dissolution, following each other in untiring and ceaseless motion of rotation, *chakra*, 'cycling', 'circling'; in order to imitate and show out in time and space, in an ever-futile and ever-renewed endeavour, that which is complete, always and at once, in the Eternal and Infinite Absolute.

Thus it comes about that the method of true Vēdānta, repeated super-im-position, *aḍhyāropa*, of an attribute upon the Supreme (object of enquiry and definition), and then de-position, refutation and striking away, *apa-vāḍa*, of it, till all particular attributes have been struck away and the Supreme remains defined as the *Un-de-fin-able*—that method is also the method of all thought, (sup-position—op-position—com-position) and the method of the World-Process, which is the embodiment of incessant endeavour to impose material Attributes upon the Attributeless throughout all time and space, endless at-tempt to de-*fine* Spirit in terms of Matter.¹

¹ See foot-note 2, on p. 84, *supra*.

Aham Eṭaṭ Na¹—this transcendent *sa m viṭ*, thought, consciousness, awareness, idea, thus, timelessly, spacelessly, and changelessly, constitutes and is the *S v a - b h ā v a*, 'own-being', Nature, of the Absolute, which Nature and which Absolute *i.e.*, which Absolute-Nature is also, therefore, identical with the totality of the World-Process; such totality being attained, not by endless addition of parts and pieces of moving things in time and space as *outside* of us; but by grasping of the *Whole* of the Not-Self, with all time and space and things moving therein, as *within* us; so that Past and Future, Behind and Before, collapse into Now-and-Here, and *all* relative *parts* are summed up, by *abolition*, in the Absolute *Whole*.

All Questions Answered

What merits and qualifications, or absence of merits and qualifications, that may rightly be sought in and required of the Absolute, without which the Absolute would not be what its name implies, are missing from this? Is not that the Thought which is Independent of all Else? Does it not contain all in It-Self? The Absolute is the Unconditioned. What condition limits this perfect cognition, this Complete Idea, which is its own end and looks to no end beyond It-Self, which is also its own means and seeks no means out of It-Self for its realisation? It is One single act of Consciousness, which looks not before or after, to

¹ अहं एतत् न.

past or future, but is *complete*, and complete *now*, in the Eternal Moment, complete *here*, in the Infinite Point. The 'I,' holding the whole of the 'Not-I' before It-Self, denies, in one single moment which includes all time, at one single point which exhausts all space, in one single act which sums up the whole of the World-Process in It-Self, the whole of that 'Not-I'; denies that It-Self is anything Other-than-I; a mighty truism which abolishes and yet covers all possible details of knowledge, for all possible 'not-I's' that may be known, are summed up in the 'Not-I' so denied. All possible conditions of space, time; causation, *ḍéśha*, *kāla*, *nimiṭṭa*, are within this Absolute idea. All contradictions are within it.¹ All the Relative is, and all relatives are, within it. Yet it is not opposed to them or outside of them; for it indeed is the very substratum and possibility of them; nay, it *is* them, in their entirety; for, so taken all together, they counter-balance and abolish each other wholly, and leave behind only the Numberless Zero, out of which all plus-and-minus numbers emerge, and into which they merge back again. All divisions are within it; yet it is unbroken, un-divided, consistent, partless and numberless, the beyond number, for the One and the Many are both within it; addition neutralising subtraction, subtraction nullifying addition, multiplication counteracting division, and division completely balancing

¹ सर्वविरुद्धार्थानां तत्र समावेशं दर्शयतीति । *Taṭparya-prakasha Tika* on *Yoga-Vasishtha*, VI, Pūrvārḍha, xxxvi, 10.

multiplication. All possible opposites that constitute the factors of *sa m s ā r a*, are present in it, in equation and equilibration. It is the reconciliation of all opposites. It is *n i r - g u ṇ a m*, attribute-less. It is *g u ṇ a - b h u k . s a - g u ṇ a m*, taster, eater, container of all attributes, also. Being is in it ; Nothing or Non-Being is in it too. It is beyond Being and Nothing. It is Being ; it is Nothing ; it is both ; it is neither.¹ Yet it is there, within us, around us, unmistakable. It is the whole, and also the constant process, of our daily life. “ It moveth and it moveth not, far is it, yet 'tis near ; it is within the heart of all and yet apart from all.” It is the all. All is in it. Assertion by it, and in it, gives existence to *An-Ātmā*, the Not-Self : rejection and denial by it, and within it, imposes non-existence on that same *An-Ātmā*. It sayeth : I (am) This ; and the This, the Not-Self, is. It sayeth : (I this) Not-Self (am) not ; and the Not-Self is no more. But it sayeth both these things in the same breath, simultaneously. What is the result ? This Endless Process that is ever coming out of nothing into being, and vanishing out of being into nothing. We *see* it plainly, yet may not describe it adequately. Truly indescribable, *a - n i r - v a ç h a n ī y a*, has it been called ; as also has been called the World-Process which is It. It is the Vacuum,

¹ नासदासीन्नो सदासीत् ; *Rg-veda*, X, cxxx, 1, 2.

नासन्न सन्न सदसन्न महन्न चाणु ; Hymn by Shaṅkarāchārya.

² तदेजति तन्नैजति, तद् दूरे तदु अन्तिके,

तद् अंतरस्य सर्वस्य, तद् उ सर्वस्य अस्य बाह्यतः । *Īsha-Upaniṣat*, 5.

s h ū n y a, of the s h ū n y a - v ā ḍ ī,¹ when Self and Not-Self are regarded as having neutralised each other in mutual Negation. It is the Plenum, g h a n a m, of the g h a n a - v ā ḍ ī,² which is ever full of both, in the Affirmation that ever lies implicit and hidden in the heart of the Negation. Two eternals are here in this Absolute, eternal 'I' and pseudo-eternal 'Not-I,' eternal Being and

A few more scripture-texts to the same effect may be cited :

एतं संयद्वाम इति आचक्षते ; एतं हि सर्वाणि वामानि अभिसंयन्ति, एष हि सर्वाणि वामानि नयति ; *Chhandogya*, 4-15-2

'The Self is known as s a m y a ḍ - v ā m a, because all contraries inhere in It ; It leads forth, It is the commander of, all contradictory pairs'.

यस्मिन् विरुद्ध-गतयो हि अनिशं पतंति,

विद्यादाऽयो विविधशक्तयः आनुपूर्व्या ; *Bhāgavata*, 4-9-16. तस्मै समुन्नद्ध-

विरुद्ध-शक्तये, नमः परस्मै पुरुषाय वेधसे ; *op. cit.*, 4-17-28.

'Salutation, adoration, to the Supreme Self, Parama-Purusha, Sovereign and Law-Giver of Nature, within Whom contrary energies, s h a k ṭ i - s, are revolving day-and-night, a (h a r) - n i s h a m ; Who spurs on as well as reins in these opposite-leaping forces (with sure hand)'.

यद् अविद्या च विद्या च, पुरुषस्तु उभय-प्राश्रयः । *op. cit.* 2-6-10.

'Error, False Knowledge, and Wisdom, True Knowledge—the Reservoir of both is the Supreme Purusha'.

The metaphysical reason *Why*, of the psycho-analyst's 'ambivalence', heaven-and-hell, sub-conscious under-world of selfish hate devilish thoughts, devils, and supra-conscious upper-world of unselfish love, angelic thoughts, angels, is to be found here.

For further texts from scriptures of Vaidika Dharma as well as other religions, declaring the inherence of utterly antagonistic qualities in the Supreme, the reader may look into *The Essential Unity of All Religions*, index-references 'Duality', 'Opposites', 'Good', 'Evil.'

¹ 'He who holds the doctrine that all is Nothing, a mere Vacuum, S h ū n y a, or that all arises from and goes back into Nothing, Emptiness.'

² 'He who hold that all is one g h a n a, Density, Plenum.'

pseudo-eternal Nothing; yet they do not limit or restrict each other in any way, for there *is* only one eternal, and the other eternal is pseudo, *is not*. Beyond space and time are they yet, and therefore beyond limits; and neither limits the other, but rather each necessarily fits into the other, or, yet rather, the other is entirely lost in the one. None can take objection to the eternity of a pure Nothing beside the eternity of pure Being; yet the two ^{within} are opposed and not identical; and yet also both inhere in and make up the Absolute. If we are inclined to feel that 'I', holding up to itself and denying 'Not-I', implies a duality, let us remember what 'Not-I' is, *essentially*, and what this denial of it by 'I' amounts to. 'Not-I' is the Negation of 'I,' and this denial of it is the Negation of a negation of itself by the 'I'.¹ What objection can there be to the statement that "I am not Not-I," "I am nothing else than I"? Is it not purely equivalent to the statement "I am only I"? And if so, where is duality in it? A difficulty *seems* to arise when we vaguely feel that pure 'Not-I' cannot be equivalent to the totality of all particular 'Not-I's'. This difficulty will be dealt with, later, in a further endeavour to show that pure 'Not-I' *is* equivalent to the totality of all particular 'Not-I's'.

¹ Compare the Samskr̥t expressions अन्यद् अन्यस्मात्, 'other than other,' i.e., other than-not-I; and अनन्यत्वाद् अन्यत्, 'not other than other,' i.e., including the other or not-I within Itself. These expressions occur in the footnote on p. 125 *supra*. See also f. n.s on pp. 113, 114, 121.

The In-de-scrib-able

Such, then, is the Indescribable of which the Totality of the World-Process is the Endless Description. Exact, rigorous, scientific description here perforce becomes a hymn, which may seem 'mystic' to the unscrutinising observer, yet is strictly accurate, 'rational', 'practical' also. The indescribability of the Absolute Brahman is not the result of a powerlessness of thought, but of thought's completion. It is indescribable if we will use only one of the two sets of thought-counters, terms of Being *or* terms of Nothing, such as are used in dealing with things relative and limited ; but it is fully describable if we will use both sets at once.¹

Many are the names of this Absolute, as said before.² To fix the nomenclature and prevent confusion, the English term used to describe it in future in this work will

¹ But not in the way of Hegel, see ch. vi, *supra*. After going through the considerations of this chapter, the reader will have realised that Hegel should have said, not that 'Being is Nothing,' but that 'Being is not-Nothing,' or 'Being is no-Thing,' or 'Being is no-particular-thing'; also that, instead of saying this last, he should have said 'Ego is not non-Ego'; and instead of that, that 'I is not not-I'; and instead of that, again, he should have said that 'I am not not-I'; and, finally, he should have said that 'I am not This,' i.e., 'I-This-Not.'

² एतम् एके वदन्ति अग्निं, मनुम् अन्ये प्रजापतिम् ,

इंद्रम् एके, परे प्राणम् , अपरे ब्रह्म शाश्वतम् ।

प्रशासितारं सर्वेषाम् , अणीयांसम् अणोर् अपि,

स्कृमाभं, स्वप्नधीगम्यं, तं विद्यात् पुरुषं परम् । *Manu*, xii.

ordinarily be the word Absolute, and the Saṃskṛt Brahman. Para-Brahman is the same word as the last, with only the intensive and eulogistic *p a r a*, *i.e.*, Supreme, added. One other common and significant Saṃskṛt name for it, which should be specially noted here, is Param-Ātmā—the Supreme Ātmā, Supreme Self. In strictness, the Absolute is as much the whole of Not-Self as Self; but it is given the name of the ‘Supreme Self’ especially, because the human *jīva*, as will be apparent from what has been said in Chapters IV and V, arrives *first* at the Praṭyag-ātmā,¹ the ‘inward’ or ‘abstract’ and universal Self; and being established there, it then includes the pseudo-universal Not-Self within itself; and thus realises ultimately its identity with the Absolute, which it then calls the Param-Ātmā—the Supreme Self, because it is first seen through and as the universal Self, though now seen also to contain the Not-Self; and because the Self is the element, the factor, of *Being* in the triune Absolute.

केचित् कर्म वदन्ति एनं, स्वभावम् अपरे जनाः,

एके कालं, परे दैवं, पुंसः कामम् उत अपरे ।

एष भूतानि, भूतात्मा भूतेशो भूतभावनः,

स्वशक्त्या प्रायया युक्तः, सृजति, अर्त्ति च, पाति च । *Bhagavaṭa*, IV, xi.

इंद्रं मित्रं वरुणम् अग्निम् आहुः, अथो दिव्यः सः सुपर्णो गरुत्मान् ।

एकं सद् विप्रा बहुधा वदन्ति, अग्निं यमं मातरिश्वानम् आहुः । *Rg-veda*.

See *The Essential Unity of All Religions*, pp. 139-140, *et seq.*, for translation of the above, and many more such names, in Vaidika Dharma as well as in other religions and languages; also pp. 96, *et seq.*, for equivalents in the scriptures of other religions, of the Logion ‘I-This-Not.’

¹ प्रत्यगात्मा परमात्मा माया चेति कथम् । *Sarva-sāra Upaniṣat*.

“ This udgīṭa, this music-sound, the AUM, is Supreme Brahman. In it are the Three, well indicated by the three letters. Realising the secret hidden between them, knowers of Brahman merge therein and become free from rebirth. When with the lamp of the Ātmā, the jīva beholds Brahman with all-intentness, Brahman, the unborn, the time-less, the pure of all ṭ a ṭ v a s, then he becometh free from all bonds.’ ”

१ उद्गीतम् एतत्परमं तु ब्रह्म, तस्मिन्मयं सुप्रतिष्ठाक्षरं च ।

अत्रांतरं ब्रह्मविदो विदित्वा, लीना ब्रह्मणि तत्परा योनिमुक्ताः ।

यदाऽत्मतत्त्वेन तु ब्रह्मतत्त्वं दीपोपमेन इह युक्तः प्रपश्येत्,

अजं ध्रुवं सर्वतत्त्वैर्विशुद्धं, ज्ञात्वा देवं मुच्यते सर्वपाशैः ।

Shvet-ashvatara, i, 7, 15.

A few more Ancient Texts

NOTE.—Some more texts from Vaiḍika as well as Buddhist writings may be added here, in support of the contents of this chapter.

Védic Writers

यदृच्छालाभसंतुष्टो, ‘ द्वंद्वानीतो ’, विमत्सरः,

समः सिद्धौ असिद्धौ च, कृत्वाऽपि न निबध्यते ; *Gīṭa*, iv. 22

‘ He who has visioned *That Which is Beyond Duality*’ Which includes all Duals, he becomes free from all bonds and fetters of the soul ; sane, equable, tranquil, in all conditions of gain or of loss ; satisfied with and welcoming all that befalls ; devoid of all discontents and jealousies.’

निर्मानमोहाः, जितसङ्गदोषाः, अध्यात्मनित्याः, विनिवृत्तकामाः,

‘ द्वंद्वैर् ’ विमुक्ताः सुखदुःखसंज्ञैः, गच्छन्ति अमूढाः पदं अव्ययं तत् ; xv. 5.

'Changeless, undecaying, unincreasing, is the state of *That Which Transcends Duality*. To It go those who have cast off pride and fear, clinging attachments, blinding infatuating desires ; who look equably on the primal Duals, Pleasure and Pain ; and devote themselves constantly to meditation on that ' *Self Beyond Duality* '.

कर्मणां च विवेकार्थं धर्माधर्मौ व्यवचयत् ;

'द्वंद्वैर्' अयोजयत् च इमाः सुखदुःखादिभिः प्रजाः ; *Manu.*, 1. 26

'The Supreme (It-Self beyond all Pairs, becoming focussed in a Brahmā, to create this our world) created Pleasure-and-Pain (as Primal Pair), and invested all living things with them : and (out of the experiencing, by humans, of these two, in innumerable settings, forms, situations, the Brahmā-Ruler of our solar system, or this earth) wove the Scheme of Sin-and-Merit and distinctions between Good-and-Evil deeds '.

विद्यां च, अविद्यां च, यः तद् वेद उभयं सह (सः ह),

अविद्यया मृत्युं तीर्त्वा, विद्ययाऽमृतं अश्नुते ; *Isha*.

'The True Knowledge (I-am-Not-This) and the False Knowledge (I-am-This-body etc.)—*he who knows* the Pair of *both* these *together*, he crosses beyond death, after having tasted and experienced it in consequence of the False Knowledge ; and he tastes Immortality through the True Knowledge (which includes the False Knowledge *plus* its simultaneous repudiation).'

तद् एजति, तन् न एजति, तद् दूरे, तद् उ अन्तिके,

तद् अन्तरं अस्य सर्वस्य, तद् उ सर्वस्य अस्य बाह्यतः । *Isha*.

अस्थूलो, अनणुः ; अमध्यमो, मध्यमः ; अव्यापको व्यापकः ;

हरिः आदिः, अनादिः ; अविश्वो, विश्वः ; निर्गुणः, सगुणः ; इति ।

तुरीयं, अतुरीयं ; आत्मानं, अनात्मानं ; उग्रं, अनुग्रं ;

वीरं, अवीरं ; महान्तं, अमहान्तं ; विष्णुं, अविष्णुं ; ज्वलंतं,

अज्वलन्तं ; सर्वतोमुखं, असर्वतोमुखं, इति ।

Nṛsiṃha-Tāpinī Upaniṣhaṭ.

' It moveth, and It moveth Not ; 'Tis far, and yet 'Tis near : It is within all This, It is without ; It is not large, nor small ; not middling, yet the middle ; not-pervading, all-pervading ; with beginning, and beginningless also : not the whole, also the whole ; attributeless, and yet possessed of every possible attribute. It is the Fourth which transcends the Three, and yet not such (for It is immanent also in everything which is within the Three) ; It is the Self, It is also the Not-Self ; It is harsh (and all-destroying), It is gentle (all-preserving) ; heroic, timid too ; great, small ; all-grasping, all-abandoning ; flaming, and cool ; facing on all sides, and facing none '.

अस्तीति नास्तीति च, वस्तुनिष्ठयोः, एकस्थयोः भिन्नविरुद्धधर्मयोः,
अवेक्षितं किंचन योगसांख्ययोः, समं परं ह्यनुकूलं ब्रूहत् तत ;

Bhāgavata, VI iv 32

' Is and is not—both, and also all possible other contradictory qualities abide within that ultimate Reality, which Yoga and Sāṅkhya endeavour to describe as equal with all and greater than all, as friend of all and foe of all '.

There is another ' mysterious ' aphorism in the *Nyāya-Sūtras*, which, like the one quoted on p. 125, *supra*, is pure Vēdānta, taken by itself ; though, in the context, it is given another meaning :

न सन् , न च असन् , न सद्-असत् , सद्-असतोः वैधर्म्यात् ; iv. i. 48,

' Not existent, nor non-existent, nor both, because it has not the quality of either.'

Buddhist Writers

The famous Bhikkhu, Asanga, who spread Mahāyāna Buddhism in Thibet, writes in his *Mahāyāna-sūtra-Alaṅkāra*, V. 1.,

न सन् , न चासन् , न तथा, न चान्यथा, न जायते, व्येति, न चावहीयते,
न वर्धते, नापि विशुध्यते पुनः, विशुध्यते तत् परमार्थलक्षणं ।

' Not being, nor non-being ; not thus, nor otherwise ; It is not born, nor diminishes, nor decays in any way, nor increases, nor can be made purer—such is that Pure and Perfect Parama-ar̥tha, Highest object of understanding '.

Another very famous Bhikkhu, Nāgārjuna, great chemist, discoverer and inventor of metallic preparations, r a s a-s, for medical purposes, as well as profound philosopher, writes in his *Mādhyamika Kārikā*,

अनिरोधं, अनुत्पादं, अनुच्छेदं, अशाश्वतं,
अनेकार्थं, अनानार्थं, अनिर्गमं, अनागमं ।

' Not destructible, nor constructible, not slayable, nor procreatable, not transient, nor permanent, not One, nor Many, not coming, nor departing—such is It (the Self denying the Not-Self).'

Gauda-pāda, the guru's guru of Shankarāchārya, practically copies the above, in his *Māndūkyā-Kārikā*, 32,

न निरोधो, न च उत्पत्तिः, न बद्धो, न च मुक्ता,
न मुमुक्षुः, न विमुक्तः, इति एषा परमार्थता ।

' No in-hibition, no ex-hibition, no bondage, no freedom, no craving for deliverance, no emancipateness—such is the state of Parama-ar̥tha, Highest Object (of knowledge).'

Mutual Copying

During the 1200 years of the Buddhist period of Indian history, followers of Gauṭama Buddha and followers of the Vēdas reproduced more or less the same old old teachings ; varied the words, and often, ostensibly and ostentatiously, (though, in private they may have spoken more sincerely and made honest confessions even), told their respective disciples, ' What I am teaching is different from all other teachings and quite original.' Human weakness—to afford another illustration of the inseparable duality—' high and noble thought ' and ' mean and low motive ' side by side !

In Gauda-pāda's *Kārikā*-s, the words Buddha, Sambuddha, Pra-buddha, and Praṭi-buddha occur repeatedly. In two or

three places Gauṭama Buddha is meant certainly ; in some others, advanced souls, performing the functions of a Buddha, seem to be referred to, generally (see *The Mahātmā Letters*, pp. 43-44, regarding "the last Khobilgan, . . . Sang-Ko-pa of Kokonor, XIV century"), in the remainder, only 'wise knowers' are meant. But Vaiḍika annotators, e.g., Shankarāchārya, explain all in the last sense only.

The Beyond-the-Two

As regards the inclusion of both Pratyā-ātmā and Mula-Prakṛti in Param-ātmā, *Vishṇu Purāṇa*, says,

प्रकृतिर्या मयाऽख्याता, व्यक्त-अव्यक्त-स्वरूपिणी,
पुरुषश्चापि, उभौ एतौ, लीयेते परमात्मनि ।

Guṇā says,

प्रकृतिं पुरुषं चैव, विद्धि अनादी उभौ अपि,
परमात्मा इति चापि उक्तो देहेऽस्मिन् पुरुषः परः ; xiii, 19-22.
द्वौ इमौ पुरुषौ लोके, क्षरः च अक्षरः एव च ;
उत्तमः पुरुषस्तु अन्यः, परमात्मा इति उदाहृतः ; XV, 16-17.

'Prakṛti and Purusha (Pratyag-ātmā), both, are latent in Param-ātmā. The former is changeful ; the latter, changeless ; the third, Param-ātmā, is the highest, including both and distinguishable from each.'

A Sufi's Testimony to the Distinctionless

Some beautiful lines by the famous Persian Sūfi poet and philosopher, Maulānā Rūmi, on the disappearance, during slumber, of all time and space and motion, illustrate what has been said on the subject, in the text above.

Shab, ze zindān, bé-khabar zindāniyān ;
Shab, ze ḡaulaṭ, bé-khabar sulṭāniyān ;
Nai gham o anḡéshe-é sūd o ziyān ;
Nai khayāl-é in fulān o ān fulān ;
Hāl-e ārif in buwaḍ bé-khvāb ham.

'Oblivious is the prisoner of his chains ;
Oblivious in the monarch of his wealth ;

The tradesman, of his losses and his gains ;
 The sick man, of his torment of ill-health ;
 And every one, of this, that, great and small ;
 When they sleep as the dead, at dead of night.
 The wise man who has seen the Self in all,
 Oblivious is of all, e'en in daylight.'

CHAPTER IX

DVAM-DVAM ¹—THE RELATIVE

पराञ्च खानि व्यतृणत् स्वयम्भूः, तस्मात् पराङ् पश्यति, न-अन्तरात्मन् ;
 कश्चिद् धीरः प्रत्यग्-आत्मानं ऐक्षद् , आवृत्तचक्षुः अमृतत्वं इच्छन् ; *Katha*.

'The Self-born pierced the senses outwards ; therefore the soul looketh outwards, not inwards. One resolute one, here and there, turneth his vision inwards, desirous of immortality, determined to achieve it, resolved to conquer Death ; and he then beholdeth, and identifieth himself with, Pratyag-Ātmā, the Deathless Inner Self.'

(A) PRAṬYAG-ĀTMĀ—SELF

AHAM,² I, Self, in the great logion, is Pratyag-Ātmā. It is the inward, abstract, universal Self or Spirit, eternal

¹ द्वंद्वं, 'two-and-two', the paired, the double.

² अ, a, is the first letter of the Samskr̥ṣṭ alphabet, and ह, ha, the last ; therefore the two together, between them, exhaust all the contents of all possible 'experience,' which can be possibly expressed by all the

Subject, wherein all *jīvas*, individual, particular, discrete spirits, selves, or subjects, inhere as whirlpools in the ocean, as whirl-winds in the air, as vortices in ether, as points in space.¹ It pervades them all, as the genus pervades all individuals. It is all those individuals. The 'appearance' of separateness, individuation, differentiation, is caused by matter, *Mūla-Prakṛti*, as will appear later. In itself, it is the *avyakṭa*, the unmanifest, unspecialised, unindividualised; sheathed in *buḍḍhi* or *mahaṭ*, universal mind, (corresponding to the connotation of the plural and yet unbreakably unitive, connective, collective 'we'), it becomes

letters of the alphabet, *i.e.*, language, and which is all overshadowed by the transiency, perishingness, negation, that is indicated by the *म्*, *m*. Therefore, अ-ह-म् are the appropriate vocal symbol of the I, which is the only 'experiencer,' in whom alone all experience, with its negation, is. ह, *ha*, also stands for the *ākāśha-ṭaṭṭva*, the substrate of sound, and the first material manifestation and sheath or body of conscious life, in this solar system at least, according to the *Purāṇas*; and it therefore appropriately takes the place, in the name of the individual ego, which is occupied by उ, *u*, in that of the Absolute Ego.

अकारः सर्ववर्णाग्र्यः प्रकाशः परमेश्वरः ;

आद्यम् अंत्येन संयोगाद् 'अहम्' इत्येव जायते ।

Nāndik-ēshvara-karika, 4.

¹ *Bhrama*, *bhrāṇṭi*, is one of the names for the 'illusion,' the 'appearance without reality,' of the World-Process; a sort of anagram of 'Brahman', and means 'turning round and round,' as the opposite of the Moveless. This circling *bhrama* of the World-Process is visible even to the physical eye, and requires no difficult thinking. The earth, the moon, the planets, suns, stars, all revolve; the seasons, the biological functions, psychological, political, economical, social, historical phenomena—all observe cyclical periodicity, which takes on the form of spirals, for reasons explained later on in the text. The Self 'makes-believe'; It believes 'as if' It is 'this, that, and the other not-Self'; and then, discarding the mask, It comes back into It-Self.

the supra-conscious, out of which emerge and into which merge back again, all *v y a k ṭ i s*, individuals, manifest consciousnesses, particular minds, *m a n a s - e s*, (corresponding to the singular and separative 'I'). It is the One, *é ka*, in a special degree. It is the essence, source, and substratum of all similarity, sameness, continuity, unity, all oneness. It is *Īshvara* in the abstract sense, the one *Īshvara* of all particular *Īshvaras*—their Self, as also the Self, and as much so, of the *j ī v a s* that have not yet arrived at the state of *Īshvara*-hood. It is sometimes called the *Māyā-sha b a l a m* Brahman, or *Sa-gu ṇ a m* Brahman, Brahman conjoined with attributes, enwrapped in, coloured with, *Māyā*. The *Upanishats* mostly describe it, this *Pratyag-Ātmā*, and, leading the enquirer to it, finally state that it is identical with Brahman. Such aphoristic utterances, apparently, have led to the confusion which seems to prevail at the present day amongst the *v é d ā n ṭ i s* of the various schools, as to the relation between *Pratyag-Ātmā* and *Param-Ātmā*, or Brahman. The following great words of the *Upanishats* refer to the *Pratyag-ātmā*: "Unmoving, it outstrippeth the wind; the gods themselves may not attain to it; it goeth beyond all limitations; by knowledge of it, the *j ī v a* attains to the (first) peace of unity; it is the white, the bodiless, the pure, the Self-born, itself uncaused and changeless,¹ and causing all things else and all their

¹ A metaphysical axiom in *Saṃskṛt*, says, *यद् अपरिणामि तद् अकारण*, 'That which undergoes no change has no cause,' or, more briefly, 'the changeless is causeless'. Hume uses the words, "What is incorruptible must be ungenerable".

changes, smaller than the smallest, yet vaster than the vastest; it cannot be spoken of or seen or heard or breathed, but itself speaks and sees and hears and breathes; it espouses the enquirer and appears within him of its own law, and may not be taught by another; ever it hides in the cave of the heart; it upholds the three worlds; it divides itself and appears in all these endless forms, and yet is best described by saying, 'not this,' 'not this'.'¹ And then comes the addition; "This Ātmā is the Brahman."² The meaning is that the one *so described* is the Ātmā, but the same Ātmā *plus the description, viz., 'Not This'*—that is to say, plus the consciousness that "I am Not Other than I," which consciousness is inseparable from, nay, *is* the very being, and the whole being, and the whole nature of the Self—is Brahman.

This Praṭyag-ātmā³ is the true n i ṭ y a, the constant, the fixed, the eternal, k ū t a s ṭ h a - n i ṭ y a, the changelessly and movelessly permanent; as opposed to p a r i ṇ ā m i - n i ṭ y a, the changefully persistent and ever-lasting, the sempiternal. While the Absolute may be said to be beyond Eternity as well as Time—or

¹ *Vide Isha, Kéna, and Katha Upanishads.*

² *Mandūkya, 2.*

³ This word is not prominently used in the later works on Védānta, but is of frequent occurrence in *Bhāgavata*, e.g., III, xxxv, 27; III, xxvi, 27, etc. *Yoga-Sūtra*, I, 29, appears to refer to the same principle under the name of Praṭyak-chétana. Shankar-āchārya, in his commentaries on *Kéna*, iv. 6, *Katha*, i. 3, 11-12, and ii, 1. 1-2, on Gauda-pāda's *Mandūkya Karika*, 65, and *Brahma-sūtra*, I. i. 1, mentions some other aspects, and even senses, of it. Words often put on new meanings, as souls do new bodies.

rather to include them both as Eternity *plus* Time, seeing that Eternity is opposed to Time, and the Absolute is not opposed to anything else and outside of it, but contains all opposites within itself—the word Eternal, as opposed to Temporal, may properly be assigned to the Pratyag-ātmā in its abstract aspect. As such it is ever complete and undergoes no change, but is the substratum and support of all changing things and of Time, even as an actor of his theatrical attires.

For concrete illustration, take the case of *sushupti*, sound slumber, awaking from which a person says: 'I slept well, I knew nothing.' Knowing *Nothing*, *i.e.*, the Not-Self, he was *out of Time* literally, he was at complete rest in the Eternal, wherein he felt perfect repose after the day's turn of fatiguing work; whereout he comes back again into Time and to the cognition of *some-things*, when the restlessness¹ of desire for the experiences of *samsāra* again overpowers him. The further special meaning of *sushupti*, the meaning of sleep, as of death, may appear later. In the present connection, it is enough to refer to this one aspect of it, and to point out that the inner significance of the expression, 'the Self knows *no-thing* during *sushupti*,' is that It, in that condition, positively knows what is technically called No-Thing *i.e.*, the Not-Self as a whole;

¹ The words of the Yoga-system, for the repose and the restlessness mentioned in the text, are निरोध, *nirōḍha*, and व्युत्थान, *vyuṭṭhāna*, restraint and 'uprising,' retirement and enterprise, inhibition and exhibition, obliviscence and reminiscence, unmanifest consciousness or sub-consciousness or dormant memory and manifest consciousness, rest and work, fatigue and activity, sleep and wakefulness.

for the potency, the necessity, of the Being of the Self maintains constantly, before or within that Self, in one unbroken act or fact of consciousness, this No-thing, *i.e.*, No-particular-thing but mere general This-ness or pure Not-Self. In other words, *jīva*, in the moment of *sushupti*, passes almost entirely (since, strictly speaking, it cannot pass quite entirely, for reasons that will appear on studying the nature of the *jīva*) out of the region of the many experiences of particular not-selves, of successive somethings; passes into the other side, the other facet (and yet not other but rather all-including aspect) of that region, *viz.*, into the region of the Single, underlying, ever-present, One Experience, One Negating Consciousness, in the universal Self, of the pseudo-universal Not-Self. That *jīva* does not pass entirely out of the state of awareness or 'experience,' out of a consciousness which is its very nature and essence, is the reason why the thread and continuity of its identity reappears unbroken after the soundest slumber.

As with reference to Time, the Self obtains the name of the Eternal, *Nitya*, coexistently present at every point of Time—for all the endlessly successive points of time are coexistent to, and in, its eternal and universal all-embracing consciousness, *Now*; so, with reference to Space, Its name is *Vi-bhu*, pervasive-being, infinite, unextended, or extensionless; and, again with reference to Motion, Its name is *Sarva-Vyāpī*, all-permeating, Omnipresent, the simultaneously present at every point of space; for all the countless coexistent points of Space

are simultaneously present in that same consciousness, in one point, *Here*. Introspection on the nature of sound Sleep is useful for understanding the nature of Space as of Time. In sound sleep we lose consciousness of Motion, Time, Space, all. (Thus, a person falling sound asleep when his train is standing at one station, and waking up when it is again standing at another, cannot say whether the train has moved at all and how long in time and how far in space he has slept). In slumber we 'bathe', are immersed in, Brahman, and are 'renewed'.

With reference to Motion, its best name seems to be Kūta-sṭha, rock-seated, or Avi-kārī, or Apari-ṇāmī, un-changing, the fixed, or, again, Anṭa-r-yāmī the inner watcher or ruler.¹

¹ As regards what has been said above about Ātmā plus 'Not This,' an earnest student and scholar wrestled with the idea for long. His recurring difficulty was: "Why should not Brahman remain pure consciousness; why should there be *in It* the necessity of a denial of another, and so movement?" Another might take the next step further in the same direction and ask: "Why should there be any Brahman at all? Why not let there be Nothing only?" The case of Bhushundi questioning Mārkaṇḍeya, in the Purāṇas, is similar. More preparation and practice in meditation is needed to realise the simple truth. A study of the Time and Space and Motion experiences, of dreams and reveries and flights of even waking but rapt and absorbing imagination, is exceedingly helpful, nay necessary; and the *absence* of all such experiences in deep sleep should also be carefully pondered on at the same time. Until the opposition between *Time* and *Eternity* is realised, the difficulty about movement and change will continue. The *Yoga-Vasistha* stories are very helpful in this reference. The whole point is that time and movement are *within*, and *negated* by, the Eternity of the Moveless All-Consciousness. The questions at the outset of this note may be more directly dealt with, once again, thus: The reply is by a counter query—What do you understand by *pure consciousness*? Is not *pure consciousness*=the denial of *impure consciousness*? How can you talk and think and know at all of the pure, except by at the same time opposing it to the impure? And why do you use the word *remain*? Is it not that you have at the back of your mind the idea of *pure consciousness persisting* from one moment of time to another, and then to another, and so on endlessly?

Two Triads of Attributes

Out of the relation of the Self to the Not-Self, as embodied in the logion, there arises a Triplicity of Attributes in both. The triune nature of the Absolute—the one constant and timeless ‘moment’ thereof which contains within it three¹ incessant moments (movements, momentums) of Time, *viz.*, Past, Present and Future—imposes

But *successive* moments of time *cannot* be distinguished in *pure* consciousness. Successive ‘impure consciousness,’ *i.e.*, particular, definite experiences, sensations, thoughts, emotions, volitions, movements in short, *mark and make* the successive moments of time and points of space; (the words *to us* may be added, but they are perfectly superfluous and useless, for of *to others* in the strict sense we have no notion and cannot speak). (Identifying ourselves with them by turns, we can see that) one cycle of a conscious sun absorbed in the act of rolling may be as one circuit of a race-course by a horse—though in human count, the former covers millions of years and billions of miles, and the latter a single minute and about half a mile. Each is just one mind-filling experience to its experiencer, the equivalent of, so to say, one moment of time. The next run will make the next moment; and so on. When there are no such ‘impure consciousnesses’ there can be no ‘remaining’. The next question, “Why not let there be Nothing?” contains its own answer. Surely let there *be-Nothing*, by all means. But Brahman is just this *be-nothing*, *be-no-thing*, *is-not-this*. This is not quibbling. It is perfectly serious. We cannot think or talk of nothing without also thinking and talking of being; and the two together, at once, are Brahman. If you mean-by the words, “Why not let there be nothing?”, only the question “Why are there any changing things at all?”, then the whole preceding text is an attempt to answer this very question. If you mean “Why is there any unchanging thing?”, then the answer, already given in the text also, is, again, “A *why* is not possible to ask, and cannot be asked, with regard to what is clearly recognised as really unchanging”.

¹ Compare the verse quoted from *Jñāna-garbha* in the foot-note at p. 21 of *Shiva-Sūtra-vimarshinī*, edited and published by Mr. J. C. Chatterji, in 1911, for the Kashmir State Series of Texts.

क्रम-त्रय-समाश्रय-व्यतिकरेण या संततं

क्रम-त्रितय-लंघनं विदधती विभाति उच्चैः,

क्रमैकवपुर अक्रमप्रकृतिर एव या शोभते,

करोमि हृदि ताम् अहं भगवतीं परां संविदम् ।

severally on Self and Not-Self, three *guṇas*, attributes, functions, properties, or qualities. These three inseparable 'moments' in the Absolute may be thus distinguished: (a) The 'I' holds the 'Not-I' before itself, and, so facing it, denies it, *i.e.*, cognises Not-Self's non-entity, its nothingness. This face-to-face-ness constitutes the moment of *Cognition*, including sub-divisions to appear later. (b) This cognition of Not-Self by Self is due to, and is of the nature of, a self-definition by Self, a constant definition of its own nature to It-Self as being actually different from all Not-Self, from all things other than the pure Self, which things might *possibly* be regarded as identical with itself. *Implied* therefore in this Self-consciousness is the *Action* of an 'identification' and then a 'separation' of Self with and from Not-Self. This is the moment of *Action*, having its subdivisions also. (c) The third moment is that which intervenes between the other two, the inner condition, so to say (for there is no real distinction of inner and outer here), of the 'I,' its *tendency* or *Desire*, between the holding of the 'Not-I' before itself,

"I invoke, in the heart, the Goddess Consciousness, of supreme perfections, whose manifest body is the triple succession, and whose inner Nature or Spirit is successionlessness." This work and some others belonging to the Kashmir School of Shaivism, which have become available since the publication of the first edition of this work and of the first volume of the *Pranava-vaḍa*, show that that school has many ideas in common with these. A learned friend has referred me to the definition of Shakti, which appears in the commentary by Yoga-raja on Abhinavagupta's *Paramartha-sāra*, *kārikā* 4, as निषेधव्यापाररूपा शक्तिः which, if the context allows, and if it is a definition, can only mean that "the nature of Shakti is to operate as negation"; see ch. xi *infra* and *Pranava-vaḍa*, I, 53, *etc.*

on the one hand, and its movement into or out of it, on the other. This third moment, of *Desire*, also has subdivisions, to be developed later. These three moments manifest in the individual *jīva* as *jñāna*, *kriyā*, and *ichchhā* respectively.¹ They will be treated of in detail further on. Here it is enough to say that these three moments in the Absolute Brahman appear in the universal *Pratyag-ātmā* as the three attributes of *Chit*, *Sat*, and *Ānanda*, respectively, which are the seeds, principia, possibilities and potencies, universal and abstract aspects, of what in the individual *jīva* manifest as *jñāna*, *kriyā* and *ichchhā*.² *i.e.*, cognition, action, desire. *Sat*, 'being', is in a special sense and degree,

¹ ज्ञानं, इच्छा, क्रिया. The English words 'know, con, ken, cognise,' 'create' and 'wish' are apparently derived from (probably etymologically the same) Samskr̥t roots, *viz.*, 'jñā,' 'kr,' and 'ish,' respectively.

² In current Védānta works, the meaning, as generally accepted, of *sa*, *chit*, and *ānanda*, is explained to be being, consciousness, and bliss respectively. This is not incorrect in itself, but is misleading and vague; it certainly does not bring out the *characteristic* significance of each. The correspondence between the two triplets, mentioned here, which at the time this was written was only a guess based upon indications in current Samskr̥t works, was afterwards amply confirmed by the *Pranava-vaḍa*. Also, subsequently, I have found a definite statement of it, though indirectly, in the *Bhūmikā* or Introduction to *Gupṭavaṇī Tika* on *Durga-saptā-shaṭi*. ज्ञानेच्छाक्रियाणां व्यष्टीनां महासरस्वती-महाकाली-महालक्ष्मीरिति नामांतराणि; 'Mahā-Sarasvaṭi, Mahā-Kālī, Mahā-Lakshmi are only other names for (the powers of) cognition, desire, and action.' And again:

महासरस्वति, चिते !, महालक्ष्मि, सदात्मिके !,

महाकालि, आनंदरूपे !, त्वत्तत्त्वज्ञानसिद्धये,

अनुसंदध्महे, चंदि !, वयं त्वां हृदयांबुजे !

"O Chandī! that art Mahā-Sarasvaṭi or *Chit*, Mahā-Lakshmi or *Sat*, and Mahā-Kālī or *Ānanda*, we con-temple thee in the lotus of the heart, in order to achieve knowledge of Thy essential being."

the principle in consciousness of *act-ual* (self-) *assert-ion* and (other-) denial, *act-ual* identification and separation, making and unmaking; it corresponds to *kriyā*, which alone gives or takes away *existence*, *i.e.*, manifest and particularised being. *Chit*, 'consciousness' in its special aspect of cognition, is the mere holding before oneself of a not-self and ignoring it, denying it, knowing it to be not; it corresponds to *jñāna*, which enables a thing to be known as existent or non-existent, true or false. *Ānanda*, the inner condition of the Self between cognition and action, is that principle of consciousness which connects the other two, is the basis of desire, which leads the *jīva* from knowledge into action. That which in the Universal, All-embracing, Omnipotent is *Ānanda*, 'bliss,' the fulfilment, or rather fulfilled condition, of *all* desires and wants, is the Eternal want of want, that appears in the individual as joy after the fulfilment of a particular want, craving, *desire*, *ichchā*. What, in the Infinite, All-judging, Omniscient, is *Chit*, consciousness, the fulfilled condition of all-knowing, is the denial of the possibility of all not-selves, is the simultaneous positing and denying of all else than Self; that appears in the limited *jīva* as partial *knowledge* of thing after thing, half-truth, the error or *a-vidyā* of assertion, and then the *remaining*, *nishéḍha-shésha*, critical, 'well-judged,' *vidyā*, supplementary and completing truth, of the denial of things, 'all is vanity,' 'vortices of nothing,' 'much ado about nothing'. Finally, that which in the Motionless and Changeless, Omnipresent, is Perfect and

Peaceful Being, Sa ṭ, Being everywhere, that same appears, in the finite person, as effort to be, to exist, in place after place, time after time, *i.e.*, is *action*, followed by rest. (Be-ing is to 'be-*in*-Self'; *ex*-istence is 'out-istence').

It should be borne in mind that these three aspects, sa ṭ, ch i ṭ, and ā na n ḍ a, are not prior in time to k r i y ā, j ñ ā na, and i c h c h h ā; nor are they in any sense external causes or creators of the latter. They are co-eval with each other in their universal and unmanifested aspect, and are identical with the second triplet, which is only their particular and manifested aspect; even as universal and particular, abstract and concrete, substance and attribute, plural and singular, whole and parts, We and I, may be said to be identical. The two cannot be separated, but only distinguished, as before pointed out. Praṭyag-ātmā cannot and does not exist without and apart from jīvas, and jīvas cannot and do not exist without and apart from Praṭyag-ātmā. But while in Praṭyag-ātmā, consciousness is Self-Consciousness, which, against the foil of the Not-Self, is Self-action or Self-assertion, Self-knowledge, and Self-desire or Self-enjoyment, all in one, all evenly balanced and equal, none greater than any other, all merging into each; so that Praṭyag-ātmā is often exclusively referred to in the *Upanishats* by only one of the three attributes, as only ā na n ḍ a, or ch i ṭ, or sa ṭ or ā na n ḍ a-ghana, ch i ḍ -ghana, sa ḍ -ghana; jīva is a compound of j ñ ā na, i c h c h h ā and k r i y ā, which, by the necessary fact of their confinement to particulars, realise their inseparable contemporaneousness

only in an endless succession ; so that they rotate one after the other, two being always latent, but never absent, while one is patent.¹

How and why three moments come to be distinguishable in what is partless, will appear on fully considering the nature of the second factor in the triune Absolute.²

Such then is Saṭ-Chiḍ-Ānanda, Saguṇa-Brahman, having three attributes as constituent principles of its being, three potentialities which are necessarily present in it with reference to the necessary nature of its two co-factors in the Absolute. But we see clearly all the while that it is not personal, not individual, not some one that is separate from other ones, not the single ruler of any one particular kosmic system ; but is Universal Self which is the very substratum of, and is immanent in, all particular Īshvaras,³ i.e., jīvas risen to be rulers of world-systems and all jīvas therein ; (Chiefs of hosts of Planetary spirits).

¹ But, by *predominance* of one function extending over a long period in a lifetime, individual jīvas become distinguished, despite the perpetual rotation of all three, as 'men of knowledge,' 'men of action,' and 'men of desire,' or as men of undifferentiated, unskilled, little-skilled work.

² See the next chapter.

³ The technical definition in Samskr̥t is, कर्तुम् अकर्तुम् अन्यथा वा कर्तुं समर्थः ईश्वरः, "He who can do, or not do, or do otherwise as he pleases". Etymologically, ईशते इति ईश्वरः, "he who rules, is master, the sovereign". In the full sense, only the Universal Self is Īshvara. In the comparative sense, infinite numbers of jīvas, at an infinite number of stages and grades, are Īshvaras, lords, masters. A 'lord of men,' a chief, a king, is a नरेश्वर, nar-ēshvara. Technically, the three Rulers, or, rather, the Triple or Tri-une Ruler, of a solar system. Brahmā, Viṣṇu, and Shiva. are Īshvaras regarded as Three ; they are Param-ēshvara regarded as a Tri-Unity.

The triplicity of attributes in the Self is a reflection of the triuneness of the Absolute: Self, with reference to the Self, whose very being is constant awareness of It-self, is *C h i t*; with reference to the Not-Self, which it *posits*, therefore creates, *i.e.*, gives to it the appearance of existence, and *denies*, therefore destroys, becomes *S a t*; with reference to the Negation, ceasing from the restless turmoil of the Many, it shows forth *A n a n d a* and the bliss of peace.

Worship of Pratyag-ātmā

This Pratyag-ātmā is in a sense capable of being worshipped. Worship and devotion may be directed to it in the shape of constant study and re-cognition of its nature; of constant *desire* to see and feel, by universal love, its presence everywhere, and as all selves, and in all not-selves; of constant endeavour to *realise* such presence by *acts* of compassion and helpfulness and service. Such is the worship of the *Ātmā* by the *jīva* who, having finished (for that cycle) his journey on the path of *p r a v ṛ t t i*, pursuit, marked out by the first half of the logion, is now treading (for that cycle) the return-path of *n i v ṛ t t i*, renunciation, which is laid down by the second half of that same logion. To such a *jīva*, the special *Īshvara* of his own particular world-system is the higher individuality of which his own individuality is, in one respect, an integral part; is the father of his material sheaths; and, in another aspect, the high ideal of

renunciation and self-sacrifice whom he is lovingly and devotedly to serve and closely to imitate, as far as may be, within his own infinitesimal sphere.

Students who cannot yet quite clearly grasp the nature of the relation between Self and Not-Self in its purity and nakedness, cannot yet clearly distinguish *Pratyag-ātmā* from its veil of *Mūla-prakṛti*, but, still, more or less vaguely, realise the universality of Self, who are in short at the stage of *Vishisht-ādvaita*—such students worship the particular *Īshvara* of their world-system in a vaguely universalised aspect. Still other *jīvas*, at the stage of *Ādvaita* and of the theory of creation, worship only and wholly the individual ruler of their world-system, or a subordinate deity, regarding him or her or It as the extra-cosmical creator, final cause and explanation, of the universe.

Absolute Brahman transcends and includes all worship.

CHAPTER X

DVAM-DVAM—THE RELATIVE (CONTINUED)

(B) MŪLA-PRAKṚTI OR MATTER—NOT-SELF

WE have dealt with the first factor of the triune Absolute, namely the Self. The second factor is the Not-Self. Its many names, each significant of a special aspect, are :

An-ātmā, Not-Self: A-chiṭ, the non-conscious; An-ṛta, the false; Jaḍa, the non-intelligent, non-sentient, inert; Nānā, the Many; Jñēya, the knowable: Vishaya, the Object; Bhēḍa-mūla, root of separateness; Mula-prakṛti, Root-Nature; Praḍhāna, the chief, the root-base, of all the elements, wherein they all 'subsist'; Mātrā, the measurer, the measure-setter, the delimiter, the de-fin-ing or finitising principle, the mother, Matter; and A-vyakṭa, the Unmanifest.¹ Mūla-prakṛti and Praḍhāna are specially prominent in Sāṅkhya, and of frequent occurrence elsewhere too.

¹ अनात्मा, अचित्, अजड, जड, नाना ज्ञेय, विषय, भेदमूल, मूल-प्रकृति, प्रधान, माता. Each name is significant of an important aspect.

The word m ā ṭ r ā has, regrettably, dropped out of current use somehow; it deserves restoration, being etymologically the same as the well known English word 'matter.' It is used in this sense in the *Bhagavad-Gītā*, मातास्पर्शास्तु, कौन्तेय !, शीतोष्णसुखदुःखदा: ii, 14. The word avyakṭa is not specific to the Not-Self, it should be noted; it is used for Praṭyagātmā, or abstract Self, also for Not-Self, and also for m a h a ṭ - b u ḍ ḍ h i of Sāṅkhya, the 'great' diffused Intelligence, universal or sub-supra-Conscious Mind, unindividualised by a sheath and un-particularised or unfocussed by an act of attention. Mahān-ātmā also occurs, now and then, in the sense of Self plus this Universal Mind. Sometimes ā k ā ś h a is also called a v y a k ṭ a, as a substitute for root-matter or 'This,' which is the indispensable second basis of universal mind, the first being Self.

The etymology of P r a - k ṛ ṭ i, is thus explained in *Dēvi-Bhagavata*, IX, i:

प्रकृष्टवाचकः प्रश्न, कृतिश्च सृष्टिवाचकः ;

सृष्टौ प्रकृष्टा या देवी, प्रकृतिः सा प्रकीर्तिता ।

गुणे सत्त्वे प्रकृष्टे च प्र-शब्दो वर्तते श्रुतः,

मध्यमे रजसि कृष्ट, ति-शब्दस्तमसि स्मृतः ।

"The first letter indicates greatness; the next two, activity, creation, emanation; also, the three letters respectively mean the three g u ṇ a s, s a ṭ ṭ v a. r a j a s, and ṭ a m a s."

This Not-Self is—by the Necessity of Negation of it by Self, which Necessity is the very Nature of the Absolute—the opposite of Self, in every possible respect and aspect; as is indicated in the fact that some of its most characteristic names are made up by prefixing a negative to the names of Self. Because of this fact, as the essential characteristic of Self is Unity, the very essence of Not-Self is Manyness, separateness; and as the marks of Self are Universality and unlimitedness, so the marks of the Not-Self are limitedness, Particularity, ever-specifiedness. As Fichte has said¹: “All reality is in consciousness, and of this reality that part is to be ascribed to the Non-Ego which is not to be ascribed to the Ego, and *vice versa* . . . The Non-Ego is what the Ego is not, and *vice versa*.” Or, better, as reported by Schwegler²: “Whatever belongs to the Ego, the counterpart of that must, by virtue of simple contraposition, belong to the Non-Ego.”

This characteristic consequence of the opposition of Self and the Not-Self should be carefully considered, together with other aspects of the Nature of the Absolute. Solution of the various difficulties, alluded to before from time to time, hinges upon it.

Because nothing particular can be said of Ego, therefore everything particular, all possible particulars, must be assigned to Non-Ego. But yet again, lest the totality of these particulars should become a fact

¹ *The Science of Knowledge*, p. 83 (Kroegeer's English translation).

² *History of Philosophy*, p. 246.

different from the Non-Ego instead of identical with it, even as positive is different from negative, these particulars, are paired off into opposites. These opposites, again, because particular and definite, are more than presence *and* absence; both factors have the appearance of *presence*, positiveness, as debt and loan, as pleasure and pain.¹ The pain of a debt is as much a positive burden on the consciousness of the debtor, as the pleasure of a loan is a weight on that of the creditor.

When we are dealing with the ultimate universal and pseudo-universal, *viz.*, Self and Not-Self, Being and Nothing, then even presence and absence are adequately opposed; it is enough to prefix a negative particle to Self and Being. But when we are in the region of particulars, this is not so; positive cold, in order to be neutralised, must be opposed by positive heat, and not merely by no-cold: a positive debt is not sufficiently set off and balanced by a no-debt, but only by an asset; *plus* is not nullified by zero, but by *minus*; a colour is not abolished by no-colour, but by another equally positive complementary colour. It should also be borne in mind, in this connection, that the positiveness of particulars, the reality of concrete things, is, after all, not so very definite and indefeasible as it seems at first sight, but on the contrary, a very elusive and illusive fact. In the ultimate analysis its whole essence is found to be nothing else than consciousness; the more consciousness we put

¹ See *Yoga-bhāṣya*, ii, 5; "A - v i d y ā is not merely non-knowledge but 'opposite' or wrong knowledge, as a - m i t r a, non-friend, un-friendlly, is not merely 'absence of friend' but a positive foe".

into a thing, the more real it becomes, and *vice versa*. That a house, a garden, an institution, falls out of repair, or order, and gradually disappears, loses its reality, its existence, if it is neglected by the proprietor or manager ; that is to say, if the latter withdraws his consciousness from it ; is only an illustration of this on the physical plane. The essential fact is always the same, consciousness upholding itself as well as its object, though the details differ ; thus, to maintain its objects on the physical plane, consciousness employs the *bahish-karaṇa*, the 'outer,' or physical, senses, organs, instruments and means, for repairs, etc. ; while on the mental plane it employs the '*aṇṭah-karaṇa*,' the 'inner instrument'. As in the case of the individual and his house, on the small scale, so, on the large scale, when Brahmā 'falls asleep' and withdraws his consciousness from it, his *brahm-āṇḍa*,¹ world-egg or system, disappears. We should remember here that the *arrangement* of materials which is the *house*, the *garden*, etc., is, for all purposes, the *creation* of the maker's individual consciousness, and that the other *arrangements* of material which he uses as senses, means and instruments, etc., are also evolved and created by his life or consciousness ; (that functions create organs, and not organs, functions, is becoming quite a commonplace

¹ Like so many other facts and laws stated by Saṃskṛt metaphysic, these 'world-eggs,' or 'eggs of Brahman, the Immense, the Infinite,' are literal facts, which need no abstruse science or elaborate thinking to perceive, but can be veritably seen by physical eyes. Earth Moon, Sun, all the 'orbs' and 'globes' of Heaven, i.e., the Immense Firmament, Boundless Space, are quite obviously 'eggs' of the Infinite.

of at least one school of advanced science now);¹ and finally that that material, ultimately 'the Not-Self, over which he as an individual has no power, is the creation of, the result of positing or affirmation by, the Universal Consciousness, the Self. If these facts are duly taken into account, then the presence of all possible kinds of mutually-destructive pairs of 'reals,' 'concretes,' 'particulars,' within, and as making up the total of, Not-Self, equivalent to Nothing or Non-being in its totality, will not appear altogether incomprehensible.

¹ Compare *Chhāndogya*, VIII, xii, 5, "The Self ideating or imagining itself as hearing, seeing, etc., *became* the ear, the eye, etc."

All creation is a continuation of self. No creation is possible without identification of the producer with the product, (comparatively). Every creation is, more or less, a *pro*-creation, *forth*-emanation, (as of a child). It is *positing* of the *creat*-ure, directly or indirectly, as 'I-(am)-this'. 'My' is the (comparatively) indirect form of positing; it is only a lesser degree of 'I'. All dissolution is, similarly, *denying* that identity; 'I-not-this', or 'not-mine-this'. However distant from me, and apparently indifferent to me, yet still the stars, the planets, the earth's poles, the earth's centre—are all 'I' or 'my', or 'not so'; though very vaguely. Whatever is of 'interest' to 'me', is related to me in terms of love or hate; therefore, in terms of 'I' and 'mine', a h a m - ṭ ā and m a m a - ṭ ā, or of 'not I' and 'not mine', n a - a h a m and n a - m a m a. The Vēda hymns, known as c h a - m a - k a and n a - m a - k a, vividly express this idea: 'The Sun is Mine, the Moon is Mine, Indra is Mine, the Wind is Mine', etc., and, again, 'Not Mine, Not Mine'. To bring home the fact that 'mine' is only a continuation of 'I', consider this; a person 'creates' a house *for him-self*; he feels and wishes, 'a h a m g ṛ h i s y ā m', 'May I become a house-man,' (hus-band, house-owner, house-dweller); this feeling, this consciousness, converts ā r a m b h a into a ḍ h y - ā - r o p a or a ḍ h y - ā s a; changes *creation* into *self-transformation* (which includes

Countless Paired Positives

The negative Not-Self thus appears as a mass of countless paired positives, *ḍva m-ḍva m*, 'two-and-two'. These appear as particular and positive when we view each of the two factors of every pair *separately*, from the standpoint of the limited. Yet by the fact of their being *paired* into opposites, by the affirmation *and* negation contained in the Absolute, they are always destroying each other by internecine controversy, and thereby always leaving intact and maintaining the negativity of the negative, considered from the standpoint of totality. In

pa ri - ṇā ma); it transforms the 'potter' into the theatrical 'actor'. All authors, more or less, *put themselves* into their creations; authors of even science-books; much more of novels and dramas. Literal and visible proof, of owner and house being identical, are shell-fish, molluscs. In later, higher, forms of life, this house becomes more and more, and then quite, separate, *physically* only. The cause, the force, which creates a book, a machine, a state, an empire, is the *ideation-and-will*, of some individual self, 'May I be an author, a machine-inventor, a statesman, an emperor'. Birds fly with wings, fishes swim with fins and tails, which are (part of) *them-selves*; men fly and swim with aeroplanes and ships and submarines which are *theirs*. Yoga-siddhas may re-place the machines which are *theirs*, by organs which would be (parts of their bodies) *them-selves*; as telescopes and microscopes may be replaced by keener eyes and clairvoyance. The evolutionist (Lamarckian) view, that 'functions create organs'; the poet's conviction, that 'the Spirit's plastic stress' shapes all things; are only corollaries of the above. Incidentally, for a very entertaining exposition and defence of Lamarckism or neo-Lamarckism as against Darwinism or neo-Darwinism, the reader may see Bernard Shaw's *Preface to 'Back to Methuselah'*.

other words, the Whole is the summation, and at the same time the opposite, the abolition and annihilation, of all its parts; as zero is the summation as well as the abolition of all possible plus-figures and all possible minus-figures. This paired feature of Mūla-prakṛti is only a reproduction, a reflection, therein, of the essential constitution of the Absolute, the opposition of the primal pair of Praṭyag-ātmā and Mūla-prakṛti, which is necessarily the supreme archetype and paradigm for all constitutions within it; there being nothing outside it to borrow from. This being clearly grasped, the famous quill of Krug. (p. 73 *supra*) may now be deduced easily. Where *everything* must be, the quill also may be, nay, shall be; and not only the quill, but the agencies that destroy the quill. All arbitrariness, all caprice, is done away with by this one statement. Arbitrariness means nothing more nor less than this: one thing *more* than another, one thing *rather* than another, *without due reason*. Where *all are, equally*, and none more than another; and, further, where everything *is* with its opposite, with its negation, with its *is not*, also, at the same time; there, there is no arbitrariness, no caprice. If we ask, why this particular thing at this particular point of space and time, the reply is: In the first place, the particular space and time of the question have no particularity apart from the particular thing which defines them; so that the particular thing and the particular time and space are inseparable, are even indistinguishable, almost; are one thing in fact, and not three. In the second place, all possible orders

or arrangements, all possible particulars, cannot *actually* be at the same point of space and time, to *one limited* jīva; and yet they are all there also, to him, one *actually* and the rest *potentially*, to satisfy even such a demand. And they are there also actually, *turn by turn*, to that same jīva. On the other hand, *all* possible orders and arrangements and things are *actually* present also at any one point of space and time; but they are so only when we take into consideration all possible constitutions and kinds of jīvas, and see that any one order corresponds to one particular kind of jīva. Thus, the extreme demand that "everything must be everywhere and always"¹ *actually*,

¹ एतावद् एव जिज्ञास्यं, तत्त्वजिज्ञासुनाऽत्मनः,

अन्वयव्यतिरेकाभ्यां, यत् स्यात् सर्वत्र सर्वदा । *Bhagavata*.

'The seeker for the Truth of Self, should find out That which is every-where and al-ways. He should do so by a n u-a y a and v i-a ṭ i-r é k a; by discriminating between what persists and what changes'; i.e., by the method of agreements and differences, or concomitant variations. See pp. 22-23 *supra*.

सर्व सर्वत्र सर्वदा । *Yoga-Vasishtha*. So far as potential presence is concerned, a biological illustration is supplied by the doctrine of biophores, each containing an infinite number of ids or determinants, developing and manifesting by turns. Compare also Leibnitz, *Monadology*: "He who sees all, could read in each what is happening everywhere;" and again, "each monad (jīva) is a living mirror of all the universe." Jevons, in *The Principles of Science*, describes how each atom is a register of all the happenings of all the universe. "What a wonderful revelation to the historian and artist it would be ... if he could stand in a modern gallery and see artists of all ages and generations at work, or talk to writers, dramatists, and philosophers of all times. Yet this is what the scientist possesses in living intensely active Nature"; *The Origin and Nature of Life* (Home University Library), pp. 71-72. The word 'gene' is now in vogue in place of Weismann's 'id', but seems to mean much the same. It may be noted here that such views as Bergson's, of Creative Evolution, and Morgan's, of Emergent Evolution, all *assume* change, of one sort or another, and do not *explain* it; while the view, expounded here, *explains all possible* forms of Change as being always within the Changeless.

as it of course is *potentially*, is also justified and satisfied. Such is the reconciliation of the opposites involved in *Sa m s ā r a*, and explanation of its endless flux, its *a n ā ḍ i - p r a - v ā h a*, beginningless flow, as well as its ever-completeness and rock-like fixity, *k ū t a - s ṭ h a - ṭ ā*. The significance of this will appear more and more as we proceed ; for while all laws exist and operate and interpenetrate simultaneously and pervasively, they cannot, owing to the limitations of speech, be described simultaneously. " Speech proceeds only in succession,"¹ like all other activities of the World-Process.

We see, then, that the negative Not-Self is a mass of positive particulars, and that, at the same time, because of its being in inseparable connection with Self, it necessarily takes on the appearance of the characteristics of Self, and becomes pseudo-eternal, pseudo-infinite, pseudo-unlimited, so that matter appears indestructible through all its changes.²

¹ वाक् किल कमवर्तिनी ; *Yoga-Vasishtha*.

² अविप्रणाशः सर्वेषां कर्मणां, इति निश्चयः ;

महाभूतानि नित्यानि, भूताधिपतिसंश्रयात् ;

तेषां च नित्यसंवासो, न विनाशो वियुज्यताम् ;

कर्मजानि शरीराणि, शरीरऽकृतयः तथा । *Mbh.*

¹ No actions, no body-forms resulting from those actions, no elements, are ever completely annihilated. Because they are connected with, because they are ideated by, the Sovereign Lord of All, the *Eternal Self*, therefore are they also *pseudo-eternal*, *ever-lasting*, *sempiternal*, seeming to disappear, but remaining in potentio in that Ideator, and therefore also re-appearing, endlessly'.

A Sūfi mystic, Jili, in his work *The Perfect Man*, expresses the same fact : 'The existence of God is eternal, and the knowledge (of God)

Though essentially a-saṭ, Nothing, Mūla-prakṛti is yet pseudo-Being, *i.e.*, existent, sa ṭ; though many, and particular, and changing, yet it has a pseudo-oneness, and a pseudo-universality, and a pseudo-changelessness (of laws, *all-ways*); though finite, it is also pseudo-infinite; though dying, it is also pseudo-eternal. It is pseudo-eternal, because it is, not only dying, but, *ever* dying; *ever*, in order to keep pace, as it must, because of inseparability from it, with the eternal Self. It is pseudo-infinite, because it is, not only finite, but, *everywhere* finite; *everywhere*, in order to avoid separation from that same in-finite and omni-present Self from which it may never be separated. The same is the case with all the other characteristics.

*Why the Logion must be taken in Parts, as well
as in the Whole*

Let us now pass on to the question why the Logion has to be taken *in parts*, as well as in the whole.

By opposition to the Unity and unlimitedness of Self, Not-Self is Many and limited. Under these necessary conditions, Self denies Not-Self. But while pure Non-Being, *i.e.*, the *whole* of Not-Self, in being denied, and in order to be effectively denied, becomes simultaneously affirmed, and so becomes a

is eternal, and the object of knowledge is inseparable from the knowledge, therefore it is also eternal"; quoted in translation, by R. A. Nicholson, *Studies in Islamic Mysticism*, p. 128.

multitude of passing and mutually-destructive particulars, *any one of these particulars*, by the very reason of its being limited, being defined in time and space and motion, is, from its own standpoint, *incapable of simultaneous affirmation and denial*. Pure Non-Being may, without objection, be affirmed and denied in the same breath; but a *particular limited something*, which is *a-saṭ* and yet *saṭ*, which is *saḍ-a saṭ*, existent and non-existent, *cannot be both 'simultaneously.'* And yet it must be both, for Absolute-Consciousness contains both the affirmation and the negation of it. *Reconciliation of these contradictory necessities*, these two antinomies of the reason, the solution of this apparently insuperable logical difficulty, is found in the '*successive*' *existence and non-existence* of each limited something. Hence the logion *appears*, (and this appearing is the World-*Proces-sion*), *as divided in two parts*, first 'I (am) this,' and secondly, '(I) this (am) not'; *first* affirmation, *then* negation; *first* the positing by Self of its identity with a possible and therefore actual 'this,' a piece of matter, and *then* the denying of that identity with an impossible and therefore perishing 'this' or piece of matter; *first* birth, *then* death. This 'succession' is *mīṭhya*, mythical, a mere illusion,¹ an appearance; because it is true only from the

¹ That the World-Process is an illusion, is, like so many other 'meta-physical' laws and facts, *visible* even to the 'physical' eyes. That which passes, which is at one moment, and is not the next—how else can it be named and described than as *illusion*? Does it not violate all the so-called laws of thought? Science has been described as organised knowledge. But the World-Process is an Organised Process; Nature has an Organic Unity, is a *parā r̥tha sanghāṭa*, in the words of Sāṅkhya, 'an organisation for the sake of the Self'. Therefore sciences are

standpoint of the limited. Pass into the non-limitation of the Self, by turning the consciousness inwards, whenever and wherever you like, and thence into the fullness of the Absolute, and there is *no succession*. The *whole* of the limited, past, present, and future, is *in* that un-conditioned thought *at once*. The ever-complete and perfect balance of the Absolute *appears*, to the limited, and from its own standpoint, as the successive and continuous *balancing* of things in Samsāra. And this *continuity* of succession, this perpetual resurrection and rebirth, repeated life and death, this recurrence of existence and non-existence, this Becoming between Being and Nothing, this

only *descriptions* of portions or aspects of the World-Process as so organised. And Metaphysic, the Chief of Sciences, which co-ordinates all the others, is therefore only an accurate *description* of the essential facts of the World-Process as completely organised and co-ordinated by the Unity of the Self. Hence the *Chhândogya Up.*, (6-1-6), 'Knowledge of the One is knowledge of the Whole'; (see also *Yoga Sūtra*, iv, 31). There is no other mystery than the Mystery of the One Self. The simplest, the nearest, and dearest, is the truest and deepest; as here, so everywhere; as now, so ever; as thus, so al-ways; as the atom, so the solar system; as the microcosm, so the macrocosm, There is no break in the Law of Analogy, *i.e.*, of Continuity, *i.e.*, of Unity, anywhen and anywhere and anyway. Once this is realised, *all* facts, happenings, laws, so-called errors and so-called truths, *i.e.*, part-truths, all become *self-evident*, (*véda*, 'seen'), matters for mere *description*. There is nowhere any originality or invention. That they are not self-evident to everyone always, as the elementary truths of mathematics are—what does this mean? There are primitive or savage races which cannot count beyond the five of the fingers of one hand. Are the self-evident facts of higher arithmetic, or even the elementary ones of geometry or dynamics, etc., self-evident to them? The self-evident facts of higher mathematics are not self-evident even to the vast majority of the highly civilised. Yet who that has once *arrived* at and *seen* them, after the necessary labour of intellect, can question their self-evidence? It is the *same* with all sciences (and *all* scientific ideas, even those now 'exploded,' each in its own time and place and appropriate aspect); and much *more* so, if possible (as it is *not*) with Metaphysic. Even what is called, and rightly called, error, is self-evident, in the sense that it is Not-Self-evident, as evident as the Not-Self. Numberings, postulates, the directions of force, are all 'arbitrary' assumptions even in exact mathematics.

equivocation between affirmation and denial, may itself be regarded as a third part in the logion ; *viz.*, ' I am not this, but am this other this ; and not this either, but this other this,' and so on, endlessly completing the triplicity which is found every-where because of the triuneness of the Absolute.

Safeguard against Surds

But lest this appearance of succession should seem to introduce something new and foreign to the S v a - b h ā v a , the Nature, of the Absolute, the safeguard, already mentioned in other words, is provided. While each one of a pair of opposites is *succeeded* in a later time in the same place (or *space*) by the other, it is also *coexisted with* in the same *time* in *another* place by that other ; for the endless limited positives that make up the pseudo-unlimited negativity or non-being of the Not-Self, in order to do so, must be *constantly* paired as opposites, so that they *always* counterbalance each other, and so actually leave behind a cipher only, *whenever* the totality of them may be summed up. Thus a *constant* balance too appears in the World-Process, wherein the many coexist with, as well as succeed, each other. The truth of this may be verified in the daily life of human beings as well as the life of kosmic systems. Life to one means and necessarily implies death to another simultaneously, at the same time, and to that one itself successively, *i.e.*, at a later time. Pleasure to one is pain to another, and,

again, to that one, in the same way. So with the rise and decay of the natural kingdoms of minerals, vegetables, animals, men, *ḍévas*, etc., of human kingdoms or nations, of planets and of solar systems, at the expense and the gain, respectively, of one another. That this must be so, is due to the fact that the *Totality* of paired and opposed *Matter* (positive and negative) is *fixed, once for all, as the Whole*, by that unconditioned thought or idea which is the Absolute, and cannot newly be added to or taken away from; that *Totality* being, as said before, always *Zero, equal plus and minus*. Matter is thus uncreatable as well as indestructible.¹ Therefore

¹ There are some very interesting and suggestive statements in the *Pranava Vāda* in the connection, thus, Matter has two kinds, "light atoms" and "dark atoms"; as *Shakṭi*-energy is "affirmative" and negative". In modern scientific writings too there have been speculations about "well-atoms" and "sink-atoms", "light suns" and "dark suns", "vortex-rings" gyrating or spirating in opposite directions, which, when they meet, neutralise each other, and are, to all appearance, annihilated, but still persist in potency, in possibility (and therefore actuality) of revival, as *bīja* or *samskāra*.

A friend asked, "With what negative is this positive book to be paired off?" The reply was, "With the things, wind and weather, heat and dust of summer, damp of rains, worms of many kinds, which are slowly disintegrating it, and will complete its 'non-existence' some day. The book has been formed out of elemental material, and has left blanks, emptinesses, in various places, which are constantly calling for a restoration of the *status quo*. Vast buildings have been raised in all countries, in the passing centuries; walls and towers, as in Babel, temples and pyramids, as in Egypt, India, Mexico, Peru; more recently, thousand, twelve hundred, thirteen hundred feet high sky-scrappers, like Woolworth and Empire Buildings in New York and Lenin Memorial in Moscow. All have been built with materials taken from various places. The *positive* hollows left in those spots are the *negative* opposites of the *positive* buildings, which are the *negative* opposites of the *positive* hollows, in turn. The forces which raised the buildings are perpetually resisted by the forces which are craving to restore the *status quo*, to lead back from *vaiśhāmya*, heterogeneity, to *sāmya*, sameness, homogeneity. These latter began imperceptible wearing down of the buildings simultaneously with their erection; and have completed, or will complete some day, the

what appears as an increase in one place and moment, is necessarily due to a decrease in another place and moment, and *vice versa*. This will appear further in treating of the Law of Action and Reaction.

In these facts, coexistent and successive, combined with the infinity and eternity of Self—against which they are outlined, and which they constantly endeavour to reflect and reproduce in themselves—we find embodied and manifested, continuous movement of all and everything, from place to place and moment to moment ; and also recurring return of all and everything, though only in appearance and not in actuality, to the same position (comparatively, never exactly,), in coexistent surroundings amidst its companion-objects, and also to the same position in the successive order and arrangement of those objects.

This thought, if properly followed out, explains the *Why of Recurring Cycles*, in individual as well as kosmic life ; why history is always repeating itself, in the main outlines ; why every *jīva* and all *jīvas* must pass through all experiences and the same experiences, turn after turn ; how every finite thing, even a passing thought, an atom vibration, the most evanescent phenomenon, is pseudo-infinite and pseudo-eternal, *i.e.*, endless and everlasting ; why there must be an endlessness of veils upon veils, planes within planes, senses besides senses, and elements after elements ; why nothing and no one, levelling down of them and the filling up of the hollows. It is a commonplace of geology that mountains turn into ocean-beds and vice versa, by slow erosions and fillings and liftings, or sudden cataclysms.

atom-dust or solar system, is on the whole, really more important than any other ; why and how the immortality of Self is assured to all ; and how all are yet always graded to each other and bound up, in ever higher and higher range of Unity, in (every consciousness, because all consciousnesses are equally contained in) the One Consciousness.¹

The considerations which explain why the logion is taken in two, or rather, three parts, also explain how three moments are distinguishable in the Absolute. Indeed, the difference between the three parts and the three moments is only the difference between the third person, on the one hand, and the first and second, on the other ; between looking at Self and Not-Self as Being and Nothing, or as 'I' and 'This'. The simultaneity of past, present, and future ; the compression into one point, of behind, here, and before ; the absence of all movement ; these are congenial to the Whole, but are not possible to and in the part and the particular. The positing, the sup-posing (while denying), of Not-Self by Self, the op-posing (while affirming) of Not-Self by Self ; the com-posing of (while negating all connection between) the two by means of Negation ;

¹ In Puranic pictography, this fact of the 'end-less continuous spiral' of the World-Process is described as the 'coils of A n - a n ṭ a - Sh é s h a', the 'ever-unfinished, ever-remaining' Serpent of a thousand heads who bears a world on each head. See the diagram on p. 432 of *The Secret Doctrine*, III. Sh é s h a means 'that which always remains behind as Residuum' ; it also means, in Nyāya, 'the means which look to an end as their residue'. The word is derived from sh i ś h, 'to leave a residue' ; sh é s h a ṭ i, leaves a remainder' ; sh i ś h y a ṭ é, 'is left behind as remnant'.

these three facts, while *simultaneous* in the Absolute, where the whole Self deals with the whole Not-Self, *cannot be such* where a particular, limited, not-self or 'this' is concerned. They can appear only in succession: first sūp-posing, positing, moment of jñāna; then op-posing (after identifying), moment of kriyā; and, intervening between them, or, indeed, enveloping them both and holding them together, com-posing, the moment of ichchhā. Yet, even while so succeeding one another, these moments cannot, as pointed out in the previous chapter, altogether lose the contemporaneousness which belongs to them by right of being in the timeless and successionless Absolute. This synchronousness appears in the fact that when any one *comes* into the foreground, the other two *remain* in the background, and that these also come forward, turn by turn; in short, they succeed, not only one another but, each other, and in incessant rotation.¹

Thus is the World-Process one vast device, or, rather, one vast mass of countless devices, for perpetual reconciling of the opposed necessities of the reason.

Another of the more important consequences issuing from the essential nature, the limitedness, the particularity and manyness, of Mūla-prakṛti, may also be noted.

The distinctions between thought and thing, ideal and real, abstract and concrete, are all immediately due

¹ These facts illustrate the metaphysical 'why' of the continuum of consciousness, in one aspect, the theory of which has been propounded by James Ward, Stout, and others in the West.

to this characteristic, and are in reality nothing more than the distinction between whole and part. From the standpoint of the whole, the Absolute, or even from that of the universal *Pratyag-ātmā*, all possible varieties of Not-Self are 'ideal,' are 'thought,' are parts of the 'abstract' Not-Self, are *thought*, by the Self, *as negated*; but each such variety, from its own standpoint, to itself, is 'real,' is 'thing,' is 'concrete'. The present, to that which is present, is the re-al, while the past and the future are idea-l; but to the eternal, wherein past, present, and future are all present, *all* is ideal, or *all* real (the name does not matter). Because all is present in the *Pratyag-ātmā*, therefore memory of the past and expectation of the future become possible in the *jīva-ātmā*¹ All this will be discussed more fully, later on, in connection with the nature of 'cognition'.

The Special Attributes of Not-Self

We may now consider those special attributes of Not-Self which stand out with prominence in *Saṃskṛt* books. They are *sa t t v a*, *r a j a s*, and *ṭ a m a s*. They correspond exactly to the three attributes of *Pratyag-ātmā*, and arise also from the same compelling necessity of the constitution, *S v a - b h ā v a*,

¹ The Universal Mind of *Pratyag-ātmā* is the sub-supra-consciousness of *jīva-ātmā*, the basis of its memory and expectation, of *ch i t t a m*, the individual mind, which indeed is the individual *jīva* (or *jīva*-atom). *Ch i t t a m* is that which *ch é t a y a t i*, remembers, looks before and after, is conscious, is aware; it is the limited form of the unlimited *C h i t* or *C h i t i*.

essential Nature, of the Absolute, as described by the Logion. It is unnecessary to repeat here all that has been said in this reference before. It will be enough to say that : (a) as Saṭ is the principle of 'action' or activity in Self, so rajas is the corresponding principle in Not-Self, which makes it capable of being acted on, makes it amenable and responsive to all activity, gives it the tendency to active movement, 'mobility or motility'; (b) as Chiṭ is the principle of 'cognition' in the One, so saṭṭva is the principle of 'cognisability' in the Many; (c) as Ānanda is the principle of 'desire' in the Enjoyer, the Subject, so ṭamaś is the principle of 'desirability' in the enjoyed, the Object. They correspond, respectively, to what appears in the particular, i.e., manifest matter, as karma, movement, guṇa, quality, dṛavya, substance¹; and, again, to the Ētaṭ, the Aham, and the Na, respectively, in the Absolute.²

¹ सात्त्विकस्य ज्ञानशक्ती, राजसस्य क्रियात्मिका,

द्रव्यशक्तिस्तामसस्य, तिष्ठश्च कथितास्तव । *Dēvi-Bhāgavata*, III, vii, 26

² The ordinary, current, and, so far, almost exclusively accepted meaning, as goodness-passion-inertia, respectively, of saṭṭva-rajas-ṭamaś, is different; as in the case of Saṭ-Chiṭ-Ānanda, being-consciousness-bliss, also *Gītā*, ch. xviii, deals largely with these three attributes of Mūla-prakṛti: and they are also defined in *Saṅkhyā-Kārika*. At first sight, there seems to be no connection between the meanings assigned here to the two triplets of qualities belonging to Self and Not-Self, and the meaning assigned in current Samskr̥t works. When the ordinary vēdāntī wishes to describe the opposites of Saṭ-Chiṭ-Ānanda, which he vaguely ascribes to Brahma (without making any definite distinction between Brahma and Praṭyag-ātmā), he speaks of anṛta-jaḍa-ḍuhkha, untrue-unconscious-pain, as characterising what he, again vaguely, calls Samsāra, the World-Process, or Pra-pañcha, the 'quintuplicate' or the 'tangled'. This is, for instance, the phraseology employed in *Saṅkshēpa-Shariraka*. These current acceptations are by no means

Such are the three guṇas, rajas, saṭṭva and ṭamas, or, in the order in which they are usually mentioned, saṭṭva, rajas, and ṭamas—the great attributes of Mūlaprakṛti. This usual order has been changed above, in order to make it correspond with the order in which the attributes of Pratyaḡ-ātmā, Saṭ-Chiḡ-Ānaṇḡa, are usually spoken of; *i.e.*, in order to bring out the reflection-and-alliance, the correspondence, between Saṭ and rajas or action-less Being and alterable movement; Chiṭ and saṭṭva, or cognitionless Consciousness and cognisable quality; and finally Ānaṇḡa and ṭamas, or desire-less Bliss and desirable substantiality. With regard to these it has been

incorrect, but they are not the 'whole truth'. They are correct only if regarded as expressing one, and a comparatively less important, aspect or portion of the full significance. A little reflection will show how they naturally arise out of, and are connected with, the interpretations given here. The following statement of the various senses, in which each of these six words is used in Saṃskṛt, will help to show how thought has passed from one shade of meaning to another :

सत्, saṭ, is being, existent, real, true, good, also asserted or assertable, actual ,

चित्, chiṭ, is living, conscious, aware, cognisant ,

आनन्द, ānaṇḡa, is peace, feeling of satisfaction, joy, bliss, pleasure, realisation of desire ;

सत्त्व, saṭṭva, is being, existence, truth, goodness, harmony, living being, energy, illuminating power, vital power ;

रजस्, rajas, is that which colours, dust, stain, blood, passion, restlessness, activity.

तमस्, ṭamas, is darkness, dullness, inertia, confusion, chaos, pain, faintness, sleep.

Saṭṭva, rajas, ṭamas, have often latterly been translated as rhythm, mobility, inertia. But these words indicate only one sub-aspect of each. Saṭṭvika rajas is rhythm, *i.e.*, harmonious or uniform repetition, and the imposition, thereby, of *one*-ness on a series of *many* movements. Rājasa rajas is mobility proper. Tāmasa rajas is inertia, persistent clinging to a state of relative rest or *motion*.

said that 'there is no individual or thing, either on earth here or in heaven amongst the gods, which is free from (*i.e.* devoid of) any one of these three qualities".¹ Their inseparability from each other and from Not-Self, and therefore from Self, follows naturally from all that has gone before. *Devī-Bhāgavata*² states clearly and shows how, while one quality may, nay must, predominate in a certain individual, the others are never, and can never be, entirely absent, even in the case of the high gods, Brahmā, Viṣṇu, and Shiva; though they are ordinarily regarded as wholly rājasa, sāttvika, and, tāmasa, respectively.

The manifestations and results, but not the causes, of these guṇas, are spoken of largely in the current Saṃskṛta works. Nor are any clear and detailed statements as to the correspondences between these triplets of attributes, Saṭ-C hi ḍ-Ā na ṇ ḍ a, r a j a s-s a ṭ ṭ v a-t a m a s, k r i y ā-j ṇ ā n a-i c h c h ā, and k a r m a-g u ṇ a-ḍ r a v y a, available in the extant books. Of course, it is enough, in a certain sense, to group the contents of the World-Process under the categories of saṭṭva, rajas, and tāmas, because, at present, the Mūla-prakṛti or material aspect is the most prominent in human life; but full understanding of their significance necessarily requires knowledge of the other triplets.

This Not-Self, the second of the three ultimates of the World-Process, is not capable of receiving worship,

¹ *Gīta*, xvii, 40.

² III, vi, vii, viii, ix.

or of being made the basis of religious practice, except in the way of study, as the object. But even so, because it is one of the ultimates, it will necessarily lead, in the end, to a recognition of the other two, and so to Peace. To single-minded, disinterested, and unselfish scientists and students of the world of material objects, may be applied the words of Kṛṣṇa: 'They also, ever desirous of the good of all creatures, come ultimately to Me, *the Self*.'¹ Witness the instinctive recognition of Self, in these statements by a man of science: "Science serves life, not life science"; "The world is an idea, or a sum of ideas"; "The actual problem . . . consists not in explaining psychical by physical phenomena, but rather in reducing to its psychical elements physical, like all other psychical, phenomena."² It is not surprising that such recognition should often be imperfect and often distorted, as witness this other statement of the same man of science: "...this monistic conception . . . alone holds strictly to experience . . . and necessarily sets aside the ancient doctrine . . . of the wandering of the soul."³

¹ *Gītā*, xii, 4.

² Max Verworn, *General Physiology*, translated into English by F. S. Lee (1899), pp. 2, 37, 38.

Monism includes Pluralism

³ *Ibid.*, p. 39. Study of physical science, pursued sufficiently far, no doubt leads to monism also; to the realisation that the World-Process is something continuous, unbroken: that the individual is not independent, but part of one continuous whole. But the *aḍvaiṭa* thus reached is generally an external or objective *aḍvaiṭa*, so to say, one in terms of the third person. Further reflection converts it into internal and subjective; transforms it into terms of the first person. To reach *aḍvaiṭa* is to attain *moksha*; and *vichāra*, *vivēka*, thinking, is the way: pondering, reflecting, discriminating, meditating, dwelling on any one of the main aspects or factors of the universe, 'consciousness' (see pp. 26-29, *supra*), or 'will,' 'cause,' 'matter,' or

It is much to have advanced to a recognition of Self ; correction of inaccurate and hasty deductions, is possible only on due study of the nature of that Self. That study will show how there may be, or rather must be, one Self and monism or rather non-dualism, and yet also many selves and "wanderings of souls," at the same time.

'force,' etc. In fact, the seeker may start anywhere, but if he only goes on to the end, he will surely arrive at the same goal. But, it should be noted and remembered, the intellectual attitude of *a b h y ā s a*, perseverant search, must be accompanied by the ethical attitude of *v a i r ā g y a*, passionate rejection of the selfishness of the personal or individual self ; otherwise the Universal Self will remain hidden ; for the plain reason that the eye, which is turned to the finite by selfish desire, cannot see that which is in the opposite direction, the Infinite, to which the eye can be turned only by *un*-selfish desire ; but *when* it is so turned, it simply cannot help seeing It.

NOTE.—Such statements as those of Max Verworn, quoted above, have become increasingly common in the half-century that has elapsed since the appearance of that scientist's book. Modern physicists have begun to say, 'Matter is only Force,' 'Atoms are vortices of *Nothing* ;' which is, perhaps, going to the other extreme. (See leading scientists' opinions collected in *The Essential Unity of All Religions*, pp. 19-26). *Mūla-Prakṛti* (Matter, *M ā ṭ r ā*) and *Daivi-Prakṛti* (Force, *Sh a k ṭ i*, from *ḍ i v*, to shine, to play) are not separable ; but they are distinguishable. *The Secret Doctrine* says, "Fohat digs holes in Space" ; which holes are atoms. The idea seems to be that if you regard Space as a Plenum, then atoms are to be understood or imagined as holes in it (like air-bubbles in a solid lump of glass), by contrast of 'finite individual' against 'In-finite Universal'. *Per contra*, if you look upon Space as a Vacuum, then atoms have to be thought of as 'solid particles', for the same contrast. A brief look into the 500-pages of minute-print Indices (*Secret Doctrine*, Vol. VI of the Adyar edition), at references to 'Atom', 'Fohat', 'Force', 'Space', 'Plenum', 'Vacuum', will convince the reader of the overwhelming character of the very numerous and very different statements regarding each. After a second and a third systematic

reading of the whole work—to say nothing of the much more frequent consultation of particular pages—the mind remains puzzled and bewildered. At the same time, it also remains convinced that the book is not to be lightly put aside, in hopeless revolt against its ‘mysteriousness’, but must be pondered over, again and again. Almost every statement, however dis-jointed-seeming, has some important significance; and each successive pondering brings some new and interesting aspect into view. Anyway, even one reading of the great work, and of *The Mahatma Letters*, leaves the reader in possession of a positive general idea, though cloudy and tantalising, of the law of cyclic and spiral involution-evolution, as governing the Whole World-Process, and the subsidiary law of septenates, as governing at least the solar system to which our earth and our race belong. It also gives a very encouraging glimpse into, and throws light on, the meaning of Purāṇic allegories.

If a few metaphysical principles are drawn from Vé-dānta, and are firmly held and carefully and diligently applied, they may prove a very helpful clue in the labyrinthine jungle of facts and ‘fancies’ (allegories), set out in the books. Their complexity only copies the actual World-Process; and the books themselves insist, over and over again, on the necessity of studying Brahma-vidyā, Ātma-vidyā, Vé-dānta, in order to simplify the complexity, and to *understand* the Nature, of the World-Process, and also to *practise* successfully, the wholesome individual and social life of ‘Dharma, which brings happiness here and hereafter.’ Study of metaphysic is strongly advised in *The Mahatma Letters*, pp. 250, 262.

The reader is invited to peruse carefully, pp. 79-83 of the Proem (in Vol. I, of *The Secret Doctrine*, Adyar edition), at this stage, and consider whether the preceding chapters of the present work help to make any clearer, the connotations of, and the relations between, (1) “Para-brahman, the One Reality, the Absolute, . . . Absolute Consciousness, . . . Absolute Negation, . . . (2) Spirit (or Consciousness) and Matter, Subject and Object. . . . (3) Pre-cosmic Ideation . . . *fons et origo* of (3-a) Force and of all Individual Consciousness; . . . (3-b) Pre-cosmic Root-substance (Mūla-prakṛti), . . . that aspect of the Absolute which underlies all the objective planes of Nature;” (p. 80). On p. 81, it is said :

"Just as pre-Cosmic Ideation is the root of all individual Consciousness, so pre-Cosmic substance is the substratum of Matter in the various grades of its differentiation. . . . Apart from Cosmic substance, Cosmic Ideation could not manifest as individual Consciousness, since it is only through a vehicle that consciousness wells up as 'I am I', a physical basis being necessary to *focus* a Ray of the Universal Mind. . . . The Manifested Universe, therefore, is pervaded by *Duality*, which is, as it were, the very essence of its EX-istence as 'Manifestation'. But just as the opposite poles of Subject and Object, Spirit and Matter, are but aspects of the One Unity in which they are synthesised, so, in the Manifested Universe, there is *that* which *links* Spirit to Matter, Subject to Object. This something is called by Occultists, (4) *Fohat*. It is the 'bridge' by which the (4-a) Ideas existing in the (5) Divine Thought are impressed on Cosmic substance as the 'Laws of Nature'. Fohat is thus the (6) Dynamic Energy of Cosmic Ideation, or, regarded from the other side, it is the (7) intelligent medium, the guiding power of all manifestation, the 'Thought Divine'. . . . Fohat, in its various manifestations, is the mysterious link between Mind and Matter, the (8) *animating principle*" [*prāṇa* in one aspect, *jīva* in another] "electrifying every atom into life." (The figures 1 to 8, in brackets, have been put in by the present writer, in the above excerpt.)

'Absolute Negation', 'Absolute Consciousness', 'I am I', the *Why* and the *How* of the *origin* of *Duality* in or from the 'One Unity'; the metaphysical crux of *such* a Relation between Subject and Object, Spirit and Matter, as will not falsify the Absoluteness of the Absolute Negation;—all these may perhaps be better understood if 'Absolute Negation' and 'I am I' are interpreted in the light of 'I-am-(Not Not)-I'. So, too, Fohat, as 'that which *links* Spirit to Matter,' as 'dynamic energy of Cosmic Ideation,' as 'intelligent Medium, the Thought Divine' and as 'the animating principle'—all this may, perhaps, be better understood, if 'I-(am)-Not-Not-I' is seen as the Supreme Logion (or Logos), *Mahā-vākya*, Great Word, the whole of Cosmic Ideation, Thought Divine, and the One Supreme Law of Nature; if it is seen as the Necessity of the

whirling wheeling round and round each other, in mutual succession, of 'Am' and 'Am-Not', as 'Dynamic Energy'; and if the Desire-Will aspect of 'Am' and 'Am-Not' is seen as 'animating principle', and the subordinate Laws of Nature as 'subsidiary necessities', issuing like corollaries from the One Primal Necessity hidden in the Supreme Logion, and expressed by minor mahā-vākya-s. The succeeding chapters may perhaps help to make the nature of Force-Shakti a little clearer.

The all-important facts or concepts of Space, Time, and Motion, also naturally figure prominently, and are referred to frequently, in H.P.B.'s great work (as the Index indicates amply). But the metaphysical *Why* and *How* of them does not appear to have been expounded in it. An attempt is made in this work, in the preceding, and further endeavour will be made in the succeeding, chapters, to supply this, as well as a few other thoughts or things, out of Saṃskṛt scriptures.

The Mahatma Letters and The Secret Doctrine

In connection with this topic, of *de-finite a-tom* (in-divis-ible, from Gr. *a*, not, and *tonein*, to cut, to divide) and *In-finite* space, the following quotation from *The Mahatma Letters*, pp. 77-78, may be helpful to bear in mind: "The whole individuality is centred in the middle, or 3rd, 4th, and 5th principles. During earthly life it is all in the 4th (Kāma-rūpa, sometimes called Kāma-Manas), the centre of energy, volition, will." *Vēda-Upanishats* say, Kāma-maya éva ayam puruṣaḥ, '(in-divid-ualised) Man is Desire only', i.e., Desire is the *in-divid-ualising*, *focussing*, finitising, defining, de-limiting, principle. Now, that which is Desire-Force in the mental, ideal, 'spiritual', or 'subjective' aspect, that same manifests as Fohat-Force in the physical, real, 'material', or objective' aspect, and makes the in-divid-ual in-divis-ible a-tom. Fohat 'focusses' the Universal, concentrates it, brings It to a point, makes it an in-divid-ual, (as a magnifying glass does the diffused sunshine). It does this by linking, binding (bandha), the whole and Universal I with a part-icle, a part-icular 'this', an 'a-tom', an up-āḍhi, 'I-am-this'. *The Secret Doctrine* defines and describes Fohat and its doings in dozens of ways (vide Index); but this metaphysical idea will probably help to synthesise

them all. The chapters which follow, attempt to expound this idea further. *The Science of the Emotions* deals in *extenso* with the view that 'the individual man is essentially Desire', and Cognition and Volition-Action are adjuncts; and that the fading away of Desire is, *per contra*, the re-universalising of the individual, the resolving and dissolving of the whirlpool, its moksha, releasing, back into the Ocean.

CHAPTER XI

DVANDVAM—THE RELATIVE (CONTINUED)

(C—1.) NEGATION AS SHAKTI-ENERGY—THE RELATION AND THE CAUSE OF INTERPLAY BETWEEN THE SELF AND THE NOT-SELF

THE third factor in the S'v a - b h ā v a, own-being, of the Absolute is n i - s h ē ḍ h a, or p r a ṭ i - s h ē ḍ h a, Negation, denial, 'Not,' or rather the connecting of 'Not' with 'Not-I' by 'I'.¹ From the standpoint of the Absolute, this third factor is not a third, any more than the second is a second; for the third is a negation of the second

¹ स्व-भाव ; नि-षेध, प्रति-षेध. 'Own-being' may be regarded as a variant of 'thing-in-itself'; it is 'self-being,' 'being-in-its-self,' the peculiarity, personality, individuality of the thing; 'temperament' in the mediæval medical phrase; 'constitutional idiosyncrasy' in the modern scientific medical phrase; p r a k ṛ ṭ i, nature, in both Samskr̥ṭ Ḍ a r ś h a n a, i.e., philosophy, and V a i ḍ y a k a, i.e., medicine.

Mula-prakṛti or Matter and Daivi-prakṛti or Force, together, make up the whole S'v a - b h ā v a of Purusha or Praṭyag-ātmā. शक्ति-शक्तिमतोः अमेदः, 'Force and Possessor of Force are not-different, not-separate though distinguishable.'

which is Nothing, No-limited-or-particular-thing, Not-Being ; and, where this is so, it also follows that the first is not a first, for there is nothing left to recognise it by as a first ; the resultant being a Purity of Peace as regards which nothing can be said and no exception taken. The full significance of this Negation, which is the nexus between Self and Not-Self, will appear when we consider the different interpretations, which turn upon it, of the logion, each correct, and each exemplified and illustrated in the universe around us. Thus, the logion Aham-Eṭaṭ-Na may mean :

- (a) M U A. Not Not-Self (,but only) Self (is).
- (b) U A M. Not-self (is, and) Self (is) Not.
- (c) M A U. (Only vacuity, nothingness is, and) Not Self (or) Not-Self.
- (d) A M U. Self (is) Not Not-Self ; or, Self (is) Not (,to the) Not-Self.
- (e) U M A. Not-Self (is) Not Self ; or Not-Self (is) Not (,to) Self.
- (f) A U M. Self (is) Not-Self (and also) Not (it).
- (g) A—U—M. Self—Not-Self—Not, the Absolute wherein all possible permutations are.¹

¹ These permutations are based on statements made in the *Pranava-Vaḍa*, an unpublished Samskr̥t MS., referred to in Note I at the end of Ch. VII (p. 121, *supra*). As explained in detail in that work, Vēḍa, in the full sense of the word, is Cosmic Ideation, *i.e.*, everything, (see footnote, p. 40 *supra*), and the four collections of hymns, currently known as the Vēḍas, in the plural, may be regarded as comparatively small but highly important text-books of superphysical art and metaphysical science.

The question may be legitimately asked : If all these permutations and combinations of the factors of the logion are, as indeed they obviously ought to be, included in Cosmic Ideation, and therefore true in

Such permutations and combinations of Self and Not-Self and Negation give rise to the actual varieties of facts in the universe and to the corresponding beliefs of man ; now to the prevalence of Spirit, now to the

their own times, places, and circumstances, is there any final absolute truth, independently of time, place, and circumstance ; and is there any infallible test of truth ? Who is to judge between the rival claimants of truth ? What will decide ? Is it spiritual experience ? But spiritual experiences differ also ; who is to judge between them ?

These difficulties may be solved thus. Absolute Truth can be only that which totals up, reconciles, and synthesises in itself, all ' other ' truths, showing that they are all relative or partial or half-truths.. If a person says : " No ; errors and heresies are the irreconcilable opposites of *the* truth," then he has to explain how they, (like sin, evil, pain, etc..) came to *be*. If he says, " By the act of God," then ' God ' is his absolute truth wherein the reconciliation is found. What ' God ' means, and how he brings home the ' absolute truth ' of ' God ' creating error, etc., will remain for him to explain, or rather for the questioner and seeker to find out ; for, the person who says errors are irreconcilable and synthesis impossible, has *no use* for absolute truth, *i.e.*, the Absolute ; he is *not* seeking it and does not want it—yet. He is perfectly content with what he has got, and it would be a mistake to try to give to him something else which he does not want ; as food to one not hungry. If there be any special reasons making it right to do so, then the need should first be aroused in him. But the craving for Absolute Truth is not easily aroused from without, by ' another '. It comes from within, through the cyclic processes of life of the individual self. Therefore, among the special and peculiar qualifications mentioned for the student of Vêdânta, the seeker after Brahma, is the *ethical* attitude of *vairāgya*, revulsion from the worldly life and dispassionate compassion for all sufferers, and *śama*, *dhama*, *uparati*, *titikshā*, *śradḍhā*, *samādhāna*, inner subsidence of desire and consequent serenity, self-control over senses, wish for retirement and repose, resigned endurance of whatever befalls, firm faith in one-Self and in the guide and teacher one has chosen with due care, and collected single-mindedness ; *Brhad Up.*, 4. 4. 23 ; *Nṛsimha Uṭṭara Tāpini Up.*, 6 ; Shankara, *Shārtraka Bhāshya*, I. i. 1.

न अनुभूय, न जानाति, जंतुर्विषयतीक्ष्णताम् ;

निर्विद्येत स्वयं तस्मान् ; न परैर्मिन्नधीः पुनः । *Bhagavaṭa*, VI, iv, 41.

Daksha, reprimanding Nārada, (who has led Daksha's young sons astray, preaching *vairāgya* to them), says : ' Without experience of the sharpness, the intensity, of the objects of sense, there can be no surfeit and no real, lasting, revulsion therefrom ; the *jīva* should, therefore, turn from the world, *suo motu* ; not mis-led prematurely by others.'

triumph of Matter, again to the reign of *pralaya*; to dreaming, waking, and sleeping; to subjective monism or idealism, objective monism or materialism, *shūnyavāda* or nihilism, pantheism, solipsism, dualism, absolutism, etc. (corresponding broadly, not strictly, to *a*, *b*, *c*, etc., above, respectively) and all other possible forms of beliefs.¹ All these permutations mean only the

But as soon as the craving *is* aroused, the possibility of fulfilling it is aroused also. So soon as, and no sooner than, a question forms in the mind, the answer begins to form also. In fact the question is the first part of the answer. As soon as a person says, "I want the Absolute Truth," he means, "I want something which will reconcile, synthesise, *explain*, and not merely condemn and abuse, all truths other or less than this ideal Absolute Truth"; and, as soon as he *means* that, he is on the track of it, he has got hold of a vital feature of it. "It takes two to tell the truth, one to tell it and one to *hear* it"; 'truth is truth to *him* who believes it'; 'the one *test* of truth is the belief of the *believer*', if you convince a person that what he has believed so far is *not* true, then you have created a new belief in *him*; therefore *he*, the I, the Self, the One We, is the final, universal, absolute test of Truth. 'Self-evidence' is the absolute test and the Absolute Truth. He who asks, "Who is to judge?" understands the answer, "The judge must be common, impartial, equally benevolent to him, you, me, all the parties, and, here, such is the Self"; and he who asks "What is to prove," will understand the answer, "Self-evidence," the evidence of the Self, by, to, and in the Self. The western school of thinkers who said 'conceivability' was the test, really meant this. 'Spiritual experience' is nothing distant and mysterious. *All a-pa-roks ha*, *direct* 'experience,' which *comes home*, whether cognitive, emotional, or actional, is such; and whether of physical or of superphysical and subtle things. It attains its highest degree, its 're-alisation', its 're-ality', its 'act-uality', when all these aspects of the consciousness coalesce, when the individual's *cognition* is so clear and certain that he feels or *desires* and also *acts* accordingly. The faith that maketh martyrs witnesseth itself. See pp, 22-23, 96, *supra*.

¹ इति नाना प्रसंख्यानं तत्त्वानां ऋषिभिः कृतम् ।

सर्वं न्याय्यं युक्तिमत्त्वात्; विदुषां किमशोभनम् । *Bhagavata*, XI, xxii.

'The seers have thus explained the fundamental constituents and features of the universe in various ways. Each way is just, because of its own special reasons. The wise see no conflict and no lack of beauty in any.'

Each preceding view leaves behind an un-reduced surd, and consequent discontent, which grows slowly. When the last view is reached,

accentuating, in different degrees, of the factors of the Logion severally. If we emphasise them all equally, then we find the Peace of the Absolute left-untouched; because the net result, of the three being taken in combination, is always a neutralising, a balancing, of opposition, which may indifferently be called fullness or emptiness, peace or blankness, "the voice, the music, the resonance of the silence"; because the three, A, U, and M, are verily simultaneous, are in inseparable combination, are not amenable to arrangements and re-arrangements, to permutations and combinations; and these last merely *appear*, but appear inevitably, only when the *whole* is looked at from the standpoint of a *part*—an A, a U, or an M, which is necessarily bound to an order, a succession, an arrangement. And yet also the whole multitude and Turmoil of the World-Process is *in* that Peace; for 'No-thing,' Not-Self, is 'all things destroying each other,' and Negation is 'abolition of all these particular things'; and 'I' is that for the sake of which, and in and by the consciousness of which, all this abolition takes place. This is the true significance of the Sāṅkhya doctrine that Prakṛti, Not-Self, displays herself and hides herself incessantly, only in order to provide an endless foil for the Self-realisation, the amusement,

no surd remains; all views are reconciled; each is seen to have its own beauty and duty. From one standpoint, pantheism may appear as a combination of I and Not-I only, rather than as a permutation of all three factors of the Logion. But (f) above may be interpreted as Spinoza's pantheism, *viz.*, that A and U, Thought and Extension, (Mind and Matter), both, are two aspects of that which is Not-describable otherwise; or as Pope's pantheism, *viz.*, "The universe is one stupendous whole, whose Body Nature is and God the soul".

of Purusha, Self.¹ In such interplay, both find everlasting and inevitable fullness of manifestation, fullness of realisation, and unfettered recreation.

Metaphysical Catalysis

¹ Compare H. Ellis, *Psychology of Sex*, Vol. III, p. 95 ("Love and Pain"): "... The male is active and the female passive and *imaginatively attentive* to the states of the excited male ... The female develops a superadded activity, the male becoming relatively passive and *imaginatively attentive* to the psychical and bodily states of the female. ..."; and the well-known doctrines, of Sāṅkhya, *viz.*, that Purusha is the actionless Spectator of the movements, the dance, of Prakṛti; and of Vēdānta, *viz.*, that the juxtaposition or coexistence of Purusha and Prakṛti, (the metaphysical archetypes of sex), superimposes, causes a *ḍ h y ā s a* of, the characteristics of each upon the other, by *v i - v a r ṭ a*, inversion.

The mere presence and proximity of a person of one sex is enough to produce *some* excitement (not necessarily lustful at all) in a person of the other sex. The Sāṅkhya description of Prakṛti *exhibiting* Herself to the *watching* Purusha, and shrinking away ashamed, as soon as the latter loses interest and turns away His eyes—this is, literally, an expansion, to the Universal and Infinite scale, of the facts of daily sex-life; and the latter are, conversely and obversely, the contraction to the finite scale, of the Infinite Fact, of the never-ceasing Drama of the Interplay of the Eternal Masculine and the pseudo-Eternal Feminine.

पुरुषस्य दर्शनार्थं, कैवल्यार्थं, तथा, प्रधानस्य,

पंगु अन्धवद्, उभयोर् अपि संयोगः, तत्कृतः सर्गः ।

प्रकृतेः सुकुमारतरं न किञ्चिद् अस्ति, इति मे मतिर्भवति,

या दृष्टाऽस्मीति पुनर्न दर्शनं उपैति पुरुषस्य ।

Sāṅkhya Kārikā, 21 and 16.

¹ In order that Purusha may see Prakṛti and then retire into Soli-tude, and that Prakṛti may show Herself (and then shrink away), the two come together; as may the lame man who cannot walk but can see, and the blind man who can walk but cannot see, in order to help each other. Very modest, shy,

The why of the movement of this Interplay, of to and fro, identification and separation, action and reaction, has been already dealt with, in one aspect, in the previous chapter. It will have appeared from what was said there, that the Negation *necessarily appears*, and *can* only appear, in the *limited* as, *first*, an affirmation, and *then*, a negation.

We may now consider a little more fully the nature of the affirmation and the negation. The statement, repeated from time to time, that negation hides affirmation *within* it, and as *preceding* it in time, should be clearly grasped. In the logion, Ego Non-ego Non (*est*), the bracketed *est*, (or *sum*), is the hidden affirmation. A little reflection shows that it should be so, and must be so, quite unobjectionably; that thought can detect no fault in the fact. Take away the *est*, not only from the sentence but really from consciousness, and the remaining three words lose all coherent meaning. To deny a thing, it is necessary first to describe it, to allege it as at least a supposition, a hypothesis; and to describe it, is to postulate for it at least a false, an assumed,

sensitive, is Prakṛti; for having shown herself, and been seen, if the spectator turns away, she vanishes.' The chemical phenomenon of catalysis seems to correspond to the psychological phenomenon of "imaginative attention" and its effects upon that which is attended to. The watering of the mouth in the presence of a tasteful edible; the expanding of the eyes or the nostrils, in that of a beautiful form or color or fragrant perfume—all these are variants of the same fact. In all cases, of course, the perceiver must be 'interested' and 'pursuant'; not 'tired' and 'renunciant'.

existence. In order that Non-Ego may be denied, it must first be alleged as at least a supposition. For this reason, and for the reason that affirmation and negation cannot be contemporaneous in a single, particular, limited, thing, it comes about, as we have seen, that the logion, for the purposes of the limited, in order that the limited may exist and appear and be a fact at all, necessarily falls into two parts, (a) Ego Non-Ego, and (b) Non-Ego Non. The first contains implicitly, hidden in its stated words, the word *est* or *sum*, for otherwise it has no meaning; and the second part also similarly contains implicitly within it the same word *est* or *sum*, which alone gives it any significance. For the reasons already partially explained in chapters VII and IX, the affirmation and the negation respectively take on the form of an identification of Self with Not-Self, and of a separation from it. The mere unconcerned assertion, in the third person, of the being or the non-being of Non-Ego, has no interest for Self; it has no motive for making such an apathetic assertion. Such indifferent statement about another would have no reason to justify it, to make it necessary, to explain why it came to be made at all. It cannot be said that Not-Self is a fact, and so has an existence independent of the motives and reasons and interests of Self; because it has been settled at the outset that Not-Self cannot be, must not be, is not, independent of Self, but very dependent thereon for all such existence as it has. Therefore it follows necessarily that the assertion and denial of that Not-Self by Self should be connected with a purpose in

Self, should immediately subserve some interest in that Self. The only purpose and interest that there can be, in that which is Ever-Perfect, Full, Desireless, and therefore Purposeless, is Self-recognition, Self-definition, Self-realisation, Self-maintenance, Self-preservation, Self-assertion. The eternal Self requires nothing in reality from outside of it-Self; it is only ever engaged in the one pastime of asking: "What am I? what am I? am I this? am I this?" and assuring itself: "No, I am not this, I am not this, but only My-Self." This pastime,¹ it must be remembered, which, from the standpoint of the 'this' is repeated again and again, is from the standpoint of the 'I' but one single, eternal, and changeless act of consciousness in which there is no movement. Thus, therefore, the affirmation necessarily takes on the form of an identification of 'I' with 'Not-I,' and the negation, that of the dis-identification, the separation, of 'I' from 'Not-I'. The logion is not merely a neutral statement of the non-entity of 'Not-I'.

The affirmation, then, Ego est Non-Ego, not only imposes on 'Not-I' the Being which belongs inherently to Self, but also, for the time, makes it identical with the Self, *i.e.*, a self; and at this stage, that is to say, in the separation of the two parts of the logion, because 'Not-I' is always a particular, a limited something, it takes on its most significant character and name, *viz.*,

¹ लोकवत् तु लीलाकैवल्यम् । *Brahma-Sūtra*, II, i, 32. Līlā is pastime. A western writer has said well that "The history of man is one long search for God". Vēdānta and Sāṅkhya-Yoga instruct us how "The history of the whole universe is one eternal search-and-finding by Self of It-Self". See f. n. 2 on p. 84, *supra*.

'this,' *i ḍ a m* ', or 'é ṭ a ṭ,' as it is called in Samskr̥ṭ books. Side by side, also, with this change of name of Not-Self, (which does not mean any change of nature, but only indicates the special and most important aspect and manifestation of the nature of Not-Self), the bracketed *est* becomes *sum*, and the first part of the logion becomes: 'I (am) this.' In continued consequence of that same reason, the second part of the logion becomes: 'This not (am I),' having the same meaning as, 'I am not this,' with a special significance, *viz.*, that in the actual World-Process, in every cycle—whether it be the daily waking and falling to sleep of the individual human being, or the *s a r g a* and *p r a l a y a*, creation and dissolution, of world-systems—the I-consciousness begins as well as ends the day, the period of activity and manifestation. The new-born baby's first shut-eyed feeling in the morning is the vague feeling of a self, in which of course a not-self is also present, though a little more vaguely; and his last shut-eyed feeling in the evening is the same vague feeling of a self returning, from all the outward and gradually dimming not-self, into its own inwardness and sleep. The order of the words in Samskr̥ṭ, *Aham-Éṭaṭ-Na* (*a s m i*), expresses this fact; and it expresses something additional also, for *a s m i*, '(I) am,' indicates that the individual 'I', at the end of the day's work, is, as it were, fuller, has more deliberate and definite self-consciousness, than it had at the beginning thereof.

The 'this,' it now appears, is, in the first place, the *u p ā ḍ h i*, the body, the sheath, or the organism,

which the individualised spirit occupies, owns, identifies itself with, and, again, rejects and casts away ; and, in the second place, it is all the world of 'objects' with which the Spirit *may* identify itself, which it *may* possess and own as part of itself, as belonging to itself, and again renounce, in possibility.

Thus, through the dual nature of Negation, dual by reflection of the being of Self and the non-being of Not-Self, is kept incessantly moving, that revolving wheel of Samsāra of which it has been declared : 'That wherein all find living, that wherein all find rest, that which is boundless and shoreless—in that tire-less wheel of Brahma, turneth round and round the h a m - s a, the swan, because, and so long as, it believeth itself to be separate from the mover of the wheel ; but when it recogniseth its own oneness with that Self which ever turneth the wheel, it forthwith cometh to rest, and attaineth the Peace of Immortality.' 'So-ham,' is the jīva that recognises the

सर्वाजीवे सर्वसंस्थे बृहन्ते तस्मिन् हंसो भ्राम्यते ब्रह्मचक्रे,
पृथग् आत्मानं प्रेरितारं च मत्वा ; जुष्टततस्तेन अमृतत्वम् एति ।

Shvetāshvatara, i, 6.

Gītā also speaks of the *chakra* of the World-Process (ii, 16). The 'cyclical' movement of the World-Process, in space and in time, is a patent fact ; its reason is to be found in the alternating, rhythmic, succession of the two parts of the logion. *Chakra*, *kuklos*, cycle, circle, are etymologically allied. The same idea, as expressed by *b h r a m a* or *b h r ā n ṭ i* appearing in Brahma, 'wandering and straying round and round in space,' has been referred to on p. 159, *supra*. To run round and round in circles, as the orbs of space are doing, like puppies chasing their own tails, is to be aimless, mistaken, illusion-ed.

identity of the Universal Ego with the individual ego in the words 'Sah Aham,' 'That am I'; whereas 'ham-sa' (which, as an ordinary word, means the migrating swan, recurrently, periodically, flying to and fro between the arctic and the temperate zones, between cold and heat), is the reversal and contradiction of this recognition, and indicates the *jīva* (migrating recurrently

The word *bhrama* covers all these meanings, all these analogies. Say that 'chasing one's own tail' is 'chasing one's own Self', and the aimless becomes the aimful; the illusion-ed, becomes the illumin-ed. To put it in another way: This verse of the *Upanishat* pictures the *vi-varṭa* view. Believing it-self to be an infinitesimal speck, the *jīva* rushes round and round, trying to achieve Infinity by encompassing *all* Space. It does so, because, though outwardly believing itself to be limited, finite, inwardly it knows it-self to be Infinite; and the endless circling and cycling is due to the necessity of making the Outer belief *One* with the Inner; and thus abolishing the restless and intolerable pain of inconsistency and conflict. So soon as the *jīva* discovers that it is It-Self this Infinite Space, that It has that Space *within* It-Self, instead of It-Self being within It, so soon is the *vi-varṭa*, 'reversal' of outlook, change of attitude, completed. It is the same with Time and Motion. The 'solid' substantial speck or atom, which the *jīva* formerly identified itself with, in 'empty' Space, now begins to be seem as a 'vacuum'-bubble ('koilon'), a 'vortex of nothing', (mere 'imagination'), in a Plenum of Consciousness. There is a reversal, *vi-varṭa*, in all aspects and respects. The world is seen in a 'new' light. Every-thing becomes 'new'; 'प्र'कर्षेण सर्वं 'नवी'करोति इति 'प्र-णवः'; 'because it makes everything seem *new*, therefore is it called *Pra-ṇava*'. 'The solid-seeming world doth vanish like a cloud, nor leaves a wrack behind'; becomes a dream, when 'man, most ignorant of what he's most assured, his glassy essence', casts off that i-gnor-ance, a-vidyā, recovers vidyā, wisdom, assurance of his glassy essence, his Self, the Self of all.

between 'this world' and 'that world', and also from body to body) which does not recognise its identity with the 'I'. Two arcs, and two only, and always, are there in the endless revolution of this wheel. On the first arc, that which *is not*, 'This,' appears as if it *is*; it takes 'name and form,' 'a local habitation and a name,' and predominates over Self. This is the *Pravṛtṭi-mārga*, Path of Pursuit, whereon the individualised self feels its identity more and more with some not-self, separates itself more and more from the Universal Self, runs after the things of sense, and takes them on to itself more and more. But when the end of this first arc of his particular cycle comes, then it inevitably undergoes *vivēka* and *vairāgya*,¹ discriminative, reflective, introspective, intense thinking and surfeit, and turns round on to the other arc, the *Nivṛtṭi-mārga*, Path of Renunciation; on which, realising more and more its identity with the Universal Self, it separates itself more and more from the things of sense, and gradually and continually gives away all that it has acquired of Not-Self to other *jīvas*, who are on the *Pravṛtṭi-mārga* and need them. Thus, while on the first arc, Not-Self, falsely masquerading as a self, prevails, and the true Self is hidden, on the second arc the true Self prevails, and that Not-Self, or

¹ See pp. 12, 18. *Vi-vēka* is discrimination between *nitya* and *anitya*, the Permanent and the Fleeting; and *vai-rāgya* is the co-efficient revolt against all selfish desire for fleeting things and sorrow-pervaded joys. The Permanent appears to the *jīva* first as the lasting, then as the ever-lasting, and only finally as the true Eternal, the *opposite* or *vi-varṭa* of the other two, in correspondence respectively with the three answers (chs. ii and vii, *supra*).

the false self, is hidden and slowly passes out of sight. To him who sees with the ' eye of matter ' only, incognisant yet of the true Self, the *jīva* seems to live and grow on the first arc, and to decay and die on the second, and be no more at the end of it. The reverse is the case to the ' eye of spirit '. What the truth is, of both and in both, is clear to him who knows the *S v a - b h ā v a* of the Absolute, and the perfect balance between Spirit and Matter.

Inasmuch as ' this-es ' are endless in number and extent of temporal and spatial limitation, cycles are also endless in number and extent, ranging from the smallest to the largest ; and yet there are no smallest and largest, for there are always smaller and larger. Again, cycles and periods of activity are always and necessarily being equally balanced by corresponding periods of non-activity ; and *vice versa*. Further reasons for this may appear later on, in connection with the Law of Action and Reaction, and the nature of Death. Thus *s a r g a*, emanation, is succeeded by *p r a l a y a*, dissolution, and the latter by the former, endlessly, on all possible scales ; and their minute intermixture and complication is pseudo-infinite. Thus are the names justified, of *n i ṭ y a - s a r g a*, continual incessant creation, and *n i ṭ y a - p r a l a y a*, perpetual unremitting destruction. From this complication it results that there is no law belonging to any one cosmic system, small or large, which *the limited jīva* can divine and work out, *on limited data*, with the lower reason, *i.e.*, the understanding or *m a n a s*, of which law there is no

breach and to which there is no exception ; and, again, there is no breach which will not come under a higher law belonging to another and larger system ; that ultimately, ' order ' and ' disorder ' are both equally illusions, both essentially subjective, both ' such stuff as dreams are made of '. The pure or higher or transcendental reason or *buḍḍhi*, sees the necessity of both, the particular law and the breach of that law, from the standpoint of the all-inclusive Absolute.¹

¹ The distinction between *buḍḍhi* and *manas* has been indicated before and will become clearer as we proceed. Briefly, Universal Mind, unconscious or sub-conscious or supra-conscious omniscience, reason which relates together all things at once and is ' pure ' from all admixture of motivation and therefore limitation, obscuration, perversion, or aberration by selfish egoistic desire—and, so far as possible, the manifestation of such pure reason in the individual consciousness also—is *Buḍḍhi*. Individual mind, dominated by egoism, its vision coloured and narrowed by a particular interest, not made transparent and world-wide by the ' pure ' wish to know *all*, for the sake of the ' deliverance ' of all—such egoistic mind, manifesting in and by *attention* to a *particular* object, is *Manas*. Indeed, such *manas* is the *jīva* itself. (*Vide* the quotation from *Yoga-Vāsishtha* in the foot-note at p. 32, *supra*, and *Gītā*, XVI. 17, and III. 29).

In terms of the logic, we might put it thus. Universal I, ideating the whole of Not-I, is Universal Mind, *Mahāt*, *Mahān-Ātman*, *Vishṇu*, etc. ; from the standpoint of the individual I, this Universal Mind is the unconscious, sub-conscious or supra-conscious ; it is *buḍḍhi* or ' pure ' reason or *śhūḍḍha-jñāna*, in the fullest sense, reason here being not the step-by-step arguing intelligence, but the all-relating awareness, all-grasping intuition. The same Universal, when faintly individualised (the ' We ' aspect predominant, the ' I ' aspect very subordinate, the egoistic intensity and limitation unaroused and undefined by strong desire), and

Having thus very cursorily indicated some of the most important features of the Interplay of Self and Not-Self in the World-Process, as arising out of the

ideating the most general aspects of the things that make up Not-I, with the faintest trace of succession, is *buddhi* in manifestation, cognising metaphysical, mathematical, scientific generalisations. The same I, when ideating not-I's, 'this-es', in the predominantly particular and singular aspects, itself being focussed or canalised by definite egoistic desire, is *manas*, the outstanding feature of which is 'attention,' whereby the 'hot point' or focus in the *field* of consciousness changes from place to place. (See William James, Stout, Hoffding, etc.) The ability to direct this power of 'attention' deliberately and effectively, by practice in inhibition, *nirōḍha*, of psychoses that are not wanted, and in contemplation, *saṃ-yama*, of, and focussing on, that which is wanted, is *yogāsiddhi*, achievement, accomplishment (of attentional mind-power, mental force; achievement of which ability is the first practical object of applied psychology, *i.e.*, Yoga). (Bergson's writings help to illustrate this.)

In the more definitely individualised I, which is the *manas* above-mentioned, compounded of 'I' and 'not-I,' 'jīva' and 'atom,' the *reflection*, of the Universal *Buddhi* above-mentioned, appears as intellect, also called *buddhi* in Samskṛt, with the function of *jñāna* or cognition; the reflection of the 'I' appears as *aḥam-kāra* with the function of desire-emotion; and the reflection of *manas* itself as the *manas* again, with the function of conation and action. The summation of these three functions is called *chittā*; which, however, has a function of its own, memory, which, again, is, so to say, the Universal Mind in the individual, the infinite storehouse out of which the individual, by attention, draws, in succession, what it wants, and into which it merges, when the whirling harmonogram of *vāsanā*-desire, the will to live as a separate individual, *trishṇā*, libido, which makes *chittā* what it is, disappears in *moksha* or *pralaya* (for the time being). The theosophical doctrine of *Ātmā-Buddhi-Manas* seems to be in accord with these ideas.

affirmative-negative nature of the third factor of the Absolute, we may next deal with the *Cause* of the Inter-play, from another standpoint than that taken up in Chapter X, in connection with the question *why* parts appear in the logion.

For illustration by analogy, we may say that the person in deep sleep represents Absolute Consciousness; just before full waking, while he is taking a prospective view of the whole of the coming day's work, he represents *buddhi*; when awake and actually engaged in a piece of the work, *manas*. At the end of this chapter will be found a collection of relevant Samskr̥t quotations in a separate note. It seems to be an important, perhaps even fundamental part of Yoga-discipline, to 'wake up' the soul and make it *conscious* in the region of what is now its *un*-conscious. A Master has said that a disciple progresses through "soul-struggles by night". The meaning seems to be that the disciple should *fix* in his mind, during the day, the determinate *resolve* that he *will not* allow himself to become, in the night, the puppet of his dreams; *i.e.*, of his 'unconscious' lower desires, carnal passions, etc., which come out, like thieves in the night, and secure indulgence and satisfaction for themselves, by creating the images, fancies, phantasies, dramatic scenes, situations, of the dreams; and which, the disciple has prevented his mind from entertaining during his waking hours; (or, in other words, which desires of the lower mind have been kept at bay by the disciple's higher mind, during the waking hours); and that, by such fixed resolve, he becomes more and more able to *struggle* against those base fancies; he can more and more *consciously* prevent them from arising, even during the dreams; and his dream-life, therefore and thereby, becomes, so to say, a continuation of his day-life, part of his waking consciousness. The same Master has said elsewhere (but my memory here is faint and doubtful) that he, the Master, sleeps without dreaming at all, the three or four hours, out of the twenty-four, that he ordinarily spends in bed. In this way, the 'individual', progressing on the Upward Path becomes

It has been said that this multitudinous process of Saṃsāra takes place through Negation, and the word 'necessary' and its derivatives have been used from time to time, all along, in accounting for step after step of the deduction. It is clear that Negation, with its included affirmation, is only a description of the Relation between Self and Not-Self. It stands between them as a nexus between two termini. It inheres in the two, and is nothing apart and separate from them; by itself it can do nothing; but, as being the combined Nature of the two, it explains, expounds, accounts for, and supports the infinitely complex process of Saṃsāra. This combination of the Nature of the Two into the dual Negation constitutes the *Necessity* of the movement involved in the Logion.¹ This Necessity requires no support or justification; it is self-evident at every step of the deduction; it plainly inheres in, and is part of more and more perfectly self-controlled on all planes of his being, more and more Master of him-Self.

Persistent introspection, praṭya k - chēṭa n ā; tracing semi-consciously, even during the dream, its occurrence to the influence of incidents which have actually taken place in the day; maṇṭra - japa, continuous inner silent recitation of some 'sacred words of power'; willing and praying to the All-pervading 'Power', for 'power' to resist evil thoughts, and bring in good ones only—all this helps the *soul* to *struggle* successfully.

¹ A *fact* is a necessary fact, a *necessity*. Every event is its own justification. When a fact is, so to say, violently and arbitrarily disrupted, and insistently pieces itself together in a new synthesis, a new form, the disruption is said to have been followed by its *necessary* consequence, illustrating the law of causality, which is the Law of Identity, *i.e.*, Identity persisting through apparent changes in succession.

the nature of, the three factors of the triune Absolute, which have been sufficiently explained, justified, and established, before. For, remember, this nature is not three separate natures—or even two separate natures, belonging to three or two separate, or even separable, factors of the Absolute—but is only *One Single and Changeless Nature*, the Nature of 'I' *denying that It is 'Not-I'*. Whatever may be distinguished or said of Not-Self and Negation, or of their respective natures, can be said only by the courtesy of that Supreme Nature which is the source, the essence, and the whole, indeed the very Nature, of what we call their natures. Bearing this in mind, we may easily see that this Supreme and changeless Nature is *Ni-ya-ṭi*, the 'fixed', *Ā v a ś h y a k a - ṭ ā*, *Necessity*,¹ i.e., the nature of the *Whole*, that which must be always, that which cannot be changed and avoided. This Necessity is the One Law of all Laws, because it is the nature of the changeless, timeless, Absolute; all other laws flow from it, inhere in it, are included within it. It is the Primal Power, the One Force, the all-compelling Supreme Energy, in and of the World-Process, from which all forces are derived, and into which they all return; because they are inseparable from it, are only its endless manifestations and forms.

¹ If 'Necessity' is derived from *ne*, not, and *cessum*, to yield, to give up, and means 'that which will not yield', then it is literally the same as *ā-v-a-ṣ-h-y-a-k-a-ṭ-ā*, that which is beyond *v-a-ś-h-a* or control, that which cannot be checked. The word *niya-ṭi* (*niṭa-rām*, wholly, *yam*, to control) is used frequently in *Yoga Vāsishtha*, in the sense of 'fixed' necessity. *Dishta* is another Samskr̥t word with an allied sense, 'destiny', 'fated', 'ordained', 'doomed'; from *ḍish*, to direct, order, point out the direction (*ḍi-ś-h-ā*, *ḍeś-h-a*) in which to go.

Its unbreakable and unalterable Oneness and Completeness appears in the facts of the Conservation of Energy ; and of Motion (which undergoes transformations only, and never suffers any real reduction, so that the distinction between *static* and *kinetic* is at bottom illusory, *apparent* only, and, in reality, one of only comparative degree); and the Indestructibility of Matter, which manifests in ever-new ways, ever-new qualities, but is never changed in the Total quantity ; for the Absolute may not be added to nor subtracted from. It is Absolute Free-Will, which is called in the sacred books by the name of Mâyā-Shakṭi, Impersonal Goddess of a thousand names and a thousand hymns ; ' who alone is in reality worshipped by every worshipper, either as Nirguṇā

१ चैतन्यस्य समायोगात् निमित्तत्वं च कथ्यते ।

प्रपञ्चपरिणामाच्च सहकारित्वमुच्यते ।

केचित्तां तपः इत्याहुः, तमः केचिज्, जडं परे,

ज्ञानं, मायां, प्रधानं च, प्रकृतिं, शक्तिम्, अपि अजाम् ।

विमर्शः इति तां प्राहुः शैवशास्त्रविशारदाः ।

अविद्याम् इतरे प्राहुर्वेदतत्त्वार्थचिन्तकाः ।

एवं नानाविधानि स्युर्नामानि निगमादिषु ।

Dēvi Bhāgavatā, VII, xxxii,

' Shakṭi becomes an *Efficient Cause*, *nimitta*, by conjunction with Consciousness, *Chaitanya*; and a necessary *Condition*, concomitant, *sahakāri*, (or *sādhārāṇa*, *a-prthak-siddha*, *upa-kāraṇa*) in transformations of objects. Some call Her *Tapas*, some *Tamas*, *Jada*, *A-jñāna*, *Mâyā*, *Prakṛti*, or *Ajā*. Shaivas name Her *Vimarsha*; *Vaidikas*, *A-vidyā*. Such are Her many names in the Nigamas, traditions, of different thinkers and worshippers.'

रुद्रहीनं विष्णुहीनं न वदन्ति जनाः किल ;

शक्तिहीनं यथा सर्वे प्रवदन्ति नराधमम् । *Ibid.*, III, vi.

Vidyā or as Saguṇā A-vidyā; because she ensouls all the million forms that human beings worship, each according to his heart's desire. It includes in itself the characters, or rather the single character, of all the Three Ultimates, and it thereby becomes another expression for and of the Absolute, viz., Becoming. Thus, a hymn, personifying Shakti in imagination, utterly inseparable though she is from the Absolute, and therefore impersonal, exclaims: 'Thou art the consort of the most high Brahma.'¹ This Necessity is the cause of all causes, kāraṇaṁ kāraṇānāṁ,² and all other so-called necessities are but reflections of it.

We may appropriately consider the meaning of 'Cause' in this connection. From the standpoint of psychology, as has been shown over and over again by various acute and accurate thinkers in many lands, the world is an endless succession of sense-impressions; and the idea of absolute necessity, which we associate with the successions that are described as cause and effect, is a mere hallucination produced by the fact that a certain succession has been invariable so far as our experience has gone. This view is correct so far as it goes; but

प्रणवार्थस्वरूपां तां भजामो भुवनेश्वरीम् । *Ibid.*, VII, xxviii.

'When men wish to express contempt for a (feeble, lethargic, inert, spineless) person, they do not call him Rudra-less or Vishṇu-less, but Shakti-less, Power-less, Energy-less. We meditate on Her, the Sovereign Goddess of the Universe, as the very Meaning, the whole significance, of Praṇava, AUM.'

¹ त्वं असि परमब्रह्ममहिषी ; Shankara, *Ānanda-Lahari*.

² कारणं कारणानां ।

only so far as it goes. It does not go far enough. It does not explain satisfactorily the 'Why' of the hallucination. Indeed, some holders of the view refuse to deal with a 'Why' at all. They content themselves with a mere description, a 'How'. But others will not rest within such restrictions. They must understand *how* and *why* there come to be a 'How', and a 'Why' at all in our consciousness; how and why we talk of 'because' and 'therefore' and 'for this reason'. It is true that every so-called law of nature is only "a *résumé*, a brief description, of a wide range of perceptions,"¹ but why is there any uniformity in the world at all, such as makes possible any such *résumé* or brief description?

The explanation of all this is that each 'why,' each generalisation, each law, is subsumed under a wider and wider law, till we come to that final and widest law, the Logion; which is the *résumé*, the Sva-bhāva, the nature, of the Absolute, which, Sva-bhāva, because of its Changelessness, requires *no further* 'why'.

¹ Pearson's *Grammar of Science*, p. 132, 1st edn.

² यद् अपरिणामि तद् अकारणम् । 'The unchanging is the uncaused.' The series of 'whys,' with reference to actions, 'Why did you do this?' 'Because of this,' 'Why that?' 'Because of that,' etc., ceases when the reply comes, 'It was my pleasure'. Few people ask further, 'Why was it your pleasure?' There is an instinctive recognition of the fact that the pleasure, the Will of the Me, the Self, is something final. But if any should ask that question also, the reply is but an expansion, or another form or aspect, of the same fact. *viz.*, that all 'things' are in the I; *i.e.*, all 'this-es,' all conjunctions and all disjunctions with all possible things, *i.e.*, all possible pleasures (*i.e.*, desires and fulfilments of desire or will for conjunction), and also all possible corresponding reactive and necessarily implied pains (which also are 'pleasures,' लीला, being willed by the Self, sub-consciously, as fulfilments of desire or will for disjunction) are Mine. In other words, 'It was, and is, and will be

A cause is asked for by the human mind only when there is an effect, a change. We do not ask 'Why?' otherwise. We ask it because the very constitution of our being, our inmost nature of unbroken unity as the one Self, 'I am I,' 'A is A,' revolts against the creation of something *new*; against A disappearing and not-A appearing; against A becoming 'not-A,' *i.e.*, becoming B, C, etc. We cannot assimilate such an innovation; there is nothing in that inmost nature of ours to respond to it. Our whole being, our whole nature, insistently demands Continuity, Identity, in which is to be found Changeless Immortality, and without which our Eternity would be jeopardised; for if *any*

my pleasure to undergo all possible experiences, including this one, which you ask about'. In the f.n. on p. 50, *supra*, is stated the question which Viḍura, sorely exercised in mind, put to Rshi Maitrēya. Maitrēya answered him in words which may be interpreted in two ways:

सा इयं भगवतो माया यत् नयेन विरुध्यते,

ईश्वरस्य विमुक्तस्य कार्पण्यं उत बन्धनं;

यद् अर्थेन विनाऽमुष्य पुंसः आत्मविपर्ययः

प्रतीयते उपद्रवः स्वशिरश्छेदनादिकः । *Bhagavata*, III, vii, 9-10.

'This is the Lord's Mā-yā which defies all *nāyā*, logic, reason, all why and wherefore—this, *viz.*, that Ishvara, the Sovereign Lord of the Universe, the Ever-Free, appears as a humble creature bound in bonds of all sorts; that, without any *arṭha*, meaning, purpose, without rhyme or reason, senselessly, the Supreme Man turns Him-Self inside-out, upside-down, reverses Him-Self, becomes the Opposite of what He really is. The Witness of all, sees Him-Self, appears to Him-Self, as to a by-stander, as if He had cut off His own head, as jugglers do!'

Such is the plain meaning of the words; but, equally plainly, it is not a satisfying reply to Viḍura's question. The real reply is in the riddle of the words, *y a ṭ n a y é n a v i r u ḍ h y a ṭ e*. They admit of another interpretation, by separating the single-seeming *nāyēna* into two, *nā* and *yēna*. In Skt., the gloss would run: इयं सा माया, यत्, येन 'एतदा' भगवान् विरुध्यते, तत् न; 'The Illusion is that *This*, *É ṭ a ṭ*, which,

thing could be annihilated, why might not I also be liable to the same catastrophe? We therefore inevitably break out with a 'why?' whenever we see a change. And the answer we receive is a 'because,' which endeavours to *resolve the effect into the cause*, in the various aspects of matter, motion, force, etc., and shows that the *effect is really not different from the cause*, but is identical with it. And we are satisfied, our sense of, and our craving for, Unbroken Unity is soothed.¹ Causality is the reconciliation between the necessity, the fixed unity, of Self on the one hand, and the accidentality, flow and flux, manyness, of Not-Self, on the other.

is the Opposite of the Lord, Self, is *Not*.' In this way, the Līlā, Play, is seen to be static, eternally frozen, changeless; not kinetic, moving, changeful.

This may, no doubt, appear a forced explanation. But we know well that 'mystic' writings are full of such riddling rhymes, and that the 'the kingdom of Heaven has to be taken by storm'.

¹ See foot-notes, ch. II, pp. 7, 9, 11, *supra*. Hoffding's treatment of the problem of causation, in *Outlines of Psychology*, ch. V-D, will be found useful in this connection, as explaining in modern terms, *vikāra-* or *pariṇāma-vāda*, which may be called the *scientific conception of causation*. Hoffding himself holds it, as distinguished from what he calls the *popular conception of causation*, corresponding to *ārambha-vāda*. The last stage of thought in this respect, which may similarly be called the *metaphysical conception of causation*, is *vivarṭa-vāda*, next dealt with in the text, and briefly defined in *Pañcha-dashī*, xiii, 9, thus:

अवस्थांतरभानः तु विवर्तो रज्जुसर्पवत् ।

'The *false appearance* of changes of states in the Changeless One, as of a snake in a piece of rope in the dark, is *vivarṭa*, vortex, turning round, facing round, opposition'; *false appearance* as distinguished from *really passing* from one state into another.

Or, in *Vēdaṇṭa-sāra*, thus, अतत्त्वतोऽन्यथा प्रथा विवर्त इत्युदीरितः।

The corresponding definition of *vikāra* is, सतत्त्वतोऽन्यथा प्रथा विकार

But, all the same, it is only a subterfuge, an evasion, a māyāvic illusion; it is only 'the next best thing';

इत्युदीरितः । 'Appearance of change, when there is no real change, is v i v a r ṭ a; change, when real, and in a real substance, is v i k ā r a'.

Another way of describing the three stages is this ;

(1) कार्य (आरम्भात्) पूर्वं असत्, पश्चात् सत्; 'The effect is non-existent before its birth; it is existent, real, after birth': this is the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika view.

(2) कार्य (उत्पत्तेः) पूर्वमपि सत्, पश्चात् च सत्; यस्मात् कारणाद् अभिन्नं, तस्य रूपान्तरं एव, तस्य परिणामः, विकारः; 'The effect is existent before as well as after birth, because it is not really different from the cause, but only another form of it'; this is the Sāṅkhya view.

(3) कार्य पूर्वं अपि असत्, पश्चाद् अपि, 'The effect is non-existent, unreal, untrue, before as well as after birth, i.e., appearance': this is the Vedānta view.

The reconciliation of all these is thus: A r a m b h a - v ā ḍ a (Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika) may be said to be true with reference to the *new form*, and to the k a r ṭ ā, the doer, actor, maker, the *efficient cause*, whose s h a k ṭ i, power, will, creates or brings into manifestation, the new form; in other words, produces the transformation, the change, the newness. P a r i ṇ ā m a - v ā ḍ a (Sāṅkhya) is true with reference to the u p ā ḍ ā n a, the material cause, the matter or substance which is transformed. V i v a r ṭ a - v ā ḍ a (Vedānta) is true with reference to the One Nature of all the Factors *taken together at once*, from the transcendental standpoint (as distinguished from the empirical or experiential standpoint which sees things in succession, one *after* another).

This Transcendental View of Causation, or absence of cause-and-effect succession, does not in the least diminish, much less destroy, the experiential value of the Law of Karma, and *does not give countenance* to any immoral anti-nomianism, i.e., absence of (moral and other) law, as that 'You may do what you like'. Of course, in a way, *it does say* to the 'emancipated soul', 'You are *free* now, since you know, and are therefore a law unto yourself, and you may do what you like', but it *also adds*, 'but be prepared for the painful consequences of sin, for you know them also.' Every elder guardian, when handing over property to a ward who has attained majority, says; 'This is yours, to utilise or to waste, as you please: you know the consequences of each way.'

Sāṅkhya says, कारणं अस्ति अव्यक्तं, (कार्यं व्यक्तं), 'cause is unmanifest, effect is its manifestation'. In other words, Undifferentiated Unconscious is Cause; differentiations are effects. All effects exist simultaneously in the Cause. The Unconscious Whole is the Cause of each part, each 'conscious'. The Darśhanas, 'views,' philosophies, up to Sāṅkhya, believe in the relation of cause and effect; also that the former invariably

not the best. For, in strictness, the merest change, the passing of something, a mere form, state, condition only though it be, into nothing, and of nothing into something, is impossible, impossible to understand. True satisfaction is found only when we have reduced change to changelessness. Then we see that there are no effects and no causes, but only steadfastness, rock-fixed-ness. Such steadfastness and shakelessness is its own necessity, and requires no external support. We find it in the Logion, wherein all possible sense-impressions, all possible conjunctions and disjunctions of Self and Not-Self, are present *once for all*, and therefore in all possible successions. These pseudo-infinite and mutually subversive successions make up the multitudinous *order* as well as *disorder* of Samsāra, World-Process, which is the Contents of the Logion. And the shadow of the ever-present Necessity of the Logion, on each one of these successions, is the fact, and the source, of the belief about 'cause and effect,' 'reason,' 'why,' 'therefore,' etc. Each one of these successions, because

precedes and the latter succeeds. Vēdānta does away with this, as with all other views ordinarily held, by its *v i v a r ṭ a*, inversion, of them all. It cannot be said definitively that the cause 'precedes' and the effect 'succeeds'—as a *generalisation*. The seed precedes and the tree succeeds, no doubt; but only in the sense of a *particular* seed and a *particular* tree. Otherwise, the tree (another *particular* tree) precedes and the seed (another *particular* seed) succeeds; and the relation is reversed. Therefore, you may say, in the case of any given event, not that the cause precedes, but that what precedes is the cause; not that the effect succeeds, but that what succeeds is the effect. From undifferentiated *a - v y a k ṭ a* arises differentiated *v y a k ṭ a*; from chaos, cosmos; from the homogeneous, the heterogeneous; and *vice versa*; and this, *necessarily*, as a rule, not as an accident. This being so, it cannot be said that such and such a thing is *always* necessarily *cause*, and such and such another, effect.

included in the necessity of the Logion, *appears* as necessary also, as a necessary relation of cause and effect. Yet it never is in reality necessary, for every law has an exception, and every exception is under another law, as said before; it is only an *imitation* of the One real Necessity. The counterpart of this truth is that every particular free-will, while not reality free at all, *appears* free by imitation of the Absolute Free-will; and Necessity and Free-will obviously mean exactly the same thing in the Absolute, Aham-Ēṭaṭ-Na, which is and includes the totality of endless Becoming.¹ We may express the same idea in other words, thus: Each one of the endless flow of sense-impressions, of motions, of successions, is an effect, of which the Totality of them is the One constant Cause; or again, the Absolute, or the Uni-verse, is Its Own Cause; or, yet again, the necessity of the Nature of the Triune Absolute is the *One Cause* of all the possible variations, details, movements, which fall within and make up that Tri-unity, all that endlessness of Becoming, as *One Effect*.

The Whole is the Cause of each Part within it. This is what we have to studiously realise in this connection, in order to understand the nature of Cause, Necessity, or Shakti-Energy. The simultaneous, the changeless, the ever-complete, the Absolute, is the cause of the successive,

¹ Consider the etymological meaning of 'auto-matic,' viz., 'self-moved,' 'self-willed,' 'free-willed.' But it has come to mean the reverse, viz., 'mechanical,' 'non-free,' 'mechanically necessitated to work in a certain way.' Autonomous is now used for 'self-determining,' 'self-governing,' 'self-willing.' Both extremes meet in the Absolute Self.

the changing, the partial, which, in its full totality as Not-Self, is always contained within that Absolute. When we so put it, the idea of causation presents no difficulty. But it may be said that the difficulty disappears because the essential idea of causation—one thing *preceding* and giving rise, by some inherent, mysterious, unintelligible power, to another thing which *succeeds*—is surreptitiously subtracted from the problem. To this the reply is that there is no such surreptitious subtraction, but an entirely above-board abolition and refutation of that so-called essential idea, and of every thing and fact that may be supposed to be the basis and foundation of that idea. We show that the idea of necessary causation, by some limited thing, of some other limited thing, is only an illusion, and a necessary illusion ; in the same way in which the idea of any one of many individuals being a free agent, having free-will, is an illusion, and a necessary illusion. The one universal Self is free, obviously, because there is nothing else to limit and compel it. Here the word 'free' may, from one point of view, be well said to have no significance at all ; but from another, it has a whole world of significance. Now, because *every self* is *the* Self, therefore it also must be free by inalienable birthright. And yet, being limited, being hemmed in on all sides, by an infinite number of *other selves* ; each of which is, like itself, not only *the* Self, but also *a* self, because identified with and limited by, a not-self ; how can it be free ? The reconciliation is that every individual *jīva* *feels* free, but *is not* free ; it is free so far as it is the One Self, and it is

not free so far as it has made the 'mistake,' a - viḍyā, of identifying itself with a piece of Not-Self. It is now generally recognised, and so need not be proved in detail here newly, that the idea of *necessity*, present in our idea of causation, is a purely subjective factor; not created by anything or any experience 'outside' of us (except in the metaphysical sense in which the 'subjective' includes the 'objective,' in which the 'outside' also is 'inside,' or, as said before, the 'without' also is 'within').¹ The outside world shows only a repeated succession, which by itself is never sufficient to substantiate any notion of invariable, inherent, *necessary*, power of causation. The validity of 'inductive' generalisations does not come from

¹ 'This is *without*, i.e., outside me,' and 'this is *within*, i.e., inside me or my mind,' 'this is *objective* and this is *subjective*,' 'this is *thing*, this is *thought*,' 'this is *ideal*, this is *real*'—all these are *thoughts*, ideas, experiences, plays or forms of *consciousness* which alone creates, and distinguishes between, both the factors of each of these pairs of opposites. 'This is a *thing*, and *not* a *thought*'—is still a *thought*. But the distinction is made, and therefore there must be some truth in it also. The truth is twofold: (a) the percept of only the individual consciousness is a 'thought,' is 'ideal'; that of the universal consciousness is a 'thing,' is 'real' (pp. 59, 189-190, *supra*); and (b) the relatively permanent, intense, strong 'thought' is a 'thing,' and the weak, passing 'thought,' contradicted and abolished by other and more permanent thoughts or things, is only a 'thought'. The distinction of individual consciousness and universal consciousness is made and grasped by the former identifying itself with the latter, and then recognising that the former is *included* in the latter, as part in whole. Cf. Hoffding, *Psychology*, pp. 130, 206, 208; and *Yoga-Vāsishtha*, generally, on bhāvanā-ḍārdhya or vāsanā-ghanaṭā 'hardening of imagination', 'density of desire'.

the *number* of instances observed. Limited data cannot yield unlimited conclusions. No addition or multiplication of finites can make the Infinite. The element of necessary validity in inductions is really a 'deductive' fact; as *once*, so *ever*; as *here*, so *everywhere*; *because* I, that am now and here, am ever and everywhere. This element of the idea comes from within us, from Self, from our self as *willing*, as exercising a power of causation, from our indefeasible *feeling* of an exercise of *free-will*¹, though that again, because limited and dealing

¹ The question of Free-will and Necessity is discussed in Samskr̥t works, mostly in terms of *ḍaiva* and *puruṣa-kāra*, 'divine will' or 'fate' and 'personal will' or 'individual effort', ('person' and 'puruṣa' are perhaps etymologically the same); and the *śiḍḍhānta*, the 'established conclusion,' from the empirical standpoint, or *vyāvahārika ḍṛṣṭi*, the stand-point of the limited, finite, separative, individualist ego, is, that what is called *ḍaiva* is only accumulated previous *Karma* operating as tendencies, habits, character, leading to corresponding opportunities or environments, etc.

पूर्वजन्मजनितं पुराविदः कर्म दैवम् इति संप्रचक्षते ।

Prayaṭna, *vyavasāya*, *kr̥ti*, are other words for effort, determination, volition, as *niyaṭi*, नियति, is another word for fate or destiny. *Baḍḍha* and *mukṭa* are well-known equivalents for 'bound' and 'free'; *ḍiṣṭa* is also used in the sense of 'pre-ordained'. *Sva-tantra* and *para-tantra*, *sva-chhanḍa* and *para-chhanḍa*, *sv-āḍhina* and *par-āḍhina*, *ātma-vasha* and *para-vasha*, are pairs of words which express different aspects of the same idea, viz., self-dependent and other-dependent, self-guided and other-guided, self-governed and other-governed, self-willed and other-willed, self-determined and other-determined. Cf. न खलु परतन्त्राः प्रभुधियः,

(*Mahima-stūti*) and सर्वं परवशं दुःखं सर्वं आत्मवशं सुखम्; (*Manu*, iv, 106); 'The Lord's volitions are not controlled by others', and 'Self-dependence is bliss; other-dependence is misery'.

The word *aḥam-kāra*, in Samskr̥t, stands for (a) *asmiṭā*, 'I-am-ness,' egoism, the sense of separate individuality focussed and concentrated by desire, emotion, *vāsanā*, *tr̥shṇā*, libido, will-to-live; (b) 'I do,' 'I make,' 'I act,' (free-will); (c) 'I am the doer, actor, maker, of my own doings, etc., accompanied by elation, pride, arrogance.

with the limited, the material, is naturally always resolvable, on analysis and scrutiny, into material forces. We thus see that the two ideas are intimately connected, nay, are different aspects of the same fact—the idea of necessary causation and the idea of causation by

All the meanings are obviously closely allied. From the transcendental metaphysical standpoint, the standpoint of the Eternal, Infinite, Universal One-Consciousness (of *Aham-Etaṅ-Na*), or *pāramārthika-dṛṣṭi*, all are equally, and together, illusions. This is also a *siddhānta*, or established conclusion, entirely in accord with the one afore-mentioned. Cf.,

ईश्वरः सर्वभूतानां हृद्देशे, ऽर्जुन !, तिष्ठति,

भ्रामयन् सर्वभूतानि यंत्रारूढानि मायया ।

प्रकृतेः क्रियमाणानि गुणैः कर्माणि सर्वशः,

अहंकारविमूढात्मा कर्ताऽहम् इति मन्यते ॥ *Gītā*, xviii, 61 ; iii, 27.

Following Skt. texts and observations may also be considered here.

Yoga-Bhāṣya says : एकमेव दर्शनम्, ख्यातिः एव दर्शनं. The current orthodox interpretation is different, but another permissible one is : एकस्मिन् वस्तुनि परमात्मनि, अनेकतादर्शनं, भेददर्शनं, भ्रान्तिः, मिथ्यादर्शनं ; अनेकेषु 'दृश्य'पदार्थेषु, एकतादर्शनं, अभेददर्शनं, परमात्मदर्शनं एव एकं सत्यं सम्यग् दर्शनं ; ख्यातिः, प्रत्यगात्म-मूलप्रकृत्योः पुरुष-प्रकृत्योः, अन्यता-ख्यातिः, विवेकेन ज्ञानं. 'To see the One in the Many, is the On(ely) Right and True View; to see Many instead of One, is Illusion' The former is the 'transcendental', the latter the 'empirical' or 'experiential', view. The former underlies *ni-gama*, deduction; the latter, *anu-gama*, induction; *ṭarka*, or *anu-māna*, negative or positive inference, connects the two.

Pāram-ārthika saṭṭā is 'essential reality of being, in the true sense'. *Vyāva-hārika saṭṭā* is 'practical, empirical, existence'. *Prāti-bhāṣika saṭṭā* is 'illusive appearance, false existence'. Strictly, the second and the third are the same; they differ in degree; not in kind, as the first does.

In the *Māḍhyamika* system, of *Mahā-Yāna Buddhism*, *sa m - v ṛ ṭ i - sa ṭ ya* seems to be the equivalent of *vyāva-hārika saṭṭā*. The word *param-ārtha-saṭya*, is common to the *Māḍhyamika* school and *Veḍānta*; as, in fact, are, all important ideas and many other words.

free-will.¹ As the one is an illusion, so is the other, neither more nor less. We can *understand* both, only by understanding how the Changing is contained in the Changeless—that there is in reality no change; that

Paramārtha-dṛśhṭi may also be called sam-pūrṇa, or samashti, or ananta, or sama, or sāmānya, or kēndriya, dṛśhṭi, in different aspects, *i.e.*, the complete, or all-comprehending, or infinite, or equal, or universal, or central, (centripetal) view. So Vyava-hāra-dṛśhṭi would be khanda-, or vyashti-, or s-ānta-, or, vishama-, or, vishēsha-; or apa-kēndra-, dṛśhṭi, 'the part-ial, or separative, or finite, or un-equal, or particular, or non-central (centrifugal), view.

Regarding these views, *Maha-bhārata* says .

केचित् पुरुषकारं तु प्राहुः दैवविदो जनाः,

दैवं इति अपरे विप्राः, स्वभावं भूतचित्ताः ।

पौर्षं, कर्म, दैवं च, फल-वृत्ति-स्वभावतः,

त्रय एते स्पृथग्भूताः, अविवेकः कथंचन । Shānti p. ch. 239

* Some call it purusha-kāra, human manly effort; others daiva, divine ordainment, yet others svabhāva, (law of) nature. But the fact is that the three, purusha, karma, daiva, all three are inseparable aspects of the same fact, with reference to phala, vṛtti, and sva-bhāva, fruit (result of action), active movement (striving), (law of) nature (which connects the two).

¹ Note here, in these very words, how intimately contradictions are blended together; ambi-valence in uni-valence. In one sense, the idea of necessary causation, *i.e.*, causation by an irresistible power, is based solely on our experience of causation by our own unchecked free-will. In another sense, necessary and free are the very opposite of each other. The word 'auto-matic,' meaning 'mechanically necessary and unavoidable,' and also 'self-moved,' *i.e.*, 'free,' finds reconciliation for these two opposed senses only when *Autos* is understood as the Great Self, whose ordinances are necessarily unavoidable, because there is None-Else, even to oppose, much less compel. In a psychological sense, while each choice, each exercise of so-called free-will, is *determined* by the predominant motive, still, inasmuch as that motive is nothing apart from or outside and independent of the moved

there is in reality no succedence and no precedence, but only simultaneity ; no causation of one part by another part, but only the un-arbitrary coexistence of all possible parts, by the one Changeless Necessity of the Nature of the Absolute ; and that whatever appears as a particular necessity of any special relation between one part and another part is only an illusive reflection, appearing from the standpoint of the particular parts concerned, of the One in that particular 'many'. The Necessity of the Changeless we can understand ; indeed we can understand it so well that we are almost inclined to call it a truism. The 'necessity' of the 'changing' is what we cannot understand, and are very anxious to understand ; but we can *never* understand it, in the way we imagine and describe the fact of change to ourselves ; because it is the very reverse of a truism, its opposite extreme ; because it is false, not a fact ; because *there is no change*. Only by understanding this can we understand the

individual, inasmuch as the jīva or self *entertains* the motive, *identifies itself with it* as its strongest wish, therefore the individual self *feels* that *it* is making the choice, of itself, by itself, *i.e.*, of its own free-will, and actually does so. To be guided by a motive is to be guided by oneself as identified with that motive. From another standpoint, from which that motive is *not* predominant (but some other is, as it must be, necessarily, for individual existence *means* attachment to a 'this' and a corresponding wish or motive), it is regarded as something outside the jīva, to be rejected and struggled against, instead of being implicitly obeyed as one's very inmost self. In Yoga and Theosophy, this other standpoint which may be regarded as higher, is provided by the 'subtle' body or sūkshma-sharīra as distinguished from the sthūla or grosser ; these are dealt with in a later chapter.

whole situation, by reducing change to changelessness; by realising that, while, from the empirical standpoint of the successive particular 'this-es', there *appears* change, from the transcendental standpoint of the universal Self, it *disappears* altogether in the rock-like fixity of the constant Negation of the whole Not-Self, *i.e.*, of *all* the parts of the many Not-Self, at once, by Self.

A slight illustration may perhaps help to make the thought clearer. A large library contains billions of different permutations and combinations of the words of a language, each permutation or combination having a connected serial as well as individual meaning. The library, as a whole, contains all these *at once* in an ever-complete and finished condition. Yet if any individual character out of the thousands whose life-story the library contains, endeavoured to picture out its own life-story, realise it in every point, it would do so in what would appear to it, from its own standpoint, only a *succession*. In the library of the universe, God's Mind, the volumes are countless; each volume, a life-story without beginning or end; sole author, the One Self; readers, pseudo-infinite in number and pseudo-eternal in time; they all also, only the Author Him-Self; each volume, again, tells only the same story, *but in an order which is different from that of every other*. Each jīva-memory too is such a library. Or take this other case, which may come even nearer home. Each one of us is living in the *whole* of his body, at every point of it, and at every moment of time. But let him try to define,

to realise, to throw into distinct relief, his consciousness of every one of these points of his body. So far as he can do so at all, he will be able to do it only in succession. The whole of the universe, the whole of Not-Self, is the body of Self. The latter lives in and at each point of the former, completely, *at once*; lives in the way of innumerable mutually contradictory and therefore counterbalancing and neutralising functions; and it lives in each one of these points in the same way as in every other. Each point, to itself, therefore, *seems* to live, in these innumerable ways and functions, in an endless *succession* which constitutes its sempiternal, un-dy-ing, life.

The nature of this endless Becoming, this endless World-Process, this cause and effect combined, is embodied in that most common and most significant name of Shakti-Energy, *viz.*, Māyā, even as the whole Nature of the Absolute is embodied in the Praṇava.

Māyā, as explained by books on Tantra,¹ is yā-mā reversed; yā and mā² being two complete Saṃskṛt words

¹ 'White' Tantra-shāstra is a very important class of Saṃskṛt literature, of which only the veriest fragments are now extant. It seems to have dealt with many departments of physical and super-physical or occult science, especially in their bearing on yoga-practice. Most of the books now available under the name of Tantra, are hodge-podges of Vēdāntic ideas and foul black magic practices and mystery-mongering.

² For another allied word, bh r a m a or bh r ā n ṭ i, illusion, see footnote at p. 159, *supra*. मी, Mā, is also the name for Lakshmi, the goddess of wealth and splendour, the mother of Kāma, Eros; and another name of Kāma is Kan-ḍarpa, meaning elator, 'arouser of pride', and also the opposite, 'breaker of pride.' The significance of this Purāṇic mythology appears when we remember them in the terms of Yoga-sūtra; a-vi-d-yā, nescience, 'that which is not,' another form of mā-yā, gives birth to a s m i-ṭ ā, egoism, whence arise r ā g a-dv ē s h a, love-hate, and a b h i-n i v ē s h a, stubborn tenacity. मी also means to measure, to limit;

which mean, when put together as a sentence, 'that which is not : ' is as well as *not*, *sa d-a sa t*, existent and not-existent ; truly mysterious to the outer view. The extant *Tantra*-books dealing with *Shakti* in a personal aspect, give to it a hidden name consisting of the single letter 'i,' इ, even as they call various other gods by single letters.¹ This letter stands naturally between 'a,' अ and 'u,' उ, as should also 'm,' म being only the outer sheath of 'i,' though it is thrown to the end, because of the fact that it appears as negation *after* affirmation. But this 'i,' placed between 'a' and 'u,' and *mā-yā* is thus only another form of *मात्रा*, *mā tr ā*, matter, (see pp. 173, 195, *supra*), it is the finitising, limiting principle, which makes the all-inclusive Universal *appear* as the separate, separatist, egoistic, individual and particular. Matter, mother, *mates*, *matrix*, *matris*, *ma tr*, *mā tr ā*, all are the same ; from Skt. *m ā*, to measure ; *nir-m ā*, to make, create, manifest Matter measures Spirit, defines it, sets limits to it, makes it manifest. So does the mother the child.

It may be noted that *asmiṭā*, 'I-am-ness', has three stages of growth and development : (a) 'I-am', *syā m*, 'may I be', 'may I continue to be', 'may I always be', 'may I never cease to be' ; (b) 'I am great', *bah u syā m*, 'may I be much more', 'may I be greater than others' ; (c) 'I am many', *bah u d h ā syā m*, 'may I be many and yet more many', 'may I be more and more numerous'. In other words, (a) self-preservation (by food), (b) self-enhancement (by possessions), (c) self-multiplication (by progeny). In yet other words, the appetites or urges of (a) hunger, (b) acquisitiveness, (c) sex.

Love-hate and the tenacious clinging to that conglomerate of thoughts, emotions, volitions, which makes up a separate-feeling personality or individuality or ego-complex, are connected with and arise out of all these forms of egoism.

The subject is discussed at length in *The Science of the Emotions* ; also in *The Science of the Self*.

¹ See *Tā ra-sā ra-Upaniṣat* for instances.

coalesces with and disappears entirely into 'a,' in the conjunction which brings out of the joined vowel-sounds, 'a' and 'u,' the vowel-sound 'o'; for AUM is pronounced as OM.¹ This is in accordance with the grammatical rules, allowing of a double *saṅdhi*² (coalescence of letters), of archaic Saṃskṛt, the deliberately 'well-constructed,' 'polished,' 'refined,' 'perfected' language; the complete grammar of which, if we only had it, would show, as tradition says, in the articulate development of vibration after vibration, sound after sound, letter after letter, word after word, and sentence after sentence, the corresponding articulate development of the vocal apparatus, as well as of the world-system to which that language belongs.³ That this coalescence and disappearance is just, is plain from all that has been said as to the nature of Shakti, which ever hides in Self; disappears into Not-Self whenever Self acts⁴ upon that Not-Self;

¹ This is taken from *Praṇava-vāda*, mentioned before. The very first aphorism of Pāṇini's famous grammar is, अ-इ-उ-ऌ; the last letter may be regarded as a blind or substitute for म्; so that the whole aphorism is the exact equivalent of A-(I)-U-M.

² Instances of this are frequently met with in such ancient works as *Rāmāyaṇa*, *Mahābhārata*, and *Purāṇas*.

³ See on this point, works on *Mantra-shāstra*, *Nandikēshvara-Kārikā*, *Aumkāra-Sarvasva*, etc.

⁴ This it does, it must be remembered, in the one single way of lending to, and at the same time withdrawing from, the Not-Self, its own being. प्रकृतिं पश्यति पुरुषः प्रेक्षकवद् उपस्थितः सुस्थः । 'Purusha, fixed, self-contained, like a spectator, witnesses Prakṛti'; *Sāṅkhya-Kārikā*, verse 65. This *beholding*, this *witnessing*, this 'imaginative attention', by Self, is the *affirmation* by it of Prakṛti, Not-Self; which affirmation alone gives to it all the existence it has; it is Consciousness which energises and makes possible all the phenomena that physical science

and goes back again to Self, through and after Negation. When we endeavour to consider it apart from the others, it will still not be separated from 'm'; and then, too, it will identify itself with the *hidden affirmative*, whereby power *manifests* and *appears forth*, in many-formed results and effects, rather than with the overt negative. This has been indicated in exoteric Hinduism in the relation between Shiva and his consort Gaurī; Gaurī, in her many forms, is the implied and affirmative aspect of *icchā*, while Shiva is its overt aspect of abolition and negation only¹; in His being, this Gaurī hides inseparably as veritable half of His frame, so that hymns addressed to Her declare that 'it is only when conjoined with her, Primal Shakti, that Shiva becomes able to prevail and energise; otherwise, cannot stir at all'.²

deals with, *per contra*, the *not beholding*, the turning the face away from the dance, of Prakṛti, by Self, is the *negation* by it of Prakṛti; which negation amounts to sleep and pralaya; it is the Principle of Consciousness, in its form of Un-consciousness, (which, in practice, is consciousness of something else) which 'dissolves' the phenomena that physical (including psycho-physical) science deals with.

¹ शेते, सर्वस्मिन्, इति शिवः; 'He who sleeps in all, is Shiva'.
गच्छति, इति गौः; ई, गति-व्याप्ति-प्रजन-कान्ति-असन-खादनेषु; 'That which goes is Gauh; that which goes, pervades, produces (young), desires, throws away, eats up, is I (= EE, as in 'see'), She who does all this is Gauh-i, Gaurī'.

² शिवः शक्त्या युक्तो यदि भवति शक्तः प्रभवितुं,

न चेद् एवं देवो न खलु कुशलः स्पंदितुम् अपि । *Saundārya Laharī*.

'Shiva,' शिव, minus ई, i, is 'Shava', शव, which means 'corpse,' lifeless, powerless.

Strictly, destruction and negation belong to the Hara or Rudra aspects of Shiva; his creative aspect, in the Shaiva Āgama, is called Bhava (corresponding to Brahmā of the Fūrāṇas), and his preservative

Because of its special connection with Negation is this Necessity, this Shakti, treated of together with Negation; not as a fourth ultimate. This ever-present *Necessity*, the very Nature of the triune Absolute, of the succession of the World-Process, *appears as*, and is, that which we call Shakti, Might,¹ Ability, Power, Force, Energy, etc. In other words, as Negation is the *Nature* of the Relation between Self and Not-Self, so this Necessity, which inheres in the combination of the three, and is not separable from any, may be regarded as the *Power* of that Nature of Self and Not-Self which makes inevitable that Relation. This Relation immediately flows from, or better, is only another form of, that Necessity, and the Necessity is therefore treated as being more closely connected with the Relation, *i.e.*, Negation, than with the other two factors of the Absolute. In this Māyā-Shakti we see repeated, the trinity of the Absolute, the primal impress of which is always appearing and reappearing endlessly everywhere. Each of the factors of the Absolute repeats in itself, over again, that trinity, in the shape of corresponding aspects. In Pratyag-ātmā,

aspect, Mṛḍa (Vishṇu); Shiva stands then for Brahma. Current pairs of words are also Shiva-Shakti, Gauri-Shankara, Bhava-Bhavāni, etc. But Gauri (the White) has also her other aspect of Kālī (the black); and abolition of the world's turmoil is Shiva's Peace

बहल-रजसे विश्वोत्पत्तौ भवाय नमो नमः,

प्रबल-तमसे तत्संहारे हराय नमो नमः,

जन-सुख-कृते सत्त्वोद्विक्तौ मृडाय नमो नमः,

प्रमहसि पदे निष्कैगुण्ये शिवाय नमो नमः । *Shiva-Mahima-stūti.*

¹ 'It may be,' 'may' ⁴⁶ be,' from *shak*, to be possible, to be able,

Saṭ corresponds to Ētaṭ, the manifest seat of action, whereby the existence of Self appears forth; Chiṭ corresponds to Aham, which is the manifest seat of knowledge; and Ānaṇḍa to Na (a s m i) wherein lies the principle of affirmation-negation, attraction-repulsion, *i.e.*, desire (or want, as negation of fullness, followed by fulfilment, as negation of want or lack or limitation). In Mūlaprakṛti again, R a j a s, mobility, corresponds to Ētaṭ; Saṭṭva, illumination, knowability, to Aham; and Ṭa m a s to Na (a s m i), denial (of Self), darkness, dullness, grossness, inertia, heaviness, clinging, materiality (opposite of Self), substantiality, possessability. In the Māyā-Shakti of Negation, the triplicity appears as the energy of: (a) affirmation, attraction, enjoyability, ā-v a r a ṇ a, enveloping, veiling, corresponding to Aham; (b) negation, repulsion, distraction, flinging away, v i - k s h é p a, corresponding to Ētaṭ; and (c) the revolution-process of alternation, balancing, s ā m y a, ā p - ā v a r a ṇ a, s a n - k s h é p a or p ṛ a ṭ i - s h t h ā p a n a, unveiling (the Truth) and steadying (the mind, establishing it in the contemplation of the Truth), corresponding to Ānaṇḍa, the spiral dance of Shiva, ṭa m a s and Na.¹ The meaning of this may become fuller and fuller

¹ There is no current triplet of Samskr̥t words, like Saṭ-Chiṭ-Ānaṇḍa, or saṭṭva-rajas-ṭamas, to express the three forms, functions, or aspects, of Shakti spoken of in the text above. The words used here, at least the first two of them, are met with in the extant works of Advaita-Vedānta, as describing the workings of Māyā-Shakti, but in a somewhat different sense, explained below. The powers of Śṛṣṭi, creation, emanation, throwing forth, Sṭhiṭi, maintenance, keeping together, and La ya, or Sa ṁ h ā r a, reabsorption, destruction, neutralisation, balancing up, which are currently ascribed to Brahmā, Viṣṇu, and Shiva, or rajas, saṭṭva, and ṭamas, respectively, seem to mean the

as we proceed, for no work that endeavours to describe the essence of the World-Process, can help imitating that process (going round, and round) more or less, combining the simultaneity of all and everything in the Absolute with its gradual development in fuller and fuller *repetition* in the succession of 'the relative' of the World-Process.

same three aspects, in essence. Looked at in another way, *saṁhāra* would be reabsorption or attraction, *śṣhṭi* would be throwing forth or repulsion, and *sthiti* would be maintenance or the balancing of the two. In this view, the correspondences of the triplets would also have to be read differently. As to these variations, see the remarks in the next chapter. *Viśarga*, *vikshépa*, *āḍāna*, *i.e.*, 'throwing out,' 'moving about,' 'taking back', respectively—is another triad of words sometimes used to describe the kinds of Shakti. Static, kinetic, dynamic—may be regarded as another Shakti-Energy triad.

See also the note at the end of this chapter on the *jñāna-ichchhā-kriyā shaktis*, mentioned in the *Purāṇas* and emphasised by the Shaiva school of practical and devotional religion-philosophy. *Āvaraṇa* would then *correspond* to *jñāna* (cognition, *avidyā* and *asmitā* of Yoga); *vikshépa* to *kriyā* (action, the *rāga* and *dvēsha* of Yoga), and *sāmya* (or *laya* of the quartet of the hindrances to *yoga-samādhi* mentioned in *Veṇḍānta*-works, *viz.*, *kashāya* and *ras-āsvāḍa*—which may be regarded as the unpleasant and pleasant or hateful and loving varieties of *āvaraṇa*—and *vikshépa* and *laya* or sleep) to *ichchhā* (or desire, the *abhinivēsha* of Yoga).

The word 'correspond,' in the preceding sentence, means only that *āvaraṇa* (from *vr*, to cover up, to envelope), 'veil,' 'curtain', 'wrapping', 'cloak,' which blinds the intelligence, is of the nature of 'cognition', but is *wrong* cognition; 'I', instead of knowing Self, and knowing It-Self as Self, knows not-selves, and knows It-Self as a not-self. So, *vikshépa* (from *vi*, intensive prefix, and *kship*, to fling), dis-'trac'-tion, at-'trac'-tion towards a wrong object, being drawn or flung astray, corresponds to 'desire' for a not-self, and includes appurtenant 'action' also. To complete a triad, we may add *sāmya*, equilibrium, or, perhaps better, *sva-sṭhā-tā*, *Své mahimni praṭi-shṭhiṭi*, return to and abiding in Self, 'firm establishment in the greatness of Self.'

In plain everyday language, *Māyā* is *asmitā-kāma-krodha*, 'egoism(pride)-lust-hate, *i.e.*, passionate egoistic desire which veils (*ā-vṛṇoti*) the eyes to the Truth, and then drags (*vikshipati*) the so-blinded person into the wrong direction. A person, obsessed or possessed and ridden by a mad desire, shuts his eyes to the truth of

This Māyā-Shakṭi is said to be the prāṇa and buddhi, 'vitality and intelligence,' of all the world ; !

things, their due proportion, and the consequences of conduct ; and rushes insanely in pursuit of that object. The counter-actives of āvaraṇa and vi-kshépa, attachment and infatuation, are vai-rāgya and abhyāsa, detachment from the world of sense (by surfeit and revulsion) and persistent practice of studious contemplation of Self (See *The Essential Unity of All Religions*, pp. 326, 593-4, of second edn.).

The following beautiful lines of poetry occur on p 122 of *The Mahatma Letters* ; they seem to be Master K. H.'s own composition, and are illuminative in this connection :

" No curtain hides the Spheres Elysian,
Nor these poor shells of half transparent dust ,
For all that blinds the Spirit's vision
Is pride and hate and lust."

Shakti-traya, 'triad of Shakti', is referred to in the following texts, among many ; they mostly mean the functions of creation-preservation-destruction, the three chief forms of causation-effectuation :

नमो नमस् तुभ्यं, असह्यवेग-शक्तित्रयाय, अखिल-धी-गुणाय,
प्रपन्नपालाय, दुरन्तशक्तये, कदिन्द्रियाणां अनवाप्य-वर्त्मने ।
नमः परस्मै पुरुषाय वेधसे, सद्-उद्भव-स्थान-निरोध-लीलया,
गृहीत-शक्ति-त्रितयाय, देहिनां अन्तर्भवाय अनुपलक्ष्यवर्त्मने ।

Bhagavaṭa, VIII, iii, 28, II, iv, 12.

शक्तित्रयऽात्मिका तस्य प्रकृतिः, कारणऽात्मिका,

अ-स्व-तंत्रा च सततं, विद्-अधिष्ठान-संयुता । *Mbh.*, Shānti, ch.238.

त्वं शक्तित्रयऽात्मकः, जगद्-उत्पत्ति-स्थिति-लय-त्रिविध-शक्ति-आधारऽात्म-
कत्वात् । *Bhāshya* on *Gaṇapaṭi-Aṭharva-Shirsha-Upanishat*, at the end of *Āhnika-Chandrika*

By the Law of Analogy, broad correspondences would be the triads of prāṇa-buddhi-sharīra, biotic-intelligent-physicochemical energies, ojas-sahas-balam, vital-intellectual-mechanical élan; sympathetic-cerebrospinal-muscular systems; affectional-(plexal or glandular)-sensor-motor organs, kaṇḍas (chakras, pīṭhas) -jñān-éndriyas-karm-éndriyas; Soma-Sūrya-Agni, idā-pīṅgalā-sushumna ādiṣ, (left sympathetic, right sympathetic, spinal cord); and so on.

¹ Symbolised as Rādhā and Durgā respectively (vide *Dēvi-Bhāgavata*, IX. ch. 50) corresponding to the motor and sensor nerves and organs, karm-éndriyas and jñān-éndriyas respectively.

it is their whole wisdom and whole wealth ; it is the power of desire for the maintenance of the world's things, and also for their destruction. Many are its aspects and corresponding names. One half of it—that which appears in the Affirmation, “ I (am) this ”—is a-v i ḍ y ā, nescience, error, illusion, imperfect knowledge, separative intelligence, which binds the j ī v a to the downward arc of the wheel of S a ṃ s ā r a. The other half—which is embodied in the Negation—appears as v a i r ā g y a and v i ḍ y ā (or v i v é k a, v i v é k a - k h y ā ṭ i) satiation with the pleasures (and also the allied miseries) of the world, and discriminative knowledge, clear understanding, of the distinction between Eternal and Ephemeral, which lead the same j ī v a on to the upward arc of the Wheel. In its completeness, it is M a h ā - V i ḍ y ā, fulfilled and perfected knowledge, unifying wisdom of b u ḍ ḍ h i and ‘ pure reason,’ which frees the j ī v a from all bondage, makes of him an Īshvara (in the strict and technical sense), and guides his life on that second arc in that condition of yoga, union, of reason with desire and action, which makes the true free-will of de-liberate conscious universal love and philanthropic activity ; and thus confers true liberty, true m u k ṭ i.

They who desire to grasp, or fling away, the things of the world, physical or subtle, worship Shakti in her form of a-v i ḍ y ā, or v i ḍ y ā, respectively, in one or other of their many aspects ; they who desire the wealth and fullness of the Spirit, worship her as M a h ā - V i ḍ y ā

or P a r a m ā - V i d y ā, the Great Wisdom.' Each worship leads on, in course of time, by cyclic necessity, to the

¹ या, मुक्तिहेतुर्, अविचिन्त्यमहाव्रता, त्वं

अभ्यस्यसे, मुनियतेन्द्रियतत्त्वसारैः,

मोक्षार्थिभिर् मुनिभिर्, अस्तसमस्तदोषैः,

विद्याऽसि, सा, भगवती, परमा, हि, देवि ! *Durga-Sapta-shaṭi*.

द्वे विद्ये वेदितव्ये, परा चैव अपरा च ; . . .

अथ परा यया तद अक्षरं अधिगम्यते । *Mundaka Up* p. 1 4.

As Philosophies may be broadly divided into those of Change and those of the Changeless, and activities into egoistic and altruistic (the division always being by *predominant* characteristic, never by exclusion or abolition of the other, but only by subordination of the other), so Worship may be also broadly classified into those of Saguna and those of Nirguna. Nir-guṇa, the Attribute-less, is the Absolute, Its worship is the steady realisation of Its nature, in and by (1) appropriate perpetual vision of the Changeless, the Universal Self, (2) individual-self-denying, renunciant, other-helping actions, (3) universal benevolence, constant prayer for the peace, shānti, welfare of all. Sa-guṇa is 'possessed of attributes'; It has as many glorified and magnified shapes as the heart-desires and ideals of worshippers. As Nirguṇa is Shiva, 'Benevolent Sleeper in all,' so Saguna is essentially Shakti, 'Wakeful Power,' 'Ability'; and all objects of worship and prayer, from the most primitive fetish to the highest gods and 'madonnas' and 'babies' of the most splendid pantheons and the most elaborate mythologies, are but embodiments, more or less concrete, of this Shakti; and all are as real as (neither more nor less real than) the individual selves and heart-desires of the worshippers. The worshippers help the gods, and the gods the worshippers, with exchange of appropriate 'nourishment', as between all the kingdoms of nature; as, indeed, between a worker and his 'instruments'; sometimes the 'instrument' is less than, in other cases far greater than, the individual worker. (*Vide Bhagavad-Gītā*, vii, 21, and iii, 11.) Prayer is only the endeavour of a weaker will to put itself *en rapport* with, to identify itself with, and so draw nourishment and power from, a stronger Will, a greater source of Power.

Prāṇa-praṇiśhtha, 'establishment of prāṇa, life', in an image; vivification, vitalisation, of it by mind-force, intense thought-concentration; by means of japa, (litany), etc., is āvāhana, 'invitation, bringing in', nir-māṇa, 'formation', of a good or a bad spirit, dēva or kṛtṛyā, good or bad elemental (or elementary); (see *Mahatma Letters*, Index-references, for distinction between the two); which spirit is as much an instrument (only more living) as an engine, a gun, a factory, a steamship, a human or animal servant.

next. The worship of Mahā-Viḍyā is the same as the worship of Shakti's consort, Praṭyag-Ātmā, whose supremacy She ever insists on, and in dutiful and loving subordination to whom, and for the fulfilment of whose universal law of compassion to all selves, She—as Gāyaṭrī, mother of Vēḍas, wisdom-illuminated will that knows how to draw upon the inexhaustible stores of Nature (Shakti herself)—confides high sciences and powers gradually to the jīvas walking on the Path of Renunciation, for the humble service and helping of all fellow-jīvas.

One point should be specially noted here. As there is confusion in extant Saṃskṛt works between Praṭyag-Ātmā and Param-Ātmā, so there is also confusion as regards Shakti and Mūla-Prakṛti or Prakṛti. And the confusion is not unnatural. Because Shakti is connected with, con-fus-ed in, both Praṭyag-Ātmā and Mūla-Prakṛti, and is herself hidden, there is a natural tendency to regard her only as the one or the other. Throughout *Dēvī-Bhāgavaṭa*, for instance, she is now identified with

As regards the two main classes of 'worship,' up-āsanā; here too we have the same perpetual swing between the two; the worship appropriate to nī-vṛtṭi, Renunciation, and the worship belonging to pra-vṛtṭi, Pursuit. All 'new' religions are only re-forms; from multi-farious 'idol'-worships and sectarianisms towards uni-tarianism and solidarity. So, Buddha taught philosophical religion, by reaction against the numerous more or less gross and vicious sects and worships that were prevalent. But again, by reaction against Buddha's emphasis on the simple life and asceticism, ending in nīr-vāṇa ('extinction'); by reaction against this, began the worship of thousands of images of Buddha, and installation of these in great temples, and luxurious ceremonial. This culminated in the worship of hundreds of varieties of Tārās, female goddesses, and, ultimately, the Bachchanalian orgies and horrors of Vajra-Yāna. Each object of worship, god or goddess, is but an apotheosis and anthropomorphisation of a desire, good or evil.

Self, mentioned under the epithet of Shiva, and now with Mūla-Prakṛti. Thus, Shakti, personified, is made to say: 'Always are He and I the same; never is there any difference betwixt us. What He is, that am I; what I am, that is He; difference is due only to perversion of thought.' But the distinction is also pointed out at the same time: 'He who knows the very subtle distinction between us two, he is truly wise, he will be freed from Samsāra, he *is* freed in truth.'¹ Again it is said: 'At the beginning of creation, there were born two Shaktis, viz., Prāṇa and Buddhi, from Samvit, Consciousness, wearing the form of Mūla-Prakṛti.'² Of course it is true, in the deepest sense, that Shakti is *not* different from the Absolute, but only Its very own Nature, Svabhāva; and, as Mūla-Prakṛti is included in the Absolute, therefore Shakti may also be identified with Mūla-Prakṛti, without which it cannot manifest and truly would not *be*. At the same time it is desirable and profitable to make the distinction—even though a distinction without a difference—from the standpoint of the limited, wherein thought must be and move, and has deliberately to be

¹ सदा एकत्वं न भेदोऽस्ति सर्वदा एव मम अस्य च ;
 योऽसौ साऽहम् , अहं योऽसौ , भेदोऽस्ति मतिविभ्रमात् ।
 आवयोर् अन्तरं सूक्ष्मं यो वेद मतिमान् हि सः ।
 विमुक्तः स तु संसारान् मुच्यते, नात्र संशयः । III, vi 2, 3.

² मूलप्रकृतिरुपिण्याः संविदो, जगदुद्भवे,
 प्रादुर्भूतं शक्तियुग्मं प्राणबुद्धयधिवैतम् । IX, 1, 6, 7.

and move, taken in its partial, 'perverted,' successive, form. The fact, also, that the words are different, and are used not always interchangeably but often differently, implies that a distinction *is* intended between Shakti and Prakṛti.

In *Gītā*,¹ also, Kṛṣṇa speaks of his *Ḍaivī Māyā*, *ḍur-aṭṭya-yā*, 'difficult to cross,' 'difficult to escape and transcend'; his *Ḍaivī Prakṛti*, divine nature or power; and again of his two *Prakṛtis*, *aparā*, lower, and *parā*, higher, the former of which, he says, consists of the various elements which Sāṅkhya describes as issuing from *Mūla-prakṛti*, while the latter is *jīva-bhūṭā*, (the life of) the '*jīvas* that uphold and carry on the work of the world'. The meaning of such passages would probably be easier to follow if what has been said above as to the nature of Self, Not-Self, and Energy which is the Necessity of the Nature of these two, is borne in mind. As *aviḍyā*, this primal Energy turns more towards Not-Self and becomes *aparā-prakṛti*, which name is used to cover not only the force which leads the *jīva* outwards, but also the objective manifestations of Not-Self which it especially brings out, and into which it leads the *jīva*. As *viḍyā*, it turns more towards Self, and is *parā-prakṛti*, the source of subjective life; nay, which, as consciousness, in Self, of Not-Self, *is* life, and so includes all *jīvas*.² As the two together, she is

¹ *Bhagavad-Gītā*, vii, 14; ix, 13; vii, 5.

² For another aspect of the fact indicated, that is to say, another interpretation of the verse, which, however, is perfectly consistent with this, and brings out only another aspect of the truth, see the NOTE following this chapter.

Dāivī-Prakṛti, in which viḍyā and a viḍyā coalesce into Mahā-viḍyā, regarded not as knowledge, but rather as Shakti, Energy, which utilises all-knowledge, for the carrying on of the World-Process.

NOTE.—This note is intended as a continuation of the foot-notes at pp. 167, 190, 191, 229, above, in connection with buddhi and manas, and with the triads of (i) saṭ, chit, ānanda, (ii) saṭṭva, rajas, ṭamas, and (iii) sṛṣhti, sṭhiṭi, laya. The first two of these triads, and those of (iv) jñāna, ichchhā, kṛiyā, and (v) dṛavya, guṇa, karma, are, as indicated in the text of this and other works, of essential importance for clearing up much obscurity and confusion in Samskrṭ literature, and for understanding the whole scheme of the World-Process. The correspondences with each other, of the various factors of these triplets, have been pointed out here, and have been dealt with in detail in *Praṇava-vāda*. But they are argued here on their inherent merits, and, so far, have not been supported by 'testimony' from current Samskrṭ-works.

It is true that if, as is claimed here, metaphysics are no less 'self-evident' than mathematics, no 'testimony' is needed for the conclusions of the former, any more than for those of the latter. But the claim is obviously not admitted by very many. Also, while solutions of simpler problems of mathematics are undoubtedly clear of themselves at every step, yet when we come to more complex ones, even veterans of the science are not unoften glad to have their work checked and verified by others. With this idea the following collection of quotations and references is given here.

As said before, the triads belonging to Praṭyag-ātmā and Mūla-prakṛti respectively, viz., saṭ-chiḍ-ānanda and saṭṭva-rajās-ṭamas, especially the latter, are to be found at every turn in the old books. But the vitally important triad belonging to Shakti as Cause or Kāraṇa, viz., jñāna-ichchhā-kṛiyā, is, for some reason, rare. So also is that which belongs to Shakti as Condition or Nimitta. viz..

désha-kāla-kriyā, or Space-Time-Motion; kriyā here being sometimes replaced by avasṭhā or krama or héṭu or nimitṭa, so that the triplet becomes equivalent to place-time-circumstance. Yet without its due application in the work of interpretation, the ideas, facts and laws, of Brahma-vidyā and Ātma-vidyā, metaphysic and psychology, do not become a-pa-r-o-k-sha, 'directly experienced'; do not *come home*; are not realised in the first person. Even in the Tanṭra-literature of the Shākṭa school, the present writer has been informed by friends learned therein, Shakti is usually referred to as ṭri-guṇā, and its three forms of subdivisions are mentioned only as sāttvikī, rājasī, and tāmāsī shaktis. It is therefore desirable to gather together, for the purpose of confirming, with additional confidence 'the reasoned faith' of the reader, by means of 'trustworthy testimony' out of the experience of the ancients, these rare statements, scattered here and there over distant parts of Samskrṭ literature.

The correspondences may first be tabulated for convenient reference.

Chit	Saṭṭva	Jñāna	Guṇa
Saṭ	Rajas	Kriyā	Karma
Ānanda	Tāmas	Ichchhā	Dravya

The first triad belongs to Universal Consciousness; the second to Universal Matter; the third, to individualised consciousness: the fourth to particularised matter. It is rather curious that none of the earliest, best known, and most studied 'major' ten *Upanishats* mentions saṭṭva-rajās-tāmas expressly. If we include two more among the 'major', viz., *Shvét-āshvaṭara* and *Kaushītaki*, as is sometimes done, because Shankar-āchārya has commented on them, then we find that *Shvét-āshvaṭara* uses the word ṭri-guṇa, without separately naming the three; but Shankara names them as the three. The same *Upanishat* says that 'the svā-bhāvika shakti of the Supreme is triple, jñāna-bala-kriyā: here clearly, bala, 'power', 'strength', stands for ichchhā, desire-force (see *Shvét.*, iv. 5; v. 5-12; vi. 2-4, 8). Among the later 'minor' *Upanishats*, *Jābāla*, *Krishṇa*, *Rāma-Pūrva-Tāpani*, *Nāḍa*, *Triṭpād-vibhūti-Nārāyaṇa*, *Maitrī*, *Maitrēyī*,

equated with *paśhyantī*; yet *ichchā* sits midway too between *jñāna* and *kriyā*.

तत्त्वज्ञानादिभूतं च सच्चिदानन्दविग्रहम् ,

सर्वकर्मघनीभूतं इच्छा-ज्ञान-क्रियाश्रयम् । *Devī-Bhāgavata*, VII, ch. 32.

‘The Supreme Being, whose garment is ‘*saṭ-chid-ānanda*’, appears densified by karma in a material body, which becomes the locus of the attributes or faculties of cognition-desire-action’.

विश्वं शरीरमित्युक्तं पञ्चभूतात्मकं, नग !,

चन्द्रसूर्याग्निदेवताभिः जीवब्रह्मैक्यरूपकम् ।

तिस्रः कोट्यस्तदर्थं च शरीरे नाड्यो मताः ;

तासु मुख्या दश प्रोक्ताः ; ताभ्यस्तिस्रो व्यवस्थिताः ।

प्रधाना मेरुदेहेऽत्र, चन्द्रसूर्याग्निरूपिणी ;

इडा वामे स्थिता नाडी, शुभ्रा तु चन्द्ररूपिणी,

शक्तिरूपा तु सा नाडी साक्षाद् अमृतविग्रहा ;

दक्षिणे या पिंगलाऽख्या, पुंरूपा, सूर्यविग्रहा ;

सर्वतोजोमयी सा तु सुषुम्ना वह्निरूपिणी,

तस्या मध्ये विचित्राख्ये इच्छा-ज्ञान-क्रियात्मकम् । *Ibid.*, ch 35

इडापिंगलासुषुम्नाः प्राणमार्गं समाश्रिताः ;

सततं प्राणवाहिन्यः सोमसूर्याग्निदेवताः ।

भूर्भुवस्स्वरिमे लोकाः, सोमसूर्याग्निदेवताः,

यस्य मात्रासु तिष्ठन्ति, तत् परं ज्योतिरोमिति । *Goraksha, Mukti-sopāna*.

तिस्र एव देवताः ; अग्निः पृथिवीस्थानो ; वायुः वा, इन्द्रो वा, अंतरिक्ष-

स्थानः ; सूर्यो युस्थानः । *Nirukṭa*, VII, ii, i ; See also *Gītā*, xv, 12.

The purport of these last quotations is that ‘out of thirty-five millions of nerves in the human body, ten are chief ; out of these ten, three are the most vitally important, *viz.*, *iḍā*, *piṅgalā*, and *sushumnā*, which respectively run along left, right, and middle of the spinal column, and correspond with *Chandra*, *Sūrya*, and *Agni* (*i.e.*, Moon, Sun, and

Fire, or middle, upper, and lower, or *bhuvah*, *svah*, and *bhūh*, or astral, mental, and physical worlds respectively), and with *ichchhā*, *jñāna*, and *kriyā*’.

अहमो महतश्चैव प्रकृतिस्त्वं हि गीयसे !

माम्यावस्थात्मिका त्वं हि शबलब्रह्मरूपिणी !

ततः परा परा शक्तिः परमा त्वं हि गीयसे !

इच्छाशक्तिः क्रियाशक्तिः ज्ञानशक्तिस्त्रिशक्तिदा ! *Devī Bhag*, XII, ch. 4.

इच्छाशक्त्या क्रियाशक्त्या ज्ञानशक्त्या समन्विता । *Ibid.*, XII, ch. 4.

‘Thou art sung as the Nature of Mahān-Ātmā, (Mahaṭ-Buddhi); thou art hymned as Shabala-Brahma, in Balanced Repose: thou art also the Supreme Might beyond all. Thou givest us *ichchhā-kriyā-jñāna*.’

(ii) The succeeding extracts show the correspondences of *ikshā-kāma-tāpana*, *jñāna-ichchhā-kriyā*, with *jñāna-bala-kriya*, *Sarāsvatī-Kālī-Lakshmi*, *chit-ānanda-saṭ*, *saṭṭva-tāmas-rajās*, *Vishṇu-Rudra* (Shiva)—*Brahmā*, and *Sūkshma-kāraṇa-sṭhūla* (*i.e.*, astro-mental-causal-physical) bodies, respectively.

... ‘तदैक्षत बहु स्याम् प्रजायेय’, ‘सोऽकामयत’, ‘तत्तपोऽतप्यत’, ‘तत्तपोऽकुर्वत’, इत्यादि त्रिविधश्रुतिसिद्धं ज्ञानेच्छाक्रियासमष्ट्यात्मकत्वं, स एव ब्रह्मधर्मः, स च धर्म्यभिन्न एव, ‘स्वाभाविकी ज्ञानबलक्रिया च’ इति श्रुतेः । तस्यैव धर्मत्वाच्छक्तिरिति संज्ञा । ... ज्ञानेच्छाक्रियाणां तिसृणां व्यष्टीनां महा-सरस्वती-महाकाली-महालक्ष्मीरिति प्रवृत्तिनिमित्तवैलक्षण्येन नामरूपांतराणि । ... सच्चिदानंदात्मकपरब्रह्मधर्मत्वादेव शक्तेरपि त्रिरूपत्वम् ।

महासरस्वति चित्ते !, महालक्ष्मि सदात्मिके !,

महाकालि आनंदरूपे !, त्वत्तत्त्वज्ञानसिद्धये,

अनुसंदधमहे, चेडि !, वयं त्वां हृदयांबुजे ।

Upodghāṭa of Guṇṭavaṭī-tilka on Durgā-saptā-shaṭī.

महालक्ष्मीर्ब्रह्मत्वं, महाकाली ख्यत्वं, महासरस्वती विष्णुत्वं प्रपेदे ।

Ibid. on Rahasya-tārya.

रजोगुणाधिको ब्रह्मा, विष्णुः सत्त्वाधिको भवेत्,

तमोगुणाधिको ह्यः सर्वकारणरूपधृक् ।

स्थूलदेहो भवेद् ब्रह्मा, लिंगदेहो हरिः स्मृतः ;

रुद्रस्तु कारणो देहः, तुरीयस्त्वहमेव हि । *Dēvi-Bhāg.*, XII, viii.

Jñāna-ichchhā-kriyā correspond to vijñānamaya-mano-maya-prāṇamaya koshas and Isha-Sūtra-Virat or Sarvajña-Hiranyagarbha-Vāishvānara and Prājña-Taijasa-Vishvānara also. (See *Veḍānta-sāra*, and *Advanced Text Book of Sanātana Dharma*, p. 170).

तस्य चेच्छास्म्यहं, दैत्य !, सजामि सकलं जगत् ।

स मां पश्यति विश्वात्मा, तस्याहं प्रकृतिः शिवा । *Ibid.*, III, xvi.

इच्छाऽस्म्यहमिति, “ पराऽस्य शक्तिर्विविधैव श्रूयते, स्वाभाविकी ज्ञानबल-क्रिया च ” इति श्रुत्युक्तबलशब्दोदिता । “ इच्छाशक्तिरुमा कुमारी ” इति शिव-सूत्रोदिता चेत्यर्थः । *Nilakantha, Tikā* on above,

How can Mahā-Kālī and Rudra, the Destructive Aspect, be connected with Ānanda, Joy ? Joy results from fulfilment of Desire : and Desire is Hate as well as Love. The Victor in battle triumphs and rejoices. Rudra and Kālī are usually represented as dancing ; macabre though that dancing be.

(iii) The same correspondences are supported by the following, with the further statement that creation—preservation—destruction (sṛṣhti—sthiti—laya) belong to rajas—saṭṭva—tamas respectively-

निर्गुणा या सदा नित्या व्याकृताऽविकृता शिवा,

योगगम्याऽखिलऽधारा तुरीया या च संस्थिता ।

तस्यास्तु सात्त्विकी शक्ती राजसी तामसी तथा,

महालक्ष्मीः सरस्वती महाकालीति ताः स्त्रियः । *Dēvi, Bhāg.*, I, ii.

विष्णौ च सात्त्विकी शक्तिस्तया हीनोऽप्यकर्मकृत् ;

द्रुहिणे राजसी शक्तिर्यया हीनोऽप्यसृष्टिकृत् ;

शिबे च तामसी शक्तिस्तया संहारकारकः । *Ibid.*, I, viii.

(iv) Shakti as sa-guṇā, 'possessed of properties,' 'in operation,' 'functioning,' 'kinetic,' and as a-vidyā, ne-science, error, passion, is the object of adoration to the 'pursuant,' those whose minds are turned world-wards; (in all the thousands of different forms of objects of devotion which persons worship in any time or clime, in accord with their particular shades of heart-desire and stages of intellectual development). As nir-guṇā, 'functionless,' static, and as vidyā, true-science, true-knowledge, realisation, she is revered by the renunciant, who wants 'Self-dependence,' the supreme bliss of moksha, the liberty of the Higher Self, 'freedom' from 'dependence on an-Other,' which dependence on another (the lower self) is the supreme misery. The worship of nirguṇā Shakti is the same as the worship of Shiva (the Supreme Self), who also is said, in Purāṇic symbology, to bestow moksha. Many schools of thinkers and devotional systems of votaries give her many names: 'Tapas, Tamas, Jala, A-jñāna, Māyā, Pradhāna, Prakṛti, Shakti, Ajā, Vi-marsha, A-vidyā; and so on. None is despised for lacking Viṣṇu or Rudra; everyone is scorned who lacks Shakti-Power. She is also known as Mahā-Māyā, Niyati, Mohini, Prakṛti, Vāsana, Bhuvan-éshvari, the Meaning of Praṇava, the Desire of the Infinite'.

सगुणा निर्गुणा सा तु द्विधा प्रोक्ता मनीषिभिः ।

सगुणा रागिभिः सेव्या निर्गुणा तु विरागिभिः । *Ibid.*, I, viii.

स्वातंत्र्येण चरिष्यामि तपस्तीव्रं सदैव हि ;

पारतंत्र्यं परं दुखं, मातः !, संसारसागरे ;

स्वातंत्र्यान्मोक्षमित्याहुः पंडिताः शास्त्रकोविदाः । *Ibid.*, V, xvi

चेतसा निर्विकल्पेन यां ध्यायति मुनीश्वराः,

प्रणवार्थस्वरूपां तां भजामो भुवनेश्वरीम् । *Ibid.*, VII, xxvii.

महामाया इति, अविद्या इति, नियतिः, मोहिनी, इति च,

प्रकृतिः, वासना, चापि, तव इच्छा, अनन्त ! कथ्यते । *Mādhava, Sarva-*

Darshana-Sangraha. 'Pūrṇa-prajña-Darshana'.

For other verses, whose purport is given above, see p. 218, *supra*. Many other names of Chiti-Shakti-Superconsciousness are given in the 5th ch. of *Māhā Upaniṣat*, which is part of *Yoga Vāsishtha*.

(v) Artha-shakti (arṥhyaṭe, 'that which is desired', is arṥha, object, purpose, intention, the thing meant, etc.), and dravya-shakti, ('substance,' the desired object), are used in the following, in substitution for, and as synonymous with, ichchhā-shakti. Bala, strength, power, as a synonym for ichchhā, we have noted before; bhakti is also used as such.

गुणानां लक्षणान्येव विततानि विभागशः ।

त्रयाणां शक्तयस्तिष्ठः, तद्वीमि तव, अनघ !,

ज्ञानशक्तिः, क्रियाशक्तिः, अर्थशक्तिस्तथा परा ।

सात्त्विकस्य ज्ञानशक्ती, राजसस्य क्रियात्मिका,

द्रव्यशक्तिस्तामसस्य ; तिस्रश्च कथितास्तव । *Dēvi-Bhāg.*, III, vii.

सत्त्वं रजस्तम इति निर्गुणस्य गुणास्त्रयः ;

स्थिति-सर्ग-निरोधेषु गृहीता मायया विभोः ।

कार्यकारणकर्तृत्वे, द्रव्यज्ञानक्रियाश्रयाः,

बध्नति नित्यदा मुक्तं मायिनं पुरुषं गुणाः ।

महतस्तु विकुर्वाणाद् रजःसत्त्वोपबृंहितात्,

तमःप्रधानस् तु अभवद् द्रव्यज्ञानक्रियात्मकः ।

सोऽहंकार इति प्रोक्तो, विकुर्वन्, समभूत् त्रिधा,

द्रव्यशक्तिः, क्रियाशक्तिः, ज्ञानशक्तिरिति, प्रभो !

Vishṇu-Bhāg., II, v.

द्वितीयस्तु अहमो यत्र द्रव्य-ज्ञान-क्रियोदयः । *Ibid.*, III, x.

य एतान्मत्पथो हित्वा, भक्ति-ज्ञान-क्रियात्मकान्,

क्षुद्रान् कामान् चलैः प्राणैर्जुषंतः, संसरन्ति ते । *Ibid.*, XI, xxi.

योगास्त्रयो नया प्रोक्ता, नृणां श्रेयोविधित्सया,

ज्ञानं, कर्म च, भक्तिश्च ; न उपायोऽन्योऽस्ति कुत्रचित् ।

निर्विण्णानां ज्ञानयोगो न्यासिनाम् इह कर्मसु ;

तेष्वनिर्विण्णचित्तानां कर्मयोगस्तु कामिनाम् ;

यदृच्छया मत्कथादौ जातश्रद्धस्तु यः पुमान्,

न निर्विण्णो, न अतिसक्तो, भक्तियोगोऽस्य सिद्धिदः । *Ibid.*, XI, xx.

The last three verses say that jñāna-yoga, the yoga-method of philosophical meditation, suits those whose temperament is not that of the men of action, who do not like restless activity; for persons of the opposite temperament, karma-yoga, the regulated performance of duties and of acts of self-sacrifice, is the best way of achieving the purpose of life; for the man of the midway, or emotional, temperament, who is neither greatly attached to, nor strongly detached from, the world, the method of devotion, bhakti-yoga, is the best. The following verses express the same main ideas in a different setting.

उदासीनमिव अध्यक्षं, द्रव्य-ज्ञान-क्रियाऽात्मनाम्

कूटस्थम् इमम् आत्मानं यो वेद, ऽप्रोति शोभनम् । *Ibid.*, IV, xx.

ध्यानेनेत्थं सुतीव्रेण युंजतो योगिनो मनः

संयास्यति आशु निर्वाणं द्रव्य-ज्ञान-क्रियाभ्रमः । *Ibid.*, XI, xiv.

एतत्पदं तज्जगदात्मनः परं, सकृद्विभातं, सवितुर्यथा प्रभा,

यथा(अ)सवो जाग्रति, सुप्तशक्तयो, द्रव्य-क्रिया-ज्ञान-भिदाभ्रमाख्ययः ॥

Ibid., IV, xxxi.

सत्त्वं रजस्तम इति त्रिवृद् एकमादौ सूत्रं महानहमिति प्रवदन्ति जीवम् ;

ज्ञान-क्रिया-ऽर्थ-फलरूपतया उरुशक्ति ब्रह्मैव भाति सदसच्च तयोः परं तत् ।

Ibid., XI, iii.

(vi) The sensor organs express buddhi and jñāna-shakti; the motor-organs, prāṇa and kriyā-shakti.

तैजसानीन्द्रियाण्येव ज्ञानकर्ममयानि च । *Ibid.*, III, v.

तैजसानीन्द्रियाण्येव क्रियाज्ञानविभागशः ।

प्राणस्य हि क्रियाशक्तिर्, बुद्धेर्विज्ञानशक्तिता । *Ibid.*, III, xxvi

It should be noted that, in this chapter of the *Bhāgavata*, occurs another verse, which says that kriyā-shakti belongs to aham-kāra, whereas our conclusion is that ichchhā-shakti is its proper co-efficient or function or power. This is only one of the many inconsistencies and perplexities which seem to beset the question. But it is not impossible to solve the inconsistencies and disentangle the

perplexities, by careful reference to different viewpoints. The fifth chapter of *Mahā Upaniṣat*, above alluded to, says that the same functioning appears now as *manas*, now as *buḍḍhi*, again as *ahamkāra*. In the 'subtle regions' of mind, even broad distinctions are difficult to fix, because all is always in a fluid condition, continual flow and flux. In this very instance, the *ahamkāra* which is said to possess *kriyā-shakti* seems to be what, in the last section of this note, is called *manas* in contradistinction from *mahat-buḍḍhi*; and it is said to have three subdivisions, *vaikārika-manas*, *ṭaijasa-buḍḍhi*, and *ṭāmasa-bhūṭaḍi*, which last is *ahamkāra* proper. *Veḍānta-sāra* assigns *anāh-karaṇa* to *sūkshma-sharīra* (also called *ṭaijasa* in the individual form and *sūtrātmā* in the universal); makes it consist of the three *koshas*, *viz.*, *viññāna-maya*, *mano-maya*, and *prāṇa-maya*; and assigns to these, the *jñāna*, *ichchhā*, and *kriyā shaktis*, respectively.

(vii) The three, *saṭṭva*—*rajas*—*ṭamas*, are utterly inseparable though distinguishable; they manifest by turns, one preponderating, the others subordinated, at any one time and place. 'They suppress, support, produce, also, one another, by turns, and always cling on to each other'.

वैशेष्यात् तु तद्वादस्तद्वादः । *Brahma-sūtra*, II, iv, 22.

न तदस्ति पृथिव्यां वा, दिवि देवेषु वा पुनः,

सत्त्वं, प्रकृतिर्जैर्मुक्तं यत्स्यादेभिस्त्रिभिर्गुणैः । *Gītā*, xviii, 40

अन्योऽन्यमिथुनाः सर्वे, सर्वे सर्वत्रगामिनः,

रजसो मिथुनं सत्त्वं, सत्त्वस्य मिथुनं रजः,

तमसश्चापि मिथुने ते सत्त्वरजसी उभे,

उभयोः सत्त्वरजसोर्मिथुनं तम उच्यते ;

न एषामादिः, संप्रयोगो, वियोगो वा उपलभ्यते । *Devī-Bhāg.*, III, viii.

प्रीत्यप्रीतिविषादात्मकाः, प्रकाशप्रवृत्तिनियमार्थाः,

अन्योन्याभिभवऽश्रय-जनन-मिथुनवृत्त्यश्च गुणाः ।

Sāṅkhya-Karika, 12. See also *Anugītā*, xxi.

(viii) The characteristics, properties, functions, consequences, implications, allies, corollaries, etc., of *saṭṭva*—*rajas*

—*ṭamas* are very numerous ; in fact, all phenomena whatever are classifiable under these three. The more important ones are mentioned in *Bhagavad-Gītā*, chs. xiv, xvii, xviii ; *Anugītā*, chs. xxi to xxviii ; *Manu*, ch. xii. There are many seeming incongruities in these statements ; but they are mostly reconcilable by the view that *saṭṭva* corresponds to *jñāna*-knowledge, *rajas* to *kriyā*-action, and *ṭamas* to *ichchhā*-desire. Obscurity is greatest with regard to the last, appropriately enough, one might say, for one of the principal meanings of *ṭamas* is obscurity, darkness ! Thus,

सत्त्वं ज्ञानं, रजः कर्म, तमोऽज्ञानमिहोच्यते । *Bhāgavata*, XI, xxii.

'*Saṭṭva* is *jñāna* ; *rajas* is *karma* ;' quite plain and simple ; but '*ṭamas* is called *a-jñāna*,' not *ichchhā*, straight. In order to make sure that *a-jñāna* is the same as *ichchhā* here, one has to go a roundabout way.

मलम् अज्ञानमिच्छति संसारोऽङ्कुरकारणम् ।

अज्ञानाद्बध्यते लोकस्ततः सृष्टिश्च संस्थितिः । *S S Vimarśinī*, 1, 2.

'*Ajñāna* is *mala*, seed of *samsāra* ' ; it is obviously the same as *a-vidyā*. The synonyms of *a-jñāna*, given in one of the quotations in (iv) above, help to show that it stands for *ichchhā*.

Bhagavad-Gītā, (iii, 37, vii, 27 ; x, 11 ; xiv, 5—17), is perplexing. It puts together : (a) *saṭṭva*, *nirmalaṭva* or freedom from impurity, *prakāśha* or illumination, *an-āmaya* or freedom from disease, *sukha* or joy, *jñāna* or knowledge ; (b) *rajas*, *rāga* or attachment, *ṛṣhṇā* or thirst for life, *karma* or action, *lobha* or greed, *pravṛtti* or activity, *ārambhah karmaṇām* or initiation of new actions and enterprises, *aśamah* or restlessness, *spṛhā* or desire (whether emulous or envious), *ḍuhkha* or pain ; (c) *ṭamas*, *ajñāna* or ne-science, ignorance, error, *moha* or confusion and blind clinging, *āvaraṇa* or veiling, *pramāda* or carelessness, inadvertence, *ā-lasya* or indolence, *nidrā* or sleep, *a-prakāśha* or non-illumination, and *a-pravṛtti* or non-enterprise, dis-inclination. About the alliances of *saṭṭva* here, there is no difficulty. The connection of *rajas* with *rāga*, *ṛṣhṇā*, *lobha*, requires explanation ; the text says, in full, that *rajas* is *rāg-ātṃmaka*, 'ensouled by attachment,' is *ṛṣhṇā-saṅga-samuḍbhava*, 'is born of, or gives birth to,

addiction to the thirst for life, the will to live,' and 'rajaso lobbah sañjāyaṭe,' 'greed is born from rajas'. The reconciliation may be found in these turns of phrase. Pra-māḍa seems to be derived from the same root as the English word 'madness'. Its fellow-derivatives are maḍana, the 'mad-dener' or Eros-Cupid, maḍa or pride, also intoxication, un-māḍa or madness, maḍya, alcohol, etc. Mohana has an allied sense also. Ṭamas, a-jñāna, a-vidyā, moha, pra-māḍa, āvaraṇa, mala, etc., all stand for blind clinging, obstinate arbitrary *desire*, which throws a veil over the luminous eye of reason, blinds it, overpowers knowledge, is thoughtless, capricious, un-reasonable, is, in fact, the very essence of un-reason, a-jñāna. Love-Hate, Desire, Passion, is obviously arbitrary Un-Reason. Unreasoning passion, as Love, creates; as Hate, destroys; Reason only mediates, maintains, brings about s̥hīṭi or pālana, preserves, keeps up some sort of balance between the two, helps to make law and order: as Viṣṇu-saṭṭva between Brahmā-rajās and Rudra-ṭamas.

Ṭamas and moha sometimes mean unconsciousness, swooning, and slumber. In excessive 'perplexity' over conflicting desires and interests, 'not-knowing' what to do, persons faint away, and then they come out of that trance or slumber with some one desire preponderating. A moment of moha or laya, oblivion, 'the waters of Lethe,' intervenes at every change of 'heart,' every change of strong desires or states of being, or worlds or planes, every birth-and-death, āvaraṇa-vikshépa, and constitutes an initiation, a dīkshā, in which the jīva dives into the Infinite Self or store-house of Desire-Energy and energies, and then emerges with a 'new' experience, of success or failure, a power gained or lost. The moment of 'confusion' experienced by one learning to swim, between the imminent drowning and the sudden floating at ease, is a familiar illustration.

Some other helpful texts are,

सत्त्वं ज्ञानं, तमोऽज्ञानं, रागद्वेषौ रजः स्मृतं ।

सत्त्वस्य लक्षणं धर्मः, रजसस्तु अर्थ उच्यते,

तमसो लक्षणं कामः ; श्रेष्ठं एषां यथोत्तरं । *Manu*, xii, 24-26, 38.

धर्मश्च, अर्थश्च, कामश्च, त्रिवर्गस् त्रिगुणो मतः ;
सत्त्वं, रजः, तमः चेति ; तस्माद् धर्मं समाश्रयेत् ।

Bhavishya Purāṇa, Mādhyama Parva, Bhāga 1, ch. 1 ;
Kūrma Purāṇa, Pūrva, ch. 11.

रगो, द्वेषः, तथा मोहो, हर्षः, शोको ऽभिमानिता,
कामः, क्रोधश्च, दर्पश्च, तंद्री च, ऽलस्यं एव च,
इच्छा, द्वेषः, तथा तापः, पर-वृद्धि-उपतापिता,
अज्ञानम् एतत् निर्दिष्टं, पापानां चैव याः क्रियाः । *Mbh. Shantī*, ch. 157.

‘Saṭṭva corresponds to jñāna and dharma ; rajas to rāga-dvṛśa and artha ; tamas to a-jñāna and kāma. Each preceding one is higher and better ; dharma is best and should ever be clung to. Love, hate, infatuation, elation, pride, like, dislike, sorrow, burning jealousy at another’s prosperity—all this is Un-reason ; as also all sinful actions’.

Foot-Note 2, p. 136, of *Secret Doctrine*, vol. I, says, quoting K. P. Telang’s translation of the 3 *Gītā*-s (S. B. E. series). “The original for Understanding is Saṭṭva, which Shankara renders Anāh-karana, refined by sacrifices and other sanctifying operations. In *Katha*, . . . Saṭṭva is rendered by Shankara to mean Buddhi—a common use of the word.” To this H. P. B. adds, “Whatever meaning various schools may give the term, Saṭṭva is the name given among Occult students of the Āryāsanga School, to the dual Monad or Ātmā-Buddhi, and Ātmā-Buddhi on this plane corresponds to Prabrahman and Mulaprakṛti on the higher plane.”

(ix) The three functions or properties and characteristics of saṭṭva, rajas, and tamas are stated more specifically and categorically in the following, in connection with chitta or mind.

चित्तं हि प्रख्या-प्रवृत्ति-स्थिति-शीलत्वात् त्रिगुणम् । *Yoga-bhāṣya*, I, i.
प्रकाशशीलं सत्त्वं, क्रियाशीलं रजः, स्थितिशीलं तमः । *Ibid.*, II, 18.
स्थितिकारणं मनसः पुरुषार्थता, शरीरस्थेव ऽह्वारः । *Ibid.*, II, 28.
प्रकाशं च प्रवृत्तिं च मोहमेव च पाण्डव । *Gītā*, xiv, 22.

प्रीति-अप्रीति-विषादऽत्मकाः प्रकाश-प्रवृत्ति-नियम-ऽर्थाः ।

Sāṅkhya-Karika, 12. See also 13.

मुख-दुःख-मोहाः प्रीति-अप्रीति-विषादाः ।

Sāṅkhya-ṭaṭṭva-kaumudī, 12.

शांत-घोर-विमूढत्वं इति वा स्याद् अहंकृतेः । *Bhāgavaṭa*, III, xxvi

नमः शांताय घोराय मूढाय गुणधर्मिणे,

निर्विशेषाय साम्याय नमो ज्ञानघनाय च । *Ibid*, VIII, iii.

प्रकाशो बुद्धेः, चांचल्यं मनसः, आवरणं अहंकृतेः ।

Foot-note to *Shiva-sūtra-vimarśiṇi*, iii, 1

‘The function of buddhi-saṭṭva is prakāsha or prakhyā, illumination, making known, prīti, cheerful joyous affection and satisfaction, shānta-tā, peacefulness; of manas-rajās, is pravṛtti, chāncalya, kriyā, restless enterprising activity, a-prīti, discontent, ghora-tā, vehemence, dire-ness; of āham-kāra-ṭamas, is sthiti, niyama, āvaraṇa, steady obstinate clinging to one thing and veiling of other things, with a regularly fixed purpose, and also vishāda and moha, cheerless desolate yearning and pining, mūḍha, perplexed and confused as to the truth, the right course of action, and as to whether the heart’s desire will or will not be gained.’

(See also my *Yoga-Concordance-Dictionary*, pub. 1938; references and explanations under chitta, pravṛtti, sthiti, kriyā, prakhyā, etc.)

The three inseparable but distinguishable aspects or faculties of chitta or mind, the single ‘internal organ,’ antah-karaṇa, (in contact with the five external and at least seemingly separate five sense-organs and five motor-organs), are buddhi (or mahat), aham-kāra, and manas. Chitta is the summation of the three. It is, in fact, the soul with three functions, the psychical ‘individual,’ corresponding to the body with three properties (i.e., sensible qualities, substantiality, movement), the physical ‘singular,’ viz., the āṇu or atom of which *Bhāgavaṭa* (II, xi) says :

चरमः सद्भिषेवाणां, अनेको, ऽसंयुतः सदा,

परमाणुः स विज्ञेयो, नृणाम् ऐक्यभ्रमो यतः ।

"The ultimate indivisible 'particular,' 'many', *i.e.*, multitudinous, but uncompounded, *i.e.*, each separate from all others, whence arises men's illusory notion of the 'final unit' or the singular—is the paramāṇu." (See also *Vaishēshika-Sūtra*, I, ii, 3, 6, for *summum genus* and *final singular* or particular, or '*infima species*').

For all practical purposes, this *chitta* of Yoga is *manas* of *Nyāya*, its singularising, finitising, principle, principle of 'attention,' of 'the hot place in consciousness' (in William James' phrase), of focus in the field of consciousness, which is the cause of the *actuality* of 'one knowledge only at a time,' *Nyāya Sūtra*, III, ii, 56-62; while *buddhi* is the cause of the *possibility* of all knowledges simultaneously included in that infinite field; but this 'comprehensive' *kshētra-jñā* quality of *buddhi* is not clearly brought out in current *Nyāya* and *Vaishēshika* works; some of these later works however distinguish two kinds of cognition, *anubhava* and *smṛti*, *i.e.*, direct perception and memorial; and the latter is said to cover all three divisions of time, while the former is confined to the present.

Veḍānta speaks of 'the tetrad of the inner organ, *anṭah-karaṇa*-*chaṭushtaya*, *viz.* *manas*—*buddhi*—*ahamkāra*—*chitta*; *Sāṅkhya*, of *mahaṭ* (or *buddhi*)—*ahamkāra*—*manas*; *Yoga*, of *chitta* with three *shila*-s or characteristics; *Nyāya* mentions *buddhi* and *manas* separately (*Sūtra*, I, i, 9), makes *jñāna* or cognition (together with other phenomena) a 'mark' or characteristic of *Ātmā* (I, i, 10), identifies *jñāna* with *buddhi* (I, i, 15), and states the distinguishing characteristic of *manas* to be prevention of more than one 'knowledge' (or 'experience') occurring at one time (I, i, 16). But *Nyāya-Bhāshya* (on I, i, 16) says: "Memory, reasoning, acceptance of testimony, doubt, intuition, dreaming, *jñāna* or knowledge, inferential conjecture, experience of pleasure, desire, etc., are 'marks' of *manas*; and besides these, also this one peculiarly, *viz.*, the non-occurrence of more than one 'knowledge' at a time." And *Nyāya-vārtika-tātparya-tīkā* (on the same) seems to identify *buddhi* (which as said above is expressly declared in the *sūtra* to be identical with *jñāna*) with *manas*, thus,

बुद्धिर्ज्ञानसाधनमिति । बुध्यतेऽनेनेति व्युत्पत्त्या मन उच्यते ।

The reconciliation and explanation of all these may be found in the statements that,

बुद्ध्यहंकृन्मनोरूपं चित्तम् । *Shiva-Sūtra-Vimarśiṇī*, iii, 1.

अनुभूयमानस्य अस्य आत्मलभो ऽनुभवश्च अंतःकरणनिष्ठः, इति मनसि रजोगुणोदये, अहंकारे तमोगुणोदये, बुद्धौ च सत्त्वगुणोदयरूपायां वृत्तिः ।

Spāṇḍa-karika-vivṛṭi, iv, 20.

‘Chitta consists of buddhi—ahamkāra—manas,’ which make up the ‘inner organ’; and of these, manas expresses rajas; ahamkāra, tamas; and buddhi, sattva.’

यदेतद् विषयवासनाच्छुरितत्वात् नित्यं तदध्यवसायादिव्यापारबुद्ध्यहं-
कृन्मनोरूपं चित्तं, तदेव अतति, चिदात्मकस्वस्वरूपाख्यातया सत्त्वादिवृत्त्यवलंबनेन
योनिः संचरति, इति आत्मा अणुरित्यर्थः । *S. S. Vimarśiṇī*, iii, 1.

अणुः जीवः, अणिति श्रसिति इति अणुः, देहपुरुषकप्रणाद्याश्रयः चित्तमयः
प्रमाता । *Ibid.*, Appendix, iv

इच्छा शक्तितमा कुमारी । *Ibid.*, i, 13.

चित्तं वै वासनात्मकम् । *Yoga-Vāsishtā*, Chūdālā-upākhyāna,

‘This three-functioned mind or chitta is aṇu, atomic, because it ‘breathes,’ aṇiṭi, expands and contracts, and keeps moving incessantly, aṭaṭi, and hence is called the ātmā-jiva-aṇu; Ātmā, really Omnipresent, therefore motionless, appears as moving (aṭaṭi) when, colored by *desire*-vāsana, it puts on a-khyāṭi (a-vidyā, a-jñāna), non-knowledge or forgetfulness of Its-Own-Nature, and, instead of Omnipresent, becomes aṇu, a limited atom; when enveloped in the triple organ and the five tan-mātras, it is the experiencer-chitta; this sheathing is due to desire, will to live: the essence and core of mind may well be said to be *desire*’; while, no doubt, the three aspects of the mind are co-equal, yet, if a ‘distinction between the prophets’ may be made at all, we would have to say that very soul of soul is *desire*; for desire, emotion, the ruling passion, makes the individuality, the peculiarity and character of the person, is the individualising, finitising, characterising, distinguishing

principle ; any given person feels his *separate* existence most fully and keenly when he is expressing a particular emotion most intensely ; creation of *kṛtyās*, (Tibetan *tulku*) 'artificial' elementals and *dēvas*, by means of *mantras*, *i.e.*, *manana*, ideation, with intense desire, is only an illustration of this fact, as also the theosophical doctrine of 'individualising' of souls from lower into human kingdom under stress of intense emotion, like 'crystallisation' under stress of chemico-physical forces corresponding to emotions ; '*desire* is the *śakti par excellence*, *śakti-ṭamā* ;' cognition and action are *śaktis* only with the energy borrowed from desire.

This is also the significance of the otherwise somewhat obscure verse,

अपरा इयम्, इतस् तु अन्यां प्रकृतिं विद्धि मे पराम्,
जीवभूतां, महाबाहो !, यया इदं धार्यते जगत् । *Gītā*, vii, 5.

'My *parā* or higher *prakṛti* is that which manifests as *jivas*, souls, individuals (of countless grades of definition, group-souls, etc., one within another), and thereby carries on and upholds this moving world.' In other words, this *parā-prakṛti* is much the same as *Daivi-prakṛti* or *Śakti*, energy, force ; and *aparā-prakṛti* is *Mūla-prakṛti*, matter. The three *guṇas*, in different aspects, belong to both, as indeed also to Spirit or *Pratyagātmā*.

Energy, force, power, though abstract, in a general sense, yet always *manifests as*, in, and through, concrete 'individuals,' human and non-human. Hence inevitable morphisation of the one *Ātma-Śakti*, in many degrees of definition, first into *prāṇika-s*, nature-forces of the *Vēdas*, *Agni*, *Mitra*, *Varuṇa*, *Indra*, *Sūrya* etc., distinguished by functions, without ascription of any sharply-defined concrete human or other shapes ; and then into *prāṇimā-s*, more concretely anthropomorphic deities of *Purāṇas*, with well-defined but changeable shapes in subtler matter, as *abhimāni devatās*, ruling over and guiding (not so much intellectually as vitally and inspirationally) masses of corresponding 'nature-spirits' of all kinds, made of subtler or superphysical matter, or consisting of vegetable and animal bacteria and bacilli (*yak-shāṇi* and *rakshāṃsi*—after whom human or semi-human

racés of yaksha-s and rākshasa-s seem to be named, because of the prevalence of such microbes in their bodies), as also 'animal-souls' of masses of animals and men; and finally into quite human and historic deities, avatāras, of *Purāṇas* and other national legends and sagas, ruling more intellectually (comparatively) 'rational-souls' of masses of men.

The already-quoted verses of *Bhāgavata* (VIII, ii), speaking of 'triple Shakti, of the nature of I-feeling, egoism,' indicate the same thing as the *Gītā*-verse.

This aham-dhīh, I-feeling, is aham-kāra of Sāṅkhya and Vedānta, and asmiṭā of Yoga, which is but the second stage, phase, or form of a-viḍyā, primal Error, by which the Infinite illusorily regards itself as a finite 'body,' an 'atom,' and 'finitises' itself.

This aṇu, or 'āṇava-mala,' 'atom stain' or 'atom-substance', takes the place, as the third subdivision of energy, viz., sāmya, mentioned on p. 238, *supra*, from a different standpoint.

गोपितस्वमहिम्नो ऽस्य, संमोहाद् विस्मृतात्मनः,

यः संकोचः, स एवास्य आणवो मल उच्यते ।

स्वातंत्र्यहानिबोधस्थ, स्वातंत्र्यस्यापि अबोधता,

द्विधा ऽणवं मलम् इदं स्वस्वरूपापहानितः । *Shiva-Sūtra-Vt., i, 3.*

We have seen above that manas, chitta, or jiva is aṇu : *Upanishats* repeatedly declare that Brahman, Supreme Ātmā, is 'larger than the largest and smaller than the smallest,' is infinite and infinitesimal both, (the word for 'large,' viz., mahān, having a special fullness of significance which will appear in a moment). We have also seen that one of the quotations above, from *Bhāgavata*, expressly says that the 'atom,' the 'final singular,' is 'many' and yet also the cause of the illusion of singularity, 'oneness,' i.e., of many ones. A quotation from *Spanda-kārikā-vivṛti* will help to show how 'extremes meet,' and not only meet but are identical.

परमार्थे तु नेकत्वं पृथक्त्वाद् भिन्नलक्षणम् ;

प्रथक्त्वैकत्वरूपेण तत्त्वमेवं (? कं) प्रकाशते ।

यत्पृथक्त्वमसंदिग्धं तदेकत्वाच्च भिद्यते ;
 यदेकत्वंमसंदिग्धं तत्पृथक्त्वाच्च भिद्यते ।
 द्यौः क्षमा वायुरादित्यः सागराः सरितो दिशः ,
 अंतःकरणतत्त्वस्य भागा बहिरवस्थिताः । iv, 21.

'In transcendental and supreme experience, oneness or identity is not distinguishable from 'separate' (or rather complete and perfect) singularity (kévalatā, of yoga). Separate-singularity which has no fringe of uncertainty of any kind about it, cannot be distinguished from true (universal) oneness; and *vice versa*. In that supreme experience, the broad firmament, all-bearing earth, ambient air, blazing sun, rolling oceans, rushing rivers, ever-receding quarters of space—all these are seen to be but portions, projected *without*, of the one *my* 'internal organ' *within*," i.e., they are all seen as constituents of the One impartible Consciousness which has illusorily divided itself up into a 'without' and a 'within'. 'Empirical' and 'universal' Ego are identical. Following verses of *Yoga Vāsishṭha*, III, ch. 84, are to same effect.

चित्तमेव हि संसारो, रागादिक्लेशदूषितं ;
 तद्वै तैर्विनिर्मुक्तं, भवान्तः इति कथ्यते ।
 सर्वं अभ्यन्तरे चित्तं विभर्ति त्रिजगन्मभः ;
 अहंसापूरं इव तद् यथाकाले विजृम्भते ।
 योऽयं चित्तस्य चिद्भागः , सा एषा सर्वार्थबीजता ;
 यच्चास्य जडभागश्च, तज्जगत्, सो, ऽहं !, संभ्रमः ।
 चित्तं साध्यं, पालनीयं, विचार्य, कार्यं आर्यवत् ।

'The Chit-element in chitta, is seed of omniscience; the Jada-element in it, is all this Jagat, moving illusion. Chitta, mind, contains all the World-Process within itself. It should be reflected upon, controlled, cultivated, refined'.

After all, is it not literally true, that every experience, and all that is contained or implied in it and by it, all its contents, is *a mood of mind*, a *vṛtti* of anāh-karāṇa, i.e., of the Self identified with, or imagining It-Self as, an anāh-karāṇa? To think, to say, 'this is my-self's experience, that

is another-Self's experience, this mountain is outside of Me '— is not *all* this, *My* experience or thought? Is not all distinguishing of one-Self and another-Self, together with both the thus distinguished selves, within the One Self which distinguishes? Indeed there is Only One Self which *includes* all selves and all not-selves, all thoughts and all things, all subjects and all objects.

It may be mentioned incidentally, that *Praṇava-Vāda* makes abam-kāra the summation of *chitta-buddhi-manas*, instead of *chitta* the summation of *ahamkāra* and the two others. As said before, this implies only a slight difference of standpoint, an emphasis on *aham* rather than on *kāra*.

(x) A few quotations regarding the three 'faculties' or 'functions' of this 'inner organ' may help to make the subject clearer.

It is true that the ancient works lay stress on the indivisible oneness of mind, *manas*, in all its psychoses *i.e.*, the psyche's functionings, moods, modes; thus,

कामः संकल्पो विचिकित्सा भ्रद्वाऽभ्रद्वा वृत्तिरुत्तृतिः हीः धीः भीः इत्येतत् सर्वं मन एव । *Bṛhad-Āraṇyaka*, 1, v, 3.

'Love and passionate desire, resolve, doubt, faith, disbelief, patience, impatience, modesty, clear insight, fear—all these are but *manas*, mind.' These psychoses (mind's functions, mentations), are typical of the scores mentioned in different works of various schools of philosophy; *e.g.*, *ālo-chana*, pure sensation, and *pratyaksha*, perception (which are the basis of all other mental operations, त्रयस्य तत्पूर्विका वृत्तिः, as said, in *Sāṅkhya Kārikā*, 30, and प्रत्यक्षपरा प्रमितिः, in *Nyāya-bhāṣya*, I, i, 8), *adhyavasāya*, or ascertainment, *abhimāna*, egoistic desire, *sankalpa* or *vyavasāya*, resolve, *viparyaya* or *viparyāsa*, error, *samshaya*, doubt, *vikalpa*, imagination, *svapna*, dreaming, *niḍrā*, sleep, *praty-avamarsha* or *praty-abhijñā*, recognition, *ichchhā*, desire, *rāga*, liking, *dvesha*, disliking, *kṛti*, volition, *abhi-saṇḍhi*, determination, *anubhava*, experience, presentation, *smṛti*, memory, etc.—all these are only moods of the one mind.

ब्रह्मणा तन्यते विश्वं 'मनसा' एव स्वयम्भुवा ;
 मनोमयं अतो विश्वं यन् नाम परि- 'दृश्य' ते ।
 यत्र संकल्पनं तत्र मनो ऽस्ति, इति अवगम्यतां ;
 संकल्प-मनसी भिन्ने न कदाचन केनचित् ;
 संकल्पजाते गलिते स्वरूपं अवशिष्यते,
 यस्य च आत्माऽदिकाः संज्ञाः कल्पिताः, न स्व-भावतः ।
 विकल्प-कलित-ऽकार- 'देश-काल-क्रिया- 'ऽस्पदं,
 चित्तो रूपं इदं ब्रह्मन् क्षेत्रज्ञः इति कथ्यते ।
 वासनाः कल्पयन् सोऽपि याति 'अहंकार' -तां पुनः ;
 अहंकारो विनिर्णेता ऽकलंकी 'बुद्धिर्' उच्यते ;
 बुद्धिः संकल्पितऽकारा प्रयाति मननऽस्पदं ;
 'मनो' घनविकल्पं तु गच्छति इन्द्रियतां शनैः ;
 पाणि-पाद-मयं देहं इन्द्रियाणि विदुर् बुधाः ।
 एवं जीवो हि संकल्प-वासना-रज्जु-वेष्टितः,
 दुःख-जाल-परीत-ऽत्मा क्रमाद् आयाति नीचतां ।
 इति शक्तिमयं चेतो, घन-अहंकारतां गतं,
 कोश-कार-कृमिर् इव स्वयं आयाति बन्धनं ।
 कचिन्मनः, कचिद्बुद्धिः, कचिज्ज्ञानं, कचित्क्रिया,
 कचिद् एतद् अहंकारः, कचित् चित्तं इति स्मृतं ;
 कचित् प्रकृतिर् इति उक्तं, कचिन् माया इति कल्पितं,
 कचिन् मलं इति प्रोक्तं, कचित् तम इति स्मृतं,
 कचिद् बन्धः इति ख्यातं, कचित् पुर्यष्टकं स्मृतं,
 प्रोक्तं कचिद् अविद्या इति, कचिद् इच्छा इति सम्मतं,
 'मनः' सम्पद्यते लोलं, कल्पना-कलनो-न्मुखं ।

Mahā Upaniṣat and Yoga Vāsisṭha.

'Self-born Brahman spreads out the worlds by Manas.
 Wherever there is sankalpa-ideation, there is Manas at work.
 There is no difference between the two. When ideation

ceases, Self Al-One remains. It is indicated by such names as Ātmā. By and in ideation, Space-Time-Motion appear, and Chiṭ-consciousness becomes Kshétra-jña, cogniser of the 'field', the 'This'. Ideating vāsanā-desires, it becomes 'aham-kāra' - ego-ism; that, making determinations, free of doubt, a-kalankī, becomes 'buḍḍhi'; that, forming an 'image', becomes 'manas': that, densifying, crystallising, becomes indriyas, sensor-and-motor-organs; these make up the body. Thus the jīva-soul, binding itself with bonds, like the silkworm imprisoning itself in a cocoon spun by itself, falls lower and lower into denser and denser matter. This one and the same Manas-Mind, according to its various functionings, is named now 'manas', now 'buḍḍhi', now 'jnāna', again 'ichchhā', then 'kriyā', now 'aham-kāra', now 'chiṭṭa', or prakṛti, or māyā, or malam, or karma, bandha, puri-ashtaka, or a-vidyā. All these are but various names of various functionings of one and the same ideating Manas-Mind'.

Still it is possible to distinguish three broad classes of functionings among these phenomena.

अवसायो, ऽभिमानश्च, कल्पनं चेति, न क्रिया

एकरूपा, ततस्त्रित्वं युक्तं अतः कृतौ स्फुटम् । *Tantrāloka*, ix.

मनश्च मंतव्यं च, बुद्धिश्च बोद्धव्यं च, अहंकारश्चाहंकर्तव्यं च, चित्तं च चेतयितव्यं च । *Prashna Upanishat*, iv, 8.

अध्यवसायो बुद्धिः, अभिमानोऽहंकारः, मनः संकल्पकम् ।

Saṅkhya-Karika, 23, 24, 37.

बुद्धि-अहंकृन्-मनः प्राहुः बोध-संरंभण-एषणे ;

करणं बाह्यदेवैः (इन्द्रियैः) यन् नैव, अपि (तु) अंतर्मुखैः कृतम् ।

बोधः शब्दादेर्विषयस्याध्यवसायः, संरंभः अहमात्माभिमानः, एषणमिच्छा संकल्पः ।

क्लृप्तिः, मतिः, स्यतिश्चैव, जाता भिन्नार्थवाचकाः,

इच्छा-संरंभ-बोधार्थाः, तेन अंतःकरणं त्रिधा । *Tantrāloka*, ix.

मनो, बुद्धिर्, अहंकारः, चित्तं, करणम् आंतरम् ;

संशयो, निश्चयो, गर्वः, स्मरणं विषयाः इमे ।

Shabḍa-kalpā-ḍruma, art. Anṭahkarapa.

यदा तु संकल्पविकल्पकृत्यं, तदा भवेत् तन् मन इत्यभिरुच्यं ;

स्याद् बुद्धिसंज्ञं च यदा प्रवेत्ति सुनिश्चितं संशयहीनरूपं ;

अनुसंधानरूपं तत् चित्तं करणमांतरम् ;

अहंकृत्यात्मश्रुत्या तु तदहंकारतां गंतम् । *Dēvi-Bhāga*, VII., xxxii.

So far there is no difficulty. There is a clear consensus in the above texts, that *buddhi* is that faculty of the mind whose function is to ascertain facts, *adhyavasāya*, *bodha*, *syāti*, *nishchaya* ; *ahaṁ-kāra*, to ego-ise, to connect all experiences with self, to reduce them to the sake of the selfishly-desiring self, *abhimāna*, *sam-rambha*, *mañi*, *garva* ; *manas*, to resolve upon which course to follow between doubtful alternatives, *kalpana*, *mañavya*, *ēshaṇā*, *ichchha*, *klṛpti*, *samshaya* or *sankalpa-vikalpa* ; *chitta*, to memorise, to connect before and after, past and present and future, and also all the three, in itself, *smaraṇa*, *anu-sandhāna*. Clearly the three first correspond to *jñāna*, *ichchhā*, *kriyā*. But when we seek for direct texts, we find some perplexing inconsistency here as in the case of *saṭṭva*, etc., (*vide* section viii, *supra*, of this note, and the references to *Gītā*). Thus,

ज्ञानमपि सत्त्वरूपा निर्णयबोधस्य कारणं बुद्धिः ; but

तस्य क्रिया तमोमयमूर्तिर्मन उच्यते विकल्पकरी ; and

इच्छास्य रजोरूपाऽहंकृतिर्ऽसीद् अहंप्रतीतिकरी । *Tattva-saṁdoha*.

(It should be noted that the quotations from Kāshmīra Shaiva works, throughout this Note, are all taken from Mr. J. C. Chatterji's excellent publications under the auspices of the Kāshmīr State.)

In these lines *jñāna*—*saṭṭva*—*buddhi* are brought together all right ; but *kriyā* and *manas* are joined to *ṭamas* instead of *rajas* ; and *ichchhā* and *ahaṁkāra* are allied to *rajas* instead of *ṭamas*. *Spanda-kārikā-vivṛṭi* (iv, 20), however, as we have seen in section ix, *supra*, of this note, assigns the correspondences rightly. *Vāṭsyāyana*, *Kāma-sūtra*. I, ii, 44, uses *abhimāna* in the sense of desire, expressly.

दांडक्यः भार्गवकन्यां कामादभिमन्यमानः सबंधुराग्रो विननाश ।

(This sentence is repeated in Kautalya, *Artha-shāstra*, I, vi.)

'King Dandaka, *desiring lustfully* to violate the daughter of the R̥shi Bhārgava, was destroyed with all his kith and kin, and all his kingdom was laid waste and became dense jungle'. Vālmiki, *Rāmāyaṇa*, has a verse which uses the word in the same sense: 'Does the king's son carefully avoid *lusting* after the wives of others?'

कश्चिन् न परदारान् वा राजपुत्रोऽभिमन्यते ।

We may, on the whole, take the following to be the net result. Buddhi is the principle or faculty of cognition, knowing, understanding, intellection, reason, which ascertains and decides, 'this is so'; it corresponds to saṭṭva; Saṃskṛt names for its operations are adhyavasāya, nishchaya, boḍha, jñāna, upa-labḍhi, etc. Ahaṃ-kāra is the principle or faculty of desiring (whereby the *separateness* of one-self is primarily accentuated), wishing (willing being, so to say, midway between wishing and acting), and of self-reference, individuation, personalisation, egoism, hence self-complacence, pride, etc.; it corresponds to tāmas; Saṃskṛt words for its functionings are ichchhā, abhi-māna, sam-rambha, garva, éshaṇā (in the sense of vāsanā, craving, etc.). Manas is the principle or faculty of action, volition, conation, determination (of what to do), resolve (after vacillation), attention (after distraction); it corresponds to rajas; Saṃskṛt words for its activities are kriyā, éshaṇā, (in the sense of seeking, anu-éshaṇā, going after), samshaya-vimarsha, sankalpa-vikalpa. Chitṭa is the summation of the three, with the special feature or function of memory (and expectation), connecting before and after; Saṃskṛt words here are chétayaté, smaraṇam, anu-san-dhānam. The name chitṭa, for individual mind or soul, is appropriately formed from the root-word Chiṭ which means consciousness generally, Chétanā, Chiṭi. The Universal Consciousness or Chiṭ, including all time, past, present, and future, is obviously the locus and the means of all memory. A portion, a slab, so to say, of this Universal Consciousness, gathered into a separate aggregate, with a definite reach backward and forward in time, becomes a chitṭa; in this individual 'memory'—and an individual *is* but a 'memory,' a biography, a number of experiences in a certain order, so that individuality is lost and disappears, when, and to the

extent that, memory is lost and disappears—the three other functions, of buddhi, etc., are all incorporated.'

The order of succession and rotation of the three classes of psychoses, cognitive, affective, conative, is indicated in the following :

ज्ञानजन्या भवेदिच्छा, इच्छाजन्या भवेत् कृतिः,

कृतिजन्या भवेच्चेष्टा, चेष्टाजन्या भवेत् क्रिया । *Shandilya*.

ज्ञानपूर्वोद्भवा लिप्सा, लिप्सापूर्वाऽभिसंधिता,

अभिसंधिपूर्वकं कर्म, कर्ममूलं ततः फलम् । *Mbh., Shantī*, ch. 204.

'Out of knowledge arises desire ; out of desire, kṛti (or prayatna), i.e., volition ; out of that, effort ; out of that, action.' 'First comes knowledge (of a thing) ; then the wish to obtain it ; then the purposeful effort, abhi-sandhi ; then the action ; then the fruit.'

जानाति, knows ; then इच्छति, desires ; then यतते, endeavours—this is one of the commonplaces of Nyāya. It is obvious that intention, purpose, will, volition, conation, innervation, exertion, muscular effort, are all intermediate states of transition from desire to action.

In Purāṇic mythical and anthropomorphic symbology, for purposes of concrete devotional worship, Vāsudēva-Kṛṣṇa (an incarnation of Viṣṇu-saṭṭva, representing knowledge, wisdom) ; his brother Sankarshaṇa-Bala-rāma (of Rudra-ṭamas, representing the anger-half of desire) ; his son Pradyumna (of Kāma-Eros, representing the love-half thereof) ; and his grandson A-niruddha (the 'unrestrained,' representing action, rajas), stand, respectively, for chitta, buddhi or mahat, the two subdivisions (anger and love) of ahamkāra, and for manas respectively (*Bhāgavata*, III, xxvi.)

For a description and illustration of the inhibitive, veiling, blinding, (āvaraṇa), distracting, diverting, selective, mis-directive and incentive, (vikshépa), preserving, steadying, (sthiti), fixing and regulating (niyama) effects of feeling, passion-desire-unreason, and of its connection with ṭamas, see Hoffding, *Outlines of Psychology*, ch. VI, 7. Thus, ". . . Feeling itself may have a hindering effect . . . But the

step once taken, feeling is the faithful guardian of what has been acquired. Then its *inertia*" (*tamas*) "is of use to knowledge" (*saṭtva*), etc. (See also Herbert Spencer, *Psychology*, vol. I, p. 110).

(Some more notes, which had gathered on the margins of my personal copy of the previous editions of this book, may be incorporated here).

स्मृतिः व्यतीत-विषया, मतिः आगामि-गोचरा,

बुद्धिः तात्कालिकी ज्ञेया, प्रज्ञा त्रैकालिकी मता । *Nyāya*

शुश्रूषा, श्रवणं चैव, ग्रहणं, धारणं तथा,

ऊहा, उपोहो, ऽर्थविज्ञानं, तत्त्वज्ञानं च, धीगुणाः ।

संज्ञानं, आज्ञानं, विज्ञानं, प्रज्ञानं, मेधा, दृष्टिः, धृतिः, मतिः, मनीषा, जूतिः, स्मृतिः, संकल्पः, क्रतुः, असुः, कामः, वशः, इति सर्वाणि एव एतानि प्रज्ञानस्य नामधेयानि भवन्ति । *Aṭṭarēya*, III, 2.

'Smṛti, memory, has the past for object; mati, expectation, opinion, the future, the coming; buddhi, perception, the present, that which is immediately before it; pra-jñā, the higher mentation, thinking, ranges over and covers, simultaneously, all three divisions of time'. 'Wish to hear *i.e.*, to learn, scientific curiosity', attentive listening *i.e.* absorption of knowledge, apprehension, retention, inferential reasoning and acceptance of a fact, (similar) rejection or refutation (of an alleged fact), understanding of purport and purpose, knowledge or grasp of the essential truth (of a subject)—these are the eight functions of dhih, intelligence'; (from dhā, to place, to do, to deposit; dhiyanṭé paḍ-arṭhāh asyām iṭi dhih, that in which all meanings of words, *i.e.*, notions of things meant by words, are deposited; dhi is a synonym for buddhi). Sensation, perception, concrete or factual knowledge, abstract thought or conceptual knowledge or generalisation, retentive intelligence, view (or outlook, doctrine), resolute fortitude (or determination), opinion, independence of mind, propensity, memory or recollection, imaginative ideation, volition, asu or prāṇa or innervation (of a motor organ or muscle, with nerve-energy, by volitional

effort for action), kâma-desire, vasha-capability or will-power—all these are only different names (of different aspects or functions) of pra-jñāna-consciousness'.

यदा मनसा मनस्यति, 'मंत्रान् अधीयीय' इति, अथ अधीते; 'कर्माणि कुर्वीय' इति, अथ कुरुते; पुत्रांश्च पशूश्च इच्छेय' इति, अथ इच्छते; 'इमं च लोकं अमुं च इच्छेय', इति, अथ इच्छते; मनो हि आत्मा, मनो हि लोको, मनो हि ब्रह्म, मनः उपास्व इति । *Chhāṇḍogya*, vii, 3. चित्तं चेतयते । vii. 5.

'By manas-mind, man resolves, 'may I study mantras', and studies; 'may I do (such-and-such) acts', and does; 'may I desire children and domestic animals, and (the joys and riches of) this world and also the next', and desires; manas is the soul, the Self, is all this world (*i.e.*, all these worlds, all this, all objects); it is Brahma; manas should be meditated on, propitiated, worshipped, given devotion to (*i.e.*, should be purified, elevated, strengthened)'; 'Chitta remembers'.

The same three functions, jñāna-ichchhā-kriyā, cognition-desire-action, with the fourth all-connecting all-including memory-expectation-consciousness, are clearly indicated in these sentences of the *Chhāṇḍogya*. Incidentally, it may be noted that Plato, in *Republic*, Bk. iv, (Jowett's translation), distinguishes "three principles of the Soul, Reason, Desire, and Passion or Spirit or Anger"; which is very feeble; in view of what Indian tradition says, from *Upanishats* downwards; "passion or spirit or anger" is only one part of 'desire', and "reason" only one part of 'cognition', and 'volition-action' is not discerned and counted at all by Plato.

Mbh., Shānti-parva, chs : 238, 254, 258, (also 203, 268, 281, and others) say :

अग्ने एव महद्भूतं, आशु, व्यक्तऽत्मकं, मनः,

दूरगं, बहुधा-गामि, प्रार्थना-संशयऽत्मकं ।

मनसस्तु परा बुद्धिः, बुद्धेर् आत्मा परो मतः ।

बुद्धिर् विकुरुते भावं, तदा भवति सा मनः ।

व्यवसायऽात्मिका बुद्धिः, मनो व्याकरणऽात्मकं ।

'Maḥat-Manas manifested first, fast-rushing, far-traveling, ever-going, desiring-and-doubting (affirming-and-denying, imagining-and-effacing). . . . 'Beyond Manas is buddhi; beyond buddhi is Aṭmā.' . . . 'When buddhi undergoes emotion or any definite functioning with reference to a specific object, it becomes manas.' . . . 'Buddhi determines, resolves, ascertains, makes sure; manas expounds, specifies.'

There is a grand hymn to Manas, of six mantras (verses), in *Yajur-Vēda*, which emphasises the all-enmeshing quality and speed of the mind :

यज् जाग्रतो दूरं उदैति दैवं, तद् उ सुप्तस्य तथैव ऐति,
 दूरंगमं, ज्योतिषां ज्योतिर् एकं, तन् मे मनः शिवसंकल्पं अस्तु ।
 यत् प्रज्ञानं, उत चेतो, धृतिश्च, यज् ज्योतिरंतरत् अमृतं प्रजासु,
 यस्मान् न ऋते किंचन कर्म क्रियते, तन् मे मनः शिवसंकल्पमस्तु ।
 येन इदं भूतं भुवनं भविष्यत् परिगृहीतं अमृतेन सर्वं,
 यस्मिंश्चित्तं सर्वं ओतं प्रजानां, तन्मे मनः शिवसंकल्पं अस्तु । ...

'This Mind of mine, which wanders far when (I am) awake, and comes back (to me) when (I am) asleep; which is the one Light of lights; which is known as pra-jñāna and chéṭas and dṛṣṭi, (knowledge, desire-memory, and will-volition-action), Immortal Inner Light of all living beings, without which nothing can be done, which encompasses all past, present, and future worlds, in which are interwoven all the minds of all beings—may that Mind of mine ever ideate holy thoughts, ever function auspiciously, beneficently'.

Chitta has been said in some of the above texts, to connect all three divisions of time. As memory, it is cognition of an object with the additional cognition of 'past-ness', in the sequence of its experience; as expectation, of future-ness; as direct perception, of presentness; (see *The Mahatma Letters*, p. 194, ré Time). Other texts assign the same power to prajñā; others to buddhi; they ascribe reasoning also to the two: it is obvious that reasoning, inference, proceeds from past experience to future similar experience, connects memory and expectation. The incessant flow and

flux, the kaleidoscopic assumptions of ever new forms and figures by the very same few pieces of differently coloured glass, which goes on perpetually in these subtle regions of the mind, has been referred to before; each function passes into another, imperceptibly as it were. Compare the statement in *The Mahatma Letters*, p. 187: "As no two men, not even two photographs of the same person, nor yet two leaves, resemble, line for line, each other, so no two states in Déva-chan are like". But this does not mean that the states cannot be grouped into great broad classes. Clouds at sunset in the rains are never still, are ever changing their shapes and colors; but the main seven colors, or the three yet more primary ones, are always there, and distinguishable. Déva-chan, (? Tibetan for Skt. Déva-jana or Déva-sṭhāna, god-world) Svar-ga, ('where sva, Self, goes'), may be said to be the Dream-world par excellence; all mano-maya and vijñāna-maya; but of *waking* dreams, so to say, vivid, 'real'; sva, Self, Mind, has much more control over Matter there; Matter is much more plastic.

Incidentally; the fuller the comprehension of the Nature of Mind and mental processes, the clearer will be understood the teachings of the Masters, as regards after-death states of normals and abnormals, suicides, 'accident-killed', elementaries, ghosts, shells, lower principles, higher principles, disjunctions of the principles from, and fresh conjunctions with, each other, etc. Each individual flowing into and out of all others; individual within and without other individuals: the principle of individuality-Manyness as well as all individuals, within the Principle of Universality and the One-Universal—this seems to be the key to the problems of personal as well as Impersonal Immortality and all subsidiary questions; the subject will come up for treatment again, later on. In this connection, an extract from Herodotus (*History*, Bk. IV, ch. 184), which is referred to in the *Secret Doctrine* (iv, 331) will be found suggestive: "around another salt-hill and spring of water, dwell a people called the Atarantians, *who alone of all nations are destitute of names*. The title of Atarantians [Atlanteans] is borne by the whole race in common; but the men have no particular names of their own. . . . Near the salt is a mountain called Atlas, . . .

so-lofty . . . the natives called it 'the Pillar of Heaven', and they themselves take their name from it, being called Atlantes . . ." A group of persons, not having any distinctive, differentiating, particular names, everyone being known as and called 'Atarantian', presumably had some sort of a 'group-individuality' also; something like that of herds of herbivores, or the populations of termitariums and bee-hives.

In the last-quoted *Mbh.* text, occurs the word *vy-ava-sāya*. Ordinarily, it means resolution, determination, in the actional sense, rather than the cognitional; f.i. *Giṭā*, ii, 41; 'The *resolute, determined, buddhi, will*, is one-pointed, single-minded, keeps one aim before it (and therefore *acts*, and achieves that aim); while the irresolute ones dream of many objects and fritter away their energy in endless vague plans'. Here, by *vyavasāya* is meant 'determination to act' rather than 'ascertainment of fact'. The cognitional sense is usually expressed by *adhy-ava-sāya*, as in many of the other texts quoted above. The word *vy-ā-karṇa* has now come technically to mean grammar; because grammar 'specifies' and 'limits' the proper use of language.

Abhi-māna and its derivatives, as meaning ego-ising, self-referring self-emphasising, self-asserting, prideful, overbearing *desire*, occur in the following texts:—

एवम् एषोऽसकृत् सर्वं कीडार्थं 'अभिमन्यते' ।

एवम् एष महान् आत्मा सर्ग-प्रलय-कोविदः,

विकृर्वाणः प्रकृतिमान् 'अभिमन्यति' अबुद्धिमान् ;

लीयते त्रिगुणैर्युक्तः तासु तासु इह योनिषु,

सहवास-निवास-डात्मा "न-अन्यो-ऽहं" इति 'मन्यते' ।

यानि चान्यानि द्वंद्वानि प्राकृतानि शरीरिषु,

'अभिमन्यति, अभीमानात्', तथैव सु (? स्व-)कृतान् अपि ;

वस्त्राणि चान्यानि बहून् 'अभिमन्यति' अबुद्धिमान् ।

'अभिमन्यति' असम्बोधात् तथैव त्रिविधान् गुणान्,

सत्त्वं-रजस्-तमश्चैव. धर्मार्थौ काम एव च—

“अहम् एतानि” वै सर्वं, “मयि एतानि” इन्द्रियाणि च ;
अक्षरः क्षरं आत्मानं अबुद्धिस्तु ‘अभिमन्यते’ ।

Mbh, Shānti, chs. 308, 309, 310.

‘This Mahān-Ātmā, for the sake of Kridā, Play, abhi-manyatī, puts upon Him-Self, takes on, a-buddhi, a-vidyā, i.e., Prakṛti, with its three guṇas; enters into these countless yoni-s, species of living things, identifies It-Self with Its companion, its garment inside which it dwells; and thinks [note these words] “I am Not anything Else *than this body*” (—instead of thinking its whole Thought, “*than My-Self*”—); thus, it abhi-manyatī, imagines, as attached to It-self, all these outer garments, vastrāṇi, made up of saṭṭva-rajas-tāmas, dharma-artha-kāma, [note the correct order]; It thinks “I am all these”, “all these are in me”, these indriyas, sensor-motor-organs which make up this body. Thus the Infinite abhi-manyatē, desirefully imagines It-Self to be finite”.

अभितः, सर्वतः, मन्यते (ति), आत्मनि आरोपयति, ‘अहम् एतद् एतत् स्याम्’ इति ।

‘May I be so-and-so, I am so-and-so’—this imposition of other things upon Self is abhi-māna.

चितिः प्रत्यक्षमर्शऽऽत्मा । चिनोति च, धारयति च, इति, चयनात् चित् ।

‘The essence of chitī is re-cognition, praṭi-ava-marsha, ability to recognise that this is the same as was perceived before. It gathers up and preserves and holds all experiences’.

यत् पूर्वं अव्यक्ताद् उत्पन्नं तत्त्वं ईश्वरं अप्रतिबुद्धगुणस्थं, एतत् पुरुषसंज्ञितं महद् इत्युक्तं, बुद्धिरिति च । सत्ता, स्मृतिः, धृतिः, मेधा, व्यवसायः, समाधि-प्राप्तिः इत्येवं आदीनि व्यक्तपर्यायि नामानि वदन्ति । ... विरिंचो, ‘ऽभिमानी’, अविवेकः, ईर्ष्या, कामः, क्रोधः, लोभः, मदः, दर्पः, मम-कारः च, एतानि अहंकार-पर्यायनामानि भवन्ति, एवं आहुः ।

¹ *Mbh*. Shānti, ch. 427; also chs. 108, 180, 316, 317, 357; *Anu-gītā*, ch. 26; *Vāyu Purāṇa* Śrīṣṭi Prakaraṇa, ch. iv; etc. :

(See also *Durgā-Saptā-Shatī*, and my *Mānava-Dharma-Sārah*, in which these and other synonyms, and names according with transformations during gradual manifestation, vyākṣa-pary-āya and aham-kāra-pary-āya, of Mind-Brahmā, are repeated over and over again, and explained etymologically ; whereby the transformations become intelligible).

We have seen before (pp. 121—131) how certain texts play, in riddle, with the word *anyaṭ*. Another text of the same kind occurs in *Mbh.*, *Shanṭi*, ch. 325 :—

न-अन्यद् अन्यद् इति ज्ञात्वा, न-अन्यद् अन्यत्र वर्त्तते ।

It occurs in the course of a great debate between the lady (philosopher-yōgini) Sulabhā and king Dharma-dhvaja Janaka (of the famous dynasty of Janakas, philosopher-kings, also known as vi-dēha ; one of whom, Sira-dhvaja Janaka, was the father of Siṭā and father-in-law of Rāma). Dharma-dhvaja was a disciple of the Sāṅkhya Teacher Pancha-Shikha. The text quoted has a different meaning, in the immediate context ; but that meaning is of no particular significance ; the other interpretation, of deep significance, is also possible here, as in the other cases (pp. 121—131), and is appropriate also, in view of the nature of the whole discussion on 'philosophy, in theory and in practical daily life'.

शत्रवो न 'अभिमन्यन्ते', भक्षान् विषकृतान् इव ।

Valmiki, *Ramayana*, II ch. 88, 24—29.

'Enemies never harbour any proud *desire* to attack the kingdom of Ayodhyā (even after Rāma has gone away to the forests, on his fourteen-years' exile, because it is guarded by his fame, and the fame of the good and strong government established there) ; they avoid it like poisoned food'.

यावद् भ्रियेत जटरं, तावत् स्वत्वं हि देहिनाम् ;

अधिकं यो 'ऽभिमन्येत', स स्तेनो दंडं अर्हति । *Bhāgavata*.

'(For the renunciant sanyāsi) necessary food is the only right possession ; he who *desires* more is as a thief, and should be punished'.

These additional texts will, it is hoped, enable the reader to judge more confidently the import and the correspondences of the three factors of the several triads which have been dealt with in this note.

The word 'faculties' has been used above wittingly. It is true that modern western text-books profess to have given up the old 'faculty-psychology'; and the abandonment is justifiable, but with reservations. We have seen above that the ancient *Upanishats* strongly affirm the indivisible unity of the mind; but that does not entail the avoidance of all classification of psychical phenomena, and of the consequent discernment of corresponding 'powers,' *śaktis*, i.e., 'faculties,' in the soul. The doctrine of 'faculties' was run to an extreme. There ought not to be a running to the opposite extreme. It has been pointed out that the three functions of the mind are distinguishable but not separable. From this it does not follow that the word 'faculties' should not be used in connection with the mind; for 'faculties' may also be regarded as distinguishable but not separable. Strictly, *pṛthakṭva*, separateness, separability, complete and perfect, does not exist even in the realm of matter: for the most utterly separate-seeming pieces of matter are found, on scrutiny, to be floating in and connected together by a subtler kind of matter of which these separate-seeming pieces are, directly, or indirectly some sort of condensation. The *organs* of audition, vision, etc., may be said to be separate, but scarcely the 'faculties' thereof, which all inhere, as 'powers,' in the indivisible soul. And even this separateness of the organs is not quite perfect separateness. Even physically they are connected together by nerves. And in abnormal psychical states, persons have 'seen' with the 'navel,' while their eyes were tightly closed and bandaged; and 'optophones' have been recently invented. The indication is that the potentialities of all kinds of sensations are present in all the sensor-nerves—on the general principle that all is everywhere and always—though one potency preponderates and has become *act*-ual in one special nerve; as is easy to understand when we remember that evolutionists have ascertained that all the sensories have differentiated out of one primal nerve of 'touch' (as moderns say; of 'audition,' as ancients say, though some verses of *Anu-Gītā*,

which refer to *sparsha-vidyut*, 'touch-electricity,' seem to lend some support to the modern view also). We have also to remember that, with progress of psycho-physical research and discovery in the 'localisation of functions,' it is being established more and more clearly, every day, that certain nerve-parts, nerve-tissues, nerve-lobes, and ganglia, preponderantly serve as channels and organs of one or another of the three main functions of the mind; so that the 'inner organ' is beginning to be seen as not wholly dissimilar from the outer organs; and *vice versa*.

In short, the distinction between 'distinguishability' and 'separability' too, is but one of degree, ultimately; for *buddhi*, which 'distinguishes,' is itself *jada*, 'unconscious,' being a transformation of *Prakṛti*, or Root-matter, as *Sāṅkhya* says; and *Prakṛti* again is but an 'idea,' in turn, an 'eject' and 'project' of Consciousness, made of veritable Conscious-stuff; 'without' and 'within' being facets of the same; appearance of contrast and opposition here also being only illusory, such as underlies all *dvam-dvam*, pairs of opposed relatives, of the World-Process; while Continuity, Organic Unity, and, finally, complete Unity and Identity of all (in One Universal Consciousness, *imag-in-ing* all-things *al-ways*) is the real fact.¹

(xi) Finally, the difference or distinction between *Buddhi* and *Manas* may be indicated from a somewhat different standpoint.

Bergson among recent philosophers in the West is specially noted for having pointedly drawn attention anew to the fact, latterly tending largely to be overlooked there, "that deeper than any intellectual bond which binds a conscious creature to the reality in which it lives and which it may come to know, there is a *vital* bond". "Our knowledge rests

¹ In one way, *Sāṅkhya* may be said to go beyond the extremist 'behaviourists' of Pavlov's and Watson's (Russian and U. S. American) Schools; but the *very great* difference between the two is that *Sāṅkhya* affirms 'mind' as a fact, though material; while the latter regard it as an illusion, as *non-est*, and thus stultify their own opinions and minds; for they would be also only 'conditioned reflexes', therefore liable to change with changed conditions, therefore unreliable and untrue.

on an *intuition* which is not, at least which is never purely, intellectual. This *intuition* is of the very essence of *life*, and the intellect is formed from it by life, or is one of the forms that life has given to it in order to direct the activity and serve the purpose of the living beings that are endowed with it." "Knowledge is for life and not life for knowledge." "One thing is certain, that if you are convinced by this or any other philosophy, it is because you have entered into it by *sympathy*, and not because you have weighed its arguments as a set of abstract propositions." "Consciousness of living is the intuition of life." "Reality is life." "Why is there any reality at all? Why does something exist rather than nothing? Why is there an order in reality rather than disorder? When we characterise reality as life, the question seems so much more pressing, for the subject of it seems so much fuller of content, than when we set over, against one another, bare, abstract categories, like the being and nothing that Hegel declared to be identical. It seems easy to imagine that life might cease and then nothing would remain. In this way we come to picture to ourselves a nought spread out beneath reality, a reality that has come to be and that might cease to be, and then again there would be nought. This idea of an absolute nothing is a false idea, arising from an illusion of the understanding.¹ Absolute nothing is unthinkable. The problems that arise out of the idea we seem to have of it are unmeaning . . ." "Why, at ordinary times, does it seem so certain that it is material things that endure, and that time is a mechanical play of things that themselves do not change? It is due to two fundamental *illusions* of the mind . . . The reality of life is essentially *freedom* . . ."

The above quotations are taken from a little monograph on Bergson's Philosophy of Change by Mr. Wildon Carr.² They help to show how near he has come to many Vedāntic conclusions—that a theory of knowledge is but a part of the theory of Life (which is knowledge plus desire-feeling

¹ See p. 120, *supra*.

² Jackson's People's Books series. For further scrutiny of Bergson's philosophy, and objections to what seen to be his defects, or even extravagances, see *The Science of the Self*, Index-references to Bergson.

plus action); that our knowledge differs with our *attitude*; that sympathy means understanding, and antipathy, misunderstanding, (the *veḍāṇṭi* would add that *rāga*, interestedness, implies error in understanding, and *vai-rāgya*, dis-interestedness, true understanding); that our daily life is based on illusion (*Veḍāṇṭa* would add that the basic illusion is that which takes finite for Infinite, and *vice versa*, and all others follow from it); and that *freedom* is real life (final freedom, *moksha*, from that basic illusion). But though Bergson has come so near, he would probably not yet quite accept the exact *veḍāṇṭic* conclusions. His own 'attitude' is one of *rāga*, of inclination towards *change*, and *progress always*, rather than of *vi-rāga* and inclination towards changelessness. Characteristically, Bergson's philosophy is known as 'the Philosophy of Change'. He is a worshipper of Shakti-Power, not of Shiva-Peace (see p. 180, f.n., and p. 242, f.n., *supra*).

At the same time, he has done good service by his work, and particularly by laying stress on Intuition as contrasted with, or at least, distinguished from, Intelligence; stress, which is likely to make certain aspects of Yoga and *Veḍāṇṭa* clearer to the modern mind. In a certain aspect, his Intuition (including Instinct) corresponds with *Mahat* or *Buddhi* (identified with *Chitṭa*); and his Intelligence with *Manas* (including *Aham-kāra*).

अनयोरेव (बुद्धिमनसोः) चित्ताहंकारयोः अंतर्भावः ।

The following quotations will help to show.

मनसश्चापि, बुद्धेश्च, ब्रूहि मे लक्षणं परम् ;

एतद् अद्यात्मविदुषां परं कार्यं विधीयते ।

बुद्धिः आत्माऽनुगा अतीव, उत्पादेन विधीयते,

तदाश्रिता सा विज्ञेया, बुद्धिस्तस्य एषिणी भवेत् ।

बुद्धिर् उत्पद्यते कार्यात् , मनस्तु उत्पन्नमेव हि ।

बुद्देशुणविधानेन मनस्तद्गुणवद् भवेत् । *Mbh.*, Vana, ch. 183.

बुद्धिः आत्मा मनुष्यस्य, बुद्धिः एव आत्मनो गतिः ;

यदा विकुरुते भावं तदा भवति सा मनः ;

इन्द्रियाणां पृथग्भावाद् बुद्धिर्विक्रियतेऽसकृत् ;
 शृण्वती भवति श्रोत्रं, सृशती स्पर्शः उच्यते ;
 यदा प्रार्थयते किञ्चित् तदा भवति सा मनः ।

Ibid., Shānti, ch. 254 ; see also ch. 203.

सर्वदा सर्वभावानां सामान्यं वृद्धिकारणम् ;
 हासहेतुर्विशेषश्च ; प्रवृत्तिः उभयस्य तु ।
 सामान्यम् एकत्वकरं, विशेषस्तु पृथक्त्वकृत् ;
 तुल्यार्यता तु सामान्यं, विशेषस्तु विपर्ययः । *Charaka*, I, i.

'Distinguishing of the characteristics of Buddhi and Manas is one of the final and most important duties of the psychologist. Buddhi is general awareness, which clings to the Universal Self, and is always a-search for It, *i.e.*, for the Unity in all things ; and is wholly dependent upon it ; making its generalisations only by diligently discerning unity or similarity in diversity. It becomes manifest in and by *uṭ-pāḍa*, up-rising, (appearing above the threshold of consciousness), and then takes shape as general concepts or laws and generalisations, *viḍhiyaṭé*. Manas on the other hand, is *uṭ-panna*, 'uprisen,' active, selective, attentive mind, 'risen above' the threshold of consciousness (*laya-sṭhāna*). Buddhi specified, particularised, by a *vi-kāra*, a change, a 'formation,' a condensation, by 'wanting something' definite, by selecting something out of the whole field (*kshétra*) and concentrating on it, becomes Manas ; it 'takes birth' and shape in a 'purpose,' a *kārya*, when it wishes to do something ; (otherwise it remains a sub-consciously or supra-consciously all-embracing 'great' memory, 'great self,' *Mahān Ātmā*, *Mahat*). Because Buddhi, as the first transformation of primal *Prakṛti*, has the three *guṇas*, therefore Manas (including *Aham-kāra*), the second transformation thereof, also manifests the three in operation.'

According to the Sāṅkhya-scheme, *aham-kāra*, the principle of egoistic desire, in its three subdivisions, as *rājasa-ṭajasa*, gives birth to *manas* ; as *sāttvika-vaikārika*, to the ten sensor and motor organs ; as *ṭāmasa-bhūṭāḍi*, to the five

sense-objects, *tan-māṭra*-s, and the corresponding *bhūṭas*, *i.e.*, the sensible-qualities or sensations-as-such, and their substrata. The reason why *manas* as the chief *indriya*, organ or instrument, of the subject-consciousness, on one side; the ten outer organs, in between; and the five great classes of 'objects', on the other side; should all be derived from *aham-kāra*, in the Sāṅkhya scheme, may be explained thus. It is Desire-Energy which connects Subject and Object, and makes the subject an organism, investing it with organs made of the same 'material' as the 'objects'—as will appear more fully in the later chapters. This Desire-Energy is the very core of the separate ego, the very principle of egoism, as said above. It connects an 'I' with a 'this,' spiritual *jīva* with material atom, or rather, indeed, it marks off and *makes* the individual *jīva* out of Universal Spirit, and singular atom (or singular 'body') out of pseudo-universal Matter. Hence, it may well be said to be the source from which the two sets of products, subjective and objective, the instruments, *karaṇas*, organs (subdivided into (i) *manas*, as chief, and (ii) the other ten, as subordinate), and (iii) their objects, are all derived.

'The element or feature of generality, universality, 'commonness,' 'sameness,' *sāmānya*, (which belongs to *buddhi*), corresponds to unity, sameness of purpose or intention, and co-operation; and it makes for the increase, the expansion, of every *bhāva*, 'existence,' 'concept,' (and sympathy), by inclusion of more and more 'probers' under the 'common'. The element of *vishésha*, particularity, speciality (which belongs to *manas*), corresponds to 'difference' from each other, to divergence of purpose and intention, to separateness and misunderstanding, and makes for decrease and decay, contraction and enfeebling, of all kinds of 'existence,' 'principles,' 'concepts', into minute details.' We have seen above how extremes meet; and how the perfectly minute, the infinitesimal, the utterly singular, the true point and moment (or instant), is the genuine 'here and now,' and is indistinguishable from the perfectly vast, the Infinite, the utterly Universal, Boundless Circumference, Unlimited and Eternal.

The fundamental ideas are the universality of the Self and the singularities of the Not-Self. Out of this pair, and always bound up with each other in inseparable Relation, issue all

other corresponding pairs, as said before. Of these pairs, the following may be mentioned here for our present psychological purpose.

Amūrta and mūrta, formless and formed, abstract and concrete, ideal and material; prakṛti and vikṛti, unmanifest nature and particular manifestation or transformation; sāmānya and vishésha, general and particular, (the name for the unbreakable relation between the two being samavāya, in the technicology of the Vaishéshika system); jāti and vyakti, species and individual; para-sāmānya and apara-vishésha, *summum genus* and *infima species* or rather *singularis* (the ultimate or highest universal and the final or lowest particular or singular or individual): samashti and vyashti, whole and part; praṭika and praṭimā, nature-force and anthropomorphous 'image'; praṭyaya and nāma-rūpa, concept and name-form; shāstra and kṛtya, science and application; naya and chāra, theory and practice; siḍdhānta, rāddhānta, mūla-sūtra, or bija-mantra, and prayoga, principles and execution; Intuition-instinct and Intelligence, buddhi and manas; insight of genius and argument, praṭibhā and tarka; yoga-ja jñāna and prākṛta-jñāna, siḍdha-ḍṛshti and laukika-ḍṛshti, satya-jñāna and mithyā-jñāna, true and intuitive understanding by love and sympathy *i.e.*, 'common-feeling,' and false intelligence or misunderstanding by antipathy or diverse and opposite feeling; vayam and aham, We and I; sarva-hiṭa and sva-hiṭa, the good of all and the good of myself; a-khanda-chétana and khanda-jñāna, continuum of consciousness and particular partial knowledge; kshétra and vishésha, vishaya or lakshya, general field of consciousness, and particular objective or focus of attention therein; a-vyakta and abhi-vyakta, latent and patent, un-manifest and manifest; an-ud-buddha and ud-buddha, un- or sub- or supra-conscious and conscious: suṭa and jāgrat, dormant and wakeful; nirodha and vyutthāna, obliviscence and reminiscence, inhibition and exhibition; jīva and dēha, soul and body, which is "the soul made visible"; yuga-paṭ and a-yuga-paṭ, simultaneous knowledge of many or all, and successive knowledge of particulars, one by one, which are the respective characteristics of buddhi and manas.

All these pairs are allied, are aspects of each other. And the process of yoga-development of the soul seems essentially

to consist in regulating, restraining, controlling, selectively and attentively turning in one direction (by sam-yama), and inhibiting along all other directions (by nirodha), the activity (vṛtti) of citta-manas-aṇu, after minimising its egoistic restlessness (by vairāgya), and making its emotional or 'affective' tone as placid (full of prasāda) as possible, by various means mentioned in Yoga-works. In this way, individual mind or ahaṅkāra-manas deliberately orients itself towards, and makes itself the channel, vessel, receiver, missionary, of Universal Mind, Maḥat-Buddhi; and replaces intelligence by intuition. All the ways of prayer are but ways of such opening of oneself to the inflow of the larger Self; and all 'willing' is also but a disguised form of 'prayer;' for every exercise of individual force and free-will is ultimately and really but the working of the Universal Force of Universal Self-Will.

A further quotation from Bergson, (from a report of his address as President of the Psychical Research Society, in 1913), may help to illustrate the relationship between buddhi and manas, and also, incidentally, the methods of soul-education, mind-development, and psychical extension and expansion of faculty. "Formerly it was held as a scientific dogma that the brain was the store-house of memories. . . . (The truth rather is) that it is the function of the brain to *recall* things remembered, an instrument to bring back the remembrance of an action, and to prolong the action in movements, and enable the mind to make adjustment to life. The brain is not the seat of memory, not an organ of preservation. It is the organ by which the mind adjusts itself to environment, prepares the body for the realisation of what the mind has apprehended. *It marks the useless part of the past, and lets through only those remembrances which are useful to serve the present.* Consciousness transcends the brain, is partially independent of it, and preserves the whole of the past intact in every detail. . . . In certain cases, as when drowning, or in battle, the total past of a man is unmasked, and the whole of it comes rushing in, because *the normal necessity of fixing attention* on the present, and still more the future, in order to live, is relaxed, and all the faculties of attention turn back to that past which *it is the business of the brain normally to*

hide from him, in order that he may keep his attention concentrated on the present and the future. . . . The inference from the fact that the consciousness is a larger reality than the brain . . . is . . . that the separation between individual consciousness(es) may be much less radical than we suppose. . . . Consciousness in individuals passes into that of other individuals, and is not cut up as it seems to be."

All these remarks may not be endorsed, exactly as they stand, by the Yoga-system of practical or applied psychology; but their general trend seems to agree with that of the latter. Thus, in the full sense, Consciousness, or, if that word be preferred, (the Unconscious, or the Principle of Life and Consciousness), preserves not only the whole of the past intact, but also already and always contains the whole of the future also, according to Nyāya and Yoga-Védānta; and it is this fact which makes memory and expectation possible.¹

¹ The Unconscious is, after all, nothing so very mysterious; i.e., it is not more mysterious than anything else! You listen to a question of many words, or a long lecture. All the mass of words goes into your ears. Each complete word-sound or sentence-sound produces a meaning, an apprehension, a concept, an idea, in your mind, and then disappears. 'Disappears' means—goes into the Un-Conscious or sub-or-supra-Conscious. Then, when the question is completed, you make a reply; when the lecture is finished, you get up and make a long criticism. The thoughts, notions, ideas, come welling up in your Mind or 'Consciousness'—from 'nowhere', from the Unconscious; and you go on clothing them in words, which also come welling up from the same 'nowhere'. Every sentence, every pageful, you speak or write or read, illustrates the same process. You have an enormous, indeed an infinite, collection of 'things', of 'books'. You cannot use *all* of them at once. Strictly, you can use *only one* particular thing, at one time, in one place. But this 'one' is undefinable, is in-de-finite. It is always a *more* definite (or rather, less in-de-finite) core, plus a *less* definite (or rather, more in-de-finite fringe. Everything shades and fades away into everything else. The *selection* of goods, the *almirah* of books, that you are more frequently using, in any given time and place, day, month, year, or lifetime, and room, house, town, country—that is your 'conscious', comparatively. The rest is your Unconscious, again comparatively. Finite conscious plus the remainder of the Infinite, is Universal Mind, Total Unconsciousness or Consciousness—just as you please to call it. Each portion of that Mind is 'conscious' to or in some one jiva, one individual, so that the *whole* of the Unconscious is Conscious, too, in the Totality of *all* pseudo-infinite jivas, at every moment of pseudo-eternal time, in all pseudo-infinite space. As the 'present' is a 'slab' or 'chunk' of time, cut out of the Time-Continuum, over which individual

Nyāya-sūtra, III, ii, 42, expressly says,

स्मरणं तु आत्मनो ज्ञ-स्वाभाव्यात् ।

'Memory (of the past, and also of the future, which is called expectation) is possible only because the very nature of Self is that of Eternal All-knower.' The *Bhāṣya* on this explains that Self is in constant contact with all knowledge, of past, present, and future.

The system of yoga of *Yoga-sūtra*, seems to be a system of profound education, of training of the mind and brain for more and more effective use; like the training of the eye or the ear or the hands. It may, indeed, be called, not inappropriately, 'the Science and Art of Attention'. All possible sounds, all possible colours and forms, are there, in space ever existent in the universe; but human eye, human

memory-expectation can range, so the 'conscious' is a 'slab' or 'block' or 'piece', cut out of the Consciousness-(or Un-consciousness)-continuum, over which individual memory-expectation can range. This Universal Mind, *Brahmā*, the first manifestation of *Brahma*, is called *Umm-ul-Kitāb*, 'Mother of Scriptures, Revelations', in *Sūfism*.

What about the claims of psycho-analysts, if what is said above is correct? The substance of them stands and remains valuable, after pruning of all exaggerations. They draw the lives too hard and fast between 'suppression' and 'repression', 'unconscious' and 'pre-conscious' and 'fore-conscious', normal forgetting and abnormal forgetting, etc.: and, for many mental phenomena, they have quite unnecessarily coined new and imposing-looking words, difficult to remember, and themselves very liable to be 'suppressed' and 'repressed' into the 'unconscious'. If we only bear in mind the facts (1) that *all* the 'abnormal' phenomena, which psycho-analysts have noted, studied, and expounded, are only 'excesses' of those emotional experiences which all 'normal' persons undergo, now and then, more or less; (2) that three fourths of the cure of psycho-neurotic trouble consists in persuading the patient gradually to *introspect* and understand the true nature of his malady, and (3) that the remaining fourth of the cure is achieved by so strengthening the patient's will, that he becomes able to control his excess of emotion—if these facts are borne in mind, psycho-analytic literature becomes very helpful in understanding Yoga-literature; and Yoga-literature becomes suggestive of ways to persuade the patient and strengthen his will.

Pratyak-chetana, 'turning the mind's eye inwards from outwards,' is the great feat, the miracle, which 'makes the whole world new'; it is the one sole secret of real conversion, real re-education, 'second birth', re-generation.

ear, is not, in the first place, so constructed as to be able to catch all kinds of them; and, in the second place, of those that it *can* perceive, it actually perceives only those towards which it is diligently and *attentively turned*. It is much the same as with telescopes and microscopes; their powers are limited, and they must be very carefully adjusted, if they are to show with the greatest possible effectiveness, what is wanted to be seen. The brain seems to be an 'organ,' the physical coefficient of the psychical 'inner organ,' as the eye-ball or the ear-mechanism is that of the 'faculty' of vision or audition; and its realm and domain is the 'field of consciousness' generally. All possible psychical (or psycho-physical, or spirituo-material, for the two are utterly interdependent and inseparable) experiences, thoughts, emotions, plans, are always existent in the total whole. The individual mind, manas-brain, catches and manifests such of them as it turns, or is turned, towards. *To turn*, deliberately, and not *be turned*, helplessly; and not only turn one's face, intellectually, towards the face of the object sought to be 'understood,' but to *enter* with one's heart, vitally, into the heart of it: to identify one's own life and being with that other's life and being, by sympathy, by love—this is, it would seem, to replace intellect, which works from 'outside,' by intuition which works from 'inside'. Generally speaking, we 'understand' what we love, intuitively; the mother intuitively perceives the requirements of the child; she fails, very often, because undeveloped or ill-cultured but insistent intellect interferes; in order to 'understand' another properly, we must 'get into his skin,' 'see with his eyes'; the meaning and definition of samāḍhi, in yoga-works, seems to be just this. Yet intellect and intuition have to check and correct each other too.

After the needed understanding has been gained through intuition, it may be utilised in various ways by intelligence. To apply to requirements, to carry out into 'action,' is pre-eminently the work of manas; as to 'ascertain' what the facts and laws and great general principles are, is that of buddhi. All great discoveries, in their first form of luminous hypothesis, may be said to be the work of such intuition; subsequent concrete details and utilisations, and devising of means to ends,

on the basis of that hypothesis, are the work of intelligence. If these views are correct, it is obvious that there is no opposition or radical difference of any kind between intuition and intellect; they may even be said to be degrees or aspects or counter-parts of each other, and to pass into each other, at times insensibly. Every act of 'attention' is, strictly, a focusing of the mind for the inflow of 'intuitional' knowledge. Yoga, (in the sense of 'inhibition of *other* mentations', so as to make possible the 'exhibition' of some one other, or a few others), so regarded, is, as said in *Yoga-bhāṣya* itself, a constant feature of the mind, and belongs to it in all its moods and at all its stages of development. But it is only when *dhāraṇā*, selection or concentration, *dhyāna*, attention or contemplation, *saṁāḍhi*, meditation, raptness, rapport—it is only when these attain a certain degree of efficiency and success, and, yet more so, when the intuitional knowledge or experience, and the extension of faculty aimed at, refer to things outside of the daily routine of life, to matters superphysical and metaphysical, that the word *yoga* is used of them conventionally and technically.

It will have been observed that the *Buddhi* and *Manas* (corresponding generally to Intuition and Intellect), dealt with in the present section, xi, of this note, are not quite the same as the *buddhi* and *manas* which, with *aham-kāra*, constitute the three faculties of the *chitta*-mind. Yet they are not altogether different either. In a sense, *Buddhi*-Intuition may be said to be the same as *Mahaṭ* or *Mahān-Ātma*, the Great Soul, the Universal Mind, of which the individual *chitta* is a reflection; while *Manas*-Intellect would include the triad of *buddhi-ahaṅkāra-manas*.

In psycho-physical Purāṇic mythology (*miṭhyā-jñāna*, primal error, which invests with *mūrṭi* or form that which is *a-mūrṭa*, formless, whence it follows that the whole of this World-Process is one vast Mythos), the *Buddhi* and *Manas* that are now being dealt with are symbolised as *Vishṇu* and *Brahmā* respectively, (Shiva then standing for *Ātma*), on the scale of *brahm-āndas*, 'eggs of the Infinite,' 'orbs' of heaven. Thus

महानात्मा मतिर्विष्णुर्जिष्णुः शंभुश्च वीर्यवान् ।

बुद्धिः प्रज्ञा उपलब्धिश्च तथा ख्यातिः धृतिः स्मृतिः,

पर्यायवाचकैः शब्दैर्महानात्मा विभाव्यते । *Anu-Gītā*, xxvi.

मानसस्य इह या मूर्तिर्ब्रह्मत्वं समुपागता,

तस्य ऽसनविधानार्थं पृथिवी पदममुच्यते ।

तस्मात् पदमात् समभवद् ब्रह्मा वेदमयो निधिः,

अहंकार इति ख्यातः, सर्वभूतात्मभूतकृत् । *Mbh. Shānti*, ch. 180.

‘Vishṇu, Jishṇu, Shambhu, maṭi, budḍhi, prajñā, upa-labḍhi, khyāti, dhr̥ṭi, smṛti, (names of various aspects of intelligence and memory), are all synonyms for Maḥaṭ or Mahān Aṭmā. From the ‘navel’-lotus, the central being, the ‘womb’, of Vishṇu or Nārāyaṇa, ‘sleeping’ in the waters of space, as sub- or supra-consciousness or Dormant Memory or Universal Mind, there arises Brahmā or Aham-kāra, who is the soul of all beings; whence arise all the five root-kinds of sens-able matter, etc.; and the scene of whose activities and manifestations is the Earth, described as a lotus. This lotus, with irregular petals, some large, some small, is spread out on the surface of the ocean, upside down; the centre of the lotus is the North Pole, and the great Capes are the apices of the irregular petals; the whole of the earth-globe, in turn, is an off-shoot as it were, from the ‘solar’ plexus or sun-heart of the larger Vishṇu of the solar system.’ Unfortunately, the metaphor of the Purāṇas has ceased to be metaphor, and is being taken literally, with endless mischief as consequence. Ar̥tha-vāda, rūpaka, allegory, symbolism, has indeed become an-ar̥tha-vāda, baneful misinterpretation in unhappy India for many centuries now.

The names of Universal Mind-Soul-Body, Intellectus-Animus-Corpus-Mundi, (which constitutes the ‘contents’ of the Logion I-This-Not), each signifying an important aspect or characteristic, are etymologically explained in the following verses of *Vāyu Purāṇa*.

मनो, महान्, मतिः, ब्रह्मा, पूः, बुद्धिः, ख्यातिः, ईश्वरः,

प्रज्ञा, चित्तिः, स्मृतिः, संवित्, विपुरं च, उच्यते बुधैः ।

तत्त्वानां अग्रजो यस्मात्, महांश्च परिमाणतः
 शेषेभ्यो गुणतत्त्वेभ्यो, 'महान्' इति ततः स्मृतः ।
 मनुते सर्वभूतानां यस्मात् चेष्टाफलं विभुः,
 सूक्ष्मत्वेन विवृद्धानां, तेनऽयं 'मनः' उच्यते ।
 बुध्यते पुरुषः चात्र सर्वभावान् हिताहितान्,
 यस्माद् बोधयते चैव, तेन 'बुद्धिर्' निरुच्यते ।
 कृत्स्नं च विन्दते ज्ञानं, तस्मात् माहात्म्यं उच्यते,
 तस्माद् विदेर् विदेः चैव, 'संविद्' इति अभिधीयते ।
 विद्यते स च सर्वस्मिन्, सर्वं तस्मिन् विद्यते,
 तस्मात् 'संविद्' इति प्रोक्तो महान् वै बुद्धिमत्तरैः ।
 बिभर्ति मानं, मनुते, विभागं मन्यतेऽपि च,
 पुरुषो भोगसम्बन्धात्, तेन चासौ 'मतिः' स्मृतः ।
 आपूरयति यस्मात् च कृत्स्नान् देहान् अनुग्रहैः,
 तत्त्वभावांश्च नियतान्, तेन 'पूः' इति चोच्यते ।
 ख्यातिः प्रत्युपभोगश्च यस्मात् संवर्त्तते ततः,
 भोगस्य ज्ञाननिष्ठत्वात्, तेन 'ख्यातिः' इति स्मृतः
 ख्यायते तद्गुणैः वापि नामादिभिः अनेकशः,
 तस्मात् च महतः संज्ञा 'ख्यातिः' इति अभिधीयते ।
 साक्षात् सर्वं विजानाति महात्मा तेन च 'ईश्वरः',
 तस्मात् जाताः ग्रहाः चैव, 'प्रज्ञा' तेन स उच्यते ।
 ज्ञानादीनि च, रूपाणि, कृतुकर्मफलानि च,
 चिनोति यस्माद् भोगार्थं, तेनासौ 'चितिः' उच्यते ।
 वर्तमानानि अतीतानि तथाऽनागतानि च,
 स्मरते सर्वकार्याणि तेनासौ 'स्मरः' उच्यते ।
 बृहत्त्वाद् बृंहणत्वात् च भावानां, सलिल(आकाश)ऽश्रयात्,
 यस्माद् बृंह्यते भावान्, 'ब्रह्मा' तेन निरुच्यते ।
 ज्ञानात् 'ज्ञानं' इत्याह, भगवान् ज्ञान-सन्निधिः ।

द्वंद्वानां विपुरी(ली) भावाद्, 'विपुरं' चोच्यते बुधैः ।
 सर्वेशत्वात् च लोकानां अवश्यत्वात् तथा 'ईश्वरः' ।
 बृहत्त्वात् च स्मृतो 'ब्रह्मा' ; भूतत्वाद् 'भवः' उच्यते ।
 क्षेत्र-क्षेत्रज्ञ-विज्ञानाद् एकत्वात् च स 'कः' स्मृतः ।
 यस्मात् पुरि अनुशेतेः च तस्मात् 'पुरुषः' उच्यते ।
 पर्यायवाचकैः शब्दैः तत्त्वं आद्यं अनुत्तमं,
 व्याख्यातं तत्त्वभावज्ञैः एवं सद्भावचिन्तकैः ।
 महान् सृष्टिं विकृते, चोद्यमानः सिसृक्षया ;
 संकल्पो, ऽध्यवसायश्च, तस्य वृत्तिद्वयं स्मृतं ।
 आत्मा, ऋषिः, कः, रागश्च, भगवान्, भवः, ओम् इति,
 सर्वज्ञः, शर्वः, आदित्यः यज्ञो, नारायणो, विभुः,
 प्रजापतिः, महादेवः, विरिञ्चिः, विश्वरूप-धृत्,
 हिरण्यगर्भः चैत्रापि, सोऽयं एकाक्षरः तथा,
 पर्यायवाचकैः शब्दैः महान् आत्मा विभाव्यते ।
 यद् आप्नोति, यद् आदत्ते, यच्च अति विषयान् इह,
 यच्चास्य संततो भावः तस्मात् 'आत्मा' निरुच्यते ।
 ('मा' इति 'एतद्' अखिलं) 'दृश्यं' 'अति-एति' च 'निषेधति',
 'अति-अयन्' चापि सर्वं तु, स्वयं संतिष्ठते सदा ।)
 'ऋषिः' सर्वगतत्वात् च 'विष्णुः' सर्वप्रवेशनात् ।
 'भगवान्' भगसद्भावात् । 'रागो' रागस्य शासनात् ।
 परश्च तु प्रकृतत्वाद् (?) । अत्रनाद् 'ओम्' इति स्मृतः ।
 'सर्वज्ञः' सर्वविज्ञानात् । 'सर्वः' (शर्वः) सर्वं यतः ततः ।
 नराणां अयनं यस्मात् तेन 'नारायणः' स्मृतः ।
 आदित्वात् च 'आदिदेवो' ऽसौ । अजातत्वाद् 'अजः' स्मृतः ।
 पाति यस्मात् प्रजाः सर्वाः 'प्रजापतिः' अतः स्मृतः ।
 देवेषु च महान् देवः, 'महादेवः' ततः स्मृतः ।
 'क्षेत्रज्ञः' क्षेत्र-विज्ञानाद् । 'विभुः', सर्वगतो यतः ।

नोत्पादितत्वात् पूर्वत्वात् 'स्वयम्भूः' इति सः स्मृतः ।
 ईज्यत्वाद् उच्यते 'यज्ञः' । 'कविः', विद्वान्तदर्शनात् ।
 हिरण्यं अस्य गर्भोऽभूद्, हिरण्यस्यापि गर्भजः,
 तस्माद् हिरण्यगर्भः सः पुराणेऽस्मिन् निरुच्यते ।

Vāyu Purāṇa, Pūrva-aṛḍha, chs , iv, v.

'हिरण्यगर्भो' भगवान् एष 'बुद्धिः' इति स्मृतः,
 'महान्' इति च योगेषु, 'विरिञ्चिः' इति चाप्यतः ।
 'अहंकारो', 'महान् आत्मा', भूत-भव्य-भविष्य-वित् ।
 सांख्ये च पठ्यते शास्त्रे नामभिः बहुधाऽत्मकः,
 'विचित्ररूपो', 'विश्वात्मा', 'एकाक्षरः' इति स्मृतः ।

Mbh., Shānti. chs. 180, 308, 316, 317, etc.

'Because this World-Mind manifests first of all ; is greater than all the guṇa-s and tāṭṭva-s, attributes and elements, that spring from it ; and, in measure, is immeasurably Immense, therefore is it named Mahān, the Great. Because it mentates the effortful evolution of all things and beings from smaller and subtler states to larger and denser, therefore is it Manas, Mind. It understands, knows, budhyaṭé, all things, and distinguishes useful from harmful, therefore it is Buddhi. It knows, vinḍaṭé, all, and its excellence is such that it also knows that it knows ; also it abides, vidyaṭé, in everything, and everything abides it ; therefore it is Sam-viṭ. It weighs (by arguments) ; analyses (facts and views) ; forms opinions with reference to the requirements of the individual ; therefore is it Maṭi. It shapes a body, pūh, of and for the tāṭṭvas, elements, and fills it, pūrayaṭé, with kind gifts (experiences), and then dwells, shéṭé, in that body as in a house or town, puri ; therefore is it known as Pūh and Puru-sha. All awareness, khyāṭi, all experience of joy and sorrow, depends upon it, and because it is 'famously' known and declared, khyāyaṭā, by many attributes and many names, therefore is it called Khyāṭi. It knows all ; has power and is sovereign over all, ishaṭé, ishté ; commands and controls all things and beings and worlds ; and is not ruled by any other ; therefore is it Īshvara. It 'knows supremely', pra-jñā, the

subtlest mysteries, and the planets (which are to the Sun as sensor-and-motor-organs are to a living organism) are Its progeny, pra-jā, therefore is it Pra-jñā. All forms, all cognitions, all volitions, all actions, and all fruits of all actions, are stored up, chinoti, in it, for ever; therefore is it Chiti. All work, past, present, and future, it remembers ever, smaraṭé; therefore is it Smara, Memory. Because it is vast, bṛhaṭ, because it expands itself, and expands, spreads out, bṛmhaṇa, all worlds, all things and beings, all feelings and emotions, in infinite space, salila-akāsha, therefore is named Brahmā. Because it is all knowledge, jñā, therefore is it Jnāna. Because it enhances, gives intensity and extensity, vipula-ṭā, ample scope, to the pairs of opposities, two-s, ḍvam-ḍvam-s, therefore is it known as Vipura. It is known as Bhava because it is the source and fount of all becomings, bhū. Because it knows the 'field', the object, of consciousness, and also the knower of it, i.e., it-Self, it is known as Kah (also, Yah, Sah; He, Who, What; all pronouns which cover all objects, as well as the subject, of consciousness). It attains all objects, āpnoti: it takes all, ā-ḍaṭṭé; it eats, tastes, all things, aṭṭi; it extends continuously over all, ā-ṭaṭa, san-ṭaṭa, saṭaṭam, ever; because it negates, mā, and transcends, aṭi-ēṭi, all This, Ēṭaṭ; and, while thus negating all Else, It-Self-remains Self-established, moveless, eternal; therefore is it named Ātmā, pre-eminently. It reaches all, ṛchchhaṭi; therefore is Ṛshi. It enters into all, vishaṭi; therefore is Viṣṇu. It possesses all the lordlinesses, marks of sovereignty, bhaga; therefore is Bhaga-vān. It is Rāga, because desire stirs in it and is controlled by it. Because it protects, avaṭi, all who meditate on it, therefore is it AUM (OM). It knows all, therefore is Sarva-jñā, omniscient. It is the home, refuge, ayana, of all souls, nara-s; therefore is it Nār-āyaṇa. Because the first, āḍi, of all gods, therefore is it Āḍiṭya. It produces and protects, pāṭi, all progeny, prajā; therefore is it Prajā-paṭi. Because it is the greatest of all gods, therefore is it Mahā-dēva. Because it pervades all, is, bhū, in all, peculiarly, vi-shéshēṇa, therefore is it Vi-bhu. Because all 'sacrifices' are offered to it, are for it, therefore it is Yajña personified. Because it surveys, ḍarshana, the whole World-Process and ranges over it all

in mighty flights (of imagination), therefore is it Kavi (ka, world, vi, bird, world-bird). Because it is the Womb of Gold, garbha of hiraṇya, Source of Golden Light, enveloped in Golden Light, (physical as well as mental), therefore is it Hiraṇya-garbha (the Sun). Because it makes all things, vi-shêshêṇa rāchayaṭi, therefore is it Vi-rinchi. It is Vishva-rūpa, because all worlds, vishva, all forms, rūpa, are its forms. Because it is not born from any thing else, but only from It-Self, therefore is it Svayam-bhū. Because it is the One and only Immortal, éka a-kshara, and also because it is ultimately named by éka a-kshara, the One-lettered (tri-une) Word-Sound (AUM) Om, therefore is it Ékākshara'.

By such synonyms, paryāya-s, which are used for It by turns, 'coming one after another', paryāyāṇa, is the Universal Mind known.

In the language of earlier theosophical literature, Ātma, the first principle, would correspond (on the cosmic scale) with Praṭyag-ātmā or the *Abstract and Universal I*; Buddhi, the second principle, with Universal Mind, all-inclusive Intuition or infinite sub-and-supra-consciousness, or the *collective I*, the *We*, the 'I am and am-not *all* this-s'; Manas, the third principle, with the *singular* or *individual I*, 'I am—and, again, later on—I am not this *particular* this,' the particular mind with its successive experiences of the nature of knowledge, feeling, and activity, and its particular recollections. These remarks have to be understood as subject to the explanation that, for practical purposes, every sūtr-ātmā 'thread-soul', 'group-soul', or larger individuality, serves as 'genus' or 'universal' to the jiv-ātmā-s or smaller individualities which are included within it, which live and move and have their being in it (see ch. xiii, *infra*).

In the same theosophical language, we may say that instinct is the 'mystic' participation of the individual soul in the life of the *astral* group-soul or sūtr-ātmā; and intuition, in the life of the *buddhic* group-soul. Every individual understands, knows *i.e.*, *feels*, the sensations of any part of his body, because he is identified with that part, vitally; so we understand instinctively and intuitionally *i.e.*, we *feel*, the experiences of those 'other' jivas whom we love and who are therefore no

longer 'other' to us but indeed parts of ourselves. If we can identify ourselves with all, if we can realise our oneness with all, we will understand or feel all. "To know all is to excuse all," as the proverb says, because to know all is not possible without loving all, and to love all is not only to excuse all as one excuses oneself, but to help all as one helps oneself.

CHAPTER XII

DVAM-DVAM—THE RELATIVE (CONTINUED)

(C.—II.) NEGATION AS CONDITION OF INTERPLAY BETWEEN SELF AND NOT-SELF

IN the last chapter we dealt with the affirmative aspect of Negation; as the Energy which links together, in an endless chain of Causality, the factors of the succession of the World-Process; as the necessity of the Whole which appears as the *Cause* of each part; as the *Relation*¹ of cause-and-effect between all the parts. We turn now to the negative aspect of Negation, wherein it appears as the *Condition* or conditions, of the Interplay between Self and Not-Self; the *conditions* in which the succession

¹ Seeing such relation (L. *ratio*, *ratus*, to think, to reason) is reasoning, ratio-cination, re-lat-ion-ing (L. *re*, back, *latus*, to carry, to bear, to bear or carry one to another, and back, to and fro, in mind). There is a deep reason why the words 'cause' and 'reason' should be equivalent and often synonymous and interchangeable; it is the fact, already mentioned, that the Universal Mind or 'Pure' Reason, Cosmic Ideation of the Whole, (bearing or carrying *all* parts, *at once*, within itself, in re-lation or ratio to each other), is the *cause* of the *appearance* of each portion, in *succession*, i.e., is the cause of each event. The Samskr̥t words *kāraṇa* and *hētu* are similarly allied; *kāraṇa* is active cause, *hētu* is passive condition, reason, motivating end or propose.

of the factors of the World-Process appears and takes place.¹

A little reflection will show that *cause* and *condition* are only the positive and negative aspects of the same thing. A cause may be said to be a positive condition, and a condition a negative cause.

Let not the objection be taken here that we are transporting, by an anachronism, the notions of our life at the present day, to a primal stage wherein pure ultimates or penultimates and subtle undeveloped essentials only, of the universe, should be discussed. It has been pointed out, over and over again, that there is no gradation, no development in time, from the abstract to the concrete. The two underlie and overlie and inextricably interpenetrate one another and are coexistent.² And, even were it otherwise, that which appears in development must have been in the seed all along. The World-Process is in and is the Absolute. Metaphysic only endeavours to trace each abstract and concrete fact of our life, taking it, as it stands before us, back into its proper place in the Absolute, in the Changeless Whole,

¹ In the technical phraseology of the Nyāya, that which is called *cause* here would be, generally, *kāraṇa*; while *condition* would be *sādhāraṇa-nimitta*, or *hetu*.

² To philosophy, the whole of all history is, as it were, ever present; *all* change is always within the Changeless. All the states that appear as *successive* stages in the life, or history, of any 'individual' organism, species, genus, kingdom, planet, solar system, in any given place, are to be found existing *simultaneously* in different individuals in different places. God has not disappeared and become absent after a single act of creation. The forces and factors of the World-Process, working at any past or future time, and near or distant place, are all working now and here, overtly or covertly, whenever and wherever we may think of them.

and so to free us from the nightmare of overpowering, irresistible, uncontrollable Change. Therefore, taking the words 'cause' and 'condition' in the sense in which we find them used to-day, we may legitimately try to show that these senses correspond to aspects of the ultimates.

Other ways of looking at them are to regard causes as successive and passing conditions, and conditions as persisting and coexisting causes; that is, that causes are conditions which cease to 'exist' when the effect begins to 'exist,' and that conditions are causes which persist throughout the existence of the effect as well as before and after; and so on. Looked at from the standpoint of the Absolute, inasmuch as everything is necessarily connected with everything else, and the Whole only is the source of each part, all these various ways of describing cause and condition resolve themselves into merely various ways of describing the different relations, all equally necessary, of facts, or parts, to each other. Out of these various ways we have the many distinctions between final cause, efficient cause, material cause, formal cause, instrumental cause, movement or action, motive, etc., in western philosophy: and between *nimiṭṭa*, *samavāyi* or *upāḍāna*, *a-samavāyi*, *saha-kāri*, *sāḍhāraṇa-nimiṭṭa* or *mukhya*, *a-sāḍhāraṇa-nimiṭṭa* or *a-mukhya*, *uddēshya*, *karṭā*, *kriyā*, *kārya*, *prayojana*, *hētu*, *kāraka*,¹ etc., all

¹ निमित्त, समवायि, उपादान, अ-समवायि, सह-कारि, साधारण-निमित्त or मुख्य, असाधारण-निमित्त or अमुख्य, उद्देश्य, कर्ता, क्रिया, कार्य, प्रयोजन, हेतु, कारक, etc. *Gītā*, xviii. 13-15, speaks of five kinds of कारणानि or

different kinds of *kāraṇa*, 'causes,' with their divisions and sub-divisions, in the eastern systems.

The one common characteristic of cause, running throughout all these, is that which is given by the old *Naiyāyikas*: *viz.*, "which being, the effect becomes, and, which not being, the effect does not become,"¹ the principle of concomitant variations, in short, as it is called in western logic. The first half represents the positive aspect, the one true universal 'cause', corresponding to the Self, the affirmation, the *Shakṭi* element of the Negation; and the second half, the negative aspect, the one true universal 'condition,' corresponding to the Not-Self, the denial, the negative element of the Negation; whereas all other so-called particular causes or conditions are in reality only so many *effects*, which have taken on a false appearance of cause or condition by reflection—in the *succession* of the World-Process—of the true universal Necessity which makes each particular a necessary fact, and so a cause and a condition, with reference to all other particulars; that is to say, makes each particular appear as the necessary effect of preceding, and the *हेतवः*. All such are classifiable under our 'Cause' and 'Condition'. Each system of philosophy has its own classifications and technical names. Buddhist systems have yet others; thus: "six kinds of causes and five of effects are—*kāraṇa-hētu* and *adhipaṭi-phalam*; *saha-bhū-hētu* and *puruṣa-kāra-phalam*; *samprayukṭa-hētu* and *vipāka-phalam*; *vipāka-hētu* and *vi-sam-yoga-phalam*; and *sarvaṭra-ga-hētu*. Or, (according to another system), four *pratyayas* (causes or conditions), *viz.*, *adhipaṭi*, *ālambana*, *sam-an-anṭara*, and *hētu*, (*i.e.*, additional cause, objective cause of mental process, immediate cause, and direct cause)"; *Systems of Buddhist Thought*, by Yāmākāmi Sogen, pp. 309-315 (pub. 1912, University of Calcutta).

¹ Bhimāchārya, *Nyāya-kosha*, p. 197, article कारणम्, *kāraṇam*, cause.

necessary cause of succeeding, particulars, in an endless and unbreakable chain, the whole of which chain, however, is only *One Effect* which is identical with its *One Cause*, the necessity of the Absolute.

We thus see that, in empirical detail, Self or Spirit and Not-Self or Matter are, neither of them, either cause or effect ; but that the *changes* of cognition, desire, and action, and of qualities, substance, and movement, of which they are the form or substratum, are causes or conditions, and effects or results, of one another in turn ; and that the transcendental totality of these changes, being regarded as one effect and result, has for *one cause*, the Shakti-Energy, and for *one condition* the Negation, embodied in the third factor of the Absolute.

This Shakti-Energy, we have seen, has three aspects : attraction, repulsion, and rhythmic alternation or revolution ; or creation, destruction, and preservation.¹ Negation proper has also three aspects : *ḍeśha*, space, *kāla*, time, and *kriyā* or *ayana*, motion.² These are the triple

¹ देशकालक्रियाऽश्रयम् occurs in *Bhāgavata*, 1V, xxix, 67 ; देशकाल-निमित्तानि in the *Yoga-bhāṣya* by Vyāsa ; देश-काल-अवस्थाभेदेन, ' by difference of time, place, and circumstance,' is an expression of frequent occurrence in Samskṛt literature.

² The Biography of Man, the whole History of all things, individuals, groups, institutions, nations, races, kingdoms (of Nature, mineral, vegetable, etc.), orbs, worlds, systems, is all comprised in the ' six forms or ways of existence, *bhāva-vikārāḥ*, *viś.*, is born *i.e.*, appears or comes into manifest existence, grows, stays, changes, decays, and dies or disappears ; *jāyate*, *vardhate*, *tiṣṭhate*, *vipari-ṇamāte*, *hiyate*, *mriyate* ; षड् भावविकाराः, जायते, वर्धते, तिष्ठते, वि-परि-णमते, हीयते, म्रियते, *Nirukta*. The yet higher categories under which these six are comprised, are, अस्ति, and न-अस्ति, ' is ' and ' is not '.

guṇas, or aspects, of Negation, in the same way as Saṭ-Chiḍ-Ānaṇḍa and Saṭṭva-Rajas-Tamas are the guṇas of Praṭyag-ātmā and Mūla-prakṛti respectively. Negation, with respect to the One limitless Self, in whose consciousness the negated Not-Self, the countless Many, are co-existent, is negation *Everywhere*, in *Simultaneity*, is the utter blankness of pseudo-infinite and kṛta-sṭha-seeming *Space*. Negation, with respect to Not-Self, the pseudo-infinite Many, which find themselves posited and denied in that consciousness turn by turn, is negation *Everywhen*, in *Succession*, is pseudo-infinite and ever-flowing *Time*. Negation with respect to Negation, is the endeavour to affirm, to justify, the consciousness of the inseparable connection between Self and the repudiated Not-Self *everywhere, everywhen, everyway*; this can be done only in and by means of un-end-ing *Motion*, which is the one way to encompass all space and time; Motion, in and by which only, Space and Time are joined together and realised, even as Self and Not-Self are realised in and by the Negation.

Let us dwell for a moment on the fact that Space, Time, and Motion are the guṇas, qualities, of Negation. We see readily, on even slight reflection, that Space and Time are mere emptinesses, vacua, which may appropriately be regarded as phases of Na, Not, the Naught. Motion presents a little more difficulty. We seem to feel that it is something positive. Yet this is due only to the fact that we are thinking more of the *moving thing* than of its *motion*. Let us try to (seem to) think of motion as

separate from the moving thing, even as we (seem to, but cannot really) think of space and time as (quite) separate from extended or enduring things; and we shall see at once that it is as much an emptiness as the latter; indeed is nothing else than an emptiness which combines in itself the emptinesses of the other two, since we know Space and Time only by Motion; in slumber, all three disappear together. It is thus doubly empty. Space seems, Time seems, to leave a trace behind. More, we feel as if Space *is, there*, always, before us; we feel that even Time *is, there*, always. We speak of even the past and the future as if they were something positive, something recoverable, something contained, locked away, in the present which we hold in our hands. But Motion?—it is gone and has left no trace; lines traced on running water, birds' flights in the air.¹ Of course the moving or the moved *thing* may remain, but that is not motion, any more than it is space or time. Motion, then, is verily the most negative of negations.

Another point. Space, Time, and Motion have been shown here as broadly corresponding to Self, Not-Self, and Negation respectively. But too much stress should not be laid on, nor too much precision expected in, these correspondences. Where everything is connected with

¹ शकुन्तानां इवऽऽकाशे, जले वारिचरस्य च,
यथा न लक्ष्यते पन्थाः, तद्वत् ज्ञानवतां गतिः ।

¹ As the path cannot be traced, of fish in water, or bird in air; so cannot be traced the passage of the *knowers*, in the ocean of Omniscience, from the Limited to the Limitless'.

everything, the distinguishing of such correspondences can only mean that certain facts, as viewed from a certain standpoint, are seen to be more specially connected with each other than with others. Change the standpoint slightly, and new connections are thrown into relief and old ones retire into the shade. This is seen to be the case, more and more, as we proceed from the simple to the complex. In the very instance now before us, for example, with reference to the fact that Negation is the nexus between Self and Not-Self, Motion may be said to correspond to Negation, as also being a nexus between Space and Time. But take another triplet into consideration: *jñāna-ichchhā-kriyā*. Here, while it may be said that the condition of *Chit* or *jñāna* is Space, implied in the 'co-existence' of subject and object, knower and known, it does not seem quite fitting to say that the condition corresponding to *Sat* or *kriyā* is time, and to *Ānanda* or *ichchhā* is motion. Of course it would not be altogether incorrect to say even this; yet it seems more obvious to say that *kriyā* corresponds to motion, and *ichchhā* to time, which, in terms of consciousness, is memory of past pleasure and pain, and present wish, and expectation in the future, to secure the one and avoid the other again.' On the

¹ One name for *Kāma-Eros*, a form of desire, is *Smara*, which means memory. Incidentally, it may be noted that Space-Time-Motion are the 'empty' *essentials* of the Great Illusion, Life, in everyway. Life is pleasurable and healthy, when it is 'spacious-leisurely-easygoing'; it is unpleasant and unhealthy, when 'cramped-hurried-driven'. To do fixed work, in fixed place, at fixed time, is to be 'orderly'; to do otherwise, is to be 'disorderly', unorganised, inefficient and ineffectual and unhealthy.

other hand, we may not unjustifiably say that Motion corresponds to *i c h c h h ā*, because *i c h c h h ā* implies a movement from the past through the present towards the future; and that the succession involved in *k r i y ā* is Time. Or, again, we may consider the matter without inaccuracy in this manner: Space seems something overt, almost visible, one may say; Motion also seems overt, something visible; but Time is hidden, it is a matter for the inner consciousness only, (except on the face of the clock, where *k ṛ i y ā*, active movement, is patent), as *i c h c h h ā* is the hidden desire between an overt cognition and an overt action; therefore, while Space and Motion may correspond with overt Self and Not-Self, Time should correspond with covert Negation. Arguing from the mere words also, one may say that Self and Not meet in Not-Self; therefore Space and Time, meeting in Motion, should be assigned to Self and Negation, respectively; while Motion should be assigned to Not-Self. Yet again, we may correctly say that Time is realised only by change, *i.e.*, Motion, and Motion is possible only in Space, therefore Space is the meeting-point of the two, and so should correspond to the nexus, *i.e.*, Negation. And so on. We see thus that, from different points of view, one and the same thing appears in different aspects. For the present, seeing that Motion has almost unanimously been regarded, in East and West, as incorporating both Space and Time, we may accept the correspondence noted first, *viz.*, that of Space, Time, and Motion, to Self,

Not-Self, and Negation, respectively, as the most prominent.

Let us now take up each of these three separately.

(A) SPACE

Space is the *Co-existence*, saha-aṣṭiṭā, together-being, saha-bhāva, together-moving, saha-chara, paired-ness or simultaneity, yanga-paḍya, of the Many.¹ It is the possibility of the coexistence of the many, and the actuality of their non-existence.² The Self is one and opposed to the many at once and eternally; hence the coexistence of the countless not-selves as well as their endless succession. The form and result of their coexistence is mutual exclusion, which produces the duality of 'side by side,' 'one beside another,' with the intervening space 'between,' as the completing third which connects the two, one on each side. This triplicity of 'side, beside, and between,' pārshva or paksha, apara-pārshva or apara-paksha, and anṭara, appears in Space as viewed from the standpoint of Not-Self. This triad may also be expressed as atṭra, here, taṭṭra, there, and maḍhya, the middle space, the 'in between'.³

¹ सह-अस्तिता, सह-भाव, सह-चार, यौगपद्य.

² In actuality, space is limited, and so come to be the possibility of the co-existence of a few, and impossibility of more; thus, when fresh passengers try to enter a crowded railway carriage, the occupants cry out. "There is *no space* here: please go to another carriage where there is, i.e. where there are *no occupants*".

³ पार्श्व, पक्ष, अपरपार्श्व, अपरपक्ष, अंतर; अत्र, तत्र, मध्य ।

Viewed from the standpoint of Self, Space may also be said to be the coexistence of Self and Not-Self. But the coexistence of these two is scarcely a *co-existence*. Such co-existence can properly be ascribed only to things of the same kind and nature, on the same level, and side by side with each other; while Self and Not-Self are opposed in nature; the one is Being, the other is Non-Being. Their coexistence is only through and in the way of the third factor, Negation; *i.e.*, Not-Self does not exactly *co-exist* with Self; it rather exists *in* it, in its consciousness, and exists only to be denied. Hence we have another form, though not essentially different in nature, of spatial relations, than that described above as 'side, beside, and between'. This other form is that of 'in and out,' *an̐ah*, and *bahih*, 'internal and external,' 'core and sheath,' both held together in the 'through and through,' *sarva̐ah*, the 'whole,' the 'pervading,' *vyāpta*.¹ Thus we have another triplicity in Space with special reference to Self. In this, again, from the standpoint of the universal Self, that Self is the enveloping Space, pure, colourless, abstract, in which the *éta̐ts*, the *this*'s. live and move; and so It may be said to be the outer, and Not-Self the inner. It is this aspect of Self, *Pratyag-ātmā*, which has probably given to *Param-ātmā* its best-known name, *Brahma*, Boundless Immensity, from the root *br̐h*, to grow, to expand, to be vast.² But from the standpoint of the

¹ अन्तः, बहिः, सर्वतः, व्याप्त ।

² खं ब्रह्म, *Chhândogya* and *Bṛhad-āranyaka*; बृद्, बृंह, बर्हति, बृंहति, increases, expands; also बृहति, works, labours, incessantly.

individual, an 'aham' limited by an 'éṭaṭ,' Self is the inner core and Not-Self the outer sheath.

We may distinguish another form of the triplicity of Space, with reference to Negation, *viz.*, 'point, radii, sphere,' *binḍu*, *jīvā* or *ṭriṣyā* or *vyās-ārḍha* and *gola*.¹ The other triplets of words, too, express nothing else than emptiness and negation, but this mathematical triplet seems to be even more abstract, more empty of content, if possible; hence the propriety of regarding it as arising from a view of Space with special reference to Negation.

Other ways of expressing the triplicity involved in Space may be said to be 'behind, here, before,' and 'length, breadth, and depth,' which last is the best known and most commonly mentioned form of the dimensions of space.

As the mathematical kinds of Motion are pseudo-infinite, as the standards and measures of Time are pseudo-infinite, so the degrees and measures of Space or extension are also pseudo-infinite. There are always, and *ad infinitum*, 'éṭaṭs' 'this-es,' objects, minutes than the minutest and vaster than the vastest. As minute vibrations of motion permeate grosser sweeps, as subtler standards of time permeate larger measures, so smaller sizes and dimensions permeate and pervade larger sizes and dimensions. In this sense, as with motion and time so with space, there

¹ बिंदु, जीवा or त्रिज्या or व्यासार्ध, गोल; another triad, included in this, would be 'centre-diameter, (or line)-circumference, केन्द्र—व्यास—दृष्टि).

are not only a certain number, but necessarily a pseudo-infinite number, of dimensions. Otherwise, the triplicity described above, in various triplets of words, represents the three dimensions proper of space, (time and motion also having their three dimensions proper, each, to be mentioned presently); all other dimensions, subtler or grosser, being but permutations and combinations of these three; and the three themselves being essentially ways of looking at the one fact of *co-existence*.¹

The meaning of this will appear further in connection with the pseudo-infinite lokāḥ, *i.e.*, planes, grades, kinds or regions of matter, each made and marked by a

¹ The fourth and higher and even infinite dimensions of space form the subject of mathematical speculations now, frequently; but it is difficult to understand them in any other sense than as above. It is said that the point 'produced' gives the line, making the first dimension; the line 'produced' sidewise, the surface, the second; the surface similarly, the solid, the third; so the solid 'produced' will give the fourth, and so on. But let us trace the process backwards; what will the point, re-duced' yield? And could that again be 're-duced' further—*ad infinitum*? H. P. Blavatsky, in *The Secret Doctrine*, (I, 295, 296) expressly repudiates, the notion of fourth, etc., dimensions in any other sense than that of "permeability," substances being able to penetrate grosser ones. As a fact, a cube 'produced' yields an ordinary three-dimensional but elongated solid. Also, as a fact, the point, the line, the surface, are mere abstractions, as of back and front, which are distinguishable, but never separable from the solid, in nature. *The Mahatma Letters*, p. 404, also say that "Humanity belongs to the three-dimensional condition of matter; and there is no reason why in (Dēva-Sthāna, abode of gods, heaven, svarga), the ego should be varying its dimensions". The purport of the whole context seems to be that "Space is infinity itself" and as such, has *no* dimensions, but only finite matter has dimensions, and these are only three, and always must be only three and no more. The notion, that, with the eye, we see only *two* dimensions, length and breadth is fallacious. In every exercise of every sense, we sense, *co-existence*,—the presence of subject and object, in the first place, and of many objects in the second. And this co-existence is always *three-dimensional*. Careful consideration of the ways and movements of even the eyeless animals or animal-cubs even, of the ocean-depths, seems to show their sensing of *three* dimensions, before, behind, and round and round.

differently vibrating and differently sized atom. Each supports, serves as ādhāra, substratum, of the next so-called lower and grosser ; and each is supported in turn by the preceding so-called subtler and finer. Each behaves in an apparently mysterious, superphysical, and space-transcending way, because of the subtler and penetrative, permeative, pervasive, nature of its vibrations, from the standpoint of the lower ; but becomes a part of, one step of, the ordinary, familiar and ' well-understood ' scale of matter, including the lower planes, from the standpoint of the higher.¹

In the language of symbology, which yet seems intended to describe literal facts of subtler planes of matter also, this Space may be regarded as meant by the garland of human heads, individual-points of consciousness and atom-points of matter, that Shiva, embodiment of ' negative ' i c h c h h ā, ever bears upon his breast ; each head separate from the other, each side by side with another, yet all united together by the strong single thread of the desire-consciousness of mutual interlinking and inseparability. It may also be symbolised by the dark and giant mammoth-skin that is the outer envelope of that inner God, for i c h c h h ā cannot manifest except in Space.

¹ एवं परस्परोत्पन्नाः धार्यन्ते च परस्परं :

आधारऽधेयभावेन, विकारास्तेऽविकारिणः ।

Vāyu Purāṇa, Purvārḍha, ch. 49. *Dēvi Bhāgavata* also has a verse to the same effect.

(B) TIME.

As movement between Self and Not-Self is the basic principle of all motion, so *succession*, *krama*,¹ of this movement, of affirmation and then negation, is the basic principle of, indeed is, Time. Time is nothing else than *succession* of events. It may also be described as the *possibility* of the succession of events, *i.e.*, changes in the conditions of objects, and the *actuality* of their non-cession, non-procession, non-duration, the ever-standing witness of their non-permanence, their non-existence. That is to say, as Space is emptiness which is the possibility of the co-existence of objects; which, regarded in itself, and as differing from these objects, is only *defined* and thrown into relief by them, and *is not* them; which, indeed, looked at thus, is their absence and their opposite; so Time is an emptiness, which is the possibility of the succession of events; is only defined and thrown into relief by those events; and is not them, but their absence and their opposite. As this succession of events, *i.e.*, experiences, identifications and separations, slackens or quickens or ceases (comparatively and apparently), so the standard of Time changes; it appears to be long or short, or even disappears altogether as in the case of sound slumber, before mentioned, to the individual and limited consciousness.² This is verifiable by anyone in

¹ क्रम.

² A person falling sound asleep on a train while it is standing at a station, and waking up again hours later at another station some hundreds

the experience of dreams, reveries, and other extraordinary or abnormal psychic conditions, as in hypnotism and trance. The same is the case with the standard of time with reference to waking consciousness ; quick steps make short distances, slow paces make long ones ; sorrow lengthens, joy shortens time ; *i.e.*, the quick or the slow *passing* of time is something subjective, and the real significance of the length or shortness of time is also subjective, being only the *feel* of such length or shortness. In view of the increasing rapidity of means of transit, people now, often, speak of distances in terms of time—‘it is so many hours’ to a place—rather than in terms of space, so many hundred miles.’

With reference to Self, Time may be said to present the triplicity of beginning, end, and middle ; beginning, ādī or ārambha, *i.e.*, the affirmation of the ‘*ētaṭ*’ or its origin ; ‘end,’ anṭa or avasāna, its negation ; and the ‘middle,’ maḍhya, which holds together both.’

The inevitable perpetual appearance and disappearance, and disappearance and reappearance, of each ‘*ētaṭ*’, ‘this,’ due to the double necessity of being limited on the one hand, and yet being also, on the other hand, in the indissoluble relation of contact with the *eternal* Self, forces upon it a pseudo-eternal succession of its own, of miles distant, is unable to say whether the train has been moving at all, or how far, or how long. For an excellent collection of concrete illustrations of the illusions of space, time, and motion, see S. T. Klein’s *Science and the Infinite*, ch. i, and *Mystic Experiences, or Tales from Yoga Vasishtha*.

¹ Cf. the use of the expression “light years”.

² आदि or आरम्भ ; अन्त or अवसान ; मध्य.

apart, as it were, from its identifications and disjunctions with the Self, and gives us another aspect of the same thing. This is that most current form of the trinity inherent in Time, *viz.*, 'past, present, and future,' bhūta, bhavaṭ or varṭamāna, and bhaviṣhya, or 'before, now, and after,' as viewed from the standpoint of the Not-Self.¹

In this second aspect is contained the secret of personal immortality in brief.² Every étaṭ, 'this,' being once in touch with the Eternal, must be marked with that eternity for ever. There is no *succession* of once, twice, thrice, etc., in the *Eternal*; but every separate étaṭ is under the sway of such succession, and there is a contradiction, an impossibility indeed, involved in the juxtaposition, the coming together and the uniting, of the successionless and the successive. But the two *are* in contact, there, before us, all around us, irresistibly bound together by and in the Nature of the Absolute. This 'antinomy of the reason' is soluble only by imposing, on the successive, the false and illusive *appearance* of the

¹ भूत, भवत् or वर्तमान, and भविष्य ।

² To *remember*, to know, to realise, that 'I am Immortal', is to *become* Immortal, is to attain, to achieve, Immortality. *Sanat-sujāta Gītā* (included in *Mbh.*) records a dialogue between king Dhr̥ṭa-rāshtra and the great ṛshi.

सनत्सुजात !, यद् इदं शृणोमि, 'न अस्ति इति मृत्युर्' इति ते प्रवादः,
 देवासुराः हि आचरन् ब्रह्मचर्यं अमृत्यवे, तत् कतरन् नु सत्यं ?
 अमृत्युं कर्मणा केचित्, मृत्युर् न अस्ति इति च अपरे ।
 उभे सत्ये, क्षत्रिय !, अद्य प्रवृत्ते ; मोहो मृत्युः संमतोऽयं कवीनां ;
 प्रमादं मृत्युं अहं ब्रवीमि, तथा अप्रमादं अमृतत्वं ब्रवीमि ।

successionless, the eternal, which simultaneously includes all moments of time, once, twice, thrice, first, second, third, etc., by making every 'this' pseudo-eternal, *for-ever-eternal*, ever-lasting, in short. Therefore, every 'this' appears and vanishes and reappears throughout

'Sanaṭ-sujāta! Reverend Sir! I hear thy teaching is: There is no Death. I also hear that gods and titans practised Brahma-charya for long periods, to secure Deathlessness. Which of the two is true? Please instruct me'. 'Kṣhaṭṭriya!, both are true. Some say Immortality is won by effort and right action; others say that Death-(is) Is-Not. Both views are current in the world to-day, and both are true. The Great Wise Poets hold that Infatuated Forgetfulness alone (of the fact that I is-am Immortal) is Death; and, following them, I say that Infatuated Error (*i.e.*, the Error, a-vidyā of believing that 'I is-am something perishable, fleeting') is Death, and alert Aware-ness (that I-am-I eternally, and the True Knowledge, Vidyā, that Death-Is-Not, Death is Naught, is Immortality.

But to this should be added the further consideration that 'All is I, Yea, All is I', and that this is the true Personal *as well as* Impersonal Immortality. Each 'you', each momentary 'you' is also (potentially) immortal, because touched by the 'All-You-He-She-It-I', All-Consciousness; because kept in Its Memory by the Universal Mind, 'In God's Memory is all being bound'; in that समष्टि-ज्ञान, samashti-jñāna, (P.:A. *ilm-i-ijmā'li*, *aql-i-kul*), is everything recorded and preserved for ever and ever.

Philosophy, the Search for Truth, *begins* in an acute desire for *Personal* Immortality, for redress of all wrongs, for abolition of all pain and all evil. It *ends* in, is accomplished, achieved, fulfilled, *completed*, in the *disappearance* of that desire, and its replacement by the *assurance*, the *realisation*, of Universal, *Impersonal*, All-Personal, Immortality, and Self-identification-dissociation with *all* good-as-well-as-evil, *all* happiness-as-well-as-misery. as Kabir says: पग पग पर पैगम्बर गाड़े, 'a prophet lies buried in earth beneath your feet, at every step you take'; and Hamlet cries: "Imperious Cæsar dead and turned to clay, Might stop a hole to keep the wind away". Atoms are incessantly changing from the sheath of one jiva to that of another. The atom-portion is in-destructible, in its own way; the jiva-portion is also such, in its Personality. 'I am separate from all other I's, is also a *feeling*, an अंतःकरण-वृत्ति, antah-karana-vṛtti, a 'mood of mind', which arises in a conjunction of (an) āham -I with (an) étaṭ-this. Analysed, it vanishes. 'You want to be immortal; but which You? Yesterday's, to-day's, or tomorrow's?' *Each is different, more or less; less, as the time-interval is less; more, as more. To be 'all-Persons' is the true 'Personal as well as Impersonal Immortality.'*

all time (*i.e.*, in the endless consciousness of the *jīva*), again and again, as a firefly in the black darkness of a cloud-shut night of the rain-time in the tropics. Hence, while, in one sense, *mukṭi* is eternal, or timeless, having no beginning and no end, as viewed from the standpoint of *Pratyag-ātmā* or *Param-ātmā*; in another sense, it is always beginning and always ending, from the standpoint of *Mūla-prakṛti*. In other words, the individual *jīva*, viewed as identical with *Pratyag-ātmā*, and so with *Param-ātmā*, is never bound and never freed. As such, it can scarcely be said ever to *become* *mukṭa*. It is above and beyond both *bandhana*, bondage, and *moksha*; liberation; indeed both are in it always, rather than it in them ever.¹ But viewed as identical with a *piece* of *Mūla-prakṛti*, an ‘*éṭaṭ*,’ a ‘this’, it is always, in literally endless repetition, falling into bondage, *i.e.*, into identification with, and voluntary imprisonment in, a body, and getting out of that bondage again into liberation, *i.e.*, separation from, and out of, that prison-house. This is why we read in *Purāṇas* that the highest gods and *ṛshis*; although all *mukṭas*, ‘free,’ ‘emancipated,’ still, without exception, return again and again, cycle after cycle, *kalpa* after *kalpa*, passing and repassing endlessly through the spirals, retaining, every one of them, like all other *jīvas*, their centres of individuality through

¹ बंधन, मोक्ष । न पापं, न च वा पुण्यं, न बंधो, नापि मोक्षणम् ;
न सुखं, नापि वा दुःखं ; इत्येषा परमार्थता ।

¹ Not sin, nor merit; not bondage, nor liberation, not joy, nor sorrow; this is the Final and Supreme Attainment.’

pralayas as through ordinary nights, despite apparent loss (from the standpoint of lower planes of matter) of their defining and demarcating circumferences. But immense complications are introduced into this incessant evolution and involution, by the ever-mutable and ever-changing nature of every 'éṭaṭ,' 'this,' 'object'. These complications are pseudo-infinite and therefore utterly unresolvable and incomprehensible in their entirety by any individual within limited time and space.

To illustrate the reflection and re-reflection of the triplicity of the Absolute everywhere, as of a light between two mirrors, and also the changes, in correspondence with changes in points of view; we may say that in this triplet of 'past, present, and future,' yielded to us by looking at Time with reference to Not-Self; the present is the nexus, or Na, Not, between the past as jñāna and the future as kriyā; or, again, the future may be regarded as the nexus which will connect together and reproduce both past and present; or, the past may be thought of as having contained both the present and the future. The three make a circle, and we may start at any point in it.

Finally, Time, viewed with reference to Negation, may be said to yield the mathematical triplet of 'moment, period, and cycle,' kṣhaṇa, samaya, and yuga, or kshaṇa, yuga, and kāla-chakra.¹

In symbology, time is Kāla, the 'dark,' the 'mover,' and the 'destroyer, death,' all three in one. It is

¹ क्षण, समय, युग; काल-चक्र ।

pictured as the vast-sweeping Garuḍa that conveys, from place to place as need for giving help arises, the god of jñāna, Viṣṇu; Garuḍa, the eagle with the two all-covering wings of the past and future, whose sole food and means of sustenance are the small cycle-serpents (that, though belonging to the family of the 'end less' Ananta, form part of the retinue of Shiva, the god of ichchhā), one of which he eats up every day of his life by ordinance of the Creator, It may also be the Vana-mālā, 'wreath of forest-flowers', that Viṣṇu wears, representing the endless chain of life-moments strung together by the thread of cognitive consciousness. It is also the Sudarshana-Chakra the blazing 'sight-pleasing, beautiful-appearing, Discus-Wheel,' which overpowers all, which nothing can withstand. It is the Wheel of Life, which Tibetan Lamaism has adopted as the chief symbol of the World-Process. Yet again, it is the thousand-hooded serpent-king, Ananta, 'without end,' Shēsha, 'the ever-remaining,' who on his countless heads and coils supports with ease the divine frame of Viṣṇu as well as the globes of the heavens, one of whose visible forms is the Milky Way, and whom alone, of all the snakes, the eagle Garuḍa is powerless to touch.¹

¹ छंदोमयेन गरुडेन समुद्यमानः । *Bhāgavata* ; 'Viṣṇu, god of knowledge, is borne along by Garuda, who is composed, of the songs of the *Vēda*,' 'the music of the Spheres'. Elsewhere, the picturing is in terms of यज्ञ-वराह, 'the sacrificial Boar'.

Viṣṇu-Bhāgavata, XII, xi, gives other explanations of these symbols, and *Pranava-vāda* still others; all different ways of looking at the same thing, not inconsistent with each other. Kāla or Mahā-Kāla is one of the names of Shiva, i.e., Brahma, even as Kham or Space is.

It may be noted here that the Purṇāic story assigns Garuḍa, here regarded as corresponding to Time and Not-Self, as vehicle to Viṣṇu, the god of saṭṭva, jñāna, cognition, corresponding to Self. "It similarly assigns the 'rosary of human heads,' here said to correspond to Space and Self, to Shiva, the god of ichchhā, desire corresponding to Negation. Even more perplexing than these, it assigns Lakshmī-Shakti, the goddess of all wealth, splendour, glory, and activity, as consort, to Viṣṇu, and Sarasvatī-Shakti, the goddess of jñāna, knowledge, to Brahmā, the god of action. The Shakti of Gaurī-Kālī (white-black, life-death, affirmation-negation), the goddess of ichchhā, is of course assigned to Shiva, the god of destruction, and also of all 'auspiciousness' and blessings. In *Rahasya-traya*,¹ Sarasvatī is said to be the sister of Viṣṇu; and Lakshmī the sister of Brahmā; and Viṣṇu takes Lakshmī in marriage and Sarasvatī is given to Brahmā.² All these and similar other apparent inconsistencies may be reconciled by this consideration, viz., one factor of any trinity is predominant no doubt, in any one individual, and is regarded as essential to that individual's being, as constituting his peculiar nature; still the other two factors are also

कालः कलयताम् अहम्, *Gitā*, 'Of movers, moving forces, I am (or is) the greatest, Kāla, Time'. Compare the English expressions, 'his day is over,' 'his time has come', 'your time is up', 'time cures'. Time as cause is the spirit, the genius, of the time; as result, it is the era or epoch, as *Mahā-bhārata* says.

¹ Ch. 1. See also Nīla-kantha's commentary on *Dēvi-Bhāgavata* III, 1, 85.

² *Dēvi-Bhāgavata*, III, vi.

necessarily present in or about him ; otherwise his peculiar nature too could not manifest and would not be ; and then they are symbolised as his shaktis, ' powers ', vehicles, apparel, ornaments, etc. Right knowledge should result in right action and lead to wealth and splendour ; so Vishṇu marries Lakshmī. Action should be guided by knowledge ; so Brahmā marries Sarasvatī. And so on.¹

(C) MOTION

We have seen above how the eternal Negation of Not-Self by Self *appears* as a *movement*, chalana, gamana, ayana, of mergence and e-mergence, ni-majjana and un-majjana, between the two, because of the limitation of the ' this '. The third, which completes and binds together this duality of ' mergence and e-mergence,' may be regarded as the ' continual recurrence ' of the process, as continual juxtaposition, sam-majjana, permeation, pervasion.² This movement, considered metaphysically, in the abstract, is the primary and essential principle

¹ No doubt, in every national or racial mythology, found at present, there are many simple Nature-myths, in which the ' children of Nature ', primitive humans, have simple-mindedly (yet often with profoundly wise poetical instinct) anthropo-morphised Nature-phenomena, facts and forces, in terms of their daily experience. At the same time, there are to be found, in many mythologies, deliberately constructed symbolical myths. This is especially true of Purāṇic Mythology, almost the whole of which (and it is very large and complex) has an elaborately artificial character, stamping it as symbolical and allegorical.

² चलन, गमन, अयन । नि-मज्जन, उन्-मज्जन, सं-मज्जन । Other aspects would be expressed by सं-कोचन—वि-कासन—स्पन्दन, san-kochana—vi-kāsana—spandana, contraction-expansion-throbbing . निःश्वसन—उत्-श्व

which underlies and determines all the motion that appears in the World-Process ; and it gives us the triplicity inherent in Motion as appearing from the standpoint of Self.

From the standpoint of Not-Self we derive another aspect of Motion. It is embodied in, and issues from, the fact that each 'this,' besides the movement into and out of Self, which it is continuously subject to, in consequence of the whole-law of the logion, has also a special motion of its own, in consequence of the part-law of that logion. 'This' is the opposite of 'I' in every respect, and the eternal completeness and fulness, the freedom from change and motion, of 'I,' is necessarily matched by the limitation and therefore imperfection of each separate 'this' ; and the motion of each separate 'this' is the necessary expression of its endless want and changefulness. If the 'états', 'this-es', could be really steady and unmoving points in endless space, not feeling any want, and therefore not moving, then the contradiction would arise that the Whole and each part were equal, being both perfect. Hence the Whole, *i.e.*, absolute Brahma, Param-ātmā, and, as identical with it, Pratyag-ātmā also, is often described as a centre without a circumference, or conversely, a circle without a centre, or as that which is all centres only, or is everywhere a

(ऋ)सन—श्वसन, nish-shvasana—uch-chhvasana—shvasana, in-breathing—out-breathing—breathing ; लयन-सर्जन-संसरण, layana-sarjana-sam-sarapa, disappearing—re-appearing—procession ; निवृत्ति-प्रवृत्ति-अनुवृत्ति, ni-vṛtti—pra-vṛtti—anu-vṛtti, retiring-advancing-circling ; and so on.

centre and nowhere a circumference, or everywhere a circumference and nowhere a centre, and so on. This is verifiable practically by everyone without much difficulty. Sitting in a quiet place, shutting in the senses, fixing the consciousness upon itself, *i.e.*, Praṭyag-ātmā, the universal inward Self, and regarding and denying the whole mass of particulars summed up as a single Not-Self, the meditator loses all sense of Time and Space and Motion, and the whole of the universe, Not-Self and himself, seems shut up into a single moveless point of consciousness. Space and Time would not exist if such Motion, as between a particular étaṭ and another particular étaṭ, and, indeed, between all possible étaṭs, did not exist. In other words, this second motion is necessarily due to the fact that *each* étaṭ, 'this', being opposed to the omnipresent, infinite and eternal, unlimited, 'I,' has to oppose it at *every point* of the whole of its endless being; and thus reproduces and reflects in itself a pseudo-omnipresence. This pseudo-omnipresence of the limited étaṭ, en-souled by and en-form-ing a self, takes shape as, becomes, is, endless and perpetual Motion everywhere, from moment to moment or period to period of Time, and from place to place, from point to point, of Space. It cannot accomplish the law and achieve, manifest, fulfil, its nature in any other way.¹

¹ Similarly to be interpreted are the pseudo-omniscience and the pseudo-omnipotence, in potentiality, of each jiva; each self, as identical with Self, must know and deny, must identify itself with and repel, *every* étaṭ; and yet it cannot do so, as regards *all* étaṭs, at once; hence, always a greater and greater compassing, and letting go, and beginning afresh.

Other ways of describing the fact are these : Motion is the perpetual endeavour of the limited to become unlimited ; of the successive to achieve simultaneity ; of the finite to secure infinity ; it is the constant struggle of Space, or extension, and Time, or intension, to coincide, and to collapse into the perfect Rest, the single point, the rockboundness of Absolute-Consciousness.

This second view of motion, with reference to Not-Self, gives us the triplet of 'approach, recess, and revolution,' or 'centripetal, centrifugal, and orbital motion,' upa-sarpaṇa, apa-sarpaṇa, and pra-sarpaṇa or pari-bhramaṇa.¹

Finally, with reference to Negation, we have the mathematical triplet, in Motion, of 'linear, rotatory and spiral,'² ṛju-bhramaṇa, chakra-bhramaṇa, and āvarṭa-bhramaṇa, corresponding to Self, Not-Self, and Negation. These three motions sum up in themselves all the possible motions of Saṃsāra, as may be pictured by the diagram on p. 432, vol. iii, of *The Secret Doctrine* (Adyar edn.), if the spines shown therein along the outer side of the single line, whose convolutions make up the whole diagram, were also made parts of, and continuous with, that same single line, and the line were shown as constantly coiling

¹ Some physicists regard vibratory or oscillatory motion as a third primary form of motion, side by side with the translatory or free-path or linear, and the rotary or circular. (*Vide* Dolbear, *Ether, Matter, and Motion*, iii.) But it will probably be found on analysis, that vibratory, undulatory, and all other forms of motion are compounded out of elements of the primary kinds suggested in this and the preceding paragraph.

² उप - सर्पण, अप - सर्पण, प्र - सर्पण or परि - भ्रमण.

and turning round and round upon itself, like a spiral wire-spring, and all this line and process of coiling were produced and carried round and round pseudo-infinitely.

This Motion, the first factor of the second trinity, seems to be figured in the *Purāṇas* as the *hamsa*, the 'swan'-vehicle of Brahmā, the lord of Action, which *hamsa* (under another interpretation of the *Upaniṣad*-text quoted before) circles with double beat of wing incessantly in the great wheel or cycle of Brahma. It may also be the *mālā*, rosary of crystal beads, that Brahmā ever turns around and tells in his right hand, in constant movement, weaving all single vibrations into one, on the thread of the action-consciousness. It may, yet again, be the ever twisting, turning, rolling stream of holy Gaṅgā stored within the same god's 'bowl' of sacred waters, the *kamaṇḍalu*.¹

Before passing on to our next subject of discussion, the individual self, or *jīva*, we may note that although Space and Time and Motion have, like *Pratyag-ātmā*, *Mūla-prakṛti*, and Negation, been treated of in successive order, this is only because of the limitations of speech, which, as has been said, can proceed only in succession. It must not be imagined, any more as regards the former trinity than as regards the latter, that there is any

¹ The statements made in this work as to symbology, it should be borne in mind, are only suggestive. They have no immediate importance here with reference to the general principles underlying the constitution of the kosmos, which are attempted to be outlined in this work, primarily. That they are made at all is only in the hope that the suggestions may be of use and possibly give some clue to students who may take an interest in working out, with the help of purāṇic legends, the details which issue out of the general principles described here.

precedence or succedence amongst the three. They are perfectly synchronous, utterly inseparable, all equally important, and all equally dependent with and on each other, and also with and on the primal trinity, of Self, Not-Self, and Negation. And all these trinities, again, co-inhere in and are inseparable from *jīva-ātmā*, *jīva-atom*, *jīva-unit*, which combines and manifests in itself all of them, and therefore is 'the immortal beyond doubt and fear,' if it will only so recognise itself.

He who grasps this secret of the heart of Motion, Time, and Space, will understand Vasishtha's riddle that 'all is everywhere and always'.¹ For *jīva* is the tireless weaver that, on the warp and woof of Time and Space, with the shuttle of Motion, weaves eternally the countless-coloured tapestry of all this multifarious illusion-world, carrying the *whole* plan thereof incessantly *within itself*, and so carrying 'all,' 'always' and 'everywhere' in one. If we turn our eyes to the warp and the woof and the shuttle, we see but the endless tapestry of Penelope that never progresses and never regresses, though worked incessantly. Law requires more law, and that again more still; to fulfil and justify the opposed necessities, to reconcile the contradictions of the constitution of the

¹ And also, incidentally, that orderliness or disorderliness in the conduct of the affairs of this 'māyā-illusion' of *samsāra*, the perpetually moving world, depends entirely upon the right or wrong use of these three 'emptinesses,' *viz.*, space, time, and motion. To make a proper division of these three, to perform fixed actions at fixed times in fixed places, is to be orderly; to do otherwise is to be disorderly. But it has to be borne in mind that both order and disorder are relative, and both, ultimately, wholly subjective. To prove to itself that it is not the slave of any particular order, the Self indulges in all kinds of 'dreams'.

Absolute, one process is invented ; that shows defect, another is invented ; that breeds only new grievances, they are amended ; ten more start up, new laws appear to cover them ! A laughable yet very serious, a fearful yet all-beautiful, an exceeding simple yet most awesome and stupendous līlā, pastime and child's-play. An untold and untellable, a veritably exhaustless, richness of variety, which is yet but the thinnest Māyā and pretence to hide the unruffled calm and sameness of the Self. A heart of utter peace within mock-features of infinite unrest and toil and turmoil. Thus ever goes on this endless, countless, strictly and truly pseudo-infinite complication, this repetition over repetition, reproduction of reproduction, and reflection within reflection. Yet is it ever reducible—at any moment of Space and Time and Motion, as soon as the jīva really chooses to reduce it so, by simply turning round its gaze upon itself—into the eternal peace of the simple formula of the logion : Aham Ētaṭ Na, 'I (am)-this-Not. This is so, because the complications are not outside of the jīva, but, as soon as it realises its identity with the universal Self, *within* it. Forgetting, as it were, its own true nature, it creates them in and by the very act of running after them till it becomes giddy, ready to fall down in despair with its own whirlings, all in vain, like a snake chasing its own tail, which it would find and seize more surely as part of its own self if it but gave up its mad gyrations, and turned back upon it quietly and peacefully and rested still. 'The Self-born pierced the senses outwards, hence

the jīva seeth the outer world, and not the inner Ātmā. A wise one here and there turneth back his gaze, from outward to inward, desirous of immortality, and beholdeth the inward Self.' ¹

¹ परांचि खानि व्यतृणत् स्वयंभूः,
 तस्मात् परांङ् पश्यति, न अंतरात्मन्;
 कश्चिद्धीरः प्रत्यगात्मानम् ऐक्षद्,
 आवृत्तचक्षुः, अमृतत्वम् इच्छन् ।
 केशव !, कहि न जाइ, का कहियै !
 अति विचित्र रचना विचारि, तव,
 समुझि, मनहि मन, रहियै,
 सून भीति पर, विविध रंग के,
 तनु बिनु लिख्यो चितेरा !
 (चित्र अनन्त, बनत अरु बिगरत,
 कबहुं न होत निबेरा !)

(O silent Sleeper in this seething Sea !
 Plain we behold, and yet speech may not be.
 We wander, wonder, search, and then we find,
 But find it in the silence of the mind.
 Who will believe the marvel, if we say,
 Though it be plain, plain as the light of day,
 That on the boundless wall of Nothingness,
 A Painter full of skill but bodiless,
 Limns phantom figures that will never fade,
 Though to efface them time has e'er essayed,
 Limns forms of countless colours ceaselessly,
 O serene Sleeper of this stormy Sea !)

Ṭulasi Dās, *Vinaya Paṭrikā*, Hymn No. 112, to
 'Ké-shava,' i.e., Vishṇu 'sleeping in the waters'.

NOTE I.—The word 'pastime' may perhaps be thought objectionable, as likely to jar the feelings of least some

earnest-minded thinkers who are holders of serious views as to the destinies of man, his relation to God, and the general purpose of creation or evolution. Readers, who, not content with the solutions now extant of the problems of life, find it worth while to read to the end of this book systematically, will, it is earnestly believed, find that the view of life advocated herein, is not inconsistent with, or exclusive of, any. They will see that it rather includes all the deepest views of, and the highest-reaching wishes for, the future of man, that have been entertained by the most honoured thinkers and well-wishers of their fellow men, so far as such may be ascertained from published writings. An endless progressiveness, an infinite perfectibility, an ever closer approach to the ever-expanding Divine, are hoped for here also for the human race, most sincerely and strongly. Only, in this work, this view is regarded as constituting not the whole, but only half the truth; as being that aspect of the Truth which is visible from the standpoint of the individual jiva pursuing the philosophy of Change and its corresponding worship. The other and supplementary half is that, from the standpoint of the universal Self, there is no progress and no regress, No change of any kind, so that if that condition may be described at all in terms of the Changing, then the only words to use are 'Pastime,' 'Play,' 'unfettered Will,' 'uncontrolled outgoing of Life,' 'unresisted and irresistible manifestation of the inner Nature,' 'the unquestionable Will of God,' 'Thy will be done,' 'Who shall question Him?' 'My will and Pleasure,' 'the Pleasure of the Universal Self,' etc. Are the free romplings of the child, and the vigorous games of youth, and the vast industries of peace (and un-happily also war) of a nation's matured manhood, that are but as means to the child's romplings and the youth's games—are these such a slur upon life that the word 'Pastime' should jar upon the serious-minded? Are not, rather, happy homes the very essence of a nation's life, and the child's and the mother's bright smile and laugh and play the very essence of the 'home'? Play is a thing as serious at least as work, in the well-balanced life. And, while this idea is yielding up to him its full significance, let the reader bear in mind that, as shown by the above inadequate translation from Tulasī Dās,

a devotee of devotees, whose book, the *Rāmāyaṇa*, has been the Bible of hundreds of millions of Hīṇḍūs, for the last three hundred years—this idea, that the world is the Pastime of the Self has been entertained with loving fervour by at least some of the most earnest-minded of men. Vyāsa himself, in his *Brahma-sūtra* (II, 1, 33), expressly uses this very word 'Lilā,' as the final explanation, together with 'Kai-vālyam,' of the appearance and the disappearance of the manifested world: 'Play, and Retirement into Sleep and Solitude, as of the ordinary human being.' This book will indeed have failed in its purpose if it leaves behind the impression that devotion to individual Īshvaras, embodying, in greater or lesser degree, the universal and impersonal ideal, has been scoffed at and belittled herein, rather than made infinitely stronger and deeper and more unshakable by being placed on the firm foundations of reason. Also, indeed, the dire tragedies that are enacted in the world, every moment, would harrow up sensitive souls irredeemably, overwhelming all sense of the equal number of comedies that also are enacted at the same time necessarily, (for the pain of one is the pleasure of another and *vice versa*), and destroying all faith in the mercy, justice, goodness of God, were it not possible to assure them that all these awful heart-crushing agonies, (as also the dance and laughter), are, verily, as unreal to the Universal Self, as theatre-plays are to the human spectator.

"God felt defect", "He took no Joy in His Sole-ness, Soli-tude", "He willed: May I be Many", "He Want-ed to love and be loved", "He willed the creation, that His Glory may be known and praised"—such are the causes assigned for the creation of the world by a Personal Creator, even by devout minds. They all, on the least analysis, come only to Lilā, Play, in order to Pass-Time, and En-com-Pass-Space, and sur-Pass-Motion.

NOTE II.—The last four lines, in bold type, of p. 314, may seem to need further explication. How to be *all* persons? How be personal as well as all-personal, Im-personal or Non-personal? How be mortal and also Immortal? The subject will probably become clear if the reader will endeavour to understand thoroughly, the nature of (a) Param-ātmā,

Pratyag-ātmā, Mūla-prakṛti, (b) jiv-ātmā, (c) the connection between them all, as expounded in the preceding pages. He may also read carefully what is said in this book, in several places, *supra* as well as *infra*, on the subject of 'individuality' and 'individuals within individuals'. Finally—and this may perhaps help him most—he should consider the case of the novelist or dramatist-actor who, while always conscious 'at the back of his mind', that he is *not identical* with any of the hundreds, or thousands, of characters and parts which he creates, yet *identifies himself*, for the time being, *with each* of these characters or parts; and, in fact, the more thorough such identification, the more realistic and successful his portraiture or acting. Any reader also, of a really fine novel or drama or even history (if it is properly written), may enter so thoroughly into the spirit of each character, that he may (as it were) forget 'his own proper self' for the time, and feel as if he was that character, present in those surroundings, and undergoing those experiences. Many dreams are so vivid that when we recall them a sufficiently long time afterwards we begin to doubt and wonder if we did not actually and really pass through that experience while awake. Children on the one hand, and, on the other, very old men, are especially liable to such 'illusions'. In 'reveries', which are 'waking dreams', we lose ourselves entirely in and into 'other worlds'.

Also, *all* jiva-s have to pass through *all* experiences, turn by turn.

एते सर्वे एव समाः, सर्वे एव अनन्ताः । *Bṛhaḍ Up.* 1. 5 13.

'All these are equal; all are infinite'.

न ज्येष्ठासः न कनिष्ठासः एते । *Shatāpāṭha Brāh.*

'Among these, none is greater, none smaller'.

नहि गतिः अधिकाऽस्ति कस्यचित्, सकृद् उपदर्शयति इह तुल्यतां ;

न भवति विदुषां महद् भयं यद् अविदुषां सुमहद् भयं भवेत् ।

‘None is ultimately higher, none is ultimately lower; none has, in the nett result, on the whole, a farther, higher, finer reach than any other. Knowing this, that (temporary) misfortune which may cause serious fear and distress to the unwise person who does not know the Truth, leaves the wise one, who knows the Truth, unshaken’.

सुखं च, दुःखं च, भवऽभवौ च, लाभऽलाभौ, मरणं जीवितं च,
पर्यायतः सर्वे एवऽप्रवृत्तिः ; तस्मात्, न मुह्येत्, न च संप्रहृष्येत् ।

Mbh., Shānti, ch. 25.

‘Joy and sorrow, growth and decay, gain and loss, life and death, come to each and all, turn by turn. Therefore, let none be depressed, none be elated; let all always maintain an equable mind.

क्रमऽन्यत्वं परिणामऽन्यत्वे हेतुः । *Yoga-Sūtra*, III. 15.

‘Differences in the order of succession of (the very same) experiences are the cause of those differences of personality or individuality which are marked by or accompany special births in special types of bodies’.

“To realise the bliss in *Devachan*, or the woes in *Avitchi*, you have to assimilate them—as we do”: *The Mahatma Letters*, p. 194. ‘We’ here means the Masters, Adepts, R̥shis.

See also the illustrations, by various examples, of what makes the illusion of difference between persons, individuals, or individualities, given on pp. 59-60 and 173-174 of *The Science of the Self*; pp. 62-63 and 411-413 of *World War and Its Only Cure—World Order and World Religion*; and, in *The Essential Unity of All Religions*, the sections, in Chap. III, on ‘The Mutual Balancing of Pleasures and Pains’ and ‘Personal and Impersonal Devotion.’

CHAPTER XIII

JĪVA-ATOMS

(A) GENERALLY

BEFORE proceeding further we may make a brief retrospect.

From the confusion of the world we travelled slowly and laboriously to the Absolute. In that we saw the first trinity, of Self, Not-Self, and Negation.¹ We saw again that Self was triple, Saṭ-Chiḍ-Ānanda ; Not-Self was triple, Rajas-Saṭṭva-Ṭamas ; the affirmative Shakṭi-Energy of Negation was triple, Sṛsṭi-Sṭhiṭi-Laya ; and, finally, that (the negative shūnyaṭā, 'emptiness', of) Negation itself was also triple, Désha-Kāla-Kriyā. We also saw that each one of this last trinity was again triple in its own turn. We may also have noticed, in passing, that the whole, the aggregate, of any three, might, in a sense, be regarded as a fourth which summarised and completed them all. We also had a glimpse of the fact that these trinities and triplets are all combined in the jīva-atom which, because of this fact,

¹ " The One can, when manifesting, become only Three. The Un-manifested, when a simple duality, remains passive and concealed. The dual monad (the 7th and 6th principles), has, in order to manifest itself, to first become a *triad* " ; *The Mahatma Letters*, 347 ; see also p. 346. It would be useful for the student to try to translate the symbols used there into the abstract terms used here.

contains, in seed, the whole of the World-Process in itself. After this brief *résumé* we may go on to consider jīva-atoms in a little more detail.

Ētaṭ, 'This,' is by necessity *Many*, by opposition to the *One-ness* of the Aham, the 'I', Self, and each of these Many, by opposition to the Self's unlimitedness and changellessness, and, again, by mutual exclusion and limitation, under the stress of Negation, is limited, and trebly limited, in space, time, and motion; *i.e.*, it has got a *parimāṇa*, dimension, extension, size in space, by limitation on this side and on that; a *spanda* or *sphuraṇa*, a vibration in motion, a pendulum-swing, a revolution within the area of a radius, limited movement, which is necessarily made rhythmic by the fact of limitation in space and time; and an *āy u*,¹ a duration, a life-period, a limited succession, in time. Such is the general description of the atoms which make up Mūla-prakṛti, the very essence of which is Manyness, atomicity. The atom is an *étaṭ*, a 'this,' having limited size, duration, and motion; it cannot apparently be defined more simply or comprehensively anywise else.

But an *étaṭ*, 'this,' cannot exist apart from Aham, 'I'; Mūla-prakṛti is inseparable from Pratyag-ātma. Each 'this' is indissolubly connected with

¹ परिमाण; स्पंद, स्फुरण; आयु। This word आयु, and आयाम, āyāma, extension, and अयन, ayana, movement, seem to be connected together in a suggestive and significant way, (though etymologically different), but the latter two are not very current now in the general meanings mentioned. Hence the other corresponding words have been given above.

'I,' by the double bond of 'am' and 'am not'—'am' representing the ascending phase of the metabolism of the life-process, and 'am not' the descending phase thereof. From all this it follows necessarily that the one Self becomes limited off into a pseudo-infinite number of 'aham-s,' jīvas or jīvātmās; that every 'aham' is em-bodied in an 'étaṭ', and every 'étaṭ' is en-soul-ed by an 'aham;' and that every one of these pseudo-infinite atoms that make up Mūla-prakṛti is therefore living. Each such living atom, combining in itself Pratyag-ātmā and Mūla-prakṛti, is an individual, an individualised jīva-atom.¹ And we may note that as each atom is a 'this,' having definite size, duration, and vibration, so is each jīva an 'I,' having a definite extent or reach of consciousness, indicated by the body ('the soul made visible') which it wears, an age or lifetime, and a restless activity of mind. The Saṃskṛt words denoting these aspects of the jīva are also the same as for the aspects of the atom, except that, in place of the word parimāṇa, dimension, the word kshétra, the 'field' (of consciousness) is more commonly used.²

¹ एतन् मिथुनं, यद् वाक् च, प्राणश्च ; ऋक् च, साम च ; तद् एतन् मिथुनं, ओम् इति एतद् अस्मिन् अक्षरे संसृज्यते ; यदा वै मिथुनौ समागच्छतः, आपयतो वै तौ अन्योऽन्यस्य कामान् सर्वान् । *Chhândogya*, I, i, 5-6. 'This pair, voice (speech) and breath, hymn and melody, both come together in the Imperishable Word-sound Om (Aum) ; and when the Two come together, they fulfil all their Desire and desires for each other.'

² Or जात्यायुर्भोगाः ; jāti-āyur-bhoga, in the words of the *Yoga-sūtra*, i.e., a sheath or body extended in space, a lifetime, and a sum-total of experiences. For the word kshétra, see *Gītā*, ch. xiii.

These attributes, it is clear, appear in the jīva with reference to the primary attributes of Negation, *viz.*, space, time, and motion.

With reference to the functions of the Shakti-aspect of Negation, (*i.e.*, the Energy of the Ī, hiding in M), *viz.*, creation, preservation, and destruction, the attributes of the jīva-atom may be said to be birth, life, and death ; or, in other words, growth, stagnation, and decay ; corresponding to attraction, balancing, and repulsion.

In such a jīva-atom, mutual imposition of the attributes of each, Self and Not-Self, is complete ; in collapsing together they have taken on the properties of one another ; and the jīva-atom therefore shows, in its own individuality, the phenomenon of permanence in impermanence and impermanence in permanence, oneness in manyness and manyness in oneness. The one Praṭyag-ātmā becomes many individuals ; the many Mūla-prakṛti becomes organised ones, each indestructible, each having a personal immortality, or unending duration, and a pseudo-infinity of endless stretch of consciousness, as also the true eternity and infinity of Praṭyag-ātmā. In strictness, the reflection of the One in the Many should cause the appearance of pseudo-infinite geometrical 'points without magnitude,' true 'centres,' which make the '*singular one*,' as opposed to and yet reproducing the '*universal One*' ; but as, because of the other law, operating simultaneously with equal force, *viz.*, that the 'this' is limited as against the unlimitedness of Aham, the point must have *definite* limitation ; therefore, everywhere, we have jīva-atoms

having size, etc., as said before, in place of points, which, however, always exist as possibilities, as abstract and theoretical centres. Such definite jīva-atoms, considered with greater reference to the atom-aspect, may be called 'particulars'; with greater reference to the jīva-aspect, 'individuals'; the individual, particular, or definite, being the reconciliation of the extremes of the singular and the universal; which 'extremes meet' however, for in-fin-itesimal centre and in-fin-ite circle are equally in-de-fin-able, and are therefore undistinguishable, equal, identical.

We see now what the real value of the distinction between animate matter and inanimate matter is. Here, as everywhere else, the truth lies in the mean, and error in the two extremes. There is absolutely no matter at all that is not *en-liven*-ed, ensouled, inspired, animated by spirit; and also no spirit that is not *in-form*-ed with, inclosed, inclothed, ensheathed, embodied, in matter.¹ This—which is proved by its own irrefragable chain of deductions to the inner, 'pure,' or higher reason, the reason which looks at facts from the standpoint of the universal Self; as opposed to the outer, the 'impure,' reason, which looks at them from the standpoint, and with the egoistic clingings and limitations, of the individual self—this is now being proved even to the outward senses by the admirable industry of modern physical science. It has been shown by an elaborate and very instructive series of facts and arguments: "that a

¹ अचैतन्यं न विद्यते । *Mahā-bhārata*, Shāntiparva, ch. 184.

fundamental difference, *i.e.*, difference in the elementary *materials* and the elementary *forces*, between organic and inorganic bodies, does not exist,"¹ and that the differences between them "are no greater than the differences between many inorganic substances, and consist merely, in the mode of union of the elements".² The scientists of to-day have collected facts and performed experiments which show conclusively that so-called inanimate and inorganic matter responds to stimulus, and behaves generally in the same manner as animate and organic matter.³ Hasty deductions from such facts, *e.g.*, 'the soul is but an electric current in another form,' 'matter and spirit are identical,' are liable to misconstruction, and rest really upon inaccuracy and misunderstanding. It would be almost truer to say that 'the electric current is but soul in another form'. Minds that have not yet learnt to look leisurely, calmly, and impartially, at both sides of a question, and are still at the stage of taking hurried, passionate, and one-sided views of it, with a partisan zeal, either emphasise Matter too much and resolve Spirit entirely into it, or emphasise Spirit too much and resolve Matter away entirely into it. This is the result of looking at only one aspect, at one half, of the two-sided whole. The whole Truth is that all Matter is living, and all Life material; that the pseudo-eternal Motion of all Matter, in all its endless complication, is

¹ Max Verworn, *General Physiology*, p. 336.

² *Ibid.*, p. 272.

³ Sir J. C. Bose, *Response in the Living and the Non-Living*.

throughout accompanied, on an ineffaceable parallel, by the fact of Consciousness, the fact of Life, now higher and now lower in degree of manifestation, according to the increased or decreased elaboration of the complications.¹ *Ētaṭ* and *Aham* can never be separated.' Yet they are distinct also and can never be identified literally, except as they both are ever merged, by Negation, in the completeness and Self-sameness of the Absolute. They are distinguishable, but not separable, in brief. This psycho-physical parallelism is the inner meaning of the Sāṅkhya-doctrine, referred to before, viz., the constant

¹ See *The Mahatma Letters*, pp. 60, 63, 65, 66, 67, and other pages referred to in its Index, against the words Matter, Spirit, Force; and endeavour to reconcile the seemingly inconsistent statements. The present work may perhaps be of some use in the endeavour.

² Therefore every mood of mind has a corresponding mode of matter, in and through which it manifests. As countless radii meet in the centre, so countless worlds meet in the soul-jīva, mind-body. And the soul can pass from any radius to any other by coming back to the centre, i.e., it-Self, and issuing forth again thence. Hence, the scriptures say that persons who cultivate such-and-such virtues or vices, noble or ignoble sentiments, passions, feelings, emotions, tastes, interests, go to such and such worlds, physical and superphysical, 'heavenly' or 'hellish,' by sheer attraction in that direction. Consider how persons gravitate towards the worlds of science or art or literature or business or administration, and to one or other of the numerous sub-sub-divisions of these. The fact that the nervous system (predominantly) serves the 'intellectual'; the muscular, the 'actional'; the glandulo-vascular, the 'emotional', illustrates the same fact. A western writer has recently invented the words 'cerebro-tonic', 'somato-tonic', and 'viscero-tonic' for the three main temperaments and types of humans. Overloading of a language's vocabulary with a plethora of new coinages which are not really necessary, is not desirable; and the French are wise to keep their diction and dictionary pure and limited, by the censorship of their Academy; though Herbert Spencer disapproves such limitation. But in this particular case, an advocate of *Manu* and *Vēda* may welcome even the three strange words as supporting his arguments.

The reader may see, in this connection, pp. 355-356 of *The Science of Social Organisation*, vol. I; pp. 32-34 of *The Superphysics of War* (*Adyar Pamphlets*); and p. 79 of *World War and its Only Cure*.

con-currence or co-efficiency of Consciousness with all variations of Motion in Matter, which con-comitance or co-incidence constitutes universal Life and makes those Movements possible. This is all that Consciousness does ; Ātmā is āḍhāra, base, support, of all these motions ; without it, they would have no meaning and would not be. When all vital phenomena have been explained away into atomic affinities, as is being attempted by modern scientists anew, then the question would arise : Whence and how and why these affinities ? The only answer is : The Universal Consciousness imposes them on the atoms ; and the result is that the whole series of explanations is *reversed* ; belief in Vital Force is restored on a higher level ; and all affinities become resolved into the vital phenomena of one ever-living Universal Shakti. Of course, *real* initiation of actions and movements by *individual* consciousness is abolished even so ; but *apparent* initiation remains untouched. What the whole truth is on this point, may be gathered partially from what has been already said about free-will, and, for the rest, from the fuller discussion which may be held later on.

Distinction between animate and inanimate then amounts to this, that, to the person noting the distinction at any particular time and place, in the former, the element of Praṭyag-ātmā is more prominent and manifest, while, in the latter, the element of Mūla-prakṛti is more apparent.

Reason for this alternate predominance, now of the one and now of the other, is the alternation of 'am' and

'am not'. When 'am' is strong, we have the appearance of 'the living,' of crescent 'life,' of anabolism. When 'am not' prevails, then we have the phenomenon of 'death,' 'the dying,' 'the dead,' 'the inert,' of katabolism. In the strict sense of the words, 'life' and 'death' are not correct here; only 'living' and 'dying' are proper. The scientific truth of necrobiosis, 'dying life' or 'living death', of gradual death, is voucher for this fact. But like 'animate' and 'inanimate,' 'life' and 'death' have, as convenient words, a practical value, though the facts can never in reality be separated; living and dying are going on *constantly*, incessantly, *side by side*, and also *one after another*, because of the general principles which underlie, as explained before, the triple subdivisions of time, space, and motion; for, (1) to say, 'I am this état,' is also to say at the same time, in the same space, and by the same motion, 'I am not this other état;' and to say, 'I am not this état,' is also to say, 'I am this other état'. Again, (2) to say, 'I am this', is to say later, in another time, space, and motion, 'I am not (the same) this;' and *vice versa*. Finally, (3) it is unavoidable to be saying, everywhere and always, either 'I am this,' or 'I am not this'. Thus it comes about that every organism is living and dying, *at the same time, i.e.*, changing, and has also *successively* ascending and descending phases of metabolism. Thus are Spirit and Matter, Life and Death, ever connected like the two ends of the beam of a balance; if one rises, the other falls in equal degree; if one falls, the

other rises similarly ; but entirely separated they never can be.

It may be gathered from the above, that the word 'life,' as currently employed, means 'living and dying,' and 'death' means 'dying and living'. Let us now see more fully what death really means. When we have done that, our information as to the essential significance of one prominent aspect of the jīva-atom, the aspect of animate-inanimate, will have been rounded out and completed in a way.

By the law of *aḍhyāsa*,¹ mutual superimposition of attributes between the Self and the Not-Self, the jīva-atom must begin and end in time, *i.e.*, be impermanent, and must at the same time be permanent. Reconciliation of this contradiction is achieved in ever-recurrent beginnings and endings.² But how is this possible? How can a thing, an *éṭaṭ*, having once *been*, ever cease to be, and if it once actually *ceased* to be, how could it be again? Necessity to obviate this objection

¹ अद्यास. The word 'im-position' is peculiarly ap-posite here. Māyā is the Great Impostor or Impostress, who 'imposes' upon people ; makes the false look like the true to them ; 'imposes' false beliefs upon them. The Greek word *antidosis* seems to mean the same *aḍhyāsa*. F, n. 4 on p. 17 of Gibbon's *Roman Empire*, vol. V, (Everyman's Library series) says : "The *antidosis* of the Greeks, a mutual loan or transfer of the *idioms* or properties ('*idios*', one's own peculiarity) of each nature to the other—of infinity to man, possibility (passingness, transience, finiteness) to God, etc. Twelve rules on this nicest of subjects compose the Theosophical Grammar of Petavius." See p. 11, *supra*.

² आत्मनित्यत्वे प्रेत्यभावसिद्धिः । *Nyāya-sūtra*, IV, i, 10, 'Because *Ātmā*, Self, is eternal, therefore, it follows as a necessary consequence, that after having *departed* from one body, it *becomes* again, *i.e.*, comes into another body'.

creates at once new laws and facts. Firstly, the difficulty is solved by (apparent) successive dissociations and re-associations of ensouling inner *jīva* and ensheathing outer bodies, *i.e.*, transfer of the individual consciousness from one body to another, and thence to yet another, and so on. But having said this, it becomes necessary to explain what is meant by *inner jīva* and *outer sheath*, where we have been speaking of a single and apparently homogeneous *jīva*-atom so far. Although the *jīva*-atom is a 'one,' yet again within that one there is an irreducible and irrepressible duality—indeed, a trinity, strictly speaking; as may appear later in connection with the explanation of the metaphysic of the expression *ṭri-bhuvana*, the triple-world.¹ 'I' is joined to *ētaṭ* by 'am' in 'I (am) this'; yet they are only *joined*; the two cannot be literally identified. The consequence of this is that we have an 'inner' *jīva*, self or soul, and an 'outer' *upādhi*, sheath or body. This inner self is something which, by its very *Pratyagātmic* nature and constitution, is always eluding sensuous grasp and definition. 'How and by what may the knower be known?'² It is Self-luminous. Whenever we seek, consciously or unconsciously, to *define* It, we at once find in its place an *upādhi*, a sheath, as *Indra* found *Umā Haima-vaṭī*,³ a sheath subtler than the previous one, from the standpoint of which as 'outer'

¹ त्रिभुवन.

² *Brhad-aranyaka*. II, iv, 14.

³ *Kēna Uṇ.*, iii.

we started to secure this 'inner' self ; subtler, no doubt, but yet as undoubtably material. This 'inner' Self, the 'abstract,' would lose its very nature and falsify itself, would no longer be 'inner' and 'abstract', if it could be grasped. To be grasped means to be outer. Therefore this Self ever recedes further and further inwards, within a literally endless series of veil after veil, as we try to follow it with the eye of sense, while to the eye of the pure reason, that is to say, to It-Self, it is always present, immovably stationary. The physical reflection of this law, as found by physical science, is that "there exists upon earth at present no living substance that is homogeneous throughout," and that "the living substance that now exists upon the earth's surface is recognised only in the form of cells," each of which "contains, as its essential constituents, two different substances, the protoplasm and the nucleus,"¹ (with a connecting third kind, *viz.*, chromatin-network); and the nucleus has been found, on further investigation, to contain still inner cores and sheaths, etc., *viz.*, the nucleolus and other substances." The truth is that, as more or less openly described in *Yogā Vāsishtha*² and other works on Yoga and Vedānta, and in theosophical literature, the constitution of man, and, indeed, of all living matter, is a plantain-stem-like system of leaf-sheath within leaf-sheath, layer

¹ Max Verworn, *General Physiology*, p. 296.

² *Ibid.*, p. 91 ; see also H. W. Conn : *The Story of Life's Mechanism*.

³ *Vide* story of Līlā in Uṭpatti-Prakaraṇa ; *Mystic Experiences, or Tales from Yoga-Vāsishtha*.

within layer, fold within fold, and shell within shell, all interpenetrating one another, each distinguishable from each, yet not wholly separable from each other, but fringing off into each other by indefinable gradations. And metaphysic adds that this must be so, not up to any limited extent or definite number, which would be arbitrary (except as regards any particular world-system, which must necessarily deal with definite time, space, and motion, and therefore definite numbers of layers and planes of matter, *e.g.*, litho-, hydro-, igni-, atmo-, ethero-, etc., spheres) ; but pseudo-infinitely, which only is in accordance with reason, when the whole of the World-Process is taken into account. More about this may appear later ¹; in the meanwhile what has been said may suffice to show how we have the possibility, and therefore the necessity (for in the sight of metaphysic to be possible is to be), of the phenomenon of death, by the passing of the jīva from one outer and denser body to another inner and subtler body. This outer body, which, then, is left behind, is called dead from the standpoint of the inner jīva, which has now passed on to another sheath. And the inner jīva may similarly be called dead from the point of view of the dense body. There is a reciprocal severance of association and reciprocal death, a reciprocal cessation of interchange, interplay, intervivification. The opposite of death in this sense is 'birth' and not 'life'; and it

¹ See the remarks on 'the three worlds or planes' and 'the three bodies' in Ch. XV, on Jivas, *infra*.

may be defined in the same terms. If 'death' is the transference of the individual consciousness from one plane of éṭaṭ-matter to another, birth is the same transference from another into the one. The same event means a death in one plane or world, and a birth in another. In other words, as death is reciprocal, so is birth; each dies to the other; each is born away from the other. The sleeping of the jīva in the sṭhūla or physical body, on the physical plane of jāgrat, 'waking' consciousness, is its awakening in the sūkshma or astral body, on the astral plane of svapna, 'dreaming' consciousness; its sleeping in the latter, again, is its awakening in the kāraṇa, 'causal' body, on the corresponding plane of sushupti, 'deep sleep' consciousness; (and so on pseudo-infinitely, in a special sense), and in the reverse order. *vice versa*, (also, pseudo-infinitely, in that special sense).

But, again, the totality of éṭaṭs, 'this-es', can never be really separated from the *One indivisible* Self; nor *an éṭaṭ*, a 'this,' from *an aham*, *an 'I'*, from its own particular 'I', so to say, *viz.*, the one with which it was identified in the beginning of beginningless time; any more than it can be really unified and identified with such. There is no sufficient reason why an éṭaṭ should be really separated—especially remembering that it has to be reunited with it as said before—from any aham with which it has once, at any time, been in junction. *Once*, therefore *ever*, is the requirement of the first principles of logic, the first laws of thought: "A is

A and Not not-A." The result of these acting and counteracting necessities of reason is that we have the periodic, definite, overt, and *patent*, severance and connection of each aham with one particular étaṭ in any one particular limited cycle of space and time; and the undefined, hidden, and *latent* connection of it constantly with *all* other étaṭs, in the past, present and future. (Compare the statements in *The Secret Doctrine* on the subject of the auric egg, and in *Védānta* on the subtle atomic sheaths carried by a jīva in its passage from lower to successively higher worlds.)

In other words, the One Aham in its pseudo-infinite pseudo-subdivisions is in unceasing and yet recurrent conjunction-disjunction, *samyoga-viyoga*,² with all pseudo-infinite étaṭs; each étaṭ, or rather each conjunction and each disjunction of the pseudo-infinite number of such, representing, nay, being, a special experience, and the *whole* being one constant and changeless experience; so that we come back, as we shall always, again and again, with fuller and fuller knowledge of the content, to the fact that "all is everywhere and always".³

¹ The expression जीवकोश, *jīva-kosha*, 'jīva-cocoon or capsule,' occurs in *Bhāgavata*, IV, xxiii, 11. In one of the debates in *Shankura-Dig-vijaya*, occurs the sentence, स प्राह, जीवः, करणावसादे, यास्यन्, कृतो गच्छति भूतसूक्ष्मैः । 'The jīva, departing, goes enveloped in *sūkshma*, subtle, elements.'

² संयोग.वियोग.

³ एतावत् एव जिज्ञास्यं तत्त्वजिज्ञासुना आत्मनः,
अन्वय-व्यतिरेकाभ्यां, यत् स्यात् सर्वत्र सर्वदा । *Bhāgavata*, II, ix, 35,
स सर्वधीवृत्त्यनुभूतसर्वः । *Ibid.*, II, i, 39.

One more statement seems to be needed before we pass on to other aspects of the jīva-atom. What is the true significance of the words 'nature,' 'inanimate nature,' as used to mean lands and mountains, clouds, rivers, and oceans, fire of volcanoes, light and heat of the sun, substance of the stars, airs and gases of the atmosphere, ether of the spatial regions? These appear to stand out in sharp contrast, as vast masses of inanimate matter, to the human and other jīvas deriving their

अयं आत्मा ब्रह्म सर्वानुभूः । काममयोऽकाममयः, धर्ममयोऽधर्ममयः, सर्व-
मयः । स वा अयं अस्य सर्वस्य वशी, सर्वस्य ईशानः, सर्वस्य अधिपतिः । सर्व-
कर्मा, सर्वकामः, सर्वगन्धः, सर्वरसः इति । ब्रह्म सर्वाणि नामानि, सर्वाणि
रूपाणि, सर्वाणि कर्माणि विभर्ति ; *Brhad. Up* एष उ एव नृ, एष हि सर्वत्र सर्वदा
सर्वात्मा ; *Nṛsimha-Uttara-Tāpinī Up* । सर्वज्ञता हि सर्वत्र ; *Gauda-pāda's*
Karika

सर्वैः, सर्वकाममयः, सर्वकामार्थदः, सर्वक्षित्, सर्वगः, सर्वगतः, सर्व-
ग्रासः, सर्वप्रेमऽस्पदं, सर्वज्ञः, सर्वेश्वरः, सर्ववित्, सर्वतः पाणिपादं, सर्वतो-
ऽक्षिशिरोमुखं, सर्वतः श्रुतिमत्, सर्वतोमुखं, सर्वत्र आत्मा, सर्वत्रगः, सर्वदासंवित्तिः,
सर्वदृक्, सर्वसाक्षी, सर्वधातमम्, सर्वभुक्, सर्वऽत्मा, सर्वानुभूतः, सर्वार्थः, सर्वाशी,
सर्वाहमानी, सर्वेन्द्रियः, सर्वैषणाविनिर्मुक्तः, सर्वभूतऽशयस्थितः, सर्वभूताधि-
वासः, सर्वभूतान्तर्गतात्मा, सर्वभृत्, सर्वलोकमहेश्वरः, सर्वव्यापी, सर्वसंस्थः, सर्वसमः,
सर्वसंगविवर्जितः, सर्वसारः, सर्वसृक्, सर्वहरः, सर्वऽजीवः, etc.—are the epithets,

descriptive of the Self, in terms of 'all', which are scattered all over the *Upanishats*. 'That which is every-thing, every-where, every-when; all, al-ways, all-space, all-time, all-knowing; all-experiencing; all-ruling; all-doing, all-desiring, all-smelling, all-tasting, all-touching, all-seeing, all-hearing; all-named, all-formed, all-motioned; all-giving; all-taking; all-pervading; all-grasping; all-beloved, all-loving; all-handed, all-footed, all-eyed, all-cared, all-mouthed, all-nosed; all-seeing, all-witnessing, all-supporting, all-souled; all-desire-transcending; same and equal in, for, to, all; devoid of all; essence of all; creator, preserver, destroyer of all, etc. Such descriptions can apply and do apply to Naught-Else-than 'I', the Supreme, the Universal.

sustenance from them? How are these *masses* to be explained? Where is the Aham, 'I', in them? Or if it is there, why so latent in so much the larger portion of Mūla-prakṛti? The question seems at first sight to be exclusively within the province of mere speculation; but a true Metaphysic should include the principles of all physics and all sciences whatever; for the ideal standard thereof is that it is the system of universal principles which underlie all the World-Process and co-ordinate and synthesise all its aspects and departments, as the architect's plan underlies the building and co-ordinates the activities of all the workers on it. The explanation of this question may, therefore, properly be sought for in metaphysical as well as physical science. If found, it will help greatly to enlarge and confirm our grasp of the nature of Aham and Ētaṭ, and their pseudo-infinite variety of extent in space, time, and motion, and therefore their pseudo-infinite overlappings.

Physiological science, through leading scientists, says: "Individuals of the first order are *cells*; of the second order are *tissues*, associations of individuals of the first order; of the third order are *organs*, associations of individuals of the second order; of the fourth order are *persons*, associations of various individuals of the third order; of the fifth order are *communities*, associations of individuals of the fourth order."¹ There is no reason why this chain should not be lengthened pseudo-ininitely. It is very probable that physical science will some day

¹ Max Verworn, *General Physiology*, p. 62.

discover definitely that the vital connections between the members of a community are of a nature exactly similar to, if, perhaps, weaker in intensity than, those between the organs in a person, the tissues in an organ, and the cells in a tissue. And thus it will discover that the solidarity of the human race, as made up of communities, is not a merely poetical metaphor or political abstraction or religious ideal, but a physical and super-physical fact; and, still further, that the various kingdoms, human, animal, vegetable, mineral, etc., have a common life as well as special lives, in endless continuity, so that even ordinary pantheism is vindicable in a very literal sense, as being one part, but not the whole, of the body of truth which makes up metaphysic.

'Individuals' in the preceding paragraph really signifies selves, and the quotation shows how larger and larger masses of 'animate nature' are included within larger and larger 'selves'. We may now select some other extracts which will show how large masses of 'inanimate nature' may be inspired by single 'selves,' while the preceding paragraph, by its explanation of the flux and elasticity of individuality' in animate nature, helps to make clear the possibility of 'individuality' in inanimate nature, and so helps to abolish the distinction between animate nature and inanimate nature. Preyer thought that "originally the whole molten mass of the earth's body was a single giant organism: the powerful movement that its substance possessed was its life."¹

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 303.

Pflüger opined that "living proteid is a huge molecule undergoing constant, never-ending formation and constant decomposition, and probably behaves towards the usual chemical molecules as the sun behaves towards small meteors".¹ Of course there is difference of opinion and discussion going on amongst the holders and opponents of such views, but the result of the discussion can only be that new details and fuller significance will come to the surface, and the general truth pervading and reconciling all opposing views will be realised in a higher degree. Individual students of science may now and then secretly believe or openly call each other fanciful or unscientific, in the excusable heat of the race after truth, and under the influence of the zealous faith of each (which sometimes helps by putting vigour and energy into the chase) that his own path is shortest cut.² But truth lies in the net result of the whole, and, from this standpoint, the mere fact is enough, for the present, for our purposes, that such views are entertained by scientific men, in whose sobriety, as a collective body, the lay public implicitly believes. This fact softens, and makes possible the assimilation of, the

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 307.

² Thus a recent writer on political science says: "It is difficult to label the attitude I have adopted. It is Individualism if that only implies the denial of the existence of any Social Soul or Higher Unity in the form of a Super-person," (i.e., as we might say, of a *sūtrātmā*, an over-soul or group-soul, a *virāt-purusha*, which others believe in); C. D. Burns, *Political Ideals*, Preface, p. 5 (1915). The workings of the 'principle' of the 'group-soul', 'net-soul', in animalcules, animal-herds (shoals, schools, flights, coveys, packs, hives, termitaries), human-families (clans, tribes, races, nations), should be observed and studied, to make the significance of 'individuality' clear.

view which otherwise would look exaggerated, weird, unsober, that the earth, the moon, the sun, and the stars, might each be—they *are*, by the deductions of the reason and the testimony of *Purāṇas* and other scriptural works—as much individual beings as the matter-of-fact citizens of a civilised town of to-day; and again, not only individuals, but individuals within individuals, so that a large number, or, strictly speaking, a pseudo-infinite number, of distinct lives, *i.e.*, lines of consciousness, are being ministered to by apparently each ‘this’, while at the same time all the pseudo-infinite ‘this-es’ are, *vice versa*, ministering to the one life of the One Self (as also to the life of each individual self or *jīva*, one directly and the rest indirectly).¹

This will become clear when the student casts entirely away from him the associations of time, space, and motion, those arch-magicians, mystifiers, and illusion-makers in this *Māyā*’s Playhouse of the World-Process. He should consider the facts solely in their mutual proportion and relation. Thus considered, millions and billions of such heavenly bodies might as easily float in the veins of Macrocosmic ‘Virāt-Purusha with thousand heads, feet, hands,’² as blood-corpuscles, leucocytes, phagocytes, bacilli, bacteria, microbes, virus-es, in the veins of a single human being; and they may very well discharge similar functions also. Each of such has its

¹ This is one way of interpreting the Sāṅkhya doctrine of one Prakṛti being ‘beheld’ by many *puṛuṣas*, and the Vēdānta view of One Brahma and many-natured yet pseudo-one *Māyā*,

² *Purusha-Sūkṭa*. See also *Bhagavad-Gītā*, xi.

own life, and also forms part of the life of another, which, in turn, has its own special as also a subordinate life, and so on in a chain which extends literally endlessly.¹

The apparently inanimate masses of material nature may thus all be regarded as parts of some one or other smaller or larger 'individual'. Their inanimateness is at the most no greater than the inanimateness of a living being's teeth, nails, hair, epidermis, blood, bone, shell, each of which may, nay, does, harbour and nourish multifarious minute lives, while also itself connected on the descending or ascending phase of metabolism with a larger life. This is but another illustration of the law that an *é t a t* cannot stay devoid of an *a h a m*; if one *a h a m*, one line of consciousness, deserts it, another or others take up its place immediately. In daily experience we see this, in the springing up of new lives in disintegrating organic forms

¹ The phenomena of 'multiple personality', 'dissociated states'—of which up to eight have been observed (see Dr. Morton Prince, *The Unconscious*, Lec. II)—are very useful in helping us to realise the *Mâyā* of the feel of separate individuality; and how this varies and fluctuates, by means of *memory*, चित्तं चेतयते. We may *think* of an incident, and even call up a vivid picture of it in mind, but *feel* unperturbed, like a neutral spectator; suddenly, there comes a wave, a surge, an overpowering rush of *memory*—the principal actor in the incident is *myself*—and all the appurtenant *emotions* follow at once. So too, a chief means of consolation for past mistakes is the 'philosophical' reflection—'It was not I, my present 'I', which committed it; but a long-past 'I', another I, someone else, as it were, or even an obsessing spirit, that did it'. Memory at-taches; reflection de-taches; emotion attaches, connects, binds, identifies; intelligence detaches, analyses, discriminates, separates; (*bandha* and *mokṣha*).

The ideas put forward in Jung's *Analytical Psychology*, (trans. by C. E. Long, pub: 1920) pp. 472-4, 'Summary', supply useful commentary on *Vēdānta* views. Jung calls 'individuality', *persona*, and speaks, of 'collective Psyche', which comes near to *Mahat-Buddhi*, *Vishv-ātmā*, *Sūtr-ātmā*, etc.

that have served their purpose of sheath to a larger life and so 'died'. What the Upaniṣaṭ declares, 'This world appears forth from the Unperishing as hair and nails from the man,' is probably declared in a similar sense with reference to Virāt-Purusha.¹

The result of all this, in the words of physical science, is that, as Preyer said: "As the matter of

¹ *Mundaka*, i. 1. 7. Many *Purāṇa*-s describe, in different aspects, the correspondences between the limbs, members, parts, organs, of Virāt-Purusha, Mahā-Purusha, Mahā-Virāt, Macro-Cosmos, and those of the human purusha, kṣudra-virāt, micro-cosmos. The two are also called Brahm-anda and pind-ānda. *Bhagavata* describes them in grand words, in II, i, and repeatedly, in later chapters. The general Law of Correspondence, or Law of Analogy, is also enunciated in II viii. 8, and again, with a slight variation of language, in XII. xi, 9, thus:

यावान् अयं वै पुरुषः इयत्ताऽवयवैः पृथक्,

तावान् असौ इति प्रोक्तः संस्थाऽवयववान् इव ।

यावान् अयं वै पुरुषः यावत्या संस्थया मितः,

तावान् असौ अपि महापुरुषः लोकसंस्थया ।

'As the organs, parts, of, and arrangements and proportions thereof, of a single small-organism; even such, those of the Vast-Organism'.

'The seven *ṭala*-s (*pāṭāla*, etc.) are the Lord's nether limbs; seven *lokas* (*bhūh*, etc.) His upper parts; sun and moon are His eyes; tempests and zephyrs, His hot and cool breaths; His upper lip is the blush of Love, and the lower the Greed of that same Love, His breast is *Dharma*, and his back, *A-dharma*; His flanks are Oceans; rivers, His arteries and veins; Mountains, His mighty bones, forests are the down upon His Body; clouds His glorious many-colored hair; His smile and brilliant teeth are bewitching *Māyā*. The *Kaustubha*-jewel that He wears upon His breast is the all-illuminating Light of Self-Knowledge, the glory thereof is the mark *Shri-vaṭsa* on His chest; *Sāṅkhya* and *Yoga* are His ear-rings; His all-whelming Discus *Sudarshana* is the Wheel of Cyclic Time. *Vāsudeva* (*Kṛṣṇa*), *Sankarshana* (*Balarāma*, elder brother), *Pradyumna* (son), *Aniruddha* (grandson) are *chitta*, *ahamkāra*, *buद्धhi*, and *manas*; also *ṭuriya*, *prājña*, *taijasa*, *vishva* (planes, viz., transcendent or fourth, causal, subtle-astral, and physical)'. And so on.

The student should read up references in the Index (Vol. VI of *The Secret Doctrine*) against 'Analogy' and 'Correspondences'.

the universe is in eternal motion, so life, which itself is only a complex process of motion, is as old as

On p. 70 of *The Mahatma Letters*, occurs the following :
 " Nothing in nature springs suddenly ; all being subjected to the same law of gradual evolution. Realise but once the process of the *mahā* cycle, of one sphere, and you have realised them all. One man is born like another man, one race evolves, develops, and declines like another and all other races. Nature follows the same groove from the creation of a universe down to that of a mosquito. In studying esoteric cosmogony, keep a spiritual eye upon the physiological process of human birth ; proceed from cause to effect, establishing analogies. Cosmology is the physiology of the universe spiritualised, for there is but one law ".

" That one law " in enshrined in Aum.

For some light on this, and several obscure verses in *Manu*, 1, see *The Secret Doctrine*, V, 422-6. In this connection may also be considered the mystical kabbalistic and theosophical views and doctrines ré the Divine Man, a literal solar 'Golden God-Man', the Ruling Chief, king, president of the hierarchy of déva-s, hosts of Dhyan Chohans (in Buddhism). He (or She, strictly speaking sexless or both-sexed) is referred to, in *Upanishads*, as हिरण्य-गर्भः, -वर्णः, -केशः, -इमश्रुः, -हृषः, -रेताः, -बाहुः, -दंष्ट्रः, -शङ्खः etc., i.e., 'Golden-Wombed, colored, -haired, -moustached, -bearded, -formed, -seeded, -armed, -toothed, -crested (-corona-ed, -crown-ed, S k t, kīraṇa, ray, corona).' A well known Skt. verse, part of a grand hymn to 'our' Lord the Sun, says,

ध्येयः सदा, सवितृ-मंडल-मध्य-वर्त्ती,

नारायणः, सरसिज-डासन-सन्निविष्टः,

केयूरवान्, मकर-कुंडल-वान्, किरीटी,

हारी, हिरण्मय-वपुः, धृत-शंख-चक्रः ।

'Nārāyaṇa, seated on the golden lotus-throne in the middle of the Sun-globe, adorned with ornaments, and holding the sweet-sounding conch and light-shedding discus, should be ever meditated on as seated in one's own heart'. All jivas, high and low, of the solar system, would be as cells, tissues, organs, in His being ; and would be issuing out of and going back into that corporate being. (The analogy of the peculiar relationship between the queen-bee and the whole hive, and the queen-ant and the whole termitarium, applies). Such a solar God-Man

matter.”’ The student of metaphysic has to read ‘pseudo-eternal’ or ‘sempiternal’ in place of ‘eternal,’ and ‘conscious motion’ in place of ‘motion’.

We have floated away very far on the stream of the discussion of animate and inanimate ; but we have seen again, in the course thereof, what was stated before, how law begets law and fact, and these more laws and facts, with prolific, indeed endless, multiplicity ; and we are now in a position to understand how, if the necessary means for knowledge of concrete details, now supposed to be known only to occult physical and super-physical science, were available, every concrete object, including Krug’s quill, before referred to, (pp. 73, 179) could be deduced with even complete minuteness of steps. Thus we may realise how the whole of the solid-seeming

would be only a particular Individual, above, below, and side by side with other Individuals, smaller, larger, or of equal degree, sub-ordinate, super-ordinate or co-ordinate, in smaller and larger systems within systems without end.

It should be kept in mind, here, that ‘personality’ or ‘individuality’, ‘I am I, something separate from all other I’s’—this also is only a feeling, a mood of consciousness or *ṛt̥ti*, psychosis, in the Universal Consciousness, the All-Psyche. It too comes and goes. The desire for ‘personal’ immortality is intense, at one time ; at another, it disappears ; then supervenes, instead, the wish to merge into, and become one with, and inseparable and indistinguishable from, the All, the Whole. The former is the stage of acute *a h a m-t̥ā* and *m a m a-t̥ā*, I-ness and mine-ness ; the latter of *n a -a h a m* and *n a -m a m a*, ‘not (any separate) I and not (any exclusive) mine’. See *The Science of the Self*, re ‘will-to-live’ and ‘will-to-die’.

The streams of *b h a k̥ti*-devotion flowing upwards or inwards ; the streams of *ḍ a y ā*-compassion flowing downwards or outwards—these constitute the circulation of the Spiritual Blood of the Divine Man.

Whichever department of Nature, whichever aspect of Life, we turn our eyes to, will supply abundant illustrations of this law and fact of smaller within larger individualities, species within genera, ad infinitum.

¹ Max Verworn, *General Physiology*, p. 309.

of this world is hung on to, or indeed is entirely made up of, the airiest of cobwebs of laws and principles (that are always getting metamorphosed into facts), which the silkworm of the *Pratyag-ātmā* spins into an endless cocoon out of and around itself ; and which disappears at once, together with the silkworm, replaced by the gorgeous and free-feeling and free-flying moth-butterfly ; as soon as it realises and undergoes the perishing, the death, the nothingness, of both ; as soon as the individualised *Pratyag-ātmā* understands the endless interplay of mutual termination and determination between Self and Not-Self, and so becomes *mukṭa*, ' liberated '.

The *Upaniṣat*-verse just referred to has, thus, another and deeper metaphysical significance, besides the literal one before mentioned : ' As the spider casteth forth its web and rolls it up again, as the herbs rise up from out of the earth, as hair and down grow from the life and being of the man, so doth this universe appear from and within the Unperishing and Unchanging. '¹

¹ *Mundaka Upaniṣat*. i 1. 7. *Munda*. in Skt. means the head, the skull. Why has the *Upaniṣat* been so named ? Apparently because it was usually ' taught only to those who had undergone the discipline of the head ' , शिरोव्रतं विधिं यद् येस्तु चीर्णं (*ibid.*, iii. 2.10) ; i.e., meditation on the light or sound within the head, whereby those parts of the brain were vivified or awakened, which can apprehend and ' mirror ' metaphysical truths ; (see Annie Besant's *A Study in Consciousness* re opening up of spirillæ of brain-cells ; and *Śrī Bhagavata* XI, viii and ix. A mystical verse says.

ऋचो अक्षरे परमे व्योमन् , तस्मिन् देवाः अधि निषे निषेदुः ;

यः तत् न वेद किं ऋचा कर्ष्यति ? ये ईं विदुः तत् ते इमे समासते ! *Rg-Vēda*.

¹ The imperishable ṛchā-s (nature-secrets) are in the high heaven (*vyōma*, the skull, the head) ; all the gods (*viśhvé-dēvas*, nature-forces) dwell there. He who does not know this—what use can he make

of r c h ā - s ? They only who know this sit on high '. Nerve-centres of all sensor, motor, and other organs and glands are all in the brain.

As to the countlessness of suns and stars and systems, we have this statement :

अस्य ब्रह्माण्डस्य समन्ततः स्थितानि एतादृशानि अनन्त-कोटि-ब्रह्माण्डानि सशवरणानि उज्वलन्ति । चतुर्मुख-पंचमुख-षण्मुख-सप्तमुख-अष्टमुखऽदि-संख्या-क्रमेण सहस्रऽधि-मुखान्तैः नारायणांशैः रजोगुणप्रधानैः एकैकसृष्टिकर्तृभिः अधिष्ठितानि, विष्णु-महेश्वर-ऽाख्यैः नारायणांशैः सत्त्व-तमो-गुण-प्रधानैः एकैक-स्थिति-संहार-कर्तृभिः च अधिष्ठितानि, महाजलौघ-मत्स्य-बुद्बुद्-ऽनन्त-संघवद् भ्रमन्ति ।

Triṣṭāḍ-Vibhūṭi-Mahā-Nārāyaṇa-Upaniṣaḥ.

'On all sides of this (our) globe or system, are blazing countless billions of similar ones. The rajas-praḍhāna (predominantly rājasa) Brahmās of some have four faces (elements), some five, six, seven, eight, up to thousands (of facets); all are a m s h a - s, portions, of Nārāyaṇa (nārāṇām ayanam, 'house', 'store-house', 'reservoir' of nara-s, jīva-s). In each there is also a saṭṭva-praḍhāna Viṣṇu, and a ṭamas-praḍhāna Mahēśvara, to preserve and to destroy. They all wander about in infinite space, like shoals of fishes, or masses of bubbles in foam.' See also *World-War and Its Only Cure*, pp. 62-65 and 411-413.

Another example from biological science may be adduced : "Investigations by Mr. E. Marais, a South African scientist, point to the existence of a communal mind, in some of the lower orders of life, actuated by definite purpose, and functioning independently (? not wholly) of the matter with which it is connected. Experiments prove that white ants are controlled not only by their own individual mentality, but by a communal or group-mind as well, without an organic connection or outward touch. If a part of the nest is entirely isolated by a sheet of galvanised iron, under ordinary circumstances, the work will go on as usual. But if the queen is removed from the main body on one side of the iron, within three minutes, the ants on the other side, though completely isolated, will stop all work, and a complete cessation of their normal functions ensues. Normally, if the rest is disturbed, they will resent intrusion, and stoutly defend themselves, while the eggs will be carried into a place of safety. But on removal of the queen from one side of the division, the ants on the other side will no longer bite, or concern themselves in any way with the eggs, and are completely demoralised. (Thus) We begin to understand that soul may exist (? comparatively) independently of the (? any given) organism. The queen is nowise (no way) the source of the communal mind; she is merely the physical medium through which its influence passes, and by which it is centralised, directed, and made effective." *Theosophist*, March, 1923. Maurice Maeterlinck's book, *The Life of the White Ant*, gathers together a lot of very interesting information, of much value for psychology and philosophy. See also the description of *Myxomycetes*, in H. G. Wells' *Science of Life*, pp. 301-304 (edn. of 1938).

NOTE.—It is necessary to make distinction, to a certain extent, for the practical purposes of the daily life of the body, between atom and cell, animate and inanimate, organic and inorganic, species and species, kingdom and kingdom (mineral, vegetable, animal, human, and others), unicellular and multicellular, individual and individual, soul and vehicle (*i.e.*, instrument, means, of im-pression and ex-pression, of sensation and action), psyche and physique, body and mind, Spirit and Matter. But it is impossible to make the distinction radically, for the metaphysical purposes of the eternal life of the mind (soul, Self). That life includes all past, present, and future, and the mind ranges over it all, at will, in any order it pleases, to and fro, without limitations of time-space-motion.

The above chapter attempts to set for the such ideas in terms of a few main triads and their sub-divisions. The plain reason is that distinction and even separateness are inseparable from the changeful and limited; while in the Changeless and Unlimited, none such are possible; since all change and all limits are *within* that Changeless One Self.

Readers who would like to have further support of physical science for the fact that individuals, species, kingdoms etc., merge into each other, may usefully read H. G. Wells' *The Science of Life*, (written jointly with his son Prof. G. P. Wells and Prof. Julian Huxley; revised edition, 1938), and Arthur Schopenhauer's *The World as Will and Idea*, and Eduard von Hartmann's *The Philosophy of the Unconscious*, (both published in the English and Foreign Philosophical Library Series); or other later works describing evolution of the several kingdoms. The books named are exceedingly interesting and very informing because of the abundant examples they give from plant and animal life. One or two may be quoted.

"For most of its life a slime-mould, *Myxomycetes*, is a naked slimy mass of protoplasm—like a gigantic amoeba . . . Its motion is so slow as to be barely perceptible; nevertheless, it creeps with an appearance of appetite and purpose . . . The final large plasmode is in reality a union of hundreds of dancing swarm-spores that have completely merged their individuality

into one shapeless gelatinous sheet. Imagine that whenever two people meet each other in the street, they run together into one blob, as drops of water run together, so that ultimately the whole population of a town is rolled up into a gigantic mass of living substance that creeps about like a single creature; that is the sort of thing that happens as a matter of course in the life-history of a slime-fungus: *The Science of Life*, pp. 301-304.

"We see that all the marks which have been set up on different sides as decisive" (of distinction between vegetable and animal) "do not hold, such as partial or total locomotion, spontaneous movement, morphological and chemical differences, mouth and stomach . . . Plant and animal have something distinct, somewhat in common. . . . and we may fairly well collect the total of common characters, if in both kingdoms we descend down the scale of organisation, until we come to those structures where the differences disappear, and essentially only the common element remains . . . In this common element sensation and consciousness is still included; the lowest vegetable organisms possess sensation and consciousness; . . . we" (are therefore) "warranted in ascribing to the higher plants also, a similar, but higher, measure of sensation and consciousness:" *The Philosophy of the Unconscious*, pp. 145-146.

"In the Mediterranean there is a rich family of splendid swimming-polyps. A young polyp is developed from an egg. It begins life freely floating in the sea. At its upper end it forms a bubble, in which the air is set free which supports it; at its lower end there are formed . . . feelers and prehensile threads . . . On its stem, which is continually elongating, there is formed a filtering tube. From this stem arise bud-like shoots. Some of them form swimming-bells, which propel themselves, and consequently the whole mass. The others are metamorphosed into fresh polyps, which possess mouth and stomach, and not merely collect, but also digest food for the whole, to deliver it finally into the trunk-tube. Finally, yet other buds attain a nettle-like aspect, and provide for propagation; they bring forth ova, from which again proceed freely-floating polyps. Special polyps with long

sensitive tactile threads represent the sense organs or the intelligence of the state. What is here individual? . . . Whoever holds fast to the 'either-or', such an example must reduce to desperation; but we see in the several members, individuals partly of polyp-form, partly medusoid, and, in the whole, an individual of higher order which includes in itself all these individuals. Even in the bee- and ant-hive there is nothing wanting to complete the view of the whole as an individual of higher order but spatial unity, *i.e.*, the *continuity* of the form; here this likewise is present, and therefore the individual is indisputable. This widespread phenomenon in the animal and vegetable kingdom of a varied physiological development of morphologically originally similarly constructed individuals of the same species is termed Polymorphism": *Op. cit.*, 196-198.

Such instances make possible a new and literal (not only metaphorical) interpretation of the *Vēḍa*, and *Gīṭā* verses which describe 'puruṣa' (jīva, self, 'person') as 'thousand-headed, thousand-eyed, thousand-footed, thousand-handed, thousand-stomached'.

As to plants possessing sensation and consciousness, ancient and modern testimony has been quoted on pp. 335-336 above. Fuller text is given below: 'Their color changes and flower and fruit shrivel and even fall off, at touch of great heat; therefore plants have the sense of touch. Roar of wind and crash of thunder also cause flower and fruit to fall; therefore plants hear. Creepers move about in many directions and twine themselves round trees; therefore they see. Fragrant incense of various kinds promotes their healthy growth; foul smoke and acrid smells make them diseased or even kill them; therefore plants smell. They drink up water by their roots, and thrive if it is wholesome; or become diseased or even die if it is otherwise; therefore plants have the sense of taste. As a man, (by will) may suck up liquid through a pipe from below upwards, so do plants; (therefore they have will). Because they feel pleasure and pain, because their parts, cut off, grow again, therefore, clearly, plants have jīva-life. A-chaitanya-m-na vidyaṭé, there exists nothing which is devoid of the principle of consciousness:' *Mbh.*, Shāṇṭi-parva, ch. 182, Kumbakonam edn.; or 184 in the older

Bombay edn.). Arguments very similar to these will be found in Von Hartmann's book, to prove that animalcules have the sense of sight, hearing, touch, etc.; and also *memory*. And once memory is admitted, all the rest of intelligence, even the power of introspection, (—of course in germ—) has to be admitted also. It stands to reason, that only that can *evolve* and *develope* into man and higher, which is already present in germ and seed in the primal cells of vegetable and mineral life.

CHAPTER XIV

JĪVA-ATOMS—OBJECTIVELY, *i.e.*, ATOMS

AFTER the above general treatment of the Jīva-atom we may now take the two aspects of it separately and in a little more detail. Of these two we may dispose of the 'particular', the atom-aspect, first, and leave for later treatment the other aspect of the 'individual,' the jīva, discussion of which is the main purpose of the rest of this work ; reference to only the material side of life being made as necessary to explain and illustrate the spiritual side.

First, attributes common to jīva and atom, *viz.*, size,¹ life, and vibration, may be further particularised with respect to the atom.²

¹ The significance of 'size' in reference to jīva is explained at outset of next chapter.

² Compare जाति-आयुर्-भोगाः, *Yoga-sūtra*, ii, 13, *i.e.*, 'species or type (by birth), life-period (total life-time), and experience (as a whole, of pains and pleasures in varied settings). Also अश-गुण-कालऽस्ति, as descriptive of महत्, of *Bhāgavata*, III, v. 28 ; Shriḍhara's *Tika* explains these as (a) *chid-amsha*, principle of consciousness (broadly corresponding to *bhoga* of the *Yoga-Sūtra*), (b) of triple attributes (*jāti*), (c) of *kshobhaka*, *kalayitā*, 'stirring', 'disturbing', 'agitating', 'moving', 'instigating' time (*āy n*).

Size, in this reference, may be said to break up into the triplet of 'bulk or volume,' 'shape or form,' and 'measure, magnitude, or dimension,' which includes both the others. These again may be looked at as 'large, small, average,' 'long, round, ovoid,' 'linear, superficial, cubical,' etc.!

A hypothesis may be advanced here as to form.

It has been said above that, under stress of the necessity embodied in the logion, *ēṭaṭs*, this-es, appear in pseudo-infinite number as constituent points of manifold *Mūla-prakṛti*. It has also been said that, by that same necessity, they are never actually points without magnitude, but always points with magnitude, with definite volume, form, and measure, and are therefore atoms. Atoms would be without these if *Ēṭaṭ* were not limited. But *Ēṭaṭ* is limited, consequently they must have these. And if they must have these, or, rather, as is enough to say, form (for all three are only different ways of looking at the same thing, measure being limitation pure and simple, while form is limitation from outside, and volume is limitation from within), the sphere ought, apparently, to be their primal form, because it is

¹ The view, here suggested, is that 'a-toms' (non-divisible) have a definite size; that the size varies for different systems or planes; that the subtler interpenetrate the denser, in an indefinite series. With reference to the new ideas that have come into western physical science, regarding the make-up of atoms, by electrons, neutrons, plutrons, positrons, etc., triplets of words, in terms of these, may be coined, corresponding with those in the text. The shapes produced by the whirling of electrons have been named 'harmonograms'. But it is quite possible that all these new views and terms may change or even disappear altogether. The simpler ones, of the text above, have lasted long, and seem likely to last longer. Primitive animalcules have outlasted the saurians.

the only universally non-arbitrary form. A form which embodies the essence of 'pointness'—that *it is the same, however looked at*—can only be a sphere, which presents the same appearance or feel from whatever side it is seen or felt. Of course the law of non-arbitrariness requires and necessitates the existence of all possible pseudo-infinite kinds of forms and figures in the World-Process, but the difference between the non-arbitrariness of the sphere on the one hand, and that of 'all possible figures' on the other, is the difference (if such an expression may be used without fear of misunderstanding) between *Pratyag-ātmā* on the one hand, and the pseudo-infinite contents of Its consciousness, the varieties of Not-Self, on the other. *Pratyag-ātmā* is everywhere and always, but the contents of Its consciousness, made up of interminable and intermixing not-selves, are in definite times, spaces, and motions; so the sphere (when we abolish the periphery of limitation) may be said to have its centre potentially everywhere and always, while its contents—all possible figures made up of the numberless interlacing radii, interlacing because the centre is everywhere, each corresponding to a not-self—are only in definite times, spaces, and motions. Because of this fact, most figure-symbolology represents the self-centred *Pratyag-ātmā* as the 'point;' differentiated Matter Spirit-Matter, as the 'diameter-line,' or the cross of two diameters, or two interlaced 'triangles'; and the whole, the Absolute, as the 'circle'. The line, or cross of two lines, or double triangle, and the circle,

are used to meet exigencies of script, in place of what strictly ought to be the star of three lines crossing at right angles at their middle, and the sphere, respectively. The 'point' should stand for *Pratyag-ātmā*; countless 'radii' for *Mūla-prakṛti*; and the 'sphere' for *Param-ātmā*, including both, and being the 'Same', always, ever, everywhere, however looked at (—the circle or disc varies, f.i., the moon—); but solids cannot be 'written' on paper easily. The correspondence of the point and the line to Self and Not-Self respectively should be noted, and may prove of use hereafter. It may seem at first sight that there is no such opposition between point and line as there is between Self and Not-Self, inasmuch as a line is only a production, is prolongation, of a point. But the opposition is there. From all that has gone before, it will be clear that Not-Self is nothing independent of Self, nothing else than a production and a lengthening, a limitation and definition, of Self, that is to say, a going of the immovable Self out of Itself into a denial, a negation, of Itself. Even so, lines are the first denial of the non-magnitude of the point; and out of such denial, all the endless multiplicity of figures grows in the Metaphysic of Negation, *i.e.*, Mathematics, as all the endless multitude of not-selves grows out of the denial of Self in the complete Metaphysic. In describing these imaginary lines, by rushing to and fro, the point without magnitude may be said to be seeking to define itself, to give itself a magnitude, even as Self appears to define itself by entering into, by imposing upon itself,

imagined not-selves, and saying, 'I am this,' 'I am this'. Points in juxtaposition make a line; but if they have no magnitude, how can they juxtapose!

Corresponding to this triple sub-division of 'size', we may note a triple subdivision under 'duration' also. The words in this reference have not such a recognised standing as those connected with size. But we may distinguish 'period,' corresponding to form as limited from without; 'filling' to volume, as limited from within; and 'rate,' as limitation proper, corresponding to measure. Each of these again manifests as 'long, short, average,' 'well-filled, ill-filled, occupied', (or 'crowded, scattered, leisurely arranged'), 'fast, slow, even,' etc.

We may similarly distinguish under vibration (tentatively, as in the case of duration) the three aspects of 'extent, rate, and degree,' and subdivide each of these three again into 'great, little, mean,' 'high, low, even,' and 'intense, sluggish, equable,' etc.

In the above-mentioned arrangements of triplets we see illustrated the fact that all things of the World-Process fall into groups of three in accordance with the Primal Trinity that underlies and is the whole of the universe.¹ And these groupings are not mechanical or

¹ The Kāshmir school of 'Shaiva' philosophy, some works of which have been published, recently, is also known as that of the Philosophy of the Triad, त्रिक दर्शनम्. The main ideas of the present work appear to be very much in accord with that Philosophy. The importance of triads is amply recognised in familiar Samskr̥t literature also; thus:

त्रिधा दानानि दीयन्ते, त्रिधा यज्ञः प्रवर्त्तते,

त्रिध लोकाः, त्रिधा देवाः, त्रिधा विद्या, त्रिधा गतिः ।

empirical but organic. It may appear to the cursory observer that there is no 'why' apparent in them. But the 'why' is there, and in a very simple way too. Each member of a trinity reflects in itself each of the three and so produces three trinities; and this process is a pseudo-infinite one; hence the whole content of the World-Process is only a pseudo-infinite number of groups of such triads. All these, it must be remembered, are simultaneous from the standpoint of the Absolute, and do not grow one out of another in time. If we would know why there is such a thing as this reflection, we should reconsider the arguments in the preceding chapters, whereby the necessity of both changelessness and change, of timelessness and time, spacelessness and space, simultaneity and succession, unity and diversity, reality of non-separateness and false appearance of separateness and distinguishability, are established. The

भूतं, भव्यं, भविष्यं च ; धर्मो, ऽर्थः, काम एव च ;
प्राण-अपानौ उदानश्चापि, अतः एव त्रयो गुणाः । *Anugīṭā*, xxiv.

त्रिगुणं च, त्रितत्त्वं च, त्रयो देवाः, त्रयो ऽमयः,
त्रयाणां च त्रिमूर्तिस्त्वं, तुरीयस्त्वं, नमोऽस्तु ते । *Ādiṭya-sūtra*

त्रयीं, तिस्रो वृत्तीः, त्रिभुवनम्, अथो त्रीन् अपि सुरान्,

अकाराद्यैः वर्णैः त्रिभिर् अभिदधत्, तीर्णविकृति,

तुरीयं ते धाम ध्वनिभिर् अवर्धनम् अनुभिस्,

समस्तं व्यस्तं त्वां, शरणद !, गृणाति ओम् इति पदम् । *Shiva-Mahima-stuṭi*.

'Three kinds of gifts, sacrifices, worlds or planes, gods, sciences, paths (after death); past, present, future; dharma-artha-kāma; prāṇa-apāna-uḍāna; three guṇas; three ultimates or elements, fires; Védas states of consciousness—all these are indicated by the three-lettered AUM.'

three are one, and yet three; and the result of this apparent antinomy is that they reflect each other; each carries the image of the others in its very heart, to prove its oneness with it; and all do this endlessly.

To show that these endless multiplications, seemingly so tangible in their multitude, are, in reality, on close scrutiny, found to be very unsubstantial, we may consider a little more fully what has been parenthetically hinted above, (on p. 358), *viz.*, that volume and form mean the same thing. Form is nothing else than a negation of continuity, a denial, a limitation, a cutting short of continued existence on all sides. Volume means evidently the same thing looked at from within; it is an inability to extend further. Hence only are form and volume liable to change. If they were anything real, actual, having *being*, then how could they change, *i.e.*, pass from being into nothing and from nothing into being? 'There is no being to that which really is not, nor non-being to that which truly is.'¹ But such change is apparent every second, every millionth of a second, of our lives. The solution lies in the fact that, in all change, what really changes is only mere form (and it will appear on analysis that all other aspects or qualities of the atom are also on the same level with form), which is simply negation looked at as above; and that what remains behind is the pseudo-thing-in-itself, the 'substance' which is 'indestructible,' the essence of which we regard as 'resistance'. Resistance is nothing else than the

¹ *Gīṭā*, ii, 16.

power of attraction and repulsion embodied in a not-self, an *étau*, as exclusiveness, separateness, separate self-maintenance. It is the reflection of the affirmative-negative, attractive-repulsive, Energy of *Ichchhā-Desire* in the Self. This 'resistance,' 'self-maintenance,' *āṭma-ḍhāraṇa*, like desire (of which indeed it is but another name, in the objective language belonging to the atom, as distinguishable from the subjective language belonging to the *jīva*),¹ has no overt form of its own, and therefore, in a strict and abstract sense, never changes, remaining ever the same in totality. It is the Energy which physical science recognises as remaining constant in the universe. Its overt form is the multitude of changing forms and actions. And yet again, lest it should be said that even form is after all not pure and utter negation, but has an 'appearance' at least, has an *ex-is-tence*, outer-being, and so should not be capable of destruction, the law makes provision for this also, and ordains that no form, however ephemeral, shall be destroyed beyond recall. As it has only pseudo-being, so it shall not have fixedness, but it shall have unending possibility, and therefore actuality, of recall and repetition. The remarks that apply to 'forms' apply also to 'actions,' 'motions,' 'movements,' which constitute the essence of change.

We see thus that these reflections *add* nothing to the primal trinity, but are included in it. Their details

¹ In this consideration is to be found the reason why तमः, अज्ञानं, मोहः, इच्छा, इच्छाशक्तिः, द्रव्यशक्तिः, अर्थशक्तिः, बलम्, स्थितिः, नियमः etc., are allied terms, more or less interchangeable.

constitute all the universe, and may not be comprehended by any single individual mind and in any single particular book, however large they may be. As the extent of these is, such will be the amount of detail comprehended. But the main principles may be grasped ; and new details as they are brought forward by empirical experience, may be classified and put away, as a matter of convenience, in accordance with those main principles.

We may conclude this line of observations by noticing another series of triplets, very important in itself, and also illustrative in a high degree of the principle of reflections and re-reflections.

The attributes, size, life, and vibration, common to both aspects or halves of the jīva-atom, all considered with special reference to the primal, twofold (or threefold) motion of alternation involved in Negation, which constitutes the swing of the World-Process, yield us these parallel triplets, *viz.* :

(1) 'increase, decrease, and equality' in respect of matter ; and 'liberality, narrowness, and tolerance' in that of spirit ;

(2) 'growth, decay, and continuance' in respect of body ; and 'pursuit, renunciation, and indifference or equanimity,' in that of soul ;

(3) 'expansion, contraction, and rhythm' in respect of the sheath ; and 'pleasure, pain, and peace,' in that of the jīva.

We may also note that, in special relation to Mūla-prakṛti, the triplet of size, etc., takes on the form of

'quantity, quality, and mode'. Its transformation with reference to *Pratyag-ātmā* also may be described by the same three terms in the absence of other well-recognised ones, though the difference of connotation in the two cases is great; for they cover the different triplets mentioned by Kant under the heads of quantity, etc., in connection with the 'categories' and with 'logical judgments' respectively.

We may now proceed, in the second place, to specify the attributes that appear in the atom with reference to the primary attributes of *Mūla-prakṛti*.

These are :

(a) *Dravya*, substance, or *dravya-ṭva*, substantiality, mass, power of self-maintenance, that which constitutes it a something having a separate existence; that which makes it 'capable of serving as the substratum of movement,' 'capable of being moved'; the immediate manifestation of this substance, this 'compacted energy', being movement;

(b) *Guṇa*, all 'qualities' whatsoever, (not the 'three attributes of *Mūla-prakṛti*); and

(c) *Karma*, activity, vibration, incessant movement.¹

¹ द्रव्य, द्रव्यत्व, गुण, कर्म । द्रवितुं, or द्रावयितुं, योग्यं, द्रव्यं, 'that which can be 'driven' about, moved from place to place. Skt. *ḍru* means 'to run, to *ḍri*-ve'.

These three terms belong specially to the *Vaiśeṣika*-system of Indian philosophy, which deals with this part of metaphysic predominantly; but as with most of the other *Samskr̥t* words used in this work, so with these, though they themselves are more or less current, yet the connotations that have been put into them here would often not be quite recognised, in some cases would perhaps be repudiated, by the authors of

This triplet of *ḍravya-guṇa-karma*, substance-quality-movement, is, as already indicated, a reflection and reproduction of more primal triplets. The mergence of *Pratyag-ātmā* and *Mūla-prakṛti*, producing the *jīva-atom*, also reproduces therein their two triplets of attributes in this most familiar and therefore most important form. *Sattva-rajas-tamas* become respectively transformed into *guṇa-karma-ḍravya*; and *saṭ-chiṭ-ananda* respectively into *kriyā-jñāna-ichchhā*; which again correspond to *karma-guṇa-ḍravya* respectively. *Jñāna*, *ichchhā*, and *kriyā* will be treated of in the next section, in connection with the *jīva-portion* of the *jīva-atom*.¹

(i) *Guṇa*, then, is that in the atom which corresponds to the elements of *chiṭ* or cognition, and *sattva* or cognisability, in *Pratyag-ātmā* and *Mūla-prakṛti* respectively. It is the *qualities* of matter which alone we *know* and *can know*, and never the thing-in-itself, as that expression is used by western psychologists and philosophers; for that thing-in-itself, so far as it has a being at all, a pseudo-being, as *substance*, (which holds together or possesses the qualities), is the object of *desire* and not

most of the current Samskr̥t works in which they are to be met with. The present writer believes, however, that these are the real original connotations, and that they were lost with the growth of the spirit of separateness and selfishness in the people, and the consequent gradual loss of the deeper Metaphysic which unified and organised the various systems of philosophy as different chapters of a single work; clues to which Metaphysic, it is endeavoured to rediscover in these few pages, all too poor and fragmentary as they are. See *Praṇava-vāḍa*.

¹ Hints and more or less veiled statements, regarding these correspondences, are scattered over *Devī-Bhāgavata*, especially in Pts. III. vi—ix, VII, xxxiii., and IX, 1, and are also to be found in *Kapila-Gītā* and works on *Tantra-Shāstra*.

of *knowledge*; ¹ as its *movements* are the object of, *i.e.*, can be changed by, *action*. Guṇa may be subdivided again into three classes: (a) mukhya, chief, vyāvartaka or vishéshaka, distinguishing or differentiating, svābhāvika or prākṛtika, natural, asādhāraṇa, uncommon or special or *essential i.e., proper-ties*, characteristics, *differentia, propria, e.g.*, special sensuous properties, sound, touch, colour, taste, or smell, etc., which would form part of de-fini-tions; (b) gauṇa, secondary, ākasmika, accidental, sādāhāraṇa or sāmānya, common, or *non-essential* (or non-demarcating) *i.e.*, qualities, which would form part of de-scrip-tions; and (c) dharma (active), functions, lakshana, attributes, signs, marks, which would generally include both; for, in reality, distinction between essential and accidental rests only on greater or less persistence in space, time, and motion.' We might perceive again in this triplet a general correspondence to Self, Not-Self, and Negation, and also to cognition, desire, and action, respectively.

It may be observed that demarcating and non-demarcating qualities are only relatively such. A quality which is non-distinguishing as between individuals of the

¹ A 'thing' is *known* only by its qualities; to speak of a 'thing-in-itself' apart from qualities and seek to know it as such, is self-contradiction and self-stultification. The One and Only Thing-in-It-Self that knows (or better, is aware of) It-Self, apart from (indeed, by repudiation of) all qualities, is the Supreme Self, Param-Ātmā.

² मुख्य, व्यावर्तक, विशेषक, स्वाभाविक, प्राकृतिक, असाधारण; गौण, आकस्मिक, साधारण, सामान्य; धर्म, लक्षण.

same species, is distinguishing as between that species and other species. This fact only illustrates further, the fluidity which is continual in the higher regions of the subtle mental plane.

With reference to (a), we may note that, in the human race, only five senses are working at the present time; and hence we have the five well-known sense-properties, or sens-able properties, *ṭan-māṭras*,¹ under the sub-head of 'essential'. Varieties of each of these again are many, and if we had the necessary information as to details, we should be able to throw these into triplets, corresponding with and reflecting each other endlessly.

¹ तन्मात्रं. The word may be grammatically construed to mean, both, 'that only', (a near approach to 'thing-in-or-by-itself'!) and 'the measure of that' (i.e., that which measures, de-limits, de-fines an object). There is much obscurity as to the exact meaning of the word, in the current works of Sāṅkhya-Yoga, to which it belongs principally as a technical term. But the way in which it is used in *Bhāgavata*, III, v and xxvi, makes it certain that it means the essential property which belongs to, and distinguishes, each of the 'five elements', mahā-bhūtas or *ṭaṭṭva-s*. Thus, *śabḍa-māṭram*, 'sound only', 'pure sound', 'sound-continuum', is the property of *ākāśa-ṭaṭṭva* (?ether); *spārśa-māṭram*, 'tact only', 'tact continuum', of *vāyu*-air (invisible 'gas'); *rūpa-māṭram*, 'color-form only', 'light-continuum', of *tejas*-fire (visible luminous 'gas'); *rasa-māṭram*, 'taste only', 'taste-continuum', of *jala*-water ('liquid'), and *gandha-māṭram*, 'odour only', 'smell-continuum', of *prthvi*-earth (solid). 'Shut' the 'ear', 'skin', 'eye', 'tongue', 'nose', and you will feel some continuous sound, tact, light, taste, scent; these are the sense-continua, all-pervasive, generic: particular sensations of sounds, tacts, etc., are only particular modifications of these; as the words that are being written are particularisations of the ink-in-general which fills the ink-bottle or the fountain-pen's ink-holder. Note that *ṭa ṭ- t v a* means that-ness.

One more observation is needed. There is obscurity and confusion in the current books (even in *Bhāgavata* itself, in this very ch. III. xxvi.) as to the word which stands for the substrate of sound and that which means space. Synonyms for the letter are often used for the former. But there is reason to think that *ākāśa h* (masculine) means the *element* (? ether) which, as substratum, has the property of sound; while *ākāśa m* (neuter) means Space.

Thus, under sound, we have : soft (in tone or timbre), or harsh, low (in pitch) and grave, or high (-pitched) and acute, loud, rounded, shrill, sonorous, deep, light, heavy, even, piercing, rolling, crackling, bursting, tearing. thunderous, whistling, screaming, roaring, rushing, dashing, moaning, groaning, rasping, grinding, etc., sounds, Tacts are smooth, rough, even, silky, flowery, velvety, hard, soft, firm, cool, warm, damp, dry, clammy, moist, etc. Colours are white, black, red, yellow, blue, brown, golden, violet, orange, grey, green, purple, etc., with their endless shades and combinations. Tastes ('gusts', relishes) are sweet, salt, acid, astringent, hot, bitter, acrid, pungent, putrid, etc. Smells or scents are fragrant, malodorous, stimulating, depressing, sulphurous, stinking, skunk-y, civet-like musky, saffron, sandal, kṣas, rose, jasmine, violet, pārijāta, mālaṭī, sugandhā-rāja (the 'king of scents,' also called rajanī-gandhā the 'night-scent,') lemon, lily, lotus, blooms of myrtle or henna, neem or tamarisk, mango, etc.¹ 'Flavors' and 'savors' are mixed tastes and smells which affect palate and nostril simultaneously. Sub-varieties of sensations must necessarily be countless in accordance with the countlessness of the objects of the senses; but humanity possesses definite names only for those that it uses and experiences most frequently.

¹ *Mahā-bhārata*, Shānti-parva, ch. 182, enumerates nine kinds of smells, six of tastes, twelve kinds of forms and colours, twelve kinds of tacts, and seven kinds of sounds. *Anugītā*, ch. 35, repeats these, with slight variations: it gives ten kinds of smells and eleven of sounds. Popularly, seven kinds of sound (of the musical gamut); seven, of colour; six, of taste, are recognised as general. Of tacts and smells, no such

(b) Non-essential qualities are, by their very nature, more difficult to fix. They are, generally speaking, those which describe the relation and position of an object, to and amidst other objects ; thus, well-built, ill-built, near, distant, commodious, insufficient, etc. Many of the properties mentioned above as amongst essential, may, perhaps, on sifting, be found to be non-essential, or *vice versa*. Reference to the purpose in hand decides generally whether a quality is non-essential or otherwise.

(c) Attributes, partaking of the characters of both, may be instanced as 'heat, cold, temperateness,' 'lightness, heaviness, weightiness, softness, hardness, firmness, plasticity, rigidity, elasticity, pressure, suction, support, etc.,' 'shape, size, duration,' etc. These attributes have an obvious reference to the latent and patent aspects of energy, and to Negation ; as the others, properties and qualities, have to the Self-in-itself, and to the Not-Self as Many, respectively. Such considerations are capable of endless elaboration, which, however, has no special use.

But it may be generally useful to pair them off in opposites, as loud and low (sounds), vivid or bright

numbers are commonly spoken of. Weavers of the world-famous Kāshmir shawls are said to be able to distinguish three hundred colors and shades with the naked eye. In North India, salesmen of perfumes, (for the manufacture of which, the towns of Jaunpur and Ghāzīpur in the U. P. are famous), go about with boxes holding a dozen, or a score, or more, of glass phials, each containing a different kind of scent. Musk is good for use in cold weather ; rose, khas (scented grass which grows in special marshes in Gorakhpur in the U. P.), bēlā (a variety of jasmine), in hot weather. Some are good for all weathers. M. W. Calkins, *An introduction to Psychology*, (p. 60), quotes Zwaardemacker (a Dutch physiologist) as recognising the following classes of smells : ethereal, aromatic, fragrant, ambrosiac, alliaceous, empyreumatic, hircine, virulent, and nauseating. To the Many-ness of Nature-Mūlaprakṛti there is no limit !

and faint (colors), hot and cold (tacts), fragrant and malodorous (smells), agreeable and disagreeable (tastes); corresponding to the primal pair of pleasure and pain.

From the psychological standpoint, we may note in passing, every sense-property is something *sui generis*, on the same level and side by side with every other. As sense-properties, all are equal and independent, and none is grosser or subtler than any other, whence the current saying: 'The musk's fragrance cannot be made to be realised by any amount of oaths and affirmations'¹; i.e., it must be smelt personally to be known.² Thus each sense-property, and each shade of it, must be experienced directly in order to come within the precise cognition and recognition of any jīva. This is the manyness, the separateness and exclusiveness, of sensations. The remarks made and figures given at p. 458, vol. v, of *The Secret Doctrine* (Adyar edn., 1938) will be found very suggestive in this connection; and, read together with what has gone before, may help to show some consistency in the apparently very inconsistent statements made on this subject in *Purāṇas*. Thus, it is declared that in our world-system, the first 'element' to come forth (to say nothing of the still earlier ādi or mahat̐ ṭaṭṭva, and

¹ नहि कस्तुरिकाऽमोदः शपथेन विभाव्यते ।

² It will be seen that, in this sense, not only is Absolute Brahma 'indescribable' (see p. 148, *supra*) but every experience whatsoever.

anupāḍaka or buddhi ṭaṭṭva,¹ which are only vaguely alluded to here and there) was ākāsha (ether) with the guṇa of sound ; then vāyu (air), with the guṇa of touch ; then fire (agni), with light and form and colour ; then water (āpas), with taste ; and, lastly, earth (kṣhiṭi), with smell ; and it is added that each succeeding one was derived from the next preceding, and retained the property or properties of its originator, besides developing its own special property.² Again, it is said in *Purāṇas* that the order of evolution of the elements and properties is different in different cycles, mahā-kalpas, of this and other world-systems. It is also said that the *number* of the elements and corresponding senses and sensations differs actually (as Voltaire fancied in his *Zadig et Micromegas*) in different worlds, there being eighteen in

¹ आदि or महत् तत्त्व अनुपादक or बुद्धितत्त्व । In theosophical literature, the order given is usually ādi, then anupāḍaka, then ākāsha, etc., *Pranava-vāda* says ādi-ṭaṭṭva is the same as buddhi-ṭaṭṭva, and anupāḍaka as mahat-ṭaṭṭva. In current Sāṅkhya works, however, aham-kāra is called bhūṭ-ādi, and it is born from mahat which is the same as buddhi.

² It is scarcely necessary to point out that the words earth, water, fire, air, ether, here, do not mean the substances ordinarily understood by them in the English language. In ancient Indian thought, Consciousness is the basic fact, the psychical factor is primary, and the physical is secondary ; therefore moods of mind are regarded as 'creators,' evolvers, of modes of matter ; each peculiar sensation or sense-able quality, tan-mātra, smell, taste, etc., evolves a corresponding bhūta or ṭaṭṭva, pṛithivī or kṣhiṭi (earth), āpas or jala (water), etc., i.e., the primary atomic aspect thereof (*vide* Sāṅkhya and Vaiśeṣhika works). 'Categories' are very fully dealt with in Vaiśeṣhika philosophy, under six main heads, dravya (substance), gūṇa (attribute), karma (movement), sāmānya (universality), viśeṣa (particularity), samavāya (co-inference) ; to which some writers have added a-bhāva (non-existence).

some, thirty-six in others, and so forth,¹ as there are only five known to us in this world. Such also seems to be the meaning of the statement that 'this world-system of ours is crowded round with infinite other systems governed by Brahmās having five, six, seven and more up to thousands of *faces*.' Still again, it is said, in the doctrine of *pañchī-karaṇa*,³ 'quintuplication,' *i.e.*, the mixing of each of the five *ṭaṭṭvas* with each of the other four in certain proportions, that, at present, each material object has in it all five elements, and, therefore, the possibility of being cognised by all five senses ; but the preponderant element gives it its best-recognised nature. As a fact we find that beings having different constitutions of the same sense, and the same being during different conditions of the same sense, receive different sensations from apparently the same sense object. Thus it is now recognised that certain rays that are dark to men are luminous to ants, and *vice versa* ; and objects that taste sweet during health, taste bitter during fever.⁴

¹ *Yoga-Vāsishṭha*.

² *Tripāḍ-Vibhūṭi-Mahā-Narayaṇa Upaniṣat*, vi.

³ *Pañcha-ḍaśī*, i, 26-30, and *Pañchī-karaṇa-vivaraṇa*.

⁴ The element of truth in the theories as to 'natural names,' 'true names,' 'words of power,' 'mantras,' etc., may be found in these considerations. *Given* a certain constitution of ear, and also *given* certain surroundings, each object, because of the presence of *ākāsha-ṭaṭṭva* in it and in the surroundings and the ear, will affect that ear with a certain sound which will be its 'natural' name. So with 'natural' forms, smells, tastes, and tacts, of objects. But because there are no such 'absolute' ears and 'absolute' environments, but only varying ones, therefore there can be no 'absolutely' natural names, etc., but only 'comparatively' such. To a particular race of men, living in a particular country and climate, the words of their particular scripture would be the most 'natural names,' 'words of power,' most effective for

All this means again, in brief, that each atom, having in it the common guṇa of sense-cognisability, sens-ability, has also therefore in it what is necessarily included in this universal quality, viz., every possible particular guṇa ; but only one or some are manifest and others latent, in different conditions of time, space, and motion, to different jīvas ; jīvas being regarded as ' lines of consciousness '. That is to say, one kind of atom will mean one thing at one time

evoking the desired results in those climatic and other conditions ; to others, others. As we pass from the grosser or denser to the subtler, from the more concrete, particular, special, to the more abstract, in-de-finite, general, the range and reach of the ' natural ' quality, etc., becomes more and more wide. ' Bodies ' are very exclusive of each other ; even two cannot, each, take the whole of the same piece of edible ; but a million minds may be in unison in respect of one thought, or feeling, or resolve. In the elemental ideas of mathematics and metaphysics, in the domains of the Mahān-ātmā or Mahaṭ, Universal Mind, all jīvas are of the ' same opinion ' ; in the regions of the viśeṣa-ṭṭvas, they differ. As said in *Charaka*, I, i, (quoted before, on p. 283.)

" Generalisation expands and enhances all bhāvas, thoughts, feelings, things ; specialisation, particularisation, narrows and contracts." See also *Yoga-Sūtra* and *Bhāṣya*, ii, 19.

Schopenhauer, on pp. 482-3 of vol. I of *The World as Will and Idea* (English translation in three volumes by Haldane and Kemp, pub. 1896), illustrates this same thought in another and fine way : ". . . The good conscience . . . arises from . . . the knowledge that our true self exists not only in our own person . . . but in everything that lives. By this the heart feels itself *enlarged*, as by egoism it is *contracted*. For, as the latter *concentrates* our interest upon the particular manifestation of our own individuality, . . . the knowledge that every thing living is just as much our own inner nature as is our own person, *extends* our interest to everything living ; and in this way the heart is *enlarged*. Thus, through the diminished interest in our own self, the anxious care for the self is attached at its very root and limited ; hence the peace, the unbroken serenity, which a virtuous disposition and a good conscience affords, and the more distinct appearance of this with every good deed, for it " (deed) " proves to ourselves the depth of this disposition ". (Faith is witnessed by deed). " The good man lives in a world of friendly individuals, the well-being of any of whom he regards as his own." Here, Schopenhauer has caught and described well, one aspect of the Vēdānta reason for the Golden Rule of Ethics. For detailed exposition of this as well as other aspects, the reader may see the present writer's *The Essential Unity of All Religions*.

and space to one kind of jīva, and will, simultaneously and in that same position, mean a pseudo-infinite number of things to pseudo-infinite other kinds of jīvas; and it will also mean pseudo-infinite kinds of things to the same kind of jīva in the pseudo-infinite succession of time and space.

(ii) We may now turn to the karma-aspect of the atom, corresponding to the Saṭ and Rajas aspects of Praṭyag-ātmā and Mūla-prakṛti respectively.

It may at first sight appear that Saṭ-being, should correspond with ḍravya-substance rather than karma-movement. But if what has been said before, on the nature of Saṭ and Ānanda, and of Rajas and Tamas, is carefully considered, it will appear that Saṭ properly corresponds to karma and not to ḍravya. 'Being' is what we are inclined to regard as the innermost, the most important, factor in the constitution of an object, because it appears *prima facie* to be the most permanent; and ḍravya, as shown above, is such in the case of the atom; the idea therefore comes up strongly that ḍravya should be connected with 'being'. But the first premise here is not accurate. It does not discriminate between 'being' and 'existence'. What is being, Saṭ, in Praṭyag-ātmā, is 'ex-is-tence,' aṣṭi-ṭā, 'outer-is-ness,' in Matter. And in Praṭyag-ātmā (if such a distinction may be permitted where there is truly and strictly none possible, and where all are aspects and all absolutely equally necessary and

To realise the awful powers of sound, consider the maddening skull-bursting effects that can be produced by magnifying radio-sounds. We can understand now how the walls of Jericho were destroyed by a trumpet-blast.

important), Ānanda-bliss, is even more 'inner' than 'being'; it is, so to say, the *feeling* of own-being; the difference between a man looking at himself with eyes open and again with eyes shut. In this sense Ānanda may be said to be even more 'being' than is 'being' itself. And karma, therefore, corresponds not to this innermost being of Ānanda, but to the outer being, the existence, the manifestation of Saṭ. Existence, reality, appearance, manifestation, is all in and by action and movement. A very good physical illustration of this is the fact of natural history, that most insects, aquatic creatures, birds, quadrupeds, in wild life, are often so completely camouflaged by their protective colouring or markings that they are not distinguished at all from their surroundings, that they remain as it were non-existent, even when they are quite close to and right under the eye of the observer; but become 'manifest' at once, i.e., 'existent,' with the slightest shake, motion, or action.¹

Having thus shown that karma represents Saṭ, we may proceed to note again that it is inseparable from the atom, is in fact one of its essential constituents. The consequence is that every atom is in unceasing motion.

Karma falls also into three kinds: (*u*) expansion, prasāraṇa (corresponding to the boundlessness of the

¹ Consider the 'puzzle'-pictures, 'find the parrot, monkey, lion'.

The point has been much emphasised in a psychological reference by the distinguished psychologist, Prof. Ladd, of America, as it has been recognised by other Western psychologists that "the deepest and most central current in human nature is the *ruling passion*" (Höfding, *Outlines of Psychology*. p. 283), with the additional words, 'as *manifesting in conduct*', being understood, for our present purpose. See *Science of Emotions* and *Science of Self*; also p. 270, *supra*.

Self), in-breathing, pra-shvasana or uṭ-shvasana; (b) contraction, ākuñchana (corresponding to the separated mutual repelling and restricting of not-selves), out-breathing, nishvasana; (c) spaṇḍana or sphuraṇa or āṇḍolana, rhythmic vibration (or shvasana, in-and-out-breathing), corresponding to the (affirmative-) negation which sums up both movement and counter-movement in itself, and holds the two others together in the conjunction of alternation. The guṇas specially arising out of karma are : shīghra-tā, quickness, maṇḍa-tā, slowness, and véga, or gaṭi, speed, velocity, tempo. Minor varieties under each of the three are endless, as in the case of guṇas : thus, rapid, slow, steady; ūrḍhva-gamana, upward motion, adho-gamana, downward motion, tiryag-gamana, side-ways motion; uṭ-kṣhepaṇa, uplifting, apa-kṣhepaṇa, repulsing or casting away, atana, wandering; vertical, horizontal, oblique; centripetal, centrifugal, circumambulant; etc.¹

(iii) Lastly we come to the dṛavya-aspect of the atom which represents the Ānanda and Tamas aspects of Self and Not-Self respectively. It is the 'éṭaṭ-ness,' the mere 'this-ness' of the atom. It is that in the atom which is the 'heart' of the thing, its substance, its inertia, its mass and weight and resistance, all that

¹ प्रसारण, प्रश्वसन, उच्छ्वसन; आकुञ्चन, निश्वसन; स्पन्दन, स्फुरण, श्वसन। शीघ्रता; मंदता; वेग, गति। ऊर्ध्व-गमन; अधो-गमन; तिर्यग्-गमन। उत्क्षेपण; अपक्षेपण; अटन। केन्द्र-पाती or केन्द्र-उन्मुख; केन्द्र-वर्जी or केन्द्र-परावमुख; परिक्रामी। Many of these occur in Vaishéshika-lists.

makes it a something existing in and for itself, so far as it can have such a pseudo-existence-in-itself at all. It appears mysterious and unresolvable only when and if, after asking, 'What is *this*?' , we try fallaciously to answer the question in terms of something else than *guṇa* and *karma*. The answer to that question must always be in terms of *guṇa* and *karma* ; or otherwise, merely the reiteration, 'It is a *this*.' Three *aspects* make up the *fact* of the atom—*idam*, 'this' (*dravya*), *iṭṭham*, 'such' a this (*guṇa*), and *evam*, 'thus' is this acting (*karma*) ;¹ and they can never be separated from each other.

Dravya too may be subdivided into : (a) substances with positive weight (predominant), in the aspect of attraction, *guru*, heavy ; (b) those with negative weight (predominant),² in the aspect of repulsion, *laghu*, light, buoyant ; (c) those with inertia, dead weight, positive-negative or passive-active resistance to all change, self-maintenance in whatever condition the thing happens to be, *sṭhira*, stable.³ Subdivisions of these, as of others, 'are endless : *mahaṭ*, *buḍḍhi*, *ākāsha*, *vāyu*, *ṭejas*, *āpas*, *prṭhivī*, solids, liquids, gases, ethers, metals, non-metals, organic, inorganic, minerals, vegetables, animal substances, etc. Some of the qualities arising out of these subdivisions have been already noticed before in the *guṇa*-aspect.

¹ इदम् ; इत्थम् ; एवम्.

² See Dolbear's *Matter, Ether, and Motion*, p. 91.

³ गुरु ; लघु ; स्थिर.

We have seen that resistance is of the very essence and nature of *ḍravya*-substance, and we see now that it has the dual form of attraction-repulsion. This makes further clear, if such clarification were needed, that *ḍravya* represents the *Ānanda* and *Ṭamas* aspects, which again correspond to the *Shakṭi*-energy of the first trinity. We *desire* a *thing*, we *know* its *qualities*, and we *act* upon, change or modify, its *movements*.¹

The three subdivisions of *ḍravya* may also be regarded as corresponding, in the order in which they are stated above, to Self and *Saṭṭva*, to Not-Self and *Rajas*, and to Negation and *Ṭamas* respectively.

It will have been noticed by readers that the task, of expressing these correspondences precisely, becomes more and more difficult as we enter into greater and greater details and subdivisions, and the same triplet is repeated under more than one head. The aspects become gradually so intermingled that they cannot be distinguished easily, and the assignment of triplets in a table of correspondences may naturally and reasonably vary, if the students differ in standpoint and in the amount of attention paid to each factor, some regarding one aspect as predominant, and others another. In this last case, for example, if attraction be regarded as *active* affirmation, attention being specially directed to the activity, and repulsion as *passive* and steady negation of

¹ See J. Ward, art, *Psychology*, in *Encyclopædia Britannica*, para 9. In *Bhāgavata*, the triad is frequently mentioned, of *ḍravya-jñāna-kriyā*, instead of *ichchhā-jñāna-kriyā*; *ḍravya* being obviously equated with *ichchhā* or desire.

others, of manyness, then the two appear reasonably to correspond to Rajas or Not-Self, and Saṭṭva or Self, respectively. But if attraction be regarded as unification of others with *self*, as *self*-assertion over others, and repulsion as separation of *others* from self, as pushing away of others, then it would be right to say, as said above, that they correspond to Saṭṭva or Self, and Rajas or Not-Self, respectively. Still again, if attention were paid to the fact that the unification of attraction, when it appears in the limited atom, is a false and not a true unification, that it is the assertion in reality of Not-Self, which is then only masquerading as Self (that it is, so to say, fostering the flesh at the expense of the spirit), while the separation of repulsion is the diminution of such a false self and therefore an advancement of the true Self, then we would go back to the correspondence of attractive weight with Not-Self, and of negative weight with Self. The view of this particular correspondence put forward here as the main one, *viz.*, of positive weight to Self, of repulsive weight to Not-Self, and of inertia to Negation, proceeds upon the consideration that the fact of the unity and of the principle of unification present in the atom is more characteristic, in the present reference, than the fact that the atom is only masquerading as a one and a self.

This should not confuse the careful student, but should only help him to look at every question from many sides and standpoints, and so recognise the

harmonising elements of truth in each view, rather than the discordant elements of error.

The laws previously ascertained apply to this triplet of aspects of the atom. As these three cannot be separated from each other, though, turn by turn, one is predominant and the others in the background, so the three subdivisions of each are also contemporaneous in this way ; that one appears to be more manifest from one standpoint, while another appears to be more prominent from another standpoint at the same time. This last statement applies especially to the subdivisions of *ḍravya* and *karma*. It is known that what is solid and immovable to one individual may be pliable as a liquid or a gas to another, and *vice versa* ; and, again, that what appears to be linear motion from one standpoint appears as rotatory or curved from another, and *vice versa*. Provision for limitation, in time, space, and motion, for death and re-birth of these aspects of the atom, even in the midst of their persistent continuance, is made by the fact of change, absorption and transformation, of each into other kinds of *guṇas*, *karmas*, and *ḍravayas* ; and, yet again, recovery of their previous condition, in an endless manner. Ample illustration of this will be found in physical science, in connection with the doctrines of pseudo-indestructibility of matter, pseudo-eternity and conservation of energy, and perpetual transformation of motion, showing how substances (energies proper), attributes, and vibration, are being constantly changed, all the while retaining possibility of recovering their older shapes.

Concomitance of these three aspects, *dravya*, *guṇa*, and *karma*, and, by inference, of all their subdivisions, from the metaphysical standpoint of the whole, is especially important and significant to bear in mind. It will help to show the underlying truth in each, and reconcile all of the many conflicting hypotheses of physical science. Thus : some hold the view that atoms are nothing substantial but *only* vortices, pure motion, vortices (one may fairly say) of *nothing* ; for even when the holders of this theory say that atoms are vortices of *ether*, they, in order to avoid an obvious *petitio principii*, or self-contradiction, take care to describe ether in terms the opposite of those used in describing matter ; and so practically reduce ether to *nothing*. Others say that they are substantial, whether they have or have not a vortical or other motion besides. So too, the first theory of light was corpuscular, that light *is* corpuscles ; then it was discarded in favour of the undulatory theory, that light *is* undulations ; with the discovery of new metals, radium, etc., and observations of their behaviour, the radiatory theory is being reinstated again.¹ So again, one extreme view is that all sensations *are* merely vibrations of the objects sensed, transmitted to animal nerves ; another extreme is that they have nothing to do with vibrations, (which may or may not be a parallel coincident), but are things *sui generis*. Scientists who have

¹ The late Dr. Hübbe-Schleiden (of Döhren bei Hannover, Germany) suggested the following as a more exact statement of these theories : " 1. Light is emission of corpuscles (Newton). 2. Light is vibration of ether (Huyghens, Fresnel). 3. Light is emission of electrons."

trained themselves in philosophy also, as many are beginning to do now, look at the question impartially from both points of view ; and therefore readily see the defects of each extreme, and acknowledge that nothing yet known explains how a certain number of *vibrations* at one end of a nerve should appear as the *sensation* red, or blue, or yellow, at the other end of that nerve. The inconclusiveness of all such theories lies in their exaggeration, their one-sidedness, and their attempt to reduce *all* the aspects of the atom to only *one* aspect ; guṇas and karmas to ḍravya only ; or ḍravyas and karmas to guṇa only ; or guṇas and ḍravyas to karma only. The truth is that all three aspects are always and inseparably concomitant ; that an atom is ever a something, an *étaṭ*, a this, which has always a certain motion, a certain kind of vibration, which motion or vibration, again is always accompanied by a special sense-property. " The three aspects are inseparable and are the expression of all that happens in the physical world. Given one of the three in all its details, the other two would be known." ¹

A few more concrete, if somewhat cursory, observations may be of use to illustrate the simultaneity and concurrence of all aspects of the atom. Thus, though, at the present stage of evolution, volume and form appear to be specially, indeed, even almost exclusively, connected with the sense of vision amongst all the senses, yet it is

¹ Max Verworn, *General Physiology*, p. 546 ; his three aspects, however, are " Substance, form ; and transformation of energy ", form being substituted for sense-quality, and transformation of energy for motion ; not very different, after all.

not so, in reality. Even the current usage which employs words having a spatial reference, in connection with all senses, shows this, and is not merely metaphorical. We speak of bulky or extensive or voluminous or massive sounds and touches and tastes and smells ; also of their forms. The words are so employed because of a fact in nature ; sounds, touches, tastes, and smells also have volume and form ; they belong to sense-objects, to *états*, are in space, time, and motion. The words quantity, measure, magnitude, etc., apply to all sense-objects and with a clear meaning. Pitch and timbre of sounds ; freshness or staleness, strength or weakness, insipidity and vapidity or acuteness and intensity of tastes ; lightness or heaviness of touches ; sweet sounds, sweet sights, sweet scents, and sweet tastes ; beautiful voices, beautiful forms and colours, beautiful smells ; rough and smooth tones as well as touches ; all these are illustrations of the fact.¹ Because of such common features hiding behind diverse features, under *guṇa* as well as *ḍravya* and *karma*, is it possible to translate sensations of one sense into those of another, under special circumstances and conditions, manipulation of which belongs to that region of science which is only gradually, with many set-backs, opening up to the public, under the names of hypnotism, mesmerism, animal magnetism, psychism, telepathy, clairvoyance, etc. Cases of psychics able to experience any sensation with or at any part of the body are now

¹ Lists of sense-qualities given in *Mahābhārata*, referred to in foot-note on page 287, *supra*, include many such.

recognised by at least some scientists of note. The obscure Védāntic doctrine of quintuplication of the five *taṭṭvas* or sense-elements, (p. 377, *supra*) seems also to refer to this subject. It seems to be the completion of the physics of the universe begun by Vaishéshika and Nyāya systems in their statements as to *aṇu*, atoms, *dvyaṇuka*, di-atoms, *trasaṇu*, tri-diatoms etc.¹ This is not clear now in the absence of details, but the suggestion that they are such completion comes to one who approaches the old books in the spirit of the open-minded student, no less ready to see alliances than to note differences. Working at this suggestion and comparing the apparently conflicting statements in *Purāṇas*, the student may succeed in making up some, at least provisionally, satisfactory system of the essential principles of chemistry, physiology, and cosmogony, pending knowledge of details through development of special faculty by yoga.²

We see, then, that all three aspects run on indefeasible parallels, even as thought, thing, and motion always accompany each other, though distinguishable; and that change in any of the three will necessarily bring about a change in the other two also. In a sense, it is true, there should not be any change in the *ḍravya*; a mere 'this' will remain only 'this'; and *ḍravya*

¹ अणु, द्व्यणुक, त्रसरेणु । The last is explained in some books as tri diatoms, in others as tri-atoms. Modern science makes the 'atom' more complex.

² The student will find much help and suggestion on this point in theosophical literature generally, and in *The Secret Doctrine* of H. P. Blavatsky and Ch. I of *Ancient Wisdom* of Annie Besant especially.

constitutes the pseudo-permanent element in the atom ; yet, seeing that each *éṭaṭ* is inseparably connected with a quality and a motion, it happens that there is, as common observation shows, a *sort* of change of *nature* in the substance also. The substance is no longer recognised as the same. The energy has also changed its form. Water becomes gas, and people naturally and not unreasonably say that the *substance* has changed, as well as motions and qualities.¹ In this sense, the *ṭat-tva*, 'thatness,' the element, may properly be said to change. Rigorously speaking, there can be no change in mere, pure, 'this' (*ḍravya*) ; but no more can there be any change in mere, sheer, 'such' (*guṇa*), or in mere, abstract, 'thus' (*karma*). What changes is the particularised condition of each as limited and made concrete by necessary relativity to the others.

We have now generally defined and described the three universal attributes of the atom. Wherever an atom is, there must be present these three also. Whatever its variations, these must accompany it. Let us now try to find out something more about the variations of the atom generally. These variations will naturally be most

¹ The phenomena of allotropism and isomerism are illustrations. Views of chemical philosophers as to the development, one after another, in a 'periodic' succession, of the various so-called 'elements' out of one primal kind of root-matter, are also in accord with those propounded in the text above and in *Purāṇas* and *Sāṅkhya* as to successive genesis, one from another, of the five *mahā-bhūtas*. Compare also, G. W. de Tunzelman, *A Treatise on Electrical Theory and the Problem of the Universe*, (pub. 1910), p. 505 : "When the term energy is substituted for force, the Védic scheme of development becomes identical with the one which expresses the most recent developments of physical research, *viz.*, the Absolute or Eternal Self—Consciousness—Mind—Energy—Ether—Matter."

prominently connected with guṇa-quality and karma-movement, though change in these will cause the appearance of change in dṛavya-substance also.

Under guṇa, we have inferred that in respect of form, corresponding to Not-Self, étaṭs, this-es, have, by reflection of the unity and completeness of Self, one universal underlying form, the sphere, and a pseudo-infinity of other forms made up of the inter-mixture of points and lines. In respect of volume, corresponding to Self, the common fact is only this, that there must be 'bulk,' 'triple-dimension,' 'extension,' *some* size ; and the detail is that the étaṭ must have *every possible* size. Thus we have atoms of all possible sizes,¹ each size of atom (with corresponding other qualities, vibrations, substantial nature, etc.) constituting one plane of matter ; each plane constituting the 'outer' sheath, the material, of a pseudo-infinite series of world-systems on the same level with each other ; and the next minuter size constituting the 'inner,' 'spiritual' or 'ideal' counter-part and core thereof and therein. The case is the same with special qualities. The presence of *some one quality*, of 'sense-cognisability,' is common and inevitable ; but there is no restriction as to what that must be. Reason and the

¹ In order to see the element of truth in this very absurd-looking statement, the reader may read Fournier d'Albe's *Two New Worlds*. *Yoga-Vāsishtha* stories of worlds within atoms, and atoms within worlds again, *ad infinitum*, are made 'scientifically intelligible' by this work ; see the present writer's *Mystic Experiences or Tales from Yoga-Vāsishtha*. *Praṇava-Vāda*, of course, has much light to throw on this as on other points dealt with here. The scientific discovery of 'systems' of 'electrons' within each atom also helps to explain and support the ideas of the text.

law of non-arbitrariness require that the whole of all possible qualities must be present in the whole and every part of the World-Process, *manifesting*, of course, to *any one jīva*, only in *succession*.

The main kinds of karma-movements of atoms may be deduced, as a tentative hypothesis, as follows. We have seen that the basic ultimate atom everywhere, in whichever world-system we take it, would be a sphere, though size and quality may vary; for it is formed by the aham-consciousness revolving round itself in the circle of the logion. But, existing side by side as spheres, the forces of approach and recess work between them, as mutual attraction and repulsion. Every atom endeavours to approach and recede from every other simultaneously. The same atom would attract as well as repel another at the same time. In other words, every atom would try to *absorb* another into itself for its own growth (corresponding to the intensification and expansion of the consciousness 'aham—éṭaṭ—(asmi),' ('I-this-am)'), and at the same time to *resist* being absorbed into that other and losing instead of intensifying its own self-existence and identity. With attraction and repulsion coming into play, the self-revolving spheres would begin to move in straight lines towards or from each other. At this stage movements would become manifest. Before this, (from the standpoint of the particular world-system we may be in) the self-revolution would not be apparent as movement; the atom would scarcely be apparent even as a something; that there would be in it, even then, a

necessary movement of self-revolution, would be only a metaphysically necessary assumption. The next stage would be, that, after one atom has secured and subordinated another, absorbed it into itself, (the why and how of which may appear afterwards), the two together, making a line, would now fall into the self-revolving movement of the stronger, and the circular-disc movement would result. Lastly, the disc revolving on its own axis would become the sphere again, but a sphere, the sphericity and motion of which are manifest, instead of hypothetical! as in the condition of the primary atom. We may consider here that as the shortest line is composed of two atom-points, and the smallest disc must be made of such a line circling around itself according to the motion of the stronger atom, so the smallest solid sphere should be made of at least, and also at most, of three such lines crossing each other at the middle and revolving round that point on the axis made by the strongest line. In other words, the manifest sphere would consist of three double-atoms. Such is

¹ The three movements, of (straight-line-running-to-and-fro) piston, (circling) wheel, (revolving) sphere, seem to be the only elementary movements, of which, all possible other motions, however complex, are made up. Nature *appears* formidably complicated; but it is all only *appearance*, pretence, illusion; to her persevering devotee she uncovers her simple Beauty, 'like a loving bride to a loving bride-groom', jāyā iva paṭyuh, uśaṭī su-vāsāh. The most unravellably tangled up skein of thread is still ravellable, given the needed unflagging perseverance; because, obviously, the whole tangle is the twistings, turnings, knottings, inter-lockings, of a simple straight thread. Electricity finds its way unerringly and instantaneously through the most inextricably tangled Gordian knot of wire which connects the switch and plug with the fan or lamp. And as electricity can, so can human fingers, if they are only sufficiently persevering; for, obviously, however tangled the knot, it all is the twistings and turnings of only one single thread.

perhaps the metaphysic underlying the vague available statements of Nyāya-Vaishéshika, as to diatoms being first formed from atoms, then tri-diatoms from diatoms, and the world—our own world-system at least—from them.¹ This order reproduces respectively, the Absolute, the duality of Self and Not-Self, and the triple duality (cognition-desire-action in soul and quality-substance-movement in body) of the jīva-atom—the individual, the definite *one* (which most systems of numeral notation express by a *line*), formed by the junction of a self with a not-self. Intermixtures and modifications of these main movements, *viz.*, linear, circular, and revolutionary or spiral, make up the inevitable pseudo-infinite variations of movements in the World-Process.

As to variations of the ḍravya-aspect, it has been said that they accompany variations of the other two. It need only be added that the greater the number and the more restricted the area of the rhythm-movements, the revolutions, of the atom and the derivative molecule, the more firm, rigid, gross, and exclusive and resistant for others, and attractive and insistent for themselves, they would become; and *per contra*, the smaller the number and the wider the area of the movement, the subtler, more plastic and more evanescent, they would be. The atom of each world-system being regarded as representing mere 'objectivity,' Not-Self, Ētaṭ, This, it follows that it is uniform and unchanged throughout the life of that system. Differentiation probably begins with

¹ See f.n. on p. 389 *supra*.

diatoms, which may be regarded as coeval with guṇas, these corresponding, in the jīva-atom of a system, to what the ṭanmātra,¹ would be in the consciousness of the Ishvara of that system, as may be seen later. The guṇas referred to here are their special sense-qualities, sound, touch, etc., considered psychologically. The differentiation may be considered as definitely marked at the stage of tri-diatoms, corresponding to the 'gross-elements', sṭhūla-bhūṭa-s, defined and characterised by these sensations, viz., ākāsha, vāyu, etc., and to the respective outer sensory and motor organs of the living beings of that system. These tri-diatoms may, then, for practical purposes, be regarded as representing that ḍravya-aspect of each thing which is variable. Before the development of these tri-diatoms (in the Vaishéshika, not the modern chemical, sense) there would be probably no manifest differentiation of the various ṭaṭṭva-s, 'sense-elements,' one from the other. Variations of such ultimate molecules of a world-system, as physical science is now gradually showing (in terms of 'atoms,' however, rather than of 'molecules'), would correspond with variations of resistance and density, of number and kind of vibrations, and of special sense-qualities.

We see then, that the atom is not an invariably fixed quantity. Its fixedness is only an appearance, and exists only in connection with world-systems taken singly.² Just as a stone, a tree, an animal, a human

¹ तन्मात्र ; see p. 372 *supra*.

² Bergson, *Creative Evolution*, p. 214 : " When we observe that a thing really *is* where it *acts*, we shall be led to say, as Faraday was, that

being, have an appearance of permanence and continuance from day to day, and yet are changing incessantly from moment to moment ; just as a whirling torch, or catherine-wheel, or gas-flame, has the appearance of a flat disc or sheet of fire, though something altogether different in reality ; so an atom has only a pseudo-fixedness and sameness of size-duration-movement, etc., in space-time-motion. The appearance of fixedness in incessant change is due to the imposition of ' sameness ' by a connected individual consciousness—the consciousness of the Brahmā the chief Individualised Cosmic Mind—in each world-system. In other words, the nature of the jīva, as Self, imposes (according to its own necessities, to be dealt with later), a certain sameness and continuance, while the nature of the atom, as Not-Self, requires incessant change ; reconciliation is found in the constant *repetition* of the vibrations which maintain the other attributes together with themselves. Apart from such appearance of fixity, there is truly a pseudo-infinite variety in every aspect of the atom, and a pseudo-infinite pseudo-infinity, pseudo-infinity within pseudo-infinity. Thus each size of atom, together with all its attributes and qualities corresponding to that size, is necessarily

all the atoms interpenetrate, and that each of them fills the world ; " in other words, ' All is everywhere ' ; but Bergson jibs at the remaining two words of the Vēdānta maxim, *viz.*, ' and always '. He has his peculiar view of *creative* evolution as a ' *durational* ' progress, in *time*. Still his views, and those, *f.i.*, of Sir J. Jeans, that atoms can be " annihilated " by being " transformed into radiation ", can be reconciled with the common atomic theory, by considerations like those advanced in the text. Jeans also says : " An electron must, in a certain sense at least, occupy the whole of space " ; *Mysterious Universe*, p. 71. Jevons' views have been noted before (p. 180) to similar effect.

pseudo-infinite in number, and would be found in every part of space and time. Yet, when the geometrical axiom, which applies to all things in space, says : “ *Two things cannot occupy the same space at once,*” how can all these pseudo-infinite sizes of atoms exist in the same space ? The reconciliation is to be found in the fact that this apparent pseudo-infinity is a ‘psychological,’ an ‘ideal,’ infinity, entirely created and carried along with itself, wherever it goes, by the Consciousness of the Self as a foil to its own infinite-infinity. The geometrical axiom does not apply to the Absolute-Consciousness which transcends and includes Space-Time-Motion, and creates all the infinite overlappings of individuality which have been mentioned before, and which correspond to the apparent overlappings of the atoms.¹ Yet again, lest there should be even the appearance of a violation of the geometrical axiom, the various sizes, whenever and wherever examined by any one individual consciousness, would be found to fit one into another (as water in sand) and constitute the different and interpenetrating planes of the world-systems.

Thus it happens that what is an atom to one jīva, within the limits, spatial and durational, of a solar system, may contain whole worlds within itself to a jīva sufficiently minute. And, *vice versa*, what is a solar system to us may form only an atom to a jīva sufficiently vast. The repeated and much emphasised

¹ From the transcendental standpoint, *all* possible things (imaginations) are contained in the single point (-sphere) of this Absolute-Consciousness.

statement in *Yoga Vāsishtha*, that a world contains atoms; and each of these atoms a world; and that world, atoms again; and so on *ad infinitum*, is justified in this manner in a very literal sense.' Consider here what was said before, as to the chain of individualities in a single organism, and as to the Virāt-Purusha; then the thought may become clear. The student will also be greatly helped by the researches of physical science, going to show that what has till now been regarded as the indivisibly ultimate atom, consists of hundreds of 'corpuscles,'² and by the tentative results of

¹ *Yoga Vāsishtha* speaks also of different kinds of 'space,' especially three, mah-ākāsha, chitt-ākāsha, and chid-ākāsha, fitting one within the other, in somewhat the same sense as the different 'sizes' of atoms mentioned above, and corresponding to them, or to the three bodies.

² The word 'atom' has been used here, throughout, as equivalent to the words 'anu' or 'param-ānu' of Samskr̥t. The new word 'ion' is, it seems, nearer to 'anu'; but it has not yet got a recognised position in western science and philosophy, and is still competing with 'corpuscles,' 'electrons,' etc. When the ideas and words have settled down in the course of a few years, it may perhaps be useful to change our nomenclature also. This 'settling down' is, however, not a very likely event, except in a very comparative sense. Like 'fashions' invented by the artistic-minded, first, then invaded and copied by the 'vulgar,' then abandoned to them, after the invention of new fashions, to undergo a similar fate in turn; like the 'veil after veil' which will lift only to leave 'veil upon veil behind'; like the 'bodies' which Brahmā successively puts on and casts off to be taken up and occupied by different orders of beings, dévas, asuras, fairies, gandharvas, human beings, etc., (*Bhāga-vāta*, III, xx); like houses and institutions built up by some, and 'captured' and occupied successively by others; like these is the fate of words. Other meanings than those originally intended usurp them, and new words have to be coined to accommodate those old meanings. In the meanwhile, the idea intended to be conveyed by the word 'atom', here, is that of a piece or particle of 'étaṭ,' 'this,' 'matter,' which, for the time, and in the particular world-system, and from the standpoint, with which we may be concerned at the moment, is ultimate and 'indivisible'. Sometimes, though very rarely, the word has been used here as equivalent to 'sheath' or 'body'; and this has been done because, in the particular connection in which the word has been so used, the sheath or body is the irreducible minimum which the jīva requires for its manifestation.

enquiry by budding superphysical senses, so far as they are publicly available.¹

How order is imposed on this infinity of disorder ; how the World-Process is ever an organic whole, within whatever limits of space-time-motion we take it ; and how this pseudo-infinity of pseudo-infinities is held together in co-ordination, in a system of planes within planes, lokas within lokas, by the mighty stress of the Principle of the Supreme Individuality or Oneness of the Universal Self—this may all appear in the next chapter on the jīva.

CHAPTER XV

JIVA-ATOMS—SUBJECTIVELY, *i.e.* JĪVAS

AT the outset of this chapter we may note that the aspects of size,² specialised with reference to the jīva, would be 'range or extent of consciousness in all its manifestations, cognition, desire, and action,' 'its definiteness or intensity,' and its 'calibre or scope generally'. These would subdivide into 'broad-mindedness, narrow-mindedness, rationality or common sense,' 'vagueness or weakness, clearness or strength, distinctness or firmness,' 'long-headedness or far-sightedness, width of interests, depth,' etc.

¹ *Vide* Annie Besant's *Occult Chemistry*.

² See p. 368 *supra*.

As to specialisations of duration and vibration, it need only be said that the words used in connection with matter in the preceding chapter apply, by ordinary usage, to corresponding features of mind also.

With these brief suggestions, we may pass on to the features more prominently characteristic of the jīva, as the embodiment of consciousness.

The entire nature of consciousness is exhaustively described by and contained in the words : " I-This-Not (Am)." This is the Absolute-Consciousness, the true *Chid-ghana*, 'compacted Chiṭ,' Mahā-Samviṭ, 'Great Consciousness,' which, in its transcendence of and absolution from numbers, limitations, and relations, includes all that is governed by numbers, limitations, and relations, and indeed is all. This Consciousness is the Absolute, and includes both the factors of what is ordinarily distinguished as *dvam-dvam*, pair, of Chiṭ, 'the Conscious' (corresponding to *Pratyag-ātmā*) and *Jaḍa*, 'the Unconscious' (corresponding to *Mūla-prakṛti*). It may not unreasonably be objected, because of this fact, that the word 'Consciousness' is not altogether suitable as an epithet for the Absolute, even with qualificatory adjectives. But it becomes unavoidable, now and again, to describe the Absolute in special terms borrowed from the triplets of attributes of *Pratyag-ātmā* and *Mūla-prakṛti*, which are the Pen-ultimates of the World-Process, as the Absolute is the very Ultimate and the all. The nearest approach to the Ultimate is obviously by the Penultimates ; hence the necessity of speaking in terms

of the latter ; and this is why Brahma is described, in *Upaniṣats* and other works on Veḍānta, now as 'Pure Consciousness' or Shuddha-Chiṭ, again as Mahā-Saṭ or 'Boundless Being,' and finally as Ananda-ghana or Ananda-maya, 'composed or compacted of Bliss' ; also as the Tamas beyond Tamas, 'the darkness beyond darkness,' Shuddha or 'pure' Saṭṭva, and Paro-Rajas, transcending-Rajas. And so, for our present purposes, we have to speak of Brahma as the Absolute-Consciousness, slightly emphasising the Praṭyag-ātmic aspect thereof rather than the Mūla-prākṛtic ; but carefully guarding the while against possible misconstruction, by openly stating that fact at the outset.

In its unique completeness, then, this Absolute-Consciousness includes every possible cognition, every possible desire, every possible action, all at once and for ever ; even as it includes all possible objects of cognition, desire, and action, namely qualities, substances, and movements. But, taken as consisting of successive and separable parts in the pseudo-infinity of World-Process, it appears as broken up into three aspects jñāna-cognition, ichchhā-desire, and kriyā-action. How these three and only three aspects arise in the jīva, on the collision and coalescence of Self and Not-Self, has been already outlined in chapter IX *supra*, on Praṭyag-ātmā, where the genesis of Saṭ-Chiṭ-Ananda is explained. To restate :

An ego bound to a non-ego in the bond of the logion is necessarily bound by a triple bond at three points ; is in

contact with three corresponding points in the non-ego, *viz.*, jñāna-ichchhā-kriyā, on the side of the ego, and guṇa-dravya-karma, respectively, on that of the non-ego. 'I-this-(am) not'—in this fact we see the following :

(1) 'I' and 'this,' being placed opposite to each other, are either turning face towards face, or face away from face. The ego cognises, perceives, the non-ego, receives into itself *reflection* and imprint of that non-ego (metaphorically as well as literally, as will appear later), or ignores and forgets it. This is (dual or, with a middle state, triple) jñāna.

(2) 'I' *tends* to move *towards* or *away from* 'not-I'. This *tendency* is desire, corresponding to the affirmation-negation of Shakṭi.¹ It is (dual or rather triple) ichchhā.

¹ See pp, 165-169 *supra*. Desire may be said to correspond with Negation in this obvious sense: It *consumes* its object. It denies to it a separate existence and devours it, swallows, merges its object into the desiring self. Food is eaten up by the hungry person. Man and woman espouse each other, two becoming one. When an English poet sings, "For each man kills the thing he loves," etc., the thought, though put in an extreme and evil form, is not altogether different. The gems and jewels and fineries that people admire and desire, they put on their persons and make them part of their 'personality'. The three (psycho-) physical appetites, for food, adornment, sex, are thus 'negation-al' of the separateness of their objects. That which was a separate idam, or étaṭ, 'this,' is converted by them into mama, 'mine' (the diluted weaker form of 'I,' its 'sphere of influence, its 'aura'), and then into aham, 'I'. (Witness, how politico-economic 'spheres of influence', 'protectorates', 'mandates', 'markets', 'trusts', become absorbed). The three corresponding (physico-) psychical appetites, for honor, wealth, and power, respectively, behave in the same way. Wealth becomes 'my property,' power says 'I am the State,' the honoured person begins to think 'these, who honour me, are my obedient followers'.

In a somewhat similar sense, knowledge and action also may be said to tend to abolish the separate existence of their objects. To know, to understand, 'another,' fully, we must 'get into his (or its) skin,' 'see with his eyes,' 'feel as he feels,' 'put ourselves into his position,' 'stand in his shoes'; we must *sym-pathise* (or *em-pathise*, as some psychoanalysts say) with him to the extent of identifying him with ourselves.

(3) The ego *actually* moves towards or away from, the non-ego. This is (dual or rather triple) kriyā.

All these are but modifications, forms, aspects, or degrees of the main fact of identification or separation between Self and Not-Self.

Fichte seems to have endeavoured to express the same or a similar idea thus: “(1) The ego exhibits itself as limited by the non-ego (*i.e.*, the ego is cognitive); (2) conversely, the ego exhibits the non-ego as limited by the ego (*i.e.*, the ego is active).”¹

This is the real significance of the *rapport* of *yoga-samādhi*. (*Yoga-sūtra*, i, 43, and iii, 3). We ‘understand,’ to the acute extent of ‘feeling,’ every little pain and pleasure of our body, because we have identified ourselves with it; this is one aspect of the truth indicated in the doctrine of solipsism; this is why mothers ‘understand’ the pains of their babies. That action subserves the purpose of ‘identifying’ its object with or ‘approximating’ to, or subordinating it to the will of the actor, goes without saying, seeing that action arises out of desire. But this feature of knowledge and action is due to their inseparable connection with desire. In the case of ‘aversion,’ ‘ignoring,’ and ‘putting away,’ ‘negation’ appears in another aspect; abolition of the ‘other’ is still there, though in another manner.

Primal Libido, Élan Vital. Hormé, Appetite, Urge and Surge of Life, Shakti-Desire, Kāma, is for Self-Realisation, *Sy ā m*, ‘May I be’; its next development is *Ba h u Sy ā m*, ‘May I be *Much* or *More*’; the further and final is *Ba h u-ḍ h ā Sy ā m*, ‘May I be *Many*’ or *Muny-formed*. Skṭ. names are *L o k a-é s h a ṇ ā*, desire for ‘local habitation and a name’, appetite for Self-preservation of physical-self by food, and of psychical-self by honor and glory, name and fame; *V i ṭ ṭ a-é s h a ṇ ā*, for Self-expansion by possessions, adornment, homestead, wealth, property; and *Ḍ ā r a-s u ṭ a- (S h a k ṭ i)-é s h a ṇ ā*, for self-continuation (immortalisation, sempiternalisation) by spouse-and-child and power over them (in the present, as well as in the future, by will and testament). The first corresponds broadly to jñāna and dharma; the second to kriyā and artha; the third to ichchhā and kāma. All are inter-dependent; indeed, barely possible to distinguish. They are more fully dealt with in *Science of Emotions*, and *Science of Social Organisation* (which deals specially with dharma-artha-kāma). Incidentally, it may be noted that the present work, *The Science of Peace*, corresponds with jñāna; *The Science of Emotions*, with ichchhā; *The Science of Social Organisation*, with Kriyā; while *The Science of Self* may be regarded as summation.

¹ Stirling's *Schwegler*, p. 265.

In other words, we may say that there is a mutual action and cognition between the ego and the non-ego : the action of the non-ego upon the ego is the cognition of the non-ego by the ego ; and the cognition (if the expression may be used) by the non-ego of the ego is conversely the action of the ego on the non-ego. When the ego impresses itself on the non-ego, we have action from the standpoint of the ego, and cognition from that of the non-ego. When the non-ego imprints itself on the ego, we have cognition from the standpoint of the ego, and action from that of the non-ego. To this it should be added that the condition intermediate between cognition and action, intermediate between the ego's 'being influenced and shaped' by the non-ego, on the one hand, and its 'influencing and shaping' the non-ego, on the other, is desire. The corresponding condition of the non-ego would probably be best described by the word *tension*. This desire is always hidden, while cognition and action are manifest.

Multifarious triplets arise under cognition, desire, and action. (1) 'Waking, sleeping, dreaming' ; 'presentation, oblivion, representation' ; 'knowing, forgetting, recollection' ; 'truth, error, illusion' ; 'sensation, conception, perception' ; 'term, proposition, syllogism' ; 'paḍa, vākya, māna' ; 'concept or notion, judgment, reasoning' ; 'reasonableness or sobriety, fancy, imagination' ; 'real or actual, unreal or fanciful, ideal' ; 'observation, thought, science' ; 'concentration, meditation, attention' ; attention, distraction, re-search (or rapport, union,

yoga-samāḍhi) ', etc. (2) ' Like, dislike, toleration ' ; ' love, hate, indifference ' ; ' partiality, carelessness, justice ' ; ' desire, emotion, will ' ; etc. (3) ' Action, reaction, alternation or balance ' ; ' activity, indolence, effort ' ; ' restlessness, fatigue, perseverance ' ; ' act, labour, industry ' ; ' action, plan, scheme ' ; ' evolution, involution, revolution ' ; etc. These may be treated of in detail later on.² In the meanwhile, some observations as to the general relations of subject and object, individuals and the surroundings they live amidst, the more prominent conditions of the *life* of the World-Process, may be recorded here.

It has been said that an ego is literally imprinted with and modelled to the shape of a cognised non-ego, and that cognition by an ego means and is the action of a non-ego upon it. It might be questioned how it is that action, cognition, and even desire, which are the attributes of Self, subject, can ever belong, or be spoken of as belonging, to Not-Self, object ; and, conversely, how the capabilities of being acted on, cognised, and desired, which are the attributes of Not-Self, can ever

¹ A very important triplet, which is but another aspect of and supplementary to the Law of Causality, and explains how the fundamental Unity is being constantly restored *in succession* also, as causality preserves it in *continuity*. " Past reason hunted, and, no sooner had, past reason hated." First ' am this ', and then ' (am) not this ', the net result being always the I.

² *Pranava-Vaḍa*, 3 vols. (1910—1913), gives hundreds of such triads. " Every thing in this world is a trinity completed by the quaternary " ; H. P. B., *Isis Unveiled*, I, 508. Dr. James H. Cousins, *A Study in Synthesis*, (pub. 1934) works out a number of quartettes in a fresh manner ; the work should receive more attention than it seems to have yet received, from students of philosophy generally, and members of the Theosophical Society specially.

belong, or be spoken of as belonging, to Self. The answer is this. If we were speaking exclusively of the Universal Self or the pseudo-universal Not-Self, and if it were possible to really separate them, then it would be perfectly correct to say that *jñāna-ichchha-kriyā*, or rather their root-principles, *chit-ānanda-saṭ*, belong exclusively to Self; and *guṇa-karma-ḍravya*, or rather their root-principles, *saṭṭva-rajas-tamas*, belong exclusively to Not-Self. But we are now in the domain of the limited and the particular, and are dealing not with abstract *Pratyag-ātmā* and pseudo-abstract *Mūla-prakṛti*, but with limited, separate, selves and not-selves; and it has been amply shown in the last two chapters that a limited self (soul) means a composite of Self and Not-Self, a *jīva*-atom, wherein the *jīva*-aspect is predominant; while a limited not-self (body) equally means a composite of Self and Not-Self, but a composite in which the atom-aspect is predominant. The consequence of this is that we find both triplets of attributes present in every such composite, although of course one triplet always preponderates over the other, thereby giving rise to the distinction between animate and inanimate.

Thus it comes about that each separate not-self, being ensouled by a self, and therefore being a pseudo-self, assumes, by the connection of identity with the universal Self, the characteristics of the latter; and this assumption takes on the form of a pseudo-infinite endeavour to find, and therefore to spread and impose,

itself on everything, everywhere, and al(l)-ways.¹ Hence a pseudo-infinite radiation, by vibration, of each and every not-self, that is to say, of each and every piece or mass whatsoever of Mūla-prakṛti, out of the pseudo-infinite permutations and combinations of all possible sizes of such pieces or masses, to which it is at all possible to apply the adjectives 'each' and 'every'. In other words, each and every not-self is endeavouring pseudo-infinitely to reproduce itself and fill infinity with its own form; as is now nearly established even by physical science, in the doctrine of the incessant and endless radiation and mutual registration by all objects of their own and of all others' pictures of all qualities whatsoever, sights, sounds, smells, etc.; and this is the *action* of the not-selves, upon the selves, which action, *in* the selves, appears as cognition.²

¹ The supplement to this fact is that each separate self or soul, being em-bodi-ed by a not-self, endeavours similarly to 'radiate', 'propagate', 'spread', 'impose upon all others', its own notions, thoughts, ideas, views, knowledg-es, feelings, tastes, interests, likes and dislikes, vōlition, willings, enterprises, activities.

² In this fact, with its 'physical' and 'superphysical' implications, *i.e.*, its working in the grosser and subtler planes of matter, may be found the reason why 'every secret must out,' some time or other to some one else, if not to the general public, for 'murder' does not always 'out', to even the cleverest police; and also why, while a secret is being kept, for that time it makes the inner body stronger and fuller, whence we have such facts, observations, and injunctions as these: vows of silence make the inner life of the mind richer, promote and strengthen thought, just as restraint of expenditure increases the treasury-balance, or sex-continenence enhances vigour of body and mind and intensifies feeling; certain people do not find life worth living unless they have a secret to keep; they revel in mysteriousness; others find pleasure in leading 'double' lives, stolen joys being sweeter to them; the names of the ishta-dēva, the worshipped god, the venerated preceptor, the parents, the spouse, the children, in short all those specially near and dear and

This reproduction, it is obvious, takes place literally. When we see an object, the picture of the object is imprinted on our eye, on the retina; that is to say, the retina (or the purpurin, with which, as the latest researches go to show, the retina is covered) takes on, becomes modified into, the very shape of the object seen; and the eye is, in the life of the physical plane, veritably the very ego that sees. In the moment of seeing with the physical eye, it is impossible to say: 'My eye sees and not I.' What is invariably said and meant is: '*I see.*' The I and the organ of vision are here literally

honoured, must not be lightly taken, for relations with the bearers of those names belong to the life of the heart, and avoidance of levity and flippancy with regard to them strengthens and develops the higher nature and the *sūkshma-sharīra*. Another and more obvious psychological reason for avoiding, in unsympathetic company, the mention, with too much unction, of the objects of one's love and devotion, is, that it only too often arouses ridicule, or jealousy, or anger and counter statements of the greater merits of other's; witness, sectarians' quarrels. It has to be remembered that in all these cases the secrecy, the silence, the restraint, are effective for their purpose only up to a certain extent. Carried to excess, they fail and cause harm. They must come to an end, some time, by the metaphysical laws of nature; they should be brought to an end, periodically, wisely, scientifically, for greater good.

It should be noted that, not all secrets, being kept, make the inner body stronger in the healthy and pleasant sense. Sins committed or helplessly suffered by oneself (as by the victims of sex-violence), or even simply seen being committed by others, if kept, weigh upon the soul, oppress it grievously, suffocatingly, often drive it mad. Such phenomena have been investigated by psycho-analysts with useful (also harmful) results. But even in these cases, the general observation holds true that 'the inner body becomes stronger and fuller'; only, it becomes such, in the painful sense; not the pleasurable. Pain intensifies and prolongs the consciousness. The tongue keeps working round the fibre sticking between the teeth; the mind keeps working round the painful secret sticking between its normal functionings; the emotions concerned are deepened. In case of excess, either of pleasure or pain, disintegration of the body may happen, and does happen; in the case of pain, very frequently.

identical for all purposes.¹ It is the same with every other sense. The immediate reason of this is that while, in the converse case, the *activity* of the apparent not-self is due to its hiding a self within, in this case the *shapability*, which is cognition, of every self, is due to its hiding within a not-self, a sheath, an upāḍhi. As in the one case the not-self strives to achieve infinity in pseudo-infinite reproduction, because of having become identified with a self, and therefore *the* universal Self; so, in this case, the Self becomes limited and reflective, because of having become identified with a not-self.

In order that Self and Not-Self, so entirely opposed to each other, should enter into dealings with each other, it is necessary that each should assume the characteristics of the other, and so, abating their opposition, making a compromise, come nearer to each other. The interchange of substance between nucleus and protoplasm is a good illustration.² In this fact we see before us the principle of the genesis of upāḍhis, sheaths, organisms, and organs of sense and action. The ego *becomes* (of course, illusorily and apparently, and for the time being) the organ of sense or action, in order to perceive the sense-able or act upon it. 'The Ātmā who knows (*i.e.*, who is feeling the stress

¹ स प्राणश्चैव प्राणो नाम भवति, वदन् वाक्, पश्यंश्चक्षुः, शृण्वन् श्रोत्रं, मन्वानो मनः; अस्य एतानि कर्मनामानि । *Bṛhad-āraṇyaka*, I, iv. 7: 'Breathing, It becomes that which is named prāṇa-breath; speaking, voice; seeing, eye; hearing, ear; mentating, mind; such are its functional names; functionings of the self are named faculties'. In other words, functions create organs; not organs, functions.

² Verworn, *General Physiology*, p. 518.

of the consciousness) 'may I smell this,' *becomes* or *is* the nose (the organ of smell), for the sake of (experiencing) odour.'¹

Such is the metaphysical significance of the organs of sense and action. They are the very *jīva* for the time. The *jīva* is identified with them entirely while they are working. For there is no sufficient reason for a distinct and separate *third* something, an instrument of mediation, not only a relation but a thing, between the only two factors of the World-Process, Self, on the one side, and Not-Self, on the other.² That they are at all distinguished as *karana*,³ 'instruments,' is only from the standpoint of the abstract Self.

The metaphysical significance of sense-media, odorous particles, saliva, light, air, ether, etc., is similar.⁴ The

¹ *Chhandogya-Upaniṣaṭ*, VIII, xii, 4-5.

² The words 'distinct and separate' should be noted; for if we remove this condition, then we do have a pseudo-infinity of planes or grades of density-subtlety of Matter, each of which may be said to link together a next denser with a next subtler.

³ कर्ण.

⁴ The Nyāya system has a theory that (as in the case of saliva) rays of light, proceeding from the organ of vision to its object, assume the shape of that object, and returning to the eye, produce vision; the modern scientific view is that the rays go from the object to the eye. The Greek philosophers also believed in an "*effluvium*" or "*eidolon*," acting as a *tertium quid* to make possible the approach between the opposed subject and object. We speak of 'bright eyes' and 'dull lacklustre eyes'; feline eyes shine in the dark. That light is a substance amenable to the section of gravitation, has been much discussed by Einstein and others, since deflections of rays from stars were observed during a solar eclipse in May, 1919. A dry tongue or nose cannot taste or smell. Saliva is the overflow of 'self' and the enveloping of a 'not-self' with 'self'; and transforming the 'not-self' into 'self' and absorbing and as-*simila*-ting it with 'self'; hence salivation is necessary to digestion. The same considerations apply to the other senses and their objects.

systematic and psychologically consistent names for these media, in Saṃskṛt, whatever their exact nature may be ultimately determined to be, are pṛthivī (earth) for the medium of odour, āpas or jalam (water) for taste, tējas or agni (fire) for vision, vāyu (air) for touch, and ākāsha (ether) for sound. These media are, according to Vēdānta, the five pervasive root-elements, taṭṭva-s or mahā-bhūta-s—and not the compounds we live amidst—distinguished and defined radically by their special *sensuous* and *active* qualities, which are said to go in pairs; thus, sound and speech with ear and vocal organ belong to ākāsha; vision and figure (-and-color-) formation with eye and hands belong to agni; and so forth.¹ And their agency, to secure communion between organ and sense-object, is metaphysically necessitated, in order, by the fact of diffusion through space, to give to the sense-object the semblance of the Universal Self, which reaches and includes all and is within the reach of all. This pervasion, which, metaphysically, is pseudo-infinite in extent, is actually reproduced in the fact that each brahm-āṇḍa, 'great-egg,' 'egg of the Infinite,' world-system or macrocosm, is pervaded by one individuality; just as each pind-āṇḍa, microcosm, a human organism, is pervaded by one individuality. The vast masses of the root-elements that serve as the sense-media of the organisms inhabiting our

¹ In the human kingdom, ear as sensor and voice as motor, and eye as sensor and finger as motor, are best developed; writing, formation of visible letter-figures is done by the fingers. Ants and some other kinds of insects seem to communicate by touch and antennae; dogs and certain moths, by smell.

brahm-āṇḍa, for instance, constitute, in their totality, the *body* of the Ishvara who *is* the brahm-āṇḍa; the unity of his individuality brings together our senses and sense-objects in these sense-media; while he himself is but as an infinitesimal jīva in a vaster brahm-āṇḍa, a sidereal system in which our solar system is as a grain of sand in a solar system; and so on pseudo-infinitely. This is why Ishvaras are also called vi-bhu, 'pervading.'¹ It is only the principle of overlapping individualities, in another view. Later on there may appear more on this point, *viz.*, how communion between two *separate* things, subject and object, in the way of cognition, desire, and action, is possible, and takes place only because the two are also *one*, since both of them are part of a higher individuality, a larger subject.²

The remarks made in the preceding chapter as to the pseudo-infinite series of involucra of the jīva, one within another, should be recalled in this connection. Taking the case of vision, for instance, we find as the first step, that the act of seeing means the picturing of the object seen on the retina, which at that stage is for

¹ वि-भु.

² भूतैर्यदा पञ्चभिरात्मसृष्टेः पुरं विराजं विरचय्य, तस्मिन्

स्वांशेन विष्टः, पुरुषाभिधानं अवाप नारायण आदिदेवः ।

यत्काय एष भुवनत्रयसंनिवेशो, यस्यैन्द्रियैस्तनुभृतां उभयैर्द्रियाणि,

ज्ञानं स्वतः, श्रसनतो बलं ओज ईहा, सत्त्वादिभिः स्थितिलयोद्भव, आदिकर्ता ।

Bhāgavata, XI, iv, 3, 4.

'He who is the Beginning of All, having ideated a Frame, made of five elements, entered into it, and became the Fountain of n a r a - s.

all purposes identical with, and is, the seer. But analysing further, we find that, in the human being, the act of vision is by no means completed with this picturing on the retina. Vibrations of nerves convey the picture to a further centre in the brain—not yet quite definitely determined, it seems, by physiological investigations. Physical research leaves the matter here for the present. But metaphysic deduces, as an inference from the inseparable 'conjunction of *ḍravya-guṇa-karma*, that, whatever that brain-centre might be ultimately decided to be, it will be found that just as the vibrations and particles of the outer visible object, transmitted through the 'ether', (or whatever other element may finally be determined to be the medium of light, and however it may be named, the *Samskṛt* name being *tejas*, as said before), make a picture of that object on the retina, so the retinal picture, which has now in turn become 'the outer visible object' to the more-inward-receded *jīva*, is transmitted in still more minute particles, by

humans, *jīvas*; therefore he is named *Nār-āyapa*. All this triple world-system is His Body; all the sensors' and motors of all beings are derived from His, are parts of His; His self-consciousness is all Knowledge, His Breath is all Energy-Desire, which creates-maintains-destroys': pantheism in a fresh aspect. Berkeley also has seen and said that the perceptions of individuals are only participations in the perceptions of the Universal Ego. The name Kavi, Poet, Dramatist, Author, is especially appropriate for *Brahmā*. The 'perceptions', experiences, sayings, doings, of every character in a drama, are all only 'participations' in the Ideation of the Author; all ideas are parts of the One Universal Ideation. Great public movements, enthusiasms, panics, are participations in the ideas, ideals, feelings, views, sentiments of one (or more, but *uni*-ted) leader (or leaders), with sufficient intensity of will and feeling (*tapasyā*, divine force, hot and glowing will). Epidemics, *Yuga-dharma*, *Kāla-dharma*, Time-spirit, *Zeit-geist*—indicate the same fact.

nerve-vibrations, to a corresponding subtler organ or brain-centre which is now masquerading as the seer in place of the eye, in the present condition of organisms. And further research will show the process repeated preudo-infinitely inwards, taking the sheath into subtler, and ever subtler planes of matter.

But while this series of sheaths, one within another, is theoretically pseudo-infinite, in practice and as a matter of fact—if we take any organism, in any one cycle of space and time—we shall necessarily find that it consists of only a limited and countable number of such sheaths, with one unanalysable core; the very filmiest of films it may be, but unanalysable any further, for the time being; and in that cycle, this core represents, and for all purposes is, the very self of the jīva. From another and higher standpoint, embracing a wider cycle of space and time, that film will also be analysable, and be seen to be not the innermost core but only an outer sheath, hiding within itself another core, *which* will *then* be irreducible. Evidence of this we find even physically, in comparing the earliest available unicellular organisms of our terrene life and evolution, with the latest most complex ones. In the human being, the brain with its centres takes the place of Self, and is the main seat of consciousness (from the standpoint of physiology), but is hedged round and overlaid with numbers of other parts of the body, nerves, ganglia, senses, etc., through which only it can be reached. In the unicellular organism the nucleus is

probably the centre of consciousness,¹ and is, as it were, all the brain; the sense organs, etc., in one; in its case, the jīva has not yet learnt to make the distinction—involved in the expressions, 'my eyes,' 'my ears'—between the jīva (identified with the brain as centre of consciousness) and its sense-instruments; and hence it has got no centre of consciousness which may be separate from sense-instruments. But when the consciousness begins to make such distinction, the nucleus at once resolves into a subtler core (apparently, but not yet positively determined to be, the nucleolus) with different parts wrapping it round; and under the continuing stress of the individualised consciousness, there appears the progressive development and differentiation of functions and instruments which is called evolution.

It should be noted here that the expression 'my brain' has not the same significance as 'my eyes' and 'my hands'.² Of course it has a certain meaning, but the consciousness of my brain being distinct and different from me is by no means so definite, full, and clear in the ordinary man, as is the consciousness of the eyes and the hands being thus different and distinct. The expression gains fuller and fuller significance as the 'I' retreats further and further inwards, and is able to separate itself more and more actually from the physical body. 'My clothes' has a much fuller and clearer meaning than

¹ Verworn, *General Physiology*, p. 508.

² The ashvatṭha-tree, with its roots above and its branches below, spoken of in the *Bhagavad-Gītā*, xv, 1, probably means the nervous system of man, also, besides other things; brain above, nerves below.

'my hands and feet'; 'my hands and feet' has a much clearer and fuller meaning than 'my brain'. 'My sūkshma sharīra,' 'my kāraṇa sharīra,' 'my soul,' are practically (but not theoretically) meaningless in the mouths [of people who have never, succeeded, by means of yoga, in separating them from the outer physical body. To advanced souls, who *have* succeeded in doing so, 'my brain' has a meaning as definite as 'my shirt'.¹

This development of the complex from the simple, this opening up of separated individual consciousness through layer into inner layer, this gradual growth of nerve within nerve and instrument within instrument, this definition of body within body, this multiplication of the means to the simple ends or rather the one end, this 'long-circuiting' of the satisfaction of the elemental appetites of life or rather of the one appetite of Self-realisation—constitutes the evolution of the individual, from the standpoint of limited cycles.² To take a fanciful

¹ See *The Mahatma Letters*, p. 259. Master K. H. has gone into samādhi-trance, for three months (in 1882) in search of "supreme knowledge". Master M. has promised to him to carry on his theosophical work and correspondence with Sinnett and Hume. In the course of a letter to the former, Master M. says: "I may as well occupy a few minutes of my time to write to you in *the best English I find lying idle in my friend's brain*; where also I find in the cells of memory, the phosphorescent thought of a short letter, to be sent by himself." Master M. says that his own knowledge of English is not so good as Master K. H.'s; but the reader can scarcely think so; of course the style is very different.

² 'Long-circuiting' is a very significant word, coined in 'the science and art' if electricity. The whole World-Process is a long-circuiting of the simple Relation between I and Not-I. Commentaries and critical expositions and illustrations are the long-circuiting of the meaning of aphorisms and maxims.

illustration: it is as if we should, to increase the power and range and minuteness of our vision, first put on a pair of spectacles, then add a telescope, and over that a microscope, and so on indefinitely. In this imaginary illustration the additions are outwards. In evolution, by deliberate yoga, on the *nivṛṭṭi-mārga*, 're-turn or re-ascent into Spirit', they would be inwards, a retreating within into subtler and subtler planes of matter; on the *pravṛṭṭi-mārga*, 'descent into Matter', they would be outwards too, each self taking on denser and denser veils of matter to enjoy the experiences of a greater and greater (seeming) definition of itself—'I (am) *this*,' I (am) *this*'. From the standpoint of the Absolute, on the other hand, all cycles and all evolution, all functions, all instruments, and all functionings and actual workings of them, on all possible planes of matter, are ever completely present in the transcendent consciousness: "I—This—Not (am)."

Thus we come back again and again to the fact of an endless series of plane within plane of matter, all permeated and pervaded by the consciousness in its triple aspect of *jñāna ichchhā, kriyā*. "Veil upon veil will lift, but there must be veil upon veil behind." Let us see now how these pseudo-infinite planes of matter can be co-ordinated and brought into organic unity with each other. Co-ordinated in fact they must be; for the *états*, 'this-es'—separate in their pseudo-infinity though they are by very constitution—are not and cannot be mutually entirely oblivious and independent, when the

thread of the One Self runs through them all, and strings them together like beads.

Different planes of matter, though separate from, and, from one standpoint, independent of, each other to such an extent that they may even seem to violate the axioms of geometry, cannot escape these axioms altogether. As usual, we have disorder as well as order, negation as well as affirmation, defiance of law and yet submission thereto, here as well as elsewhere. Consciousness *appears* to transcend mathematical laws; but it is only the Universal Consciousness of Praṭyag-ātmā that can at all be said to do so, and this too only when it is considered as a whole, comprehending and *at the same time* negating the whole of Mūla-prakṛti.¹ Otherwise, it itself is the source and the embodiment of that unity, uniformity, regularity in diversity, the fact or brief description of which uniformity is called a law, and which appears when Self is intermingled with Mūla-prakṛti (as it always is), under the changeless stress of Absolute-Consciousness, Brahma. Limited individual consciousnesses are inseparably connected with limited 'this-es'; hence they can never actually transcend those

¹ It is only in respect of this one Supreme 'self-contradictory' *fact* that Metaphysics transcends, is beyond, Mathematics. But this one fact has important consequences and corollaries, which, for practical purposes, connect metaphysics more nearly, as it were, with the psychological, ethical, logical, and biological sciences, than with mathematics and the physico-chemical sciences; though, strictly, metaphysics, as repeatedly said, is equally connected with all sciences and coordinates them all. Mathematics deals with space, time, energy-motion, taking its start from certain purely metaphysical notions, as pointed out before. Metaphysics deals with these as well as with their Abolition, their Opposite, the Infinite Here, the Eternal Now, the utterly Motionless Self, full of Perfect Rest and unshakeable Peace.

laws. That they *appear* to do so from some standpoints, is due to their identity with Praṭyag-ātmā. The world of the lower astral plane, whose normal inhabitants are said to be yakshas, gandharvas, kinnaras, nāgas, kūshmandas, gnomes, undines, fairies, and such other nature-spirits, with bodies made of the same or similar 'stuff,' 'mind-stuff,' as our grosser dreams and mental images, may *seem* literally to 'occupy the same space' as the physical world, whose normal inhabitants are humans, animals, plants, minerals, etc. But this is not *really* so. The facts available point to the conclusion that as soon as the human develops the body and the instruments which enable him to begin to live consciously in the astral world as he does in the physical, he sees that the two worlds, at the most, *interpenetrate*, as sand and water, or water and air, and do not actually and literally occupy the same space. In other words, planes of matter, that appear utterly disconnected from the standpoint of individual consciousnesses limited to each plane, become only *grades of density* of matter from the standpoint of a consciousness that includes all of them.

This thought may now be expanded as follows :

The simile used above, of thread and beads, illustrates the fact of order amidst disorder, and also covers another fact which is essential in the work of co-ordination. In the chaplet, each bead touches but two others, one on each side, and not more than two; and so too we find that Saṃsāra, World-Process, is triple,

tribhuvanam, trai-lokyam,¹ whenever and wherever we take it. This fact, that it is always a triple world, whenever and wherever we take it, gives the *method* of the co-ordination ; for each factor of each such triplet is also concurrently connected with two other triplets ; and as this connection extends pseudo-infinitely, it results that all possible planes are ringed together always. Thus taking the three planes of our world-system, *viz.*, s̥hūla, sūkshma, and kāraṇa² (roughly corresponding to physical, astro-mental, and causal, of theosophical literature) and naming them F, G, and H, we should find, on research, that F is simultaneously connected with three triplets, D E F, E F G, and F G H ; so G with E F G, F G H and G H I ; so H with F G H, G H I and H I J ; and taking any of these triplets, say H I J, the mutual relation of these three would be found to be the same as that of F G H ; that is to say, to a jīva to whom J represented the physical, I would represent the astro-mental, and H the kāraṇa plane. And this series of triplets extends endlessly before D and after J.

Before passing on to the reason of this state of things, it may be well to note that the interpretation of tribhuvanam, 'triple world,' or 'three worlds,' advanced here, is not exactly what is commonly understood by the word, just as the inmost meaning of the sacred word, AUM, is not what is commonly given. Yet there is no conflict or inconsistency between the two interpretations.

¹ त्रिभुवनम्, त्रैलोक्यम्.

² स्थूल ; सूक्ष्म ; कारण.

On the contrary, the other interpretations all follow necessarily from the inmost one. Students wonder now and then how it is that resemblances occur in different departments of nature; and when it is said that one and the same statement may be interpreted in many ways, each correct and each applying to one class and one department of phenomena, sober people generally suspect some sleight-of-hand. As a fact, a statement of a true principle of nature, concerning one of the Ultimates, or rather, strictly speaking, Penultimates, naturally applies to all the different series of phenomena derived from and constantly embodying those penultimates; and the wonder may as well be, how there is difference between part and part of nature, as how there is resemblance. Mūla-prakṛti explains the difference; Praṭyag-ātmā the resemblance.¹ The law of analogy,

¹ The Unity of Self as Omni-present, is the reason, the cause, of whatever uni-formity, similarity, analogy, we find anywhere and everywhere. It is the real reason for the *certainty* felt in induction, otherwise utterly fallible. 'Once, therefore always'; 'as in one place, so in all places.' The older Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika gives the reason of *vyāpti-graha*, 'ap-prehension of pervasiveness', *i.e.*, 'inductive generalisation', as being *pratyaksha*, 'direct perception' of *jāti*, 'genus', *together* with *vyākṛti*, 'the particular', because of *samavāya*; 'co-inherence', inseparability, of 'particular' or 'singular' or 'individual' and 'general' or 'universal'. The new Nyāya calls the same fact or process, by the name of *praty-āsaṭṭi*. Max Muller, in his *Six Systems of Indian Philosophy*, has recognised that the very important category of *samavāya* "is one peculiar to Indian philosophy", and "though this relationship is known in non-Indian philosophies, it has not received a name of its own, though such a term might have proved very useful in several controversies. The relation between thought and word" (वाग् अर्थो) "f.i., is *Samavāya*, inseparableness. . . . There is *Samavāya* between threads and cloth, father and son, two halves and a whole, cause and effect, substance and qualities, the two being interdependent and inseparable"; (see pages referred to, against the word '*Samavāya*' in the Index to Max Muller's book).

'as above so below,' *s a m a-ḍ a r s h i ṭ ā*, 'same-sightedness', 'same-seeing-ness', is capable of a far wider and truer application than is now charily given to it; and it provides the reason of the existence of allegories and parables, in which there is as much literal fact as metaphor. Because of this universal applicability of basic laws, *ṭri-bhuvanam*, 'triple world', when it means only three different but interconnected worlds or planes of matter, according to the ordinary explanation of the word, means something which is the necessary result of the metaphysical triplicity of all the life of united *jīva* and atom, *i.e.*, of the *jīva*-atom. In this metaphysical triplicity, which is the inmost meaning of *ṭri-bhuvanam*, lies the reason for the state of things described in the preceding paragraph.

Everywhere we find the world and the things of the world divided into an inner and an outer, a core and a sheath, and a third something, a principle, a relation, rather than a fact or factor, binding and holding these two together. This is due to the very constitution of the Absolute as shown in the Logion, *viz.*, an inner Self, an outer Not-Self, and the third something, the affirmative-negative *Shakti*, which ties the two together indissolubly, and yet is not a third strictly, but only a repetition of the positivity, the being, of Self, and of the negativity, the nothingness, of Not-Self. So we find, in the department of consciousness taken by itself, an outer or real world, and an inner or ideal world, and a third something, the abstract consciousness, or

self-consciousness, or apperception, or pure and abstract reason, as it has been variously named, holding the two together. This pure or abstract reason is the embodiment and source, as said before, of all abstract laws and principles, which are but forms of this Self-Consciousness in its relations to the objects by means of which it may be realising itself at the time.

‘I see this book before me’—this consciousness is a consciousness of the ‘real’, the ‘outer,’ world. ‘I remember the book, in memory; I have thoughts about it, *i.e.*, I call up mental pictures of the book in relation to other things, its author, country, press, people, in which and by whom it was printed, published, and criticised; of other books on the same subject which have been written in other times and places; of the whole history of the gradual growth of learning on the subject treated of in the book, and the causes thereof, etc.,’—these are facts of the inner, the ideal world. Lastly there is the consciousness (corresponding to the Absolute) which joins together and connects, in my own self, these two sets of facts, those belonging to the ‘Me’ and those to the ‘Not-me,’ and weaves them into the one process of my life. That the thread of Self through the beads of Not-Self is, or appears as, *buḍḍhi*, laws, principles, apperception, self-consciousness, etc., may become clearer if the matter is considered thus: ‘I know and wish and act, and *I know*’ *that* I know and wish and act’—this is

¹ Or, better, ‘I am aware that I know and wish and act,’ for to say I ‘*know*’ instead of ‘*am aware*,’ seems to make the element of knowledge or cognition more essential to Self-Consciousness than the elements

self-consciousness. 'I am aware also that I knew and wished and acted before, and shall know and wish and act afterwards, in *the same* way, when the circumstances are *the same*'—this is the same self-consciousness modified into reason, ratio-cination, ratio-nality, perception of the *ratio*, relation, of sameness, of similarity, amongst not-selves, because of the *persistence and sameness*, through past, present, and future, of Self. 'Such an experience, knowledge, desire, or action, is *always* followed by such another'—this is the same self-consciousness modified into and stated as a law, a principle.

How and why does this state of things come about? Why is there an outer world and inner world? How does this distinction between the ideal and the real, ideas and realities, arise at all, and what is the distinction between them precisely? ¹

of desire and conation or action, which is against fact. Samskr̥t words corresponding to apperception, etc., are *anu-vyavasāya*, *pratīyānupa-shyaṭā*, *buddhi-boḍha*, *nija-boḍha*, *ātmā-nubhava*, *sākshiṭā*, *upa-ḍraśṭri-ṭā*, etc.

¹ Self has been regarded above as linking up (by containing within itself, both) the ideal and the real, inner and outer, within and without, *i.e.*, mental and material. A simpler and perhaps practically more useful way is to say that 'mind' is the link between Self or Spirit and Not-Self or Matter. In Mind, both are present; and all the Interplay of Spirit and Matter, 'past, present, and future', is *present* in Mind. The present *is*, is existent; the past *was*; but *is not*; the future *will be*, but *is not*. The present is the only *real*; it emphatically *is*. What we see around us, what we are, at any given moment, carries with it an intense convincingness of actuality, factness, reality, existence. Yet the passing of a year, a day, even a simple catastrophic moment, abolishes all that intense reality, and converts it into a *dream* of the past; and that too a more or less quickly *fading* dream! From the metaphysical standpoint, therefore, the present is the only and the most *un-real*; because obviously evanescent, moment by moment. From that standpoint, *past* and *future* may be said to be far more real, or even the only real, because *permanently present* in the Supra-Conscious of God's Memory. To that Memory, all the

For answer we have to refer back to the principle which is always turning up on every side under every complication of phenomena, when that complication is sifted. *Pratyag-ātmā* is the unbroken continuity of the One. *Mūla-prakṛti*, on the other hand, is the utterly discontinuous brokenness and separateness of the many. The two have nothing in common with each other; in fact they are ever and at every point entirely opposed to each other. Yet they are violently brought together into inviolable relation by the might of the Absolute-Svabhāva, the Changeless Nature of the Absolute. The reconciliation of these warring principles, each equally invincible, necessitates the further principle of 'continuity in discreteness,' whereby each discrete thing is in turn a thread of continuity to even more minutely discreted things and lower subdivisions; and, conversely, each thread of continuity is in turn a discrete and subdivisional item in a higher thread of continuity—and this endlessly. This principle applies to the constitution of a so-called atom as also of solar systems, which include smaller systems and form part of larger ones in a series that is

Procession and Panorama of the whole Universe of all possible and actual stars and systems, is an Eternal Now. Thus, what is *real* from the empirical standpoint, becomes *un-real*, or Ideal, from the metaphysical or transcendental standpoint; and *vice versa*. The finite passing moment is most intensely real to the finitised or individualised jīva; the in-finite contents of *Mahat-Buddhi*, *Supra-Consciousness*, *Universal Mind*, are the most intensely real to the Infinite Self. The jīva grips the Finite with one hand, and embraces the *In-Finite* with the other—whence arises the assurance of 'personal immortality', *jīvan-mukṭi*; feet on earth, head among stars; nest in tree, flight in empyrean; some mechanical occupation, even so-called 'drudgery,' for livelihood of body, and poetry, science, art, *yoga-siddhis*, religion-philosophy, for livelihood of soul.

endless either way; and it underlies the continuously overlapping series of individuals within individuals which make up the jīva-half of the World-Process.

This same principle, applied to the psychic half of Samsāra, that is to say to consciousness; and even there to the cognitional element specially (in connection with which it is most manifest); explains why there should be two worlds to consciousness, an ideal and a real, memory and sensation, and a third something holding the two together. The application may become clear if we endeavour to understand in a little more detail what is the significance of memory and other allied psychological processes, and how and why they come into existence.

The Absolute may be correctly described as an eternal sensation in which the Universal Self, in one single act of consciousness senses the non-existence of Not-Self; that is to say, of all possible pseudo-infinite not-selves in all the three divisions of time—past, present, and future; of space—length, breadth, and depth; of motion—approach, recess, and rhythmic vibration. Now each separate individual jīva or self, out of the whole mass of pseudo-infinite jīvas or selves, (the totality of which is unified in and by Praṭyag-ātmā), must also necessarily reproduce in itself this one single act of consciousness, this truly unique sensation, this all-embracing, all-exhausting experience, by reason of its identity with the universal Self; yet it is impossible also for it to do so, because of its limitedness. The reconciliation of these

opposed necessities gives rise to the ideal world in which we can 'look before and after' *simultaneously* (comparatively only), as distinguished from the real world in which we can have only one sensation at a time (again only comparatively), *successively*.

Thus, to begin with, the individual self requires two acts of consciousness to sense the non-existence of a single not-self. It cannot compass this in one act, like the universal Self. It must *first* sense the *existence*, and *then* sense the *non-existence* of that not-self. In the second place, it has to deal with pseudo-infinite not-selves; it can sense them all only in, so to say, twice pseudo-infinite acts of consciousness, which means, in other words, in endless acts of consciousness, extending through endless time, endless space, endless motion. Confining ourselves for the moment to the case of one self dealing with one not-self, we see that that self first senses and asserts the existence of that not-self (as identical with itself), and secondly senses and asserts the non-existence of that 'same' not-self (as non-identical with itself). The word 'same' here embodies what we know as 'memory.' The imposition of continuity on an ever-changing not-self by a self, in consequence and by virtue of its own continuity, is *memory* of that not-self. Putting the matter in another form, while all the possible past, present, and future of the World-Process is completely and simultaneously *present* in the consciousness of Pratyag-ātmā, it unfolds, as a māyāvic or illusive *appearance* of *procession*, only gradually and in succession, in

the actual life of the individual ; and the constant participation of the individual self, in the omniscience latent and ever-present in Praṭyag-ātmā, constitutes the inner ideal world of so-called sub-consciousness or supra-consciousness, mahat or mahān-ātmā or buddhi, whence arise memory and expectation and derivative mental processes.¹ Consider, in this connection, the fact that, even in ordinary usage, the word 'present' never means an imaginary point of time, dividing, as with a razor, the past from the present, but always a *period*, 'a slab or chunk of time', so to say ; thus, 'at the present time,' 'at present,' 'in this present life,' 'the present circumstances', etc.² So, 'the past', the 'future', also, ordinarily, in common usage, mean more or less definite periods, 'blocks or pieces' of time, ages, epochs ; thus : 'the future of this nation', 'the past of that person'.

The above statement is, however, not complete by itself.

Firstly : if the separate self can freely participate in the omniscience of Praṭyag-ātmā, how is it that our recollection and our prevision are so very limited, so very erroneous ? Not one in a million can remember or forecast any facts behind and beyond this present birth ; and even the facts of the present life are but very imperfectly

¹ स्मरणं तु आत्मनो ज्ञ-स्वाभाव्यात् । *Nyāya-sūtra*, III, ii, 42.

² 'Recollection (is possible) because of the all-knowing nature of the Self.' Compare Ward's views as to memory-continuum (Art. 'Psychology,' *Enc. Brit.*, 11th Ed.)

³ See p. 316 *supra*, and, *The Secret Doctrine* I, 110, 116 (Adyar edn.)

remembered and pre-vised. The answer to this is that while, metaphysically, this continuity of memory and expectation in the individual self is derived from the consciousness of Praṭyag-ātmā, practically and actually it is derived from the consciousness of the individual of the next higher order,¹ the Īshvara as Sūtrātmā, just as in the case of the connecting unity of sense-media; whence limitations. And as to the positive errors and forgettings within those limitations, they are due to the general causes which make knowledge and ignorance, recollection and forgetfulness, truth and error, possible, nay, necessary, in the World-Process at large; these causes have been indicated above (pp. 404-405) in dealing with the sub-divisions of cognition.

Secondly (and this is more relevant to our present purpose), there is the difference between the *possibility* of participation and *actual* participation. As soon as there is a positive act of memory, or positive act of prevision or expectation, it becomes distinct from the *possibility* of such recollection and prevision.² One piece, so to say, of the latent has become patent, and the general latency remains a latency as ever before. And all this while, from the standpoint of the Absolute, there

¹ See pp. 347-348 *supra*, for the significance of the expression, 'the next higher individual'. Also *Bhāgavata*, XI, iv, 4, यस्यैन्द्रियेस्तनुमृता-मुभयेन्द्रियाणि, p. 325 *supra*.

² Buddhi and Manas; Total (Collective or Universal and sub-supra-), Un-Conscious and Conscious (with its degrees of pro-, fore-, co-Conscious etc.); Avyakṭam or Unmanifest and Vyakṭam or Manifest; Abstract and Concrete; General and Special; Universal and Particular; all these pairs indicate aspects of the same Fact.

is no difference at all between latency and patency ; for, in the Absolute, all things which are limited, and can be distinguished, are exactly on the same level of *état*-‘ this ’ in the same way, and not one within or higher or lower than, or in any way different from, another. The solution of these inconsistencies is that what is latent to one is also patent to it in turn, and simultaneously to others, while what is patent to one is also latent to it in turn, and simultaneously to others ; and thus the equality of all is brought about, all existing simultaneously from the standpoint of the Absolute, all serving as latent and patent, ideal and real, one within another, at the same time. A hundred sculptors see a hundred different statues in the same block of marble simultaneously. The facts of physical science, *re* infinite registration by each atom of all sights, sounds, etc., are helpful for understanding, here.

We may further illustrate the fact thus. If a spectator wandered unrestingly through the halls of a vast museum, a great art-gallery, at the dead of night, with a single small lamp in one hand, each of the natural objects, the pictured scenes, the statues, the portraits, would be illumined by that lamp, in succession, for a single moment, while all the rest were in darkness, and after that single moment, would itself fall into darkness again. Let there now be not one but countless such spectators, as many in innumerable number as the objects of sight within the place, each spectator meandering in and out incessantly through the great crowd of all others, each

lamp bringing momentarily into light one object, and for only that spectator who holds that lamp. This immense and unmoving building is the rockbound ideation of the changeless Absolute. Each lamp-carrying spectator, in the countless crowd, is one line of consciousness in the pseudo-infinite lines of such that make up the totality of the One Universal Consciousness. Each coming into light of each object is its patency, is an experience of the *jīva*; each falling into darkness is its lapse into the latent. From the standpoint of the objects themselves, or of the universal consciousness, there is no latency, nor patency. From that of the lines of consciousness, there is. Why there is this *appearance* of lines of consciousness should be clear from all that has gone before.¹

We see then that whenever and wherever we take the World-Process, we shall find it to consist of an outer plane of grosser matter which corresponds to and makes up the 'real' world, the patent, and an inner plane of subtler which makes up the 'ideal' world, corresponding to the latent. At each stage, the *jīva*-core consists of *matter* of the inner plane, while its outer *upādhi*, sheath, consists of matter of the outer plane; and when a person says: 'I think,' 'I act,' it means that the matter

¹ For other illustrations, see p. 232 *supra* and *World-War and Its Only Cure*, pp. 411-413 f.n., Each lamp, each point of light, each *jīva*, in the illustration above, is a focus of the Diffused Continuum of Light, *viz.*, Universal Consciousness. Focussing does not mean *complete* concentration of *all* the Light in one point—an obvious impossibility. It only means a *comparative* (and that too, only *illusory*) intensification in one place, and slight reduction in the neighbourhood. W. James' phrase, 'the hot point of consciousness,' is very good. Every act of *attention* creates such a hot point.

of the inner core, which is the 'I' for the time being, is actually, positively, modified by, or is itself modifying in a certain manner, the outer real world, literally in the same *kind* of way, though vastly subtler, as a glass may reflect an image, or a compressed wire-spring may push back the object which compresses it. The *ideality* of the inner processes is due to the fact that the inner film of matter is *posing* and *masquerading*, for the time, as the truly *immaterial* Self.¹

Let us take some concrete facts to illustrate the above remarks. The lower we descend in the scale of living organisms, the less we find of that individuality, that self-consciousness, which looks 'before and after,' of memory and expectation in short. And the less we find of these, the hazier is the distinction between inner and outer, ideal and real. But as in no living organism which persists through even two moments of time can there be an utter absence of a unified consciousness, of an individuality, of the sense of 'before and after,' however vague and dim it may be, so can there not be an utter absence of inner core and outer sheath. But in the higher organisms, this distinction, of a persisting core and a more or less changing sheath, is much more definite. In the average man, the *sūkshma-sharīra* (so named in

¹ In this fact may be seen illustrated the doctrine of Sāṅkhya that *mahaṭ*, *buḍḍhi*, *abamkāra*, *manas*, etc., are all derivatives of *Pradhāna* or *Prakṛti*, born because of the simple juxtaposition of *Purusha*, and are therefore all *jaḍa*, 'material'. Intellectual and other mental processes are *shapings*, colorings, stressings, etc., of the '*mental body*,' as much as vision is the shaping of (the purpurine on) the retina. The element of *I-consciousness*, attached to the shaping, belongs to the Self alone. That is the One and Only Thing or Fact that is non-material.

Veḍāṇṭa, and corresponding to the astral, or rather astro-mental, body, of theosophical literature), made of a finer grade of matter than that which composes the physical plane we know of, is the inner core. This forms the individuality, the thread of continuity, the 'present,' in which the past and future, the before and after, of one physical life-period of a human being are conjoined, amidst the changes of his physical body and surroundings. The physical body itself has a certain 'form and shape' imposed upon it by this inner body; which form, roughly speaking, persists like an external thread of continuity, through the incessant changes of the material of the body. This but illustrates the pseudo-infinite repetition of every principle in nature. The physical body is sheath to the astral; but in the physical body itself a still further distinction is made between a grosser and a finer, and the former, the grosser, portion becomes sheath to an inner less gross, which becomes distinguished as a *līṅga-ḍeha*,¹ a 'type-body', (or etheric double, in theosophical literature).²

¹ लिंग-देह.

² And even in the grosser 'physical body,' we may not improperly say that the nervous system is the 'inner' and finer, and the rest 'outer' and coarser. Again, in the nervous system, the 'central' portion may be distinguished from the 'peripheral'; and so on, till we come to a recent theory which holds that the *nerves proper* are not really continuous threads, but consist of microscopic protoplasmic jelly-like cells, enclosed within *tubes*, which cells, during the active waking condition, stretch out on both sides and touch each other, thus becoming one continuous thread, which *undulates* with the alternate jellification and softening, or contracting and expanding, of these cells when they are carrying afferent or efferent impulses; sleep resulting when these cells become fatigued, contract, and separate from each other.

To put the matter in other words : Of the pseudo-infinite variations of the Logion, due to the pseudo-infinite variations of the 'this' contained in that logion, each variation may be regarded as representing one life-course, one line of consciousness. This one life-course, one line of consciousness, taking the case of the average human individual, is represented by the inner sūkshma-sharīra, 'subtle body', which contains, latent in itself, the whole of the (to be unfolded actual) life of that individual, as the seed contains the tree. As one single 'present,' it includes all the time-divisions, past and future, of that life within itself. Because of this fact, the jīva can range in memory and expectation over the whole of this one physical life ;¹ to him the whole of it is in a manner present at every moment of his life, because it is all present in the sūkshma-sharīra which is the ensouling core of his physical sheath and is himself. But his memory and

¹ True, most of our experiences are forgotten beyond conscious recall. But the experiments of hypnotists and investigation of 'the unconscious' show that they are still 'present' and *can* be recalled in special circumstances. In this connection should be considered the physiology of the brain. *The Mahatma Letters* and *The Secret Doctrine* say that the material of the physical body is changed and renewed entirely in every seven years. But some Professors of Physiology and Anatomy have told me, on enquiry, that the cells of the brain do not change, though they grow. The subject requires further investigation. Any way, *continuity* of physical basis, in *some way* or other (may by transference of impression from old to new cells) seems to be needed for continuity of conscious memory, while awake in the physical body. The ternaries of anabolism and katabolism within metabolism, of integration and disintegration within preservation, of tidal flow and ebb within a level, of maximum and minimum under an optimum, seem to be at work continuously, in the body, as well as in the mind, in various ways. It is obvious that the softer tissues, like the layers of the skin, are changed and renewed quickly ; the harder ones, like deep-seated ideas and feelings, slowly.

expectation cannot go beyond the limits of the present life, because the individuality of the sūkshma-sharīra does not extend over other physical births. If, however, by development of mind, by persistent introspection and metaphysical or even psycho-philosophical and abstract thought, helped by yogic practices (which are only scientifically systematised processes of education, of extension or development of special old or new faculties), a jīva advances in evolution to the stage when he separates 'himself' as much from the sūkshma-sharīra as from the sthūla-sharīra or physical body, then the sūkshma-sharīra loses, in and to him, its character of inner core; it becomes that jīva's normal seat or centre of 'waking' consciousness, as the physical or sthūla is now; and becomes merged with the physical into the outer sheath; and another body, (now called the kāraṇa-sharīra), made of a still subtler grade of matter, takes the place of the inner core, and becomes a new sūkshma-sharīra ranging over many rebirths and compassing memory and expectation of them all.¹ This process is repeated *ad infinitum*² in the endless spirals of evolution including system within system. Such seems to be the metaphysic

¹ Kṛṣṇa says to Arjuna, *Gītā*, iv. 5, 'I remember all my past births; you do not'. See also the conversation, regarding their memories of past births, between Jaigishavya and Āvatya; *Yoga-Bhāṣya*, iii, 18.

² अंतरंतः, *Tripaḍ-Vibhūṭi-Mahā-Nārāyaṇa Upaniṣat*. We have seen before, that the doctrine, that there are atoms within worlds and worlds within atoms endlessly, is very familiar in *Yoga-Vāsishtha* and other works. For the specific statement that a param-āṇu, a 'super-atom,' is also an 'organism,' a 'compound' of articulated parts, a sanghāṭa, as distinguished from a mere loose collection, a samūha, see *Yoga-Bhāṣya*, iii, 44.

of the facts stated in *The Secret Doctrine*¹ that, to the Logos of our Solar System, all the planes of that system are as the sub-planes of one plane. They would be to Him, one outer real world; his own inner, ideal, world would be a grade beyond. It is like this: If there were beings who had sense-experience of only solid matter, to them liquid matter would be in the place of soul, spirit, inner or ideal substance; but if they should gradually grow very familiar with water, and begin to have some experience of gaseous matter, then solid and liquid would become ranged as *degrees* or subdivisions of the outer plane to them, and air would take the place of soul, spirit, etc.; as air grew familiar, radiant matter, or ether, or whatever other name might be given to the next degree of matter, would take its place as principle of continuity² and support and unification, in actual life and in general estimation. Witness, in illustration of one aspect of this fact, various theories of the earlier

¹ Vol. v, pp. 424. *et seq.*, Adyar edn.

² *Devī-Bhāgavata* speaks of the five *maha-bhūtas* serving as *sūtras*, threads, principles of continuity to one another and to the countless forms within each.

एवं परस्पोत्पन्नाः, धारयन्तिपरस्परं,

आधारऽधेयभावेन विकारस्य विकारिणः । *Vāyu Purāṇa* I, iv.

'Born one from another, each preceding supports each succeeding one.'

यद इदं सर्वं अप्सु ओतं च प्रोतं च, कस्मिन् नु खलु आपः ओताश्च प्रोताश्च, इति वायौ इति ब्रह्मांकेषु; *Bṛhad Up.* III, vi.

'All this (solid land) is inter-woven with (and supported by) water. But what is water supported by? By Air. And that Air? . . . By Brahma ultimately is everything supported'.

Greek philosophers, who endeavoured to reduce the universe to one single element, earth, water, fire, air, etc., successively ; and in illustration of another aspect thereof, modern scientific theories with respect to ether. Modern scientists have collected together and discussed all the attributes assigned to this hypothetical ether, and pointed out that they are in most instances exactly opposite of those assigned to known kinds of matter.¹ As a fact, the list of attributes thus given, *e.g.*, continuity, unlimitedness, homogeneity, non-atomicity, structurelessness, gravitationlessness, frictionlessness, etc., is not a list of attributes of any kind of matter or Mūla-prakṛti, but of Praṭyag-ātmā. But it always happens in the history of evolution, that each subtler and more pliable grade of matter, in its relation to the next denser and more resistant, displays the characteristics which Praṭyag-ātmā generally displays towards Mūla-prakṛti, *viz.*, characteristics of being a source of existence and support, and of supplying a basis of continuity, of lubrication, whereby the resistant and separate are brought into relation with each other with the least possible friction, and are unified. It is worthy of remark in passing that the Saṃskṛt word *s n é h a*,² means lubricant oil, or moisture, our water, as well as love, which is Praṭyag-ātmā in the desire-aspect, desire for unity, and pre-eminently 'lubricates' our human relations. We

¹ See, for instance, A.E. Dolbear, *The Machinery of the Universe*, p. 93, (Romance of Science Series).

² स्नेह.

may well entertain the supposition, therefore, that when modern science, becoming more and more familiar with radiant matter and protyle and ether, etc., shall have discovered their real properties, they will all fall into line with the kinds of matter now better known ; and a new and hypothetical element will have to be assumed, with these same characteristics of *Pratyag-ātmā*, to explain the otherwise paradoxical behaviour of the known kinds. Purāṇic and theosophical literature speaks of two such elements, after ether or *ākāsha*, to be discovered within the time-limits of our *Manvantara*, which have been already referred to before, *viz.*, *mahaṭ* or *ādi-ṭaṭṭva* and *buddhi* or *anupāḍaka-ṭaṭṭva*.¹

Co-ordination of these pseudo-infinite planes of matter then, is to be found in the fact that, wherever and whenever we take it, we find the World-Process as a limited *brahm-āṇḍa*, a world-system, small or large, which is a *ṭri-bhuvanam*, a *ṭri-lokī*, a system of 'three worlds' or layers or planes of matter. That is to say, every *jīva*, wherever and whenever he lives, lives in a world-system which to him has three factors : an outer or real world, an inner or ideal world, and the all-embracing consciousness—which connects the two, and which, being itself essentially and fully ever-present, is the basis of

¹ P. 372 *supra*, f.n. If these are (as is said) *sense*-able, in the same way as *ākāsha*, *vāyu*, etc., and will have their corresponding sensor and motor organs, as *ākāsha* has ear and vocal (Skt. *vāk*) cords ; *vāyu*, skin and feet ; *agni*, eyes and hands,—then *mahaṭ-buddhi*, the psychological principle or faculty, *aṇṭah-karapa* or 'inner organ' of *Sāṅkhya*, has to be distinguished from them, for it has to *underlie all senses*, old or new. See *Praṇava-vaḍa*.

every 'present,' whatever stretch of time-space-motion that lower present or ideal may include. In our system, to average humanity, the outer world is the world of the physical plane and *sthūla-sharīra*; the inner, of the astro-mental plane and *sūkshma-sharīra*; the abstract consciousness (the principles or outlines on which the individual is constructed, the basic constituents of his nature, the special aspect or mode of the One Consciousness which that individual is intended to manifest, anger, or love, or art, or philanthropy, etc., in pseudo-infinite variety), of *kāraṇa-sharīra*, the 'causal' body, which is the *cause* of the others; in a way corresponding to that in which Absolute-Consciousness is cause of all that occurs within it. When, by evolution and opening up of the paths of individual consciousness through layers of the *sūkshma-sharīra* (*i.e.*, by the 'waking up' of the individual on that plane, by transfer to it of 'the hot place' in his consciousness), the latter and its material will become as much 'object' to the consciousness as the physical body and its material are now; then *kāraṇa*-body will take the place of *sūkshma*-body, and abstract consciousness will retire to a subtler plane of matter, which has been called *buddhic*, or *mahā-kāraṇa*, or *ṭurīya*¹; and then the range of memory and expectation will extend beyond the present life to past and future births, since the *kāraṇa*-body (because of its subtler matter) has a more extensive 'present,' and lasts through many physical

¹ महाकारण, तुरीय.

births, even as the sūkshma-sharīra lasts through all changes of the physical body in one birth. From the standpoint of the kāraṇa-body, physical births-deaths are as bright-dark fortnights, or even day-nights, of physical life would be to the sūkshma-sharīra.¹

We may now pass on to certain inferences from the facts stated above. But before doing so it may be noted—as useful to bear in mind in systematising apparently disjointed and otherwise inconsistent-seeming and confusing statements in old Saṃskṛt and theosophical literature—that the same words are employed, and for reasons existing in the nature of things as shown above, to indicate abstract general principles and types which have a universal application, and also special and concrete facts which are peculiar only to a particular locality or system. Thus (a) āt̥mā, (b) buḍḍhi, (c) manas—these have one universal sense, viz., (a) Self, (b) unifying Reason or Universal Mind, which is but Self ‘holding

¹ For ‘practical’ purposes, works like *Yoga-Vāsishtha* speak of only two ‘bodies,’ viz., ādhi-bhautika (made up of mahā-bhūtas) and āt̥i-vāhika (by or in which the jiva passes from one mood or body to another). In Sūfi terms, the two are *jism-i-kasīf* and *jism-i-lāṭīf*, or *nafs-i-muqīm* and *nafs-i-jārī*; (see *Essential Unity of All Religions*, Index). This latter would be ‘core’-body, as the former is ‘crust’-body. For considerations, in terms of modern science, supporting belief in the existence and the possibility of development of such an ‘inner body,’ see Edward Carpenter’s *The Drama of Love and Death*. The possibility of such extraction of a subtler and finer body from the denser, is evidenced by the even more incredibly wonderful yet very familiar *actuality* of the caterpillar—chrysalis—butterfly and larva—pupa—moth transformations. Theosophical doctrines as to larger and larger reaches of subtler and subtler bodies and planes, buḍḍhic, nirvāpic, etc., are illustrations of the principles attempted to be expounded in the text.

More on the significance of the ‘present’ will be found in *Prāṇava-vāda*.

together' the Many as' *ḍharma-megha*,¹ web of life, and network of laws, and (c) separative intelligence. They are also occasionally used in theosophical literature in another sense, *viz.*, the three subtlest planes of matter out of the seven of which our solar system is there said to consist. When all the seven planes are taken as sub-planes of one cosmic plane, these three may be regarded as composing the inner core to the outer sheath made up of the other four; even as the three subtler sub-planes of the physical plane supply the material for the 'inner' etheric double, which pervades and holds together the outer body composed of the four grosser sub-planes of physical matter, *viz.*, solid, liquid, gaseous, and etheric.

The necessary corollary from the above statements is: Planes of matter which may be very different from each other, which may be mutually uncognisable by, and even as non-existent to, the *jīvas* ordinarily inhabiting each, *i.e.*, having sheaths and bodies made of, or corresponding to, it, will always be seen from the standpoint of a higher *jīva*, having a sufficiently extensive consciousness, to be graded or related to each other in some way or other. We can conceive of beings whose bodies are made of air, and of others made of fire-flames. These two sets of beings might even interpenetrate without being conscious of each other. But a *jīva*, who was familiar with both kinds of matter in all their forms,

¹ धर्ममेघ ; *Yoga-sūtra*, i, 2, and iv, 29, 32; 'the cloud, *mégha*, which rains, *méhaṭi*, all *ḍharma* and *ḍharma-s*, virtue, and laws of Nature, and also functions and characteristic qualities of things'; see the present writer's *Yoga-Concordance-Dictionary*.

would be able to distinguish between the two, and see the gradation between the atoms composing the one and the other kind of matter. A mosquito can walk upon the surface of water; for all practical purposes, the water is to it as hard and resistant as stone. It is not so to the fish. The fish and the mosquito may not be able to understand, the one how the other lives and moves *in* water, and the other how the one can walk *upon* the surface of it without being immersed. Man can understand both things. Pseudo-infinite necessarily are these diversities of consciousness; and each plane and each kind of matter, corresponding to each variety of this diversity, is again pseudo-infinite in extent of space, time, and motion, as already said. From the narrow standpoint, which knows of only one, each may seem to exclude even the possibility of others; so that if one said that there were living beings whose bodies were composed of subtler matter, that our earth was thronged with them so that our bodies and theirs were passing through each other very often, and in entire unconsciousness of each other's existence, the statement would ordinarily either not be believed, as involving a breach of geometrical axioms, or if believed, would be regarded as disproving those axioms. But to a higher and broader outlook, both kinds of matter and their corresponding lines of consciousness fall into their proper places; and the graded relations, to each other, of these planes of matter, by interpenetration, without violation of any mathematical laws, also becomes apparent.

Another connected corollary seems to be that, by metaphysical deduction, the so-called fourth and fifth and higher dimensions of space can really not be anything differing in kind from the known three dimensions.¹ These three dimensions themselves, length, breadth and depth, are but varieties of the *one* fact of *co-existence* which is the essential and the whole significance of space. Three straight lines intersecting each other at right angles at one central point give us these three dimensions. But a million, a billion, a pseudo-infinite number, of such triplets of lines can intersect each other at the same central point; that is to say, a pseudo-infinite number of single straight lines can intersect each other, at that point, at angles of all possible degrees; and we can therefore justifiably speak of a pseudo-infinite number of dimensions of space. In any other sense, all so-called new dimensions resolve themselves into cases of interpenetration in various ways; and interpenetration itself, it is clear, is but the co-existence of atoms, or molecules, or component particles, in special positions towards each other. The case would be similar with dimensions and divisions of time and motion.

The question of how the consciousness of a *jīva* expands, so as to embrace more and more planes of

¹ The Secret Doctrine, I, 295-296, and The Mahatma Letters, p. 404, clearly repudiate the notion of any fourth, fifth, etc., dimension of space, other than the three, length, breadth, depth. They explain that 'interpenetration' has been mistaken for a new 'dimension'.

matter, is one of general evolution, or of practical yoga when an endeavour is made to accomplish this deliberately.

The nature itself of the process of expansion of consciousness is nothing peculiarly mysterious. All education is such expansion; and yoga is specialised education. A jīva takes up a new subject of study, a new line of livelihood, a new department of life and mode of existence, and forthwith a new world is opened to him, and his consciousness flows out into, becomes co-extensive with, takes in and assimilates, that new world. Every sense, ear, eye, nose, is a window into a world of its own. In another aspect of 'expansion', *viz.*, of (comparatively) simultaneous communion, we find other illustrations. Take the case of an ordinary government. The consciousness of an officer in charge of the police-administration of a sub-district is coextensive with the police-affairs of that district; that of another in charge of its revenue-administration is similarly co-extensive with its revenue-affairs; and so with a number of other departments of administration, medical, educational, arboricultural, commercial, municipal, side by side, in the same sub-district. But there are larger districts made up of numbers of these sub-districts, and still larger divisions of country made up of numbers of these districts; and at each stage there are administrative officers in charge of each department, whose consciousness may be said to include the consciousnesses of their subordinates in that department, exclude those of their compeers, and be in

turn included in those of their superiors. The more complicated the machinery of the government, the better the illustration will be, of inclusions, exclusions, partial or complete coincidences, and overlappings and communions of consciousness. At last we come to the head of the government, whose consciousness may be said to include the consciousnesses, whose knowledge and power include the knowledges and powers, of all the public servants of the land, whose consciousness is so expanded as to enable him to be in touch with them all and feel and act through them all constantly. An officer promoted through the grades of such an administration would clearly pass through expansions of consciousness. A more common illustration, which may appear to show out the so-called immediacy of consciousness better, is that of friends and relatives. Two friends may be so intimate with each other, husband and wife, and members of a joint family, may love and be in rapport with each other so much, that they have a 'common life,' a 'common feeling,' a 'common consciousness'.¹ But it should

¹ Members of a bench of judges, arriving at a concurrent judgment; disputants coming to an agreement, after examining all the pros and cons; a classful of students, following with intelligent assent, a mathematical demonstration by a professor; all these are illustrations of coincidence of consciousness; so too, a great public meeting adopting a resolution unanimously. A simple and effectively intelligible way of putting the idea is this: The 'We'-consciousness includes, synthesises, coincides with, unifies, all the 'I-, You-, He-, She-, It-consciousnesses which that 'We'-consciousness may stretch itself over, and cover, and embrace. 'We' includes all 'thou-s', 'you-s', 'he-s', 'she-s', 'it-s', 'they-s'; and

be borne in mind that, strictly speaking, there is no more immediacy in the one case than in the other, but only quicker cognition. Consciousness of the particular, the limited, working unavoidably, through an upādhi, 'sheath', 'garment', 'tenement', instrument, 'vehicle', necessarily deals with time as with space; and the time-element is always a definite element, however infinitesimal it may be in any given case. The word 'immediate' in such cases has only a comparative significance, as is apparent from the fact that the time of transmission of a sensation, from the end of a nerve to the seat of consciousness, has been distinctly and definitely calculated in the case of living organisms; and differs with the organisms; it is much longer in a whale than in a human.

Such expansion of consciousness, then, is not in its nature more recondite than any other item in the World-Process, but a thing of daily and hourly occurrence. In terms of metaphysic, it is the coming of an individual self into relation with a larger and larger not-self. The processes of yoga are no more and no less methods of e-duc-ation—using the word in its true significance of developing, 'forth-leading', opening up and orienting, of faculties already existent but weak or latent—than the processes followed in the million schools and colleges of modern life, for developing the physical and mental

it does so in such a way that every, individual, included therein, retains his, her, its, separate individuality, while feeling identity with the whole.

powers of children and youth ; only they are (probably) more systematic, better thought out, based on deeper knowledge of psychology and metaphysic. Every act of attention, of concentration, of regulation and balancing, of deliberately 'joining' and directing the self to an object, or to itself, of con-*jug*-ating it to, or en-*gag*-ing it in, anything, is (jñāna- or kriyā-) yoga (respectively, according as the *chitta*, mind, is made receptive or projective) ; and means some development of the individual consciousness.

NOTE: Two kinds of moksha, liberation, deliverance, quitting, letting go, emancipation, un-binding, (from much, 'to un-tie, re-lease') are indicated in the old books. (1) One is the 'metaphysical', moksha proper, 'radical deliverance', once for all, from all and ultimate doubt of Immortality, doubt of Utter and Perfect Self-dependence ; from fear of pain and death, fear of subjection-to-another, of being at the Mercy-of-Another. It is a change of the *attitude* of the *chitta*, mind ; change of its outlook upon Life and World-Process. One of the Masters (the real Founders of the Theosophical Society) is reported to have said, on some occasion, 'Moksha is not a change of conditions' (plural) 'but of condition' (singular). The person, whose mind undergoes this change of 'condition,' becomes Self-sure ; and instead of always thinking of, clinging to, working for, the part, the limited, *i.e.*, his individualistic egoistic self, he turns to, or rather into, the Whole ; and persistently knows, desires (the welfare of), and works 'for', or rather 'as, the whole, the unlimited Universal Self.

(2) The other may be called 'technical' moksha. Children released from school, prisoners let out from jail, public servants 'off' duty, wage-workers set free after work-hours—all these experience moksha in the technical sense, even on the physical plane, in daily life. Any 'freeing' from *any* bonds, any ties, is a moksha. Receiving the 'freedom' of a city, in England, now a formal honor, seems to have meant,

originally, that the person honored was really 'free' to enter into any house of that city and be welcomed as a guest, as a matter of right; he was 'freed' from the ordinary limitations and restrictions to which strangers are subject. (Compare *Chhāndogya Up.*, VII, xxv, 2) 'He who has such Self-Knowledge becomes Sva-rāt, Self-governed; . . . He can pass into any world and all worlds at will' (in and by 'imagination', and then in corresponding 'reality'). 'Super-physically', with the achievement, *śiddhi*, (from *s i ḍ h*, *s ā ḍ h*, to effect completely, accomplish, *suc-ceed*), of each new extension of faculty, each new sense, the person becomes 'free' *of* and *in* the corresponding new world, free to range in it at will. Also, *per contra*, if he becomes tired of any kind of experience, any world (of science, art, fairies, nymphs, gods, titans, comedies, tragedies, heavens, hells), and abandons it, then too he becomes 'free', but free *from* it; he transcends it, rises above it (*aṭy-ēti*), by negation; (see quotation from *Charaka*, p. 131, *supra*). In this sense, while 'metaphysical moksha' is of one kind only, the other, 'technical or superphysical moksha' may be of countless kinds; for there must be as many kinds of freedom as there are, or may be, of bondage; thus, books of medicine speak of a person 'freed from fever,' as *j v a r a - m u k ṭ a*.

All this implies, over again, that 'laws' are the same, for physical as well as super-physical planes, worlds, conditions; and thereby re-inforces the Law of Analogy or Correspondences.

Yoga-Bhāṣya, ii. 27, speaks of two kinds of *v i - m u k ṭ i*; (the word is here used as a synonym for *mukṭi* or *moksha*, but is seldom employed in this sense). The commentary, on this and the preceding aphorism, says in effect: The only cure for *a-viḍyā*, Primal Error ('I am this-body') is *v i v é k a*, discrimination, between *Purusha*, 'I', and *saṭṭva* (the finest attribute of *Prakṛti*, here standing for the whole of *Prakṛti*), 'This', 'Not-I'. This discrimination wavers, falters, flickers, does not burn with a steady flame. To make it steady, firm, unshakable, it has to be developed and strengthened through seven stages: (1) That which has to be given up, *viz.*, 'this'-body, to which the mind clings, is

recognised as what ought not to be clung to; (2) the causes which have produced the clinging are attenuated, (the causes being, as stated in *Yoga-Sūtra*, ii, 3, the series of five, a-vidyā-asmīṭā, rāga, dvēsha, abhi-nivēsha, error or ne-science, egoism, like, dislike, and 'ego-complex', i.e., obstinate separative individualism; of which five and the corresponding opposites, the whole World-Process is product and illustration); (3) the dropping away of them is brought about by appropriate mind-discipline, and accomplished more and more fully in and by samādhi-meditation; (4) it is realised that discrimination (as above) is the only means of the utter subsidence of the causes. These four constitute kār्या vī-mukṭi, 'freedom which has to be made', achieved, by practice. The remaining three stages constitute chitta vi-mukṭi, 'freeing, or freedom, or dissolution, of the mind'; (5) the momentum, desire-force, of buddhi, mind, is exhausted. there is no craving left for separative individualised existence; (6) the guṇa-s, saṭṭva-raja-s-tāma-s, attributes of mind or Prakṛti, like displaced boulders tumbling from a mountain-top, and rushing unstayably down to the bottom, merge back into their primal source and disappear; (7) Purusha, Self, (individual self which has become Universal Self by the dropping away of all limiting and individualising upādhi-sheath and entanglements) remains fixed in Its own Sole-ness, Kēvala-ṭā or Kaivalya m. "The dewdrop slips into the Shining Sea".

Yoga Vāsishtha also enumerates seven steps or stages, in three separate places; each list varies a little, in names and order, but not in substance. The places are Bk. 3, ch. 118, verses 3-16; Bk. 6, Pūrv-ārḍha, ch. 120, verses 1-9; and ch. 126, verses 70-73. Buddhist, Sūfī, and other schools of Yoga, have, each, their own special lists of steps, practices, disciplines.

In between the first stage and the seventh, come all the phases of 'life abounding', 'fuller life' of the Right Hand Path of White Magic, fuller life of "terrible toil and profound sadness, but also a great and ever-increasing delight" (*Light on the Path*); gradual progress on the nivṛtṭi-mārga, Path of Renunciation and Ascent, by 're-vers-ion' to more and

more subtle bodies and planes, through which the jiva had come down, grade by grade, on the Path of Pursuit and Descent, pra-vṛtṭi-mārga. *The Secret Doctrine*, V, 300, says :

"Mankind, from the first down to the last, or seventh Race, is composed of one and the same company of actors, who have descended from higher spheres to perform their artistic tour on this our planet, Earth. Starting as pure spirits on our downward journey around the world, with the knowledge—now feebly echoed in the occult doctrines—inherent in us, cyclic law brings us down to the reversed apex of Matter, which is lost down here on earth, and the bottom of which we have already struck; and then, the same law of spiritual gravity will make us slowly ascend to still higher, still purer, spheres, viz., those we started from."¹

¹ Pp. 294-296 of H.P.B.'s *From the Caves and Jungles of Hindustan* should be carefully read as a continuation of the above extract from her *Secret Doctrine*. The following sentence on p. 296 indicates that Spirit, in its descent into Matter, comes right down into the mineral stage (atom) and then reascends: "With every new Mahā-Yuga (great cycle) the Deva separates from that which is eternal, attracted by existence in objective existence, like a drop of water first drawn up by the Sun, then starting again downwards, passing from one region to another, and returning at last to the dirt of our planet. Then having dwelt there while a small cycle lasted, it proceeds again upwards on the other side of the circle." Pp. 293-294 say useful things about spiritualistic phenomena. The whole confirms belief in personal immortality and Reincarnation.

On these two subjects, *The Mahatma Letters* throw much light; read the pages referred to in its Index against 'Death' and 'Reincarnation'; pp. 170-171 give some specially beautiful injunctions for those who watch by a death-bed; these injunctions indicate that the departing soul gathers out of its past, the most important material with which it will start its next re-incarnation. H.P.B.'s *Secret Doctrine* and

In other words, out of countless Dhyān Chohans, jivas, dévas-asuras, spiritual intelligences or individuals, a great host

Isis Unveiled have also helpful information on the subject ; see their Index-references against 'Reincarnation'.

Sir Arthur Conan Doyle is well known as the creator of the famous detective 'Sherlock Holmes'. He was also a very versatile writer on many subjects, historical novels, romances, short stories, tragic and comic. A very important book by him, on a very serious subject, entitled *The Edge of the Unknown*, came into my hands only in September, 1947, (while these pages were passing through the press). It deals with the subject and the literature of spiritualistic phenomena from their beginnings, a little before the middle of the last century, till the year of its publication, 1930 ; recounts the author's own personal experiences with clairvoyants, clairaudients, levitators in broad daylight, and mediums of many sorts, and his very careful investigations and testings ; and also records the conversions of several leading scientists, journalists, and clergymen, who were formerly unbelievers. Of course the views of such believers as Sir William Barratt (founder of the Psychical Research Society), Sir Oliver Lodge, Sir William Crookes, all famous scientists, are referred to. Bulwer Lytton, the famous novelist, is described as one of the moral cowards "who admitted the facts in private and stood aloof in public" (p. 248) as regards D. D. Home's phenomena ; though himself the author of those 'Magic'-novels, *Zanoni* (referred to in *The Mahatma Letters* with some commendation) and *A Strange Story*. Sir A. C. Doyle says that all the *finer* spirits declared, through their mediums, that the sole purpose, for which they were endeavouring to communicate with the earth-world, was to convince mankind of the certainty, the fact and truth, of *personal* immortality, and thereby bring great solace and peace of mind to all, as regards the fate of their departed dear ones, and also their own future ; also to show to mankind that the Supreme Power at the heart of the Universe was essentially Just, and that there were different kinds of purgatories for sinners of different degrees, and also heavens for the virtuous similarly ; also that reincarnation was a fact. And

decided (by the Free-Will of Inner Necessity) to become 'a troupe of actors' and gradually 'descend' to the state and stage of Humanity, and then 're-ascend', equally gradually, to the primal state of spiritual intelligences, *dēvas-asuras*. For fuller understanding of this, one should read up the references in the *S.D.* Index under 'Dhyān Chohans,' 'Dhyānis,' 'Dhyāni-Buddhas,' etc. In Skt. terms, *Pitṛ-s*, 'fathers,' 'ancestors,' are born as '*puṭra-s*,' 'sons'; *i.e.*, the same old souls are born over and over again, in new bodies, generation after generation. One point may be specially noted here. *S. D.*, V, 374, says: "Vajra-dhara or Vajra-sattva is the Regent or President (chief) of all the Dhyān Chohans or Dhyāni Buddhas, he is the highest, the Supreme Buddha; *personal* yet never manifested objectively". In this sentence may be seen the reconciliation of *belief* in a Personal God (of a *particular* and *limited* world, as in a king or emperor or president or other ruler of a State), and *non-belief* in an *extra-cosmical* and *Universal* but yet *Personal* God of the whole Beginningless and Endless World-Process; see pp. 170-172, *supra*. In *The Mahatma Letters*, all notion of such an extra-cosmical, universal. 'personal' god, is strongly repudiated (pp. 52-59).

We have seen above that moksha-freedom has as many kinds, technically, as bondage. Self, having, of It-Self, 'put aside' ('forgotten') Its Freedom, and put on countless bonds of finite forms, modes, moods, experiences; is everlastingly engaged in the task of regaining Its freedom; freedom from this want, that slavery, this pain, that restriction, this limitation, that oppression, this ignorance, that powerlessness—political, economic, domestic, social, individual, biological, psychological, racial, national, etc.; freedom from inability to fly at will to planets and stars, to see what is happening, or has happened, or will happen, on any of them; and so forth.

there is little doubt that the faith of mankind at large *has* been revived on a large scale, by means of spiritualistic phenomena, as also in various other ways, directly and indirectly, in personal immortality and reincarnation. The whole book is well worth reading and pondering over by Theosophists. Also *The Wanderings of a spiritualist* (1921) by the same author.

For practical purposes, however, a few of the more important kinds or stages of moksha are specified by different schools or systems of jñāna-knowledge or bhakti-devotion, from their own respective standpoints. A yoga-method of preponderant karma-action is also recognised, viz., the karma-yoga and karma-sannyāsa-yoga expounded in Chs. iii and v of *Gītā*. But it is generally agreed that it is subsidiary; while the yogas of predominant bhakti or of predominant jñāna are more direct means to moksha; the former, chiefly to the special and super-physical kinds; the latter, mainly to the metaphysical. *Praṇava-Vāda* (see its Index-references under 'moksha') gives helpful information. The main idea to bear in mind, explaining the unfamiliar in terms of the familiar, is that these many kinds of moksha, 'free choice', are like the many vocations and careers from which any one may be selected, according to his taste and temperament, by a person, who has completed a good general education. But, while the several vocations may be regarded as of equal importance, yet there is also a grading and ranking among the persons pursuing them. Thus Ṛshis, Mahā-Ṛshis, Brahma-Ṛshis, Déva-Ṛshis, Parama-Ṛshis; Boḍhi-sattvas, Buddhas, Mahā-Buddhas, Masters or Chohans of 'seven rays', Praṭyēka-Chohans; Thrones, Principalities, Powers; Auliyā, Abdāl, Abrār, Ḡhausas or Quṭubs (in Védic, Buddhist, Christian, Muslim, schemes), have different functions as well as grades and ranks in the Invisible Spiritual Government.

Karma-yoga is the preliminary step, bhakti-yoga the next, jñāna-yoga, the last; after achieving jñāna, the soul pursues all three conjointly, with a new vision and a new purpose.

By bhakti-devotion, the soul attains the following kinds of moksha, step by step. *Chhāndogya* 2. 20. 2; *Mukti* (1. 23); and other *Upanishats*, mention them: (1) *Sālokyā*, life in the loka, world, of the loved and worshipped deity; (2) *Sāmīpyā*, 'nearness' to him or her; (3) *Sārshti*, holding of similar ṛshṭi-s, powers and possessions, (4) *Sārūpyā*, sameness of rūpa, appearance, with him or her; (5) *Sāyujyā*, complete identification with, mergence into, him or her. The worshipped object may be any one of

the great gods or goddesses. The several grades of *gaṇa-s*, retinue, of Shiva; *pārśhaḍa-s*, companions of Viṣṇu; *ṛṣhi-s*, courtiers, of Brahmā; *sakhi-s*, comrades, of Dēvi; *anu-chāra-s*, followers, of other deities; are examples. Correspondences to all these 'super-physical' states will be readily seen in human relations in earth-life. Theosophical tradition—as to the souls of Chaldean votaries of various stars and planets going away to them, at special astronomical conjunctions, by means of special rites and ceremonies—also illustrates the same idea.

The difference between such *moksha-s* and states of *svarga* or *Dēvachan* or *Sukhavaṭī*, heaven, may be regarded as one of *degree of comparative voluntariness and conscious control* in the former, and the opposite in the latter; like the differences of wakefulness and reverie.

As regards 'Metaphysical emancipation from all fetters of the soul, and gain of Self-dependence', it should be noted that 'Realisation of *the Reality, the Real, the Self*', is not merely intellectual, nor merely emotional, nor merely actional (physical, volitional), nor merely intuitional—but is all these at once. A person learning to swim, has one supreme moment, when the experience comes to him of 'Sink or Swim', and ends in 'Swim, and not Sink'. The travail, the soul-and-body-rending of the spiritual experience of 'Die, clinging to the Finite body, or Live, clinging to the Infinite I', is similar. As *Light on the Path* describes it, solemnly, beautifully, the lower nature weeps, the heart cries, the lower self frenziedly strives to preserve its separateness; but it has to be transformed, transmuted, into the Higher non-separative all-inclusive Self: "Seek in the heart the source of evil and expunge it. He who will enter upon the Path must tear this thing out of his heart. And then the heart will bleed, and the whole life of the man seem to be utterly dissolved. This ordeal must be endured . . . Fasten the energies of your soul upon the task. Live neither in the present, nor the future, but in the Eternal. This giant weed cannot flower there." The illumination, the transfiguration, comes in different ways to different souls. In some, the intellectual aspect is predominant—*ṛshis*, sages, seers; in others, the emotional—

munis, saints ; in others, the actional—hatha-yogis, ritualists. The Ultimate Goal is the same for all.

Following quotations supply further explanations and illustrations of the principles indicated above.

भव-प्रत्ययः विदेह-प्रकृतिलयानाम् । *Yoga-sūtra*, i, 19.

तदभावात् संयोगाभावः हानं, तद्देशेः कैवल्यं । ii, 25.

सत्त्व-पुरुष-ऽन्यता-ख्याति-मात्रस्य सर्व-भाव-ऽधिष्ठातृत्वं सर्व-ज्ञातृत्वं च । iii, 49.

तद्वैराग्याद् अपि दोष-बीज-क्षये कैवल्यं । iii, 50.

सत्त्व-पुरुषयोः शुद्धि-साम्ये कैवल्यं । iii, 55.

प्रसंख्यानेऽपि अकुसीदस्य सर्वथा विवेक-ख्यातेः धर्ममेव समाधिः । iv, 29.

पुरुषार्थ-शून्यानां गुणानां प्रतिप्रसवः कैवल्यं स्वरूप-प्रतिष्ठा वा चित्तिशक्तिरिति ।

Ibid., iv, 34.

दशमन्वंतराणि इह तिष्ठन्ति इन्द्रिय-चित्ताः ;

भौतिकास्तु शतं पूर्णं ; सहस्रं तु आभिमानिकाः ;

बौद्धाः दशसहस्राणि तिष्ठन्ति विगत-ज्वराः ;

पूर्णं शतसहस्रं तु तिष्ठन्ति अव्यक्त-चित्ताः ।

पुरुषं निर्गुणं प्राप्य कालसंख्या न विद्यते । *Vāyu-Purāṇa*, quoted in

Vāchaspaṭi's Tīkā on Yoga-bhāṣya, i, 19.

येज्ञैश्च देवान् आप्नोति ; वैराजं तपसा पुनः ;

ब्रह्मणः कर्मसंन्यासात् ; वैराग्यात् प्रकृतेर्लयम् ;

ज्ञानात्प्राप्नोति कैवल्यं ; पञ्च एताः गतयः स्मृताः । *Vāyu-P.*, *Purvārḍha*,

Ch. 57, and *Māṭṣya-P.*, Ch. 143.

सः यः एतं एवं वेद, एतासां एव देवतानां सलोकतां सार्धितां सायुज्यं गच्छति ।

Chhāṇḍogya, 2.20.2.

कैवल्यमुक्तिः एका एव पारमार्थिकरूपिणी ;

ज्ञानं लब्ध्वा, ऽचिराद् एव मामकं धाम यास्यसि ।

सालोक्य-ऽदिविभागेन चतुर्धा मुक्तिः ईरिता ;

सैव सालोक्य-सारूप्य-सामीप्या मुक्तिः इष्यते ;

सैव सायुज्यमुक्तिः स्यात् ब्रह्मज्ञानन्दकरी शिवा ।

प्रारब्धक्षयपर्यन्तं जीवन्मुक्ताः भवन्ति ते ;

ततः (देहे निपतिते) वैदेहीं यान्ति असंशयं । *Muktika* Up., i, 15-43.

मोक्षश्चतुर्विधो, विप्राः !, सालोक्यं, तपसा उद्भवम् ;

सामीप्यं, भक्तितो जातं ; सारूप्यं, ध्यानसंभवम् ;

सायुज्यं ज्ञानतो ज्ञेयं ; तेषां स्वामी परः पुमान् ।

द्विगुणो द्विगुणो ज्ञेयः, आनन्दो मोक्षिणां क्रमात् ।

देवानां चैव देहेषु ये मोक्षाः, पुनरागताः ।

यद्भत्वा न निवर्त्तते तद्विष्णोः परमं पदम् ।

यत्प्रसङ्गेन, विप्रैर्द्वि, सायोज्यं मे भवेत् तव,

मनुमात्रश्च यः कालः, तावत् ते मोक्ष आस्थितः ।

Bhavishya-Purāṇa, III, Khapda iv, Ch. 7.

मार्गः त्रयो मया प्रोक्ताः नृणां श्रेयो-विधित्सया,

ज्ञानं, कर्म च, भक्तिश्च, न उपायोऽन्योऽस्ति कुत्रचित् ;

निर्विण्णानां ज्ञानयोगो, न्यासिनां इह कर्मसु ;

तेषु अनिर्विण्णचित्तानां, कर्मयोगस्तु कामिनां ;

यदृच्छया मत्कथादौ जातश्रद्धस्तु यः पुमान् ,

न निर्विण्णो, नऽतिसक्तो, भक्तियोगोऽस्य सिद्धिदः । *Bhāg.* XI. XX.

देवान् देवयजो यान्ति, यान्ति मद्याजिनोऽपि मां । *Gītā*,

आधिपत्यं विना ते वै, ऐश्वर्येण तु तत्समाः,

भवन्ति ब्रह्मणः तुल्याः, रूपेण विषयेण च ;

आनन्दं ब्रह्मणः प्राप्य, मुच्यन्ते ब्रह्मणा सह ।

आभूतसंश्लवं स्थानम् अमृतत्वं हि भाष्यते ।

Vāyu-Purāṇa, Purva., Ch. vii.

अप्रतीतं असम्प्राप्तं अनुच्छिन्नं अशाश्वतं,

अनिरुद्धं अनुत्पन्नं एव निर्वाणं उच्यते ।

यः आजवंजवीभावः उपादाय प्रतीत्य वा,
सोऽप्रतीत्यः अनुपादाय निर्वाणं उपदिश्यते ।

Māḍhyamika Sūtra, Ch, 25, verses 3 and 9.

The substance of the above quotations is this: 'Kaivalya, Kévala-tā, soleness, soli-tude, L-one-li-ness, On-(e)-li-ness, is the final transcendental metaphysical moksha. I-On-(e)-ly-am and-None-Else. All-is-I, I-am-All; not-an(v)-Other. (Leave me Al-one!, the harrassed person cries!) Dis-junction of a-viḍyā (the Error, I-am-this) from I is Kaivalya. The soul that has become sure of the difference, opposition, mutual-other-ness, of Self and Nature (Not-Self, Matter, This, with its guṇas, saṭṭva, etc.) grasps all (*i.e.*, the whole of This) by (one comprehensive act of Thought, and therefore rises superior to all. (See quotation from *Charaka*, p. 131, *supra*; what I really do not care for, what I take no interest in, what I have have cut off from myself—that has no power over my mind, cannot influence me in any way; I am superior to his, her, or its guiles and wiles and witcheries). Then that soul's condition is the one called Dharma-mégħa Samāḍhi, meditation in which the Dharma-s, laws of Nature, rain down (mégħa, méħaṭi) upon the passion-less error-free truth-seeing mind; then the facts and laws of the World-Process appear fully and clearly to the meditator. When the soul loses its interest in and is tired of even such contemplation and enumeration of Nature's secrets, pra-san-khyāné api a-kusidasya; then it retires into Kaivalya. When saṭṭva becomes equal in purity to Self, it merges into the latter, (Nature dis-appears into Self, in pralaya-sleep), and Kaivalya remains. When guṇa-s, Nature's triple attributes, have no momentum left, nothing left to do, no unexhausted unfulfilled desire, no object to strive for, then they dissolve and vanish, and Kaivalya remains, *i.e.*, the Principle of Consciousness, established in It-Self.'

'Souls which still cling to the finest super-subtle aspects of nature, attain to the condition of vi-ḍéħa-s, bodiless ones, and prakṛṭi-laya-s, dissolved into Nature (This); (or the state of bodiless beings who have become dissolved into Prakṛṭi-Nature); and they enjoy this condition for long eons (though there is no time-marker in those conditions; (*vide Mahatma Letters*, ré Deva-chan, and Avichi, pp. 194-197).

Buddhist books also mention these. Purāṇas amplify details. It accord with their respective aspirations, souls merge into (a) various cosmic or systemic indriyas, senses, of the systemic Īshvara (corresponding to various dēva-s, ṛshi-s, etc.); or (b) into the systemic b h ū ṭ a-s or ṭ a ṭ ṭ v a-s, elements; or (c) into the principle of aham-kāra, egoism, mere pure—'I am'; or (d) into the principle of mahat-buddhi, universal mind; or (e) into the principle of Avyakṭa-Mūla-Prakṛti; or attain other states. (Artists of a high order, painters, sculptors, musicians, perfumers, inventors of delicious perfumes, gustators, creators of exquisite tastes, tactators, or palpators, devisers of delightful touches, as of silks, velvets, plushes, gossamers, zephyrs, cool or warm and limpid waters, soft emulsive oils and unguents—such would be candidates for the technical moksha of indriya-chinṭakas, sense-contemplators; great scientists, for that of bhūṭa-chinṭakas; abstract introverts or, rather, introspectors, of ābhi-mānika-s or ahamkāra-chinṭakas, profound comprehensive thinkers or philosophers, of buddhi-chinṭakas; meditators on the unmanifest, of Avyakṭa-chinṭakas). The state of (a) lasts for ten manvanṭaras; of each succeeding one, ten times longer than the preceding. (These figures are scarcely to be taken as precise! They generally imply that the more subtle is the longer-lasting). When the attributeless Nirguṇa Puruṣa is reached, all measure of Time disappears'.

'The states of various gods are attained by appropriate yajña-s (mystery sacrifices, mystic rituals, etc., of Virāt (a deity below Brahmā), by renunciation of the fruit of all actions; of mergence into Prakṛti, by vai-rāgya, revulsion from the world; of Kaivalya, by knowledge. These are the five gaṭi-s, goings, courses, ways, that lie before the aspiring soul.

'Dwelling in the world of the worshipped deity is known as sālōkya-mukṭi; attaining general resemblance to him (in appearance, in way of living, wearing his uni-form, so to say), is sārūpya; being entrusted with some of his powers and possessions (as a public servant is, with a king's), is sārṣhti; being near him, (as a member of a king's entourage or personal staff), is sāmīpya; being identified with him, con-join-ed

with him, (able to take his place and act for him, on occasion, as queen or son), is sāyujya '.

'While the physical body lasts, a soul that has achieved (metaphysical) moksha, is called jīvan-mukṭa; when the body falls away, it becomes vidēha-mukṭa, which is the same as kaivalya-mukṭa.'

'Sālokya is obtained by tapas-asceticism; sāmipya, by bhakti-devotion; sārūpya (and sārṣhti), by dhyāna-meditation; sāyujya, by jñāna-knowledge. Each succeeding one of these is twice as blissful as the preceding. Moksha *into dēva-s* comes to an end, soon or late; usually at the end of the Manvaṇṭara. Im-mortality, a-mṛta-ṭva, technically means conscious existence or life (in a superphysical subtle body, till the pralaya-dissolution-chaos of the elements, ā-bhūṭa-samplava.'

'There are three Paths—of (a) Karma, way of works; (b) bhakti, way of devotion; (c) jñāna, way of knowledge; in other words, energism, pietism, gnosticism. The first is for those who are not yet tired of the world; they should continue to perform all right-and-due acts till fatigue begins to come upon their mind. The second is for those who are not too strongly attached to the world, not yet detached from it; and have generally heard of me, the Self of all, and begun to aspire for a higher life (of fine feelings and fine artistic thoughts and ideas); the third is for those who are surfeited with the world, and long to cease from its restlessness, and find repose and peace!'

'Those who worship the dēvas, go to them. They who worship Me, *the Self, the God in all and of all*, they come to Me.' (*Gītā*).

'That which is causeless, is not believed or arrived at by gradual steps and stages, (but flashes forth all at once), is never destroyed, never cut short, nor is ever-lasting (in time), has no end and no beginning, (but *Is*, once for all, eternally)—that is Nirvāṇa. This com-motion, this restless going-and-coming, which, believed in and en-dur-ed (as taking place in dura-tion), time, is Samsāra, World-Process; this same, *not* believed in, *not* accepted, (as true, but seen at Illusion, as

Mind's Imaginary Creation), is Nirvāṇa.' (Buddhist *Māḍhya-mika Kārikā*).

"The *insān-ul-kāmil*, perfect man, is a man who has fully realised his essential oneness with the Divine Being in whose likeness he is made . . . An ecstatic feeling of oneness with God constitutes the *walī*, (singular of *auliya*, saints). He unites the One and the Many, so that the universe depends on him for its continued existence." (Here, the singular *he* is obviously to be understood as standing for a numerous *class of souls*, in the same way as when one may say that the atoll owes its existence to the coral insect, or that the color of the Red Sea is due to a microscopic plant). "He brings relief to the distressed, health to the sick, children to the childless, food to the famished, spiritual guidance to those who entrust their souls to his care, blessing to all who invoke Allah in his name"; Nicholson, *Studies in Islamic Mysticism*, p. 78.

Jalāl-uḍ-ḍīn Rūmī, chief of Persian Sūfis, says:

Kulle shayin hālikun juz Wajh-i-Ū.
Gar na-i ḍar Wajh-i-Ū, haṣṭi ma jū!

'All things are mortal save the Face of God.
If thou hast found no place within that Face,
Then hope not thou for Immortality!'

Face, here, means Being, the Being of the Eternal Self. The secret of preserving *personal* immortality (of the technical kinds) is indicated in these lines, entirely in accord with the theosophical view. If a soul deliberately fixes in its memory, attaches to its higher manas, the upper half of the fifth principle, any great incidents, great loves, and other noble emotions, in their settings, great devotion to a great deity, and thus *fixes*, shapes and crystallises, conglomerates, a particular personality or individuality or 'ego-complex', purposefully creates a centre of individuality, and *attaches* that strongly to its realization of the Eternal Self; then the Immortality of the latter is reflected on to the former also. Vēḍānta tradition is the same; the higher associations and memories of the *chara-ma-ḍēha*, 'the last physical body', may,

at the will of the liberated soul, be carried into the liberated condition. The 'last body' here is the same as the 'an-āgāmi' of Buddhism; it is the body in which Self is seen and realised; after the falling away of which, there is no *un*-conscious rebirth, karma having been exhausted, 'burnt up by Jñāna' (*Gītā*); whatever birth there is, afterwards, of that jiva-soul, is conscious, deliberately chosen, for some particular service of the world.

Yoga-Vāsishtha (III, ix) gives a fine description, first of the jīvan-mukṭa, (some of the verses occur in *Gītā* also); and then of the vidēha-mukṭa, thus: 'When the body of the jīvan-mukṭa falls away under the touch of time, he enters into the vidēha condition. As space he holds the stars within himself; he blazes as the sun; he blows as the breezes; as the earth he bears the mountains, the forests, the races of men and animals; he bears fruit in the trees, he flowers in the creepers, he flows as the rivers, he surges against the shores of the earth as the mountainous billows of the ocean; he rains life-sap into the vegetable kingdom as the moonlight; he kills out life as the hālā-hala venom: he illumines the heavens as light, and merges them in gloom as darkness; he lives, wakes, sleeps, sorrows and rejoices, as the minds of all; he is each atom and all stars at once; indeed he is now all time, all space, and all their moving contents! . . . But if the vidēha-mukṭa becomes thus identical with the World-Process, is that deliverance, or is it but a deeper immersion in the welter of illusion-māyā? . . . It would be such deeper sinking were it not accompanied by the consciousness that the illusion *is* illusion, that there is No Other-than-I, that Brahma is An-Anyat.' In the last statement is probably conveyed the distinction between the vidēha and prakṛti-laya of *Yoga-sūtra* on the one hand, and the kaivalya of *Yoga* or vidēha of *Veḍānta* on the other.

The ancient tradition of *Upaniṣaṭs* and *Yoga-Vāsishtha* is that when the soul turns from the finite, ethically, emotionally, and intellectually, it necessarily finds the Infinite and attains moksha; that, thereafter, the individual consciousness turns more and more into the cosmic consciousness, that jñāna-vairāgya-bhakti are but the inseparably correlated aspects of

each other, and grow towards perfection side by side. As said in *Bhāgavata*,

भक्तिः परेशानुभवो विरक्तिरन्यत्र चैव त्रिक एककालः ।

‘Devotion to, and vision of the Supreme Self, and turning away from all Else—these three are simultaneous.’ And in *Yoga-bhāshya* (i, 16).

ज्ञानस्यैव परा काष्ठा वैराग्यम् ।

‘The highest degree and fullness of knowledge is complete *vai-rāgya*’.

That this tradition has never died and is living still may be indicated by the following renderings of songs in Hindi and Urdu, the first by Kabir, and the two others by recent Sūfi poets. All mystic literatures of all religions, Védānta, Tasaw-wuf, Gnosticism, Qabbala, etc., are on the same lines.

But before recording those renderings of mystic songs, attention may be called to a very serious danger of terrible misunderstanding which lurks under the word Kaivalya, ‘Solitude’, ‘Oneness’, ‘Soleness’. It seems to be the last will of the Māyā of the ‘lower ego’, which would live on by masquerading as the ‘Higher Universal Ego’: ‘I will have moksha for myself; why should I care for others’. But Moksha is *freedom from this very egoism*; which freedom is nothing else than Universal all-others-including (not excluding) Ego-ism. Hence *mumukshā*, ‘wish for moksha’, is rightly understood as Universal Love incipient, while Moksha is that same Universal Love full-blown and triumphant. In theosophical literature, stress is laid on the fact that the greatest qualification for ‘initiation’ is—having brought others along on to the Path and helped them to their ‘majority’ of soul. *Gītā* and *Bhāgavata* and other scriptures repeatedly declare that an indispensable qualification for the aspirant is ‘love and active service of all beings’. The gateway of the Path is *vai-rāgya*, ‘dis-passion’, but it has to be a ‘passionately compassionate dispassion’. Many types of *vai-rāgya* are pictured in the classic legends of India. The purest of the pure is that of Rāma, wholly *sāttvika*, so to say, (see *Mystic Experiences or Tales from Yoga-Vāsishtha*); also that

of Gauṭama Buddha; in both we see profoundly compassion-ate wish to free all living things from their misery. Arjuna's revulsion is very limitedly sāttvika, mixed with much rajas too; his compassion is only for his kith and kin and relatives. Bharṭṛ-hari's is rājasa-ṭāmasa, caused by disgust with the world because of the infidelity of his queen; but it is, later on, made sāttvika by his intense pursuit of Ātma-vidyā. Similar is the case of the merchant Samāḍhi (in *Ḍurgā-Saṭṭa-Shaṭṭi*), who was driven away from his wealthy home by his wife and sons, because they wanted to be unchecked masters of the whole property; and, at the end of three years' severe asceticism, desired from the goddess Ḍurgā, only 'the Supreme Knowledge which would annihilate egoism'. Somewhat different is the case of Samāḍhi's companion, king Suratha (in the same high story), who desired from Ḍurgā, long-lasting kingship, and is to become the reigning Manu, Sāvarni, of the next Manvantara;¹ strictly speaking, perhaps there was no vairāgya in his case, but a sāttvika-rājasa wish to rule justly and give happiness to the people; but since such rule is not possible without good grounding in Ātma-Vidyā, the rajas in his case was infused with a high degree and quality of saṭṭva. Steadiest and also pure in sufficient degree is the deliberate 'vairāgya' of the son (or daughter) of Manu, who, having performed the duties of the first two stages of life, āśhrama-s, 'retires' from the world, philosophically; in this case too, it is not so much 'vairāgya' in the sense of sudden onset of passion or compassion, as, indeed, moksha already achieved, partly, if not wholly: for exposition of the subject of āśhramas, see *The Science of Social Organisation*, or the briefer *The Science of the Self*.

Dear reader!, if you happen to be husband, wife, father, mother, elder relative, super-ordinate officer, teacher, in the outer world!—your position acquires a new and deeper and more wonderful significance for you, when you realise this marvellous fact, that the necessary condition of your own

¹ This writer has met with no definite statement to that effect in the old books; but it almost seems that Suratha and Samāḍhi were born as Maru and Dēvāpi (*Bhāgavata*, XII, ii); are now the Theosophical Masters Morya and Kooṭhoomi; and will be the Manu and the Buddha of the next Race and Epoch.

advancement is that you help your youngers and dependents on to that same path of Progress. The realisation becomes a powerful incentive to patience and tenderness ; for you now always say to yourself consciously : ' These weaker souls have been entrusted to me that I may help them on, with myself, to that ancient Path, 'sharp as the razor's edge', yet also strewn with the flowers of love and sympathy, and also safeguarded with the balustrades of holy instructions, by the strong and watchful hands and hearts of the Elders of the Race !

' When the Soul's inebriate,
 With God, 'tis in no mood to prate !
 The gem, when found, is hid away ;
 Why make display day after day !
 The balance holds, the scales don't sway,
 What need the goods again to weigh !
 The Swan hath found the Mānasa-lake ;
 Shall it again to puddles take ?
 That wanton barmaid Consciousness
 Hath drunken love's-wine to excess
 Herself, and keeps no more the tale
 Of how much and to whom the sale !
 Thy Lover Loved is there, *in* Thee !
 Not out, but in, ope eyes and see ! '

KABIR

' No bar guards His palace-gateway, no veil screens His
 face of light,
 Thou, O Soul ! by thine own self-ness art enwrapt in
 darkest night !
 Youth is gone, and age is on thee, yet vain dreams still
 fill thy mind,
 If thou turn not from thy small self, how shalt thou thy
 Great Self find ?
 Taste the wonder of this heart-meat, as it burneth more
 and more,

Through life's ocean-brine there spreadeth savour sweet
from shore to shore !
But the names differ, beloved !, thou, I, all are only One,
In the firefly gleams the self-same beam that blazeth in
the Sun !
Since He knows all art and science, we too may invent
and know ;
In the human heart is hidden more than all the Scriptures
show !
Thou the music in the song-bird, Thou the fragrance in
the rose,
Thou the Goal that all are seeking, Thou the Self that
each one knows !
Why, and Where, art Thou in hiding, My Belovéd !,
come to Me !
Every year-long moment brings thy Lover desperate
agony !
Not without Thy-self permittest may the strongest win
to Thee,
Out of this Turmoil and Tumult of our Life's Tem-
pestuous sea !'

QARIN

' Behind the mask of every face He hid—
God, very God ; and I—I knew it not.
The Right had fallen wrongly into Wrong,
The True into Untruth—I knew it not.
The Lord of all the Worlds—in mud and mire
He begged from door to door—I knew it not.
On every page of scripture He had writ,
' Nearer am I to Thee than time own heart,'
But I—I could not read—I knew it not.
In temple, church, and mosque I sought for long,
The gold hid in the ' mine ' (Me)—I knew it not.
The moon that I had seen and had forgot—
The clouds had hid the moon—I knew it not.
The rust of selfishness o'erlay my heart,
I had forgot my-Self—I knew it not.
I sought the Wonder in the Noise Outside

It lay still in My Heart—I knew it not.
 But now, my Soul, my God, my Self, my All,
 Thou magic-maker of this vast mirage,
 Juggler of joys and sorrows, loves and hates,
 Thee sole I (know) An-other (I know) Not !-
 I know I only am, all Else is Naught !
 I only is, and all This Else is Not !
 I know I am but I, ' I-(am)-This-Not.'

HASAN SHĀH

CHAPTER XVI

SUMMATION'

ALL the main facts or rather principles connected with jīvas-souls and atoms-bodies have, perhaps, been generally brought out and summed up now. One more point deserves some words : The distinction between Universal and Singular, and the Relation between them, mentioned before. This triplet belongs equally to jīvas and atoms ; is, thus, part of the *Summation* of the World-Process ; and could not well be discussed before some general notion had been gained of the distinction between ' the ideal world ' and ' the real world ' ; the former of which is, as it were, a complete and standing picture or plan of the stream of successive events which make up the latter ;

and so occupies, to this latter, the position of universal to singular.

The aphorisms of Nyāya, as we now have them, classify and describe the constituents of Saṃsāra in their *subjective* aspect, *i.e.*, in terms of cognition, as the means of knowledge.¹ The aphorisms of Vaishéshika classify them as *objects* of knowledge, in their objective aspect, in terms of the cognised. Thus, Kaṇāḍa, author of the Vaishéshika aphorisms, states that there are six primary paḍārthas 'meanings of words', things, *i.e.*, objects, *viz.*, ḍravya, guṇa, karma, sāmānya, vishésha, and samavāya. The first three have been discussed before, (pp. 284-312 *supra*). The next three mean, respectively, the 'universal or general,' the 'singular or special,' and the 'relation of inseparable co-inherence'.

As often indicated before, the One true Universal is Pratyag-Ātmā; the Many, the manifold Singular, the Multitude of Singulars, is Mūla-Prakṛti; and the peculiar bond that exists between them is the real primal samavāya-sambandha, literally, the 'firm bond of going into, merging into, pervasion of, each other',

¹ 'Nis-shréyasa, Summum Bonum, Highest Happiness, Moksha, can be achieved only by True Knowledge of the essential nature of (1) the Means, tests, proofs, evidences, measures (*i.e.*, measur-ers), ascertainers, of true knowledge; (2) the Knowable, the to-be-known, to-be-ascertained; (3) Doubt; (4) Purpose or Motive (of enquiry or argument); (5) Familiar Example; (6) Established Tenet, accepted maxim or principle or fact; (7) the Members of a Syllogism; (8) Inference (especially of a refutative or repudiative or eliminative kind); (9) Decided Conclusion; (10, 11, 12) Three kinds of discussion (according to three kinds of purpose); (13, 14, 15, 16) Four kinds of Fallacies. It should be noted that Moksha is the principal aim, and that the nature of the Self is the first and foremost 'to-be-ascertained': Nyaya-sūtra, the very first.

'co-inherence'. Beside this One Universal¹ there is, strictly speaking, no other Universal, but only 'generals'. So, beside the (apparently, comparatively) final (pseudo-ultimate infinitesimal) singulars of Eṭaṭ-² 'This' there is no other real singular, but only species or 'specials'.³ The characteristic of these 'generals' and 'specials' or 'particulars' is that each one of them is general to

¹ सत्तासामान्य, saṭṭā-sāmānya, 'Universal Being,' पर- or अन्त्या सामान्य, para- or aṇṭya-sāmānya, 'final or ultimate universal,' or पर-जाति, Parā-jāti. summum genus.

² अन्त्यविशेष, aṇṭya-vishésha, पर-विशेष, para-vishésha, चरम-विशेष, charama vishesha, 'final, or extreme or ultimate particularity.'

³ परऽपरजाति, par-āpara-jāti.

Extremes meet. Para-sāmānya and para-vishésha are identical ; as Infinite and Infinitesimal ; Brahma and jiva. As said before, a final ultimate parama-apu as para-vishésha is a 'myth,' an imaginary concept, a convention, devised for practical convenience. With reference to sa ma vāya, some observations of Max Muller are worth quoting. They are taken from his *Six Systems of Indian Philosophy* (collected works), pp. 376-7, and 447 ; that book, so far as I am aware, continues to be the most clear, compact, concise, correct, and comprehensive work, on its subject. "Samavāya or intimate connection is a very useful name for a connection between things which cannot exist, one without the other, such as cause and effect, parts and whole, and the like. It comes very near to a-vinā-bhāva, i.e., the not-without being, and should be carefully distinguished from mere conjunction or succession". . . . " (This) category . . . is peculiar to Indian philosophy. It is translated inhesion or inseparability . . . It is different from mere connection, as between horse and rider. . . . There is samavāya between threads and eloth, (the ideas of) father and son, two halves and a whole, cause and effect, substance and qualities, thought and word, the two being interdependent and therefore inseparable. Though this relationship is known in non-Indian philosophies, it has not received a name of its own, though such a term might have proved very useful in several controversies" ; as those, we may add, of nominalism, realism, conceptualism, etc. A-yuṭa-siddhi, of Yoga philosophy, seems to be much the same as samavāya or a-vinā-bhiva. Ré the last, Max Muller's translation would perhaps be more intelligible if read as 'not-being-without,' i.e., 'each being not able to exist without the other'.

lower specials, and at the same time special to a higher general. In other words, while *Pratyag-ātmā* is the *principle* of the Universal, and *Mūla-prakṛti* the *principle* of the singular, the *jīva*-atom is individual or particular, combining and reconciling in itself both universal and singular.

Difficulty in the expression of this thought is occasioned by the fact that while the meaning of universal and general and special is comparatively fixed and free from ambiguity, such is not the case with the significations of singular and individual and particular, as the words are currently used.¹ The underlying philosophical idea of their mutual relation being indeterminate, the expression is naturally doubtful also. And this very haziness of the idea is at the bottom of the long-lasting dispute between the doctrines of nominalism and realism and their various modifications. As a fact, in the world around us, we actually find neither the true One, nor the true Many or Not-One, by itself. What we do find always, instead, is *a one* which is also *a many* at the same time.² We distinguish between the two by emphasising within ourselves the *jīva*-aspect, *i.e.*, the aspect of self-consciousness and *Pratyag-ātmā*, and, from the

¹ An instance of this may be seen in the divers arrangements made of the triplets of the categories of Kant; thus at p. 221 of Schwegler's *History of Philosophy*, the triplet of 'totality, plurality, and unity' is arranged in an order the reverse of that followed in the original of Kant.

² The pen with which, the table on which, the house in which, I am writing, each of these is a *one*; but is also composed of *many*, very many, parts.

standpoint thereof, beholding the Not-Self in juxtaposition to and yet in separation from the Self. The facts, so viewed, are clear. One and the many, abstract and concrete, general and special, universal and singular, are just as inseparable as back and front. They are inseparable in fact as well as in thought (which also is a fact, though manufactured in subtler material, as, on the other hand, every 'fact' is a 'thought,' of 'consciousness', and existing *by* and *in* consciousness.) But the phraseology requires to be settled in accordance with this fact and thought. The settlement may perhaps be made thus: The word 'universal' should be confined to the true One, Praṭyag-ātmā, and to the modifications and manifestations of its unity, *viz.*, the laws of the 'pure' reason,¹ the abstract laws and principles which underlie the details of the World-Process and are as it were the transformation of the Praṭyag-ātmā itself in association with the diversity of Mūla-prakṛti. The word 'singular' should similarly be confined to the pseudo-true Many, the pseudo-finally separate. As the universal is the One which includes and supports all, so the singular is the exactly opposite one that would exclude all else;² it indicates the pseudo-ultimate constituents of the many, which may well, for practical convenience, be technically called 'atom,' 'aṇu' or 'param-āṇu'.³ For that which is

¹ The saṭṭva-factor of Mahat-Buddhi, the cognitional element or aspect of the Cosmic Mind, Cosmic Intelligence. Cf. Dharma-mégha, p. 441 *supra*.

² परविशेष, para-vishésha or अन्यविशेष, antya-vishésha.

³ अणु, परमाणु.

between these two ones, a something which is a one and a many at the same time, a whole composed of parts, the word 'particular' seems appropriate. Such a 'particular' would be 'general' (an imitation of the universal) to those it includes and supports and holds together, and 'special' (an imitation of the singular) to that by which it itself is supported along with other co-particulars ; all so-called inanimate substances, all sheaths and bodies of the so-called animate, all objects of cognition or desire or action, all genera and species, types, sub-types and archetypes, would thus be 'particulars'. The word 'individual' is peculiar ; it would be useful if it were confined to the jīva-atom, which combines the true universal and the pseudo-true singular, rather than only generals and specials. It is not Pratyag-ātmā only, nor Mūla-prakṛti only, but both ; and yet, because of the unfixable, in-de-finite, pseudo-infinite nature of the atom, the jīva-atom may be called a particular also. Whenever and wherever we may take an actual individual jīva-atom, the atom-portion of it, its sheath, will be found to be a 'definite' that merges on both sides into the 'in-de-finite' ; it is an infinitesimal fraction, on the one hand, of a pseudo-infinite universe, and, on the other, it is a pseudo-infinite multiple of infinitesimal fractions. 'All things, all beings, all thoughts, feels, acts, begin and also end in the in-de-finite ; they are de-finite only midway.'¹

¹ अव्यक्तादीनि भूतानि, व्यक्तमध्यानि, भारत ! ,

अव्यक्तनिधनान्धेव ; तत्र का परिदेवना । *Gītā*, ii, 28.

If we were defining the main items of the World-Process in terms of the Absolute, the jīva-atom would be called the individualised Absolute, and a world-system a particularised one; the Absolute itself being then comparatively called the universal Absolute. But in view of the statements made in the preceding paragraph, it would appear to be almost more consistent and systematic to call the jīva-atom a singularised Absolute. Yet, though, in strictness, this would be the better description, still, for all practical purposes of metaphysical research—for the reasons for which the jīva-atom may be regarded as a particular also—it is more useful to employ the expression 'individualised Absolute'. The 'individuality' of the jīva in the jīva-atom is more predominant than the 'singularity' of the atom therein for

Tennyson's "Who knows! From the great deep to the great deep he goes," is an expression, in poetical and emotional form, of the same intellectual truth. All the World-Process, the world-existence, is a becoming; all life is a passing; every river is a flowing; every sensation is a feeling. Splendour is the coming in and at the same time the going out of wealth. Stoppage means sinking into pralaya. Too much care kills its object and prevents it from fulfilling its purpose and achieving its destiny. Beauty, too, is for due use, and use makes more beauty. Existence, manifestation, is in and by *action*. Every atom, and every psychosis, is a (dual) focussing, a vortex, in a *continuum* of 'ether,' and of 'general sensation' or 'affective tone' or 'volitional tension'.

शेषः सद्-असत्तोर मध्ये 'भवति'-अर्थसात्मको भवेत् ।

Yoga-Vāsishtha, III, xiv, 47.

'That which comes between *is* and *is not*, *existent* and *non-existent*, is what is meant by the word *bhavaṭi*, *becomes*; i.e., between Being and nothing is Becoming.'

"The Anglican noble, in a well-known passage of Bede, compares the life of man to the flight of a bird which darts quickly through a lighted hall, out of darkness, and into darkness again"; Inge, *Christian Mysticism*, p. 251. Many other poets and writers of note, of east and west have depicted the thought with various examples.

such purposes. Attention has been drawn before, to the fact that the Instinct behind Language has given to both *jīva* and atom, the same adjectival name, 'in-divid-ual', 'un-divid-able', 'in-divis-ible', 'a-tom'.

On the above view, recognising the nature and the necessity of the connection between the One and the Many, it becomes easy to see what the true mean of reconciliation is between nominalism and realism. Every object, being a *jīva*-atom, or a conglomerate of *jīva*-atoms (see pp. 347-352 *supra*, regarding 'individualities within individualities'), is general and special, abstract and concrete, at one and the same time. Therefore, when the new-born infant opens its eyes for the first time, it necessarily sees the *genus* 'woman' as well as the *species* '(individual) mother,' at one and the same time. As soon as we see any object, we see its generality as well as its speciality.¹ Whenever we see *a one*, we see also at once the possibility, inherent in the one, of a pseudo-infinity of that one, *i.e.*, of such ones. *The One* is universal; *a one* reproduces *the One*; the universality of the true One reappears as the generality and the pseudo-infinity of the illusive one.²

¹ The fact has an important bearing on methods of education.

² In this fact is contained the principle of the validity of generalisations, of induction, व्याप्ति, *vyāpti*, and not in any repetitions of experiments; these only help to eliminate, by means of concomitant variations, *i.e.*, agreements and differences, अन्वय, *anvaya*, and व्यतिरेक, *vyati-réka*, the accidental from the essential qualities. This fact, of the instantaneous seeing of the 'general' in the 'special', is named प्रत्यासत्ति, *pratya-saṭṭi*, in the 'new' Nyāya, started by Gaṅgeśha (circa 12th century A.C.)

It should also be noted that the considerations put forward in the text deal with one aspect of the dispute between nominalism and realism,

This fact is embodied in the grammatical affixes : 'ness,' 'ship,' 'hood' (in English), and 'tā' or 'tvā' (in Saṃskṛt), expressive of the abstract and of quality, which can be added on to any noun or adjective. It is significant that abstractness and generality should belong to, and be expressible exclusively in, terms of quality ; for quality or guṇa corresponds to jñāna, which in turn corresponds specially with Praṭyag-ātmā, the one universal and abstract. Abstraction, praṭy-āhāra, indeed, means 'drawing away from others' and reduction into terms of Praṭyag-ātmā, making a *one* and therefore a pseudo-universal, of that which was mixed up with and part of the many. So too, the concrete is mostly expressed in terms of motion or karma, which corresponds to kriyā, which corresponds to Not-Self ; as witness the fact that so many names or nouns *originate* in

viz., the one asserting that abstract concepts do not exist apart from concrete things, the other that they do. In another aspect also, about the relation between thought and language, notions and names, the dispute may be reconciled by the same considerations. The two are inseparable, though distinguishable ; as, indeed, *all* the contents of the World-Process are necessarily inseparable from each other, because held together in and by the One Consciousness, though endlessly distinguishable from each other, because held together by that Consciousness *as* Many Mūla-Prakṛti. In the course of a beautiful hymn to Puruṣa and Prakṛti, as Eternal Man and Woman, ever inseparate, *Bhāgavaṭa*, VI, xix, 13, says :

गुणव्यक्तिरियं देवी, व्यञ्जको गुणभुग्भवान् ;
 त्वं हि सर्वशरीरी आत्मा, श्रीः शरीरेन्द्रियऽश्रया ;
 नामरूपे भगवती, प्रत्ययः त्वं अपाश्रयः ।

'She is manifestation ; Thou the Final Cause thereof. She is sense and body ; Thou the Soul behind. She is name and form ; Thou the basic Thought.'

verbs.¹ Finally, the *relation* of the two is embodied in *dravya*, substance, noun or name ; it combines act and fact, characteristic action and quality, in a ' thing,' and corresponds to the hidden Negation-Shakti that manifests its various forms in the declensional changes of termination of the noun (in the older languages ; for the separate prepositions of modern languages are artificial separations of these terminational affixes).

From these observations it should be clear that the universal² is One ; the singular, Many ; and genera-species, pseudo-infinite ; and that everywhere and always there is the possibility of distinguishing the abstract from the concrete by the mere addition of ' ness ' to the latter ; in other words, by concentrating the oneness and universality of the Self upon and into the concrete, and so of discovering an endless series, in an endless gradation, of concepts, ideas, types, archetypes, etc. Plato seems to have spoken of only one archetypal world, while the legitimate inferences from the *logion* require a pseudo-infinity of such, higher and lower, in an endlessly ascending and descending scale. The *logion* itself, it should be noted, and the *laws and principles* that proceed from

¹ On the other hand, it is true that verbs also are formed, later on, from nouns ; but fewer, apparently. From cognition, action ; from action, cognition ; this is Nature's circle.

² As noted before, Vaishéshika calls the highest, or, rather, the one true universal, by the name of universal being, सत्तासामान्य, *sattā-sāmānya*, which, plainly, is the objective name for the Self ; and the lowest or true singular or विशेष, *vishésha*, it calls *anu* or atom, which is but another name for ईत-This.

it directly, can *scarcely* be spoken of as *types or archetypes*; for *types and archetypes* are comparatively *definite objects*, abstract-concrete, (though with the aspect of abstractness or generality and commonness inclining to be predominant), while *laws and principles* are only *relations* between objects.

With these remarks we may bring to a close the observations regarding the general features of jīvas and atoms, and conclude this work with a re-statement of the Summation of the World-Process in Consciousness.¹

In the preceding chapter we have seen how the endless and apparently quite disconnected diversity of atom beside atom and atom within atom, plane beside plane and plane within plane, world beside world and world within world, individuality beside individuality and individuality within individuality, collapses together into an ordered juggler's box within box under the touch of the principle of the ever-expanding Individual Consciousness, which, taking its source in the Universal Consciousness of Praṭyag-ātmā, is incessantly threading together all the otherwise disconnected beads of Mūla-prakṛti.

The more the nature of Consciousness is pondered on, the more the nature of the jīva becomes clear. As the most significant definition of the atom is that it is a persisting-point, *i.e.*, a line or sphere of objectivity, of unconsciousness, in its triple aspect of cognisability,

¹ More detailed consideration of the three aspects of the jīva's life, *viz.*, cognition, desire, action, will be found in *The Science of the Emotions, The Science of Social Organisation, The Science of the Self*, and *Praṇava-vaḍa or the Science of the Sacred Word*.

desirability, and movability, guṇa, dṛavya, and karma, so the most significant definition of the jīva is that it is a persisting-point, *i.e.*, a line or sphere of consciousness and subjectivity, in its triple aspect of cogniser, desirer, and actor. Combining these two definitions, a jīva-atom might be defined as the individualised Absolute (thus bringing out the true significance of the current saying, that 'jīva is verily Brahma and naught else' ¹); a particular number of them may be said

¹ श्लोकार्धेन प्रवक्ष्यामि यदुक्तं शास्त्रकोटिमिः,

ब्रह्म सत्यं, जगन्मिथ्या, जीवो ब्रह्मैव नापरः ।

'I will tell you in a single sentence what has been expounded in ten million books, *viz.*, Brahma is true, the moving world is an illusion, jīva is Brahma and Naught Else'. But more is wanted; realisation is in the first person, not the third. The third person is *outside* me; what I want is the first person, *within* me, my-Self.

अस्ति ब्रह्म इति चेद् वेद, परोक्षं ज्ञानं एव तद्;

अस्मि ब्रह्म इति चेद् वेद, साक्षात्कारः स उच्यते ।

'Brahma *is*—this is but indirect knowledge; *Brahma *am*, I am Brahma—this is direct realisation'. All philosophies, all religions, mysticisms, gnosticisms, sciences, arts, need to be tested by this supreme experience and reduced into terms of this First-hand Direct Knowledge, 'I-This-Not'. The work is well worth doing on an extensive scale—the reduction of different philosophers' views into terms of this Logion; (see pp. 199-204, *supra*). Thus, the Arabian Sūfi, Jili, (14th century A.D. in his work *Insān-ul-Kāmil*, 'The Perfect Man', and Hegel, use very similar expressions in developing their ontology. The former speaks of 'The Dhat developing an inward and an outward aspect, *amā* and *ahadiyya*, and *ahadiyya* again developing two aspects, *huviyya* or thatness and *Aniyya* or I-ness; and the latter, of 'The self-sundering of the Idea', 'the self-diremption of the Absolute', 'the absolute going out into its opposite, and then returning into itself', 'the unity of consciousness holds within itself in equilibrium the vital antagonism of opposites, thought and thing, mind and matter, spirit and nature, which seems to rend the world asunder'. . .'; (Nicholson, *Studies in Islamic Mysticism*, 81-97). All this becomes luminous, freed from misty obscurity, only when we translate it into terms of 'I-This-Not'. That philosophers and mystics seem to differ from each other, is only because they

to constitute a particularised Absolute, or a world-system, a cosmos that also *appears* like the individualised Absolute to be complete in itself; and the totality of these individualised and particularised Absolutes, to make up the universal or truly complete Absolute, Brahma; all this not interfering, in the slightest degree, with the fact that individual or (strictly speaking) singular, particular, and universal are not three but absolutely identical, literally one and the same.

An illustration may perhaps help to make these statements a little clearer. Suppose that life, that the World-Process, consists of ten experiences: that is to say, of five sensations, each dual as pleasurable and painful, so that the two factors of each such pair, when balanced against each other, neutralise each other and leave behind a cipher, as equal credit and debit in a banker's account may do. One self, going through these experiences in one fixed order of time, space, and motion, would exhaust them all comparatively quickly, and would form one individuality, marked and defined by the ten experiences in that one order, thus making one line of consciousness. But let us now vary the order of the ten experiences; this mere variation of order, it will be seen, implies a variation in the times, spaces, and movements connected with each item of experience. If we vary the order, then, in all possible ways, but without decreasing the number of the experiences, we have at once orders to use terms of the third person, 'he', 'she', 'it', instead of the first person, 'I', 'we'. When we speak in terms of 'I', we bring things home to ourselves.

the number of 'factorial ten,' in algebraical technicality, that is to say 3,628,800. It is clear at once that each of these millions of orders of the succession of experiences marks out and defines, and therefore amounts to, a distinct and separate individuality; for an individuality can no other wise be described, discriminated and fixed, than by enumerating the experiences of that individuality, by narrating its biography. Yet, while each one of these orders makes a distinct individuality, it is also equally clear, at the same time, that in essence, substance, completeness, all these individualities are verily and truly *one*; and that whatever difference there is between them is made up of the illusory differences of mere time, space, motion, all three utter emptinesses and nothings, the triple aspect of Negation.¹

In place of five as the number of sensations, now substitute the number 'pseudo-infinite'; for *états* are pseudo-infinite by axiom, and each is pleasurable during the affirmation of it, and painful during the negation.² The total number of our experiences then

¹ Thus, a thousand globe-trotters, travelling round the earth, at the same or different times, over different routes, with different accoutrements, will yet be able to say, if they meet and compare notes after completing the circumambulation: 'We have all seen the same countries, and passed through the same experiences' (speaking generally).

² See *Nyāya Sūtra*, III, ii, 35.

इस्य इच्छाद्वेषनिमित्तत्वाद् आरंभनिवृत्त्योः ।

अयं खलु जानीते तावद् 'इदं' मे सुखसाधनं, 'इदं' मे दुःखसाधनं, . . . सुखसाधनावाप्तये समीहाविशेषः आरंभः, जिहासाप्रयुक्तस्य दुःखसाधनपरिवर्जनं निवृत्तिः । *Bhāṣya* on same; 'The knower, *i.e.* conscious ego, is motivated by like and dislike, to advance and retreat, respectively'; 'when a

becomes $2 \times \text{pseudo-infinite}$, and the total number of permutations of these experiences is $2 \times \infty$ (factorial twice pseudo-infinite). This, at first sight, should be the total number of all possible 'lines of consciousness,' or 'individualities' or 'jīvas'. But this is so only at first sight, and we have not reached the end of our calculations even now. For we have up to now been taking the experiences all at a time. But they have to be taken in all possible combinations also, one at a time, two at a time, and three, and four, and so on, to pseudo-infinity. The result is, briefly, a pseudo-infinity of pseudo-infinities as the total number of jīvas in the World-Process; each being a distinct, immortal, ever-spirating, ever-gyrating line of consciousness; yet each being absolutely identical with all others; for the World-Process is made up entirely and exclusively of the one universal Self, passing itself through all possible pseudo-infinite experiences, *simultaneously* from the standpoint of that universal Self, *successively* from that of the limited not-selves.¹

person knows that so-and-so will give him pleasure, then he tries to secure it; if he knows that it will cause him pain, he tries to avoid it'.

¹ *The Secret Doctrine*, V, pp. 397-398, says: "What difference can it make in the perceptions of an ego, whether he enter Nirvana loaded with the recollections only of his own personal lives—tens of thousands according to the modern re-incarnationists—or whether, merged entirely in the Parabrahmic state it becomes one with the All, with the absolute knowledge and the absolute feeling of representing collective humanities? Once that an ego lives only ten distinct individual lives, he must necessarily lose his own self, and become mixed up—merged, so to say—with these ten selves."

If the reader will shut his eyes and ponder what exactly he feels would be perpetuation of his *separate* individuality, he will probably understand the problem clearly: 'What exactly is it that I crave to

It may be asked: Why this interminable variation of the order of the experiences? As usual, the answer is contained in the logion. The one Praṭyag-ātmā is the ever-present. The many Mūla-prakṛti is the ever-successive, ever-past, and ever-future. The opposition between the two is utter. Yet also is there inevitable and constant juxtaposition and relation. The one is the universal, sārṇika, sāmānya; the other is the singular, individual, prātyékika, vishésa; and between them there exists unbreakable relation of co-inherence, samavāya. The reconciliation of the contradiction is that Praṭyag-ātmā becomes as multitudinous as the étaṭs, in order to encompass them all simultaneously in the one vast present of the totality of the

perpetuate, to eternalise, when I desire *per*-sonal immortality? Any particular experience? The ownership of any particular thing? Any particular shape of face and figure? Any emotional mood? Any intellectual feat? Any physical exploit? Any particular piece of knowledge? Any relationship with any person? Any life of crime? Any of saintliness? Any agonising experience? Any particular state of delight?

The answer, after due introspection, will always be 'No' (See f. ns. on pp. 84, 141, 314 *supra*). For any and every particular experience, possession, face, mood, etc., will pall, will tire, will lose interest, after some time, short or long. When my own body, so very dear to me, becomes so tiresome to me, after sixteen, eighteen, twenty hours of waking and working, that I run away from it into sleep, day after day, night after night, how can I cling to anything else unchangingly throughout sempiternity?

Change is the law and the condition of separate individual existence. Yet it is also a fact that 'I' wants 'immortality'. What is the reconciliation? 'Immortality' means 'the assurance of immortality'; I am the Universal Supreme I, therefore necessarily Immortal. But *all* personal or individual 'I's' are the universal I; therefore I am all 'I's'. But 'personal I' means a conglomerate of particular experiences; therefore I contain all possible such experiences and conglomerates; and I can revive in memory and vivid imagination, and therefore in reality, *any* I wish, whenever I please. This potentiality is really all I crave, when I crave personal immortality; and metaphysical jñāna-knowledge assures it to me.

World-Process; and again, each single one of this multitude of (*Pratyag-ātmā* transformed into pseudo-infinite *jīvas*) also incessantly endeavours to encompass the whole of the many in the total succession of endless time and space and motion, because each *jīva* must be equal to and cannot be less than the whole of *Pratyag-ātmā*. Take the totality of the World-Process at any one instant of time, and you find all possible pseudo-infinite experiences present therein, simultaneously, coexistently, side by side, in the pseudo-infinity of space—sorrows in one region, equivalent joys in another; gains here, equal losses there; life and growth in one place, a balancing death and decay in another.¹ But, again, take any one experience, a single point or moment of consciousness, and follow it out behind and beyond, into the past and the future, along any one of the pseudo-infinite diameters that in their totality make up the solid mass of the sphere, any one of the lines of consciousness of which it is the meeting-point, the point of junction and of crossing, and along that line there will be found

¹ To realise that *all* these sorrows, joys, gains, life and death, are in the I, are in Me, *at once*—this is Moksha; to realise that they are all in Me, *successively* (as described in the next sentence of the text) is also moksha—of another kind.

मयि स्थितमिदं जगत् सकलमेव, सर्वत्र वा

स्थितोऽहम्, इति भावनाद्वितयधारणावेशतः

जगत्त्रितयनाथताऽनतिचिरेण संप्राप्यते

नृभिस्तव सपर्यया दलितकिल्बिषोपह्वये । *Jñāna-garbha*.

all possible experiences in different moments of time, in different successions.¹

Another illustration may be attempted: Take a round ball of iron. Let this ball be composed of a number of round bullets. Let the ball have a revolutionary movement of its own as a whole, on a fixed axis, so that the space occupied by it never changes. Let each of the bullets have another motion of its own, perfectly free and ever-changing in direction, but strictly confined within the periphery of the ball, and therefore necessarily so arranged that each bullet moves only by the equal displacement and movement of another. The ball now combines in itself, always and simultaneously, all the possible movements of all its constituents; and each of these constituents also passes through each one of all

¹ Compare the Saṃkr̥ṣṭ saying :

सुखस्यानंतरं दुःखं, दुःखस्यानंतरं सुखं ।

'Pain (follows invariably) after pleasure, and pleasure after pain.' *Bhāgavata*, V, xxvi, 2, expressly says that 'all jīvas must pass through all experiences, turn by turn',

त्रिगुणत्वात् कर्तुः श्रद्धया कर्मगतयः पृथग्विधाः सर्वा एव सर्वस्य तारतम्येन भवंति ।

Brhad̥ Up. has some words which may also be interpreted to the same effect, 'all are equal or similar, all are in-finite',

सर्व एव समाः, सर्व एव अनन्ताः ।

Mbh., Shanti p., also says that, 'The gaṭī, going, path, course, destiny, of no one is greater than that of any one; Vēḍa shows that all are equal',

नहि गतिर् अधिकास्ति कस्यचित्,

सकृद् उपदर्शयति इह तुल्यतां ।

For yet other illustrations, see my *World War and Its Only Cure—World Order and World Religion*, pp. 411-413, 484.

these possible movements, but in succession, the motion of each being so counterbalanced by that of another, from moment to moment, that the position of the ball, as a whole, in space, never changes. Finally, wherever in this illustration we have a definite limit of size or number, substitute unlimitedness. Let the whole ball be boundlessly large. Let each bullet composing it be in turn composed of smaller bullets; these of shot; these again of smaller shot; and so on pseudo-infinitely. Let these bullets and shot be of pseudo-infinite sizes; and let the peripheries of these bullets and shot be purely imaginary, so that each bullet and shot, while one such in itself, is also at the same time part of the volume enclosed by a pseudo-infinite number of peripheries of all possible sizes coexisting with and overlapping each other within the single periphery of the whole. The ball now becomes the Absolute. Its transcendent axis, of the pseudo-infinity of the numbers of which the ball is veritably composed, is the logion. Its revolution vanishes into a rock-like fixity of changelessness,¹ because it occupies the *whole* of space, and in the absence of a remaining and surrounding space,

¹ महाशिलासत्ता, mahā-shilā-sattā, 'rock-like-being,' frequently described in *Yoga Vāsishtha*. This illustration is not altogether fanciful. Physical science is establishing more and more clearly every day that it is almost a literal description of what is actually taking place in all solids. And when we remember that metaphysical as well as scientific reasoning favours the belief that space is a vacuum filled full with a plenum of subtler and subtler matter; that the heavenly bodies are not moving in empty but in matter-filled space; that vast masses of subtler matter cling to and form shells for what we call these 'solid' globes, and participate in their rotatory and other motions; that the thicker the rotating shell the faster will be its movement at the surface; that the quicker

against which it could be seen, no revolution can be. Its universal sphericity is the Pratyag-ātmā. Its concrete and discrete material is Mūla-prakṛti. Its bullets within bullets, and shot within shot are the pseudo-infinite jīva-atoms which, in their pseudo-infinitesimal sphericity of pointness, are identical with the infinite sphericity of the whole. The imaginary-ness of the periphery of each is the endlessness of the overlapping of individuality-points. The endless movement of each of these points makes a line of consciousness working out in successive time; while the totality of these lines of consciousness is the transcendent completeness of the Absolute.

the movement the greater is the resistance and the hardness, *i.e.*, solidity, etc.—if we remember these things we may see that it is possible that the illustration literally describes the actual World-Process, and that we are living and moving freely *within* masses of matter that present a skin of iron, a 'ring-pass-not,' to things outside. The 'discarded' old doctrines of 'cycle in epicycle, orb in orb,' of heavens one above and around another, in which the heavenly bodies are studded, as bosses in shields, etc., thus seem to have a chance of being restored with a much fuller significance. This will be only in keeping with the general law of all the march of the World-Process, *viz.*, that a thing passes into its opposite and then returns again to its original condition on a higher level, endlessly. Take up a newspaper, and we find illustrations of this in the most widely-separated departments of life—thus; (1) Pedlars and hawkers are replaced by great central stores, depots, and fixed shops, and then comes the travelling salesman again; (2) duels, single combats, heroes, are replaced by massed bands, and these are superseded by bush-fighting and sharpshooting; then the massed bands reappear as trench-fighting, and the single combats as the fights of aeroplanes and submarines; (3) Chinese writing is superseded by the alphabet, which again is threatened with displacement by shorthand, and so on.

The illustration of the rock may be interpreted in another way. The sculptor's mind fashions ideally, any number of images, one after another, in one and the same block of marble. All these *possible* images may be said to be actually contained in the block all the time. The doctrine of any number of 'theoretical arches' being formed in any given wall, any of which can be made concrete and manifest by breaking an opening in the appropriate place, illustrates the same fact.

In these illustrations we see the summation of the World-Process, while also seeing how the utter emptiness which is the utter fullness of the Absolute, its changeless balance of being against nothing, is always being endeavoured to be reproduced in the individualised Absolute, the jīva-atom. Life is balanced against death ; progress against regress ; anode against kathode ; anabolism against katabolism ; pleasure against pain ; being against nothing ; Spirit against Matter. Taking the net result of each completed life also, we see the same balancing *appear*, as has found expression, and in one sense, true expression, in words like those of Bharṭṛ-hari, the poet-king and then the ascetic-yogī : ‘ What *real* difference is there between the pleasures and the pains of Indra, the high chieftain of the gods, and those of the lowliest animal ? The joys of love and of life that the one derives, under the promptings of desire, from his goddess consort and from nectar, the same are derived by the other from his lowly mate and his (to human beings) filthy food. The terrors of death again are as keen to the one, as to the other. Respective desire-and-karma makes a difference in their surroundings and appearances. But the net result, and the relativity of subject and object, enjoyer and enjoyed, sufferer and cause of suffering, are the same.’¹ The equality

¹ इन्द्रस्य अशुचिशुकरस्य च सुखे दुःखे च न अस्ति अन्तरं ;
 स्वेच्छाकल्पनया तयोः खलु सुधा विष्ठा च भोग्याशनं ;
 रंभा च अशुचिशुकरी च परमप्रेमसास्पदं ; मृत्युतः
 संत्रासोपि समः ; स्वकर्मगतिमिथ्यान्योन्यभावः समः ।

and sameness of all jīvas, not only in the sense of the sameness of comparative results of long periods, life-times, or cycles, but also at each moment of time, in the matter of pleasure and pain, will also appear further, when the nature of those two all-important constituents of the life of the Self is carefully considered ; for there is, indeed, a pleasure hiding in every pain, and a pain hiding in every pleasure ; when the one is felt by the outer, the opposite is felt by the inner man.¹ From the standpoint of Brahma, all is the same, all is equal ; there is no difference at all, in kind as well as being ; for Brahma is indeed the denial of all difference by the Universal Self. Why should there be, how can there be, the reasonless horror

See, here, the f.n.s. on pp. 228-231, also. A very useful way of interpreting the working of the Law of Karma, as psycho-physical cause-effect or action-reaction, is to understand it in terms, not, of the pleasures or pains of the benefited or the victimised, but of the benefactors or victimisers. A land-hungry or 'glory'-hungry pride-mad 'conqueror', slays some millions of men, of and through his armies ; a butcher slaughters myriads of sheep and cattle ; a ravenous predaceous kills and devours thousands of herbivores. He or it can scarcely be slain millions or myriads or thousands of times in as many births. Even infinitely prolific and all-wise Nature would find it very difficult to keep and square the mathematical accounts correctly ; the more so, since, in every new birth, new karma, would be added on to the old ! But the (subjective) *pleasure* that the killer derived from the massacre, the pleasure of gloating or money-or-land-gain or glory-gain, is easily counter-balanced by a corresponding amount of (subjective) pain, experienced, maybe in even a single body, amidst appropriate (objective) settings. Also the pains of a prolonged malignant disease or of mangleings and mutilations in an accident, may be psychically equivalent in the finer and more sensitive organism of a human body to the death-pains of a thousand lower animals.

¹ कर्मण्यकर्म यः पश्येद्, अकर्मणि च कर्म यः

स बुद्धिमान्मनुष्येषु, स युक्तः कृत्स्नकर्मकृत् । *Gītā*, iv, 18.

'He who sees in-action in action and action in in-action, he is truly wise, and he performs all actions (rightly and wisely), without attachment.'

and hideousness, the nameless heart-harrowing, of one *really* and permanently smaller, weaker, poorer, lower, humbler, more pitiable or more contemptible, more trampled upon and tortured, than another, greater, stronger, richer, higher, prouder, more feared or more honoured oppressor, tormenter, and gloater? Where would be the justification, if there were *really* such cruel injustice of difference (as the enquirer intensely felt at the beginning of his search), and not a mere *appearance* and *play* of sage and saint, sovereign and soldier, slayer and slain, oppressor and victim, servant and slave, high god and lower man and lowlier worm and plant and mineral! ¹

¹ He who realises this becomes perfectly 'natural' again, as a child; but on the higher level of the 'second' childhood, through a 'second' birth into the Ancient Wisdom, उत्तमा सहजावस्था; नैगमो गोमुखश्चेत्; न मोक्षस्यऽकाङ्क्षा; येन त्यजसि तं त्यज; the Sufi's *ṭark-i-ṭark*. 'The natural state is best'; 'the wise man may behave, on occasion, like the very unwise; he no longer desires moksha, for he has found it; he gives up that which has enabled him to give up, as a thorn is thrown away after having been used to extract a thorn from the foot, he abandons abandoning'. Pūrṇa-puruṣa, *Marq-i-ṭamām*, *Insān-ul-kāmil*, 'final, complete, perfect man' are the expressions which describe such a one.

Another aspect of the idea may be put thus: Every atom is *a*, as well as *the*, whole universe. Every part is the whole. Every drop of water is the same (in potential contents) as the whole ocean. Every the tiniest image of the sun in every the tiniest globule of water is the whole Sun. Every jīva is the whole Universal Self. The whole universe is one infinite 'Fool's Paradise', bhrama; every jīva has its own 'fool's paradise, (or rather 'paradis-es)'; and the individual 'fool's paradise', drama, is as real or as mythical as the Universal Fool's Paradise, and is part of, or copy of, and contained in, the latter; for all is and are the Play of the Supreme Self's saṅkalpa, Will-Ideation.

For the thought of the spiritual equality, indeed same-ness, of all jīva-souls, see pp. 329-330 *supra*.

The following passage from *Bible*, Ecclesiastes, 9-2, seems to be a very near equivalent of the verse quoted and translated on p. 330 *supra*: "All things come alike to all. There is one" (*i.e.*, the same) event to

It has been said that the words of Bharṭṛ-hari are true in a sense. They are true in the deepest *metaphysical* sense, which takes account of the *whole* of space, time, and motion, in their totality. But the current view of the fact of endless evolution and progress and difference is also true, in the *practical* sense that deals with only a *part* of space, time, and motion, instead of with the whole of them. While one jīva cannot, in the net result of *all* experiences, be really different from another jīva, for both are equally Praṭyag-ātmā, yet each atom is equally necessarily different from every other atom. Hence what we have is a constant sameness underlying endless

the righteous and to the wicked: to the good and clean, and to the unclean; to him that sacrificeth, and to him that sacrificeth not; as is the good, so is the sinner''. Yet always the warning holds that ''all things'' includes *consequences* also, of good as well as evil actions.

The great Law of Analogy may be again pondered by the reader in this reference. It establishes the similarity, equality, sameness, oneness, of all.

अणुर एष पन्थाः विततः पुराणः । . . . मनसा एव द्रष्टव्यं, न इह नानाऽस्ति किञ्चन । मृत्योः स मृत्युं अभ्येति, य इह नाना इव पश्यति । . . . स एष न-इति न-इति आत्मा । . . . तं विदित्वा न लिप्यते कर्मणा । . . . आत्मनि एव आत्मानं पश्यति, सर्वं आत्मानं पश्यति, नैनं पाप्मा तरति, सर्वं पाप्मानं तरति । . . . अजरोऽमृतोऽभयो ब्रह्मा, अभयं वै ब्रह्मा, अभयं हि वै ब्रह्मा भवति य एवं वेद । *Bṛhad. Up.*, 4, 4, 8-25.

' Very subtle, atom-like, is this Ancient Path . . . See, by the mind, that there is *no many* (no separates). He goes from death to death who (and while he) sees (and clings to separatist) many (-ness). Ātmā, Self, is Not-This, Not-This. He who knows that Self, sees all in It, and It in all, and all as Self, sin touches him not, he crosses beyond all sins. He is undecaying, undying, unfearing. Brahma is Fear-less, Brahma is Fearless, Brahma is Fearless '.

differences.¹ If there were actual limits to time, space, motion; if the World-Process did not stretch backwards and forwards pseudo-infinitely; if cycles and systems were complete in themselves instead of being parts of interminable chains in time, space, motion; if the 'all' of experiences could really be fixed in and at any point of time, space, and motion; *then* only, by striking the balance of each and every life, we should literally find a cipher as the result in each case. But there are no such actual and absolute limits. Each life-thread stretches endlessly through endless cycles and world-systems. Hence there is no real beginning and no real end to any life, but only endless apparent beginnings and apparent ends, and no *final* and complete balancing of *any*, in terms of the limited and concrete, is possible. Also, as each life, taken individually, is necessarily and actually at a *different* point of time, space, and motion from every other, therefore no *simultaneous* balancing of *all* is possible. Complete balancing and casting up of accounts is possible only from the standpoint of the *true* infinite and eternal, Praṭyag-ātmā, wherein the *whole* of time, space, and motion, and therefore the *whole* possible life of each and every jīva, is summed up at once, now, here, al-ways. From the standpoint of the limited, the

¹ In this fact we find the reason why, though the chief of the gods and the beast, Indra and swine, are both similar or even the same or equal in respect of *nett* pleasure and pain, yet, in the infinite complexities of evolution and dissolution, in respect of *details*, there is very much more 'long-circuiting' and 'refinement' between the desires and the satisfactions of the one than of the other. Hence the thought and the corresponding language of 'higher and lower' is thoroughly justified, for *practical* purposes.

pseudo-infinite, on the contrary, there is an endless alternation of progress and regress, evolution and involution on an ever-differing level, which is ever making a difference of goal even in endless repetition, and thus *immortally* keeping, before every jīva-atom, an ever higher and higher 'ascent' after an ever deeper and deeper 'descent' into ever grosser and grosser planes of matter; a thought that, despite the promise of ever-higher goals, would prove most desolately wearisome, nay, most agonisingly horrible, because of the corresponding ever deeper 'descents'; were it not that the constant summation of the whole of the pseudo-infinitely complex World-Process in the utter simplicity of the Absolute, makes the endless succession of that World-Process the Līlā, the *Voluntary Play*, that it really is, of Self; and in which Play, Tragedy and Comedy balance and cancel each other completely.

Only Self, None Else, compels to anything or any mood or state or circumstance. There *is* None Else to so compel.

Therefore is the Process of the World a process of pseudo-infinite repetition in pseudo-infinite change, always curling back upon itself endlessly in pseudo-infinite spirals. The jīva that, having reached the end of the pravṛtti arc of its particular cycle, thus realises the utter equality, the utter sameness and identity, of all jīvas in the Supreme Self, amidst the utter diversity of Not-Self, cries out at the overpowering wonder of it: 'The beholder seeth it as a marvel; the narrator

speaketh it as a marvel ; the listener heareth it as a marvel ; and yet after the seeing, speaking, and hearing of it, none knoweth the complete detail of it !'¹ And he also cries out at the same time : ' Where is there despondency, where sorrow, unto him who seeth the Oneness ! ' ' He sees that all jīvas rise and fall, lower and higher, endlessly, in pseudo-infinite time, space, and motion. He sees that the jīva that is a crawling worm to-day will be the Ishvara of a great system to-morrow ; and that the jīva that is the Ishvara of a system to-day will descend into deeper densities of matter in a greater system to-morrow, to rise to the still larger Ishvara-ship of a vaster system in still another kalpa.³ Nay, not only *will be*, in the one sense, but also *is* in another sense. The single human being that is so weak and helpless, even as a worm, in the solar system of the Ishvara to whom he owes allegiance, is, at the same time, in turn, veritable Ishvara to the tissue-cells, leucocytes, and animalcules, that compose his organism ; and the currents of his large life, unconsciously or consciously to himself, govern those of the minute ones. The ruler of a solar system, again, would at the same time, in turn, be an infinitesimal cell in the unimaginably vast frame

¹ आश्चर्यवत्पश्यति कश्चिदेनम्, आश्चर्यवद्ब्रूदति तथैव चान्यः,
आश्चर्यवच्चैनमन्यः शृणोति, श्रुत्वाप्येनं वेद न चैव कश्चित् ।

Bhagavad-Gītā, ii, 28.

² तत्र को मोहः कः शोक एकत्वमनुपश्यतः । *Isha Upanishat*, 7.

³ अहं मनुरभवं सूर्यश्च । *Bṛhad-Āraṇyaka*, I, iv, 10.

of a Virāt-Purusha, whose individuality includes countless billions of such systems. And, throughout all this wonder, the knower of Brahma also knows that there is no ruthless cruelty, no nightmare agony of helplessness in it, for, at every moment, each condition is essentially voluntary, the product of that utterly Free Will of Self (and therefore of all selves), which there is none else to bend and curb in any way, the Will that is truly liberated from all bondage. He knows that because all things, all jīvas and all Ishvaras, belong to, nay, *are in* and *are* Self already, therefore whatsoever a self wishes, that, with all its consequences, will surely belong to it, if it only earnestly wishes; this earnest wish itself being the essence of yoga, with its three coequal factors of bhakti, jñāna, and karma, correponding to ichchhā, jñāna, and kriyā respectively. Knowing all this, he knows, he *cognises* Brahma; and *loving* all selves as himself, desiring their welfare as his own, and *acting* for their happiness as he labours for his own, he *realises* and *is* Brahma.¹ Such an one is truly mukta, free, delivered from all bonds; he knows and is the Ab-sol-ute, Self *ab-solved* from all the limitations of Not-Self, the Self wherein is ab-solu-tion from all doubt and error, all wants and pains, all fevered restlessness and anxious seeking. To him belongs the Everlasting Peace!

The book opens with Nachiketa's cry for the Knowledge which would give him Peace through Freedom from Doubt

¹ In the words of *Bhāgavata*, the *cognition* of the identity of one-self with all selves and All-Self is *shuddh-ādvaita*; the *feeling* of that unity is *bhāv-ādvaita*; the *working* for it is *kriy-ādvaita*.

and Fear. It ends with ancient verses which sum up that Knowledge and bring the Peace. Nachiketa refused steadfastly all the other finite and ephemeral things which were offered to him to allure him away from the Infinite and Eternal. Therefore he obtained, therefore he became the Immortal, Infinite Eternal, and in It, he found all finite things also. May all sincere seekers do likewise.

‘AUM! Such is the imperishable Brahma, such is the unwaning Supreme. Knowing It, whatsoever one desireth, that is his! The One Ruler that abideth within all beings as their Inner self, That maketh the one seed manifold!—the wise who realise That One within themselves—unto them belongeth the Eternal Joy, unto None-Else, unto None-Else! The Eternal One amidst the everlasting Many, That maketh and fulfilleth all the countless desires of the Many—they who behold That One in their Self, unto them, and unto None-Else, belongeth the Eternal Peace.’¹ ‘This is the sole sense of the Véda, such is the whole essence of all Experience—that all language declareth only Me and describeth Naught-Else; it imagineth the I in all kinds of forms and rejecteth them all; in the realising that all-Else-than-I is but My Illusion, and in the Negation and abolition thereof, is found the Final Peace’.²

‘Thus did Nachikéṭā, having obtained from the Lord of Death the Secret of Death, this Supreme Knowledge, and also the whole method of Yoga-practice, become identified with Brahma, and free from all fear

¹ *Katha Upaniṣaḥ*.

² *Bhāgavata*, XI, xxi, 43.

and doubt and death. So too may every other earnest seeker become free who acquires the Supreme Knowledge, *Aḍhyāṭma*, only'.¹



एतद्भवेवाक्षरं ब्रह्म, एवद्भवेवाक्षरं परं,
 एतदेव विदित्वा तु, यो यदिच्छति तस्य तत् ।
 एको वशी सर्वभूतांतरात्मा, एकं बीजं बहुधा यः करोति,
 तमात्मस्थं येऽनुपश्यन्ति धीरास् तेषां सुखं शाश्वतं नेतरेषां ।
 नित्यो नित्यानां, चेतनश्चेतनानां, एको बहूनां यो विदधाति कामान्,
 तमात्मस्थं येऽनुपश्यन्ति धीरास्, तेषां शांतिः शाश्वती ; नेतरेषाम् ।
 मां विधत्तेऽभिधत्ते मां, विकल्प्यापोह्यते त्वहम् ;
 एतावान् सर्ववेदार्थः, शब्द आस्थाय मां, भिदाम्
 मायामात्रमनूयन्ति प्रतिषिध्य प्रसीदति ।
 मृत्युप्रोक्तां नचिकेतोऽथ लब्ध्वा विद्यां एतां, योगविधिं च कृत्स्नं,
 ब्रह्मप्राप्तो विरजोऽभूद्विमृत्युः ; अन्योपि एवं यो विद् अज्यात्मं एव ।



सर्वस्तरतु दुर्गाणि, सर्वो भद्राणि पश्यतु,
 सर्वः सङ्गुद्धिमाप्नोतु, सर्वः सर्वत्र नन्दतु ।



PEACE TO ALL BEINGS

¹ *Katha Upanishat.*

DEDICATION

A SOUL all broken with its petty pains !—
The boundless glories of the Infinite !—
How may the one, unfit, feeble, slow-moving,
Harrassed with all the burdens of its sins,
Tell rightly of the Other's Perfectness !
Yet, for the love of self that drave it forth,
A-searching on that ancient path of thought,
They tell is sharper than the sword-blade's edge,
In hope to find that which would bring some touch
Of solace to it in its weariness—
Because that love of self hath gained its goal,
And uttermost self-seeking found the Self,
And so grown love of Self and of all selves,
It drave that soul—unworthy, full of sin,
But full of love, yea, full of agony
Amidst its new-found peace, that any self,
Thinking itself as less than the Great Self,
Should suffer pang of helpless littleness—
To cry abroad and set down what it found
In words, too poor, too weak, and too confused,
That yet, eked out by the strong earnestness
Of other searching souls, may, with the blessing
Of the compassioning Guardians of our race,
Bring to these seeking souls some little peace !
Ye that have suffered, and have passed beyond
Our human sorrowing, and yet not passed,
For Ye are suffering it of your own will,
So long as any suffer helplessly !

Ye Blessed Race of Manus, R̥shis, Buḍḍhas,
 Gods, Angels, mother-hearted Hierarchs !
 Christs, Prophets, Saints ! Ye Helpers of our race
 Ye Holy Ones that suffer for our sake !
 I lay this ill-strung wreath of bloomless words,
 But with the hands of reverence, at your feet,
 That, filled with freshness by their streaming life,
 And consecrated by their holiness,
 And cleansed of all the soiling of my sins,
 They may bespread their fragrance o'er the world,
 And bring Self-knowledge and Self-certainness,
 And quenchless joy of all-embracing Self,
 To all that suffer voiceless misery.

Peace unto all, sweetness, serenity,
 The peace that from this doubtless knowledge flows
 That there is naught beyond our very Self,
 The Common Self of old and young and babe—
 No Death, nor other Power out of Me,
 To hurt or hinder, hearten us or help—
 Knowledge that all this Process of the World,
 Its laugh and smile, its groan and bitter tears,
 Are all the Self's, My own, Pastime and Play—
 Knowledge that all is Self, and for the Self,
 And by the Self, whence is Unshaken Peace !

ॐ

सर्वः शुभमवाप्नोतु
 सर्वः शान्तिं नियच्छतु
 लोकाः समस्ताः सुखिनो भवन्तु

ॐ

INDEX OF WORKS REFERRED TO

[NOTE.—Alteration of page-numbers in these Indices, for the sake of the new edition, represents the very heavy labor of love of Miss Preston and Mr. Henry Van Zeijst. To them, deep gratitude of author and readers are due. It is true that the Indices are not quite up to date ; for new books quoted (few), and old books newly referred to (often) in the large additions made in this new edition, have not been referred to in these Indices. But this, it is trusted will not seriously inconvenience readers. The Index of Proper names has also not been enlarged ; because the new matter in the text contains very few additional names. The Glossary of Samskr̥t words has also been left unenlarged for the same reason. To bring all these up to date would have taken many weeks of heavy labor for me, which I am ill fitted for now at my age ; and the publishers, the Theosophical Publishing House, are naturally anxious that publication of the book should not be delayed longer. It has been already three whole years in the press, because of the abnormal conditions created by World War II and its aftermath ; in normal times it could have been brought out in three months, or at most six. —BHAGAVAN DAS].

Āditya-hṛdaya-sūtra, a hymn to the Sun, in *Bhaviṣhy-ottara Purāṇa*, 365.

Ānanda-Lahari, a hymn to Shakti, by Shankara, 219.

Ancient Wisdom, by Annie Besant, 389.

Anubhūti-prakāśha-sār-oḍḍhārā, a small work on Vedānta, 115.

Anu-gītā, 256, 257, 291, 365, 373.

Aumkāra-sarvasva, 235.

Bergson, by Wildon Carr, 281.

Bhāgavata Purāṇa, also called *Vishṇu-Bhāgavata* or *Śrīmad-Bhāgavata* to distinguish it from *Devī-Bhāgavata*, 33, 50, 114, 152, 161, 201, 202, 255, 257, 260, 264, 271, 301, 317, 345, 352, 360, 398, 412, 429, 462, 474, 483, 494.

Bhagavad-Gītā; see *Gītā*.

Bhāmati, by Vāchaspati, a commentary on Shankara's *Shāṅkara-Bhāṣya* on *Brahma-sūtra*, 22, 23, 83.

Bhaviṣya-Purāṇa, 456.

Brahma-sūtra, aphorisms by Vyāsa on the Vēdānta system of philosophy, 207, 256, 328.

Bṛhad-āranyaka Upaniṣat, 2, 24, 50, 85, 113, 266, 307, 341, 409, 492.

Charaka-samhitā, a work on medicine, 28, 32, 282, 378.

Chhāndogya Upaniṣat, 47, 93, 109, 112, 177, 307, 410.

Devī-Bhāgavata Purāṇa, 26, 47, 114, 173, 191, 193, 218, 240, 243, 244, 250-256, 269, 318, 370, 436.

Dignity of Man, by Fichte, 84.

Drama of Love and Death, by Edward Carpenter, 440.

Dream Problem, by Dr. Ram Narayan, 29.

Ḍurga-saptā-shatī, a part of *Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa*, describing avatāras of Shaktī, 167, 251.

Electrical Theory and the Problem of the Universe, by Tunzelman, 390.

Encyclopædia Britannica, 27, 383.

Ether, Matter and Motion, by Dolbear, 322, 382.

Examination of Sir William Hamilton's Philosophy, by J. S. Mill, 88.

Fichte, by Adamson, 79.

General Physiology, by Max Verworn, 194, 336, 342, 347, 354, 387, 409.

Gītā or *Bhagavad-Gītā*, 6, 38, 39, 90, 116, 173, 191-194, 209, 229, 242, 245, 250, 256-260, 263, 269, 318, 350, 415, 461, 471, 487, 492.

Gopātha-Bṛāhmaṇa, part of *Aṭharva-Vēda*, 110.

Goraksha-Samhitā, 249.

Grammar of Science, by Karl Pearson, 47, 220.

Guṇṭavati, a commentary on *Ḍurgā-saptā-shatī*, by Bhāskara-rāya, 167, 251.

Handbook of Chemistry, by Ostwald, 91

History of Philosophy, by Hegel, 77.

„ „ „ „ Ueberweg, 65.

„ „ „ „ Schwegler, 43, 57, 65, 80, 82, 89,
174, 403.

Introduction to the Philosophy of Religion, by Caird, 69.

Īsha Upanishat, 148, 161, 492.

Jñāna-garbha, 165, 482.

Kālāgni-rudra Upanishat, 248.

Kāma-sūtra by Vātsyāyana, 269

Kapila-Gītā, 370.

Katha Upanishat, 1, 33, 108, 161, 325, 494.

Kēna Upanishat, 32, 161, 341.

Machinery of the Universe, The, by Dolbear, 437.

Mahā-bhārata, Epic of the Great War between Kauravas
and Pāṇdavas, by Vyāsa, 235, 271, 282, 283, 291, 318,
335, 373, 388.

Mahima-stūti, a hymn to Shiva, by Pushpa-ḍaṇṭa, 116, 228,
237, 365.

Mūlinī-vijaya, 249.

Māndūkya Upanishat, 109, 161.

Mantra-shāstra, 235.

Manu, 2, 41, 151, 228, 257.

Maṭsya Purāṇa, 455.

Monadology, by Leibnitz, 180.

Mukṭi-sopāna, by Goraksha, 250.

Muṇḍaka Upanishat, 352.

Nandikēshvara-Kārikā, 159, 235.

New Psychology, The, by Scripture, 91.

Nirālamba Upanishat, 15.

Nirukṭa, a work on the principles of Veda-exegesis, by
Yāska, 250.

Nyāya-Sūtra, the aphorisms of the Nyāya System of philo-
sophy, by Gauṭama, 261, 288, 340, 428, 479.

Nyāya-bhāṣya, commentary on the above, by Vātsyāyana,
32, 261, 266, 479.

Nyāya-vārtika-tātparya, annotations by Vāchaspaṭi, on a gloss by Uḍyotakara on the above.

Nyāya-kosha, a dictionary of the technical terms of the Nyāya philosophy, by Bhīmāchārya, 300.

Occult Chemistry, by Annie Besant and C. W. Leadbeater, 399.

Origin and Nature of Life, The, by Dr. B. Moore, 180.

Pancha-dashī, a work on the Vedānta System of philosophy, Viḍy-āraṇya, 7, 9, 25, 222, 377.

Panchī-karaṇa-vivaraṇa, a small treatise on the doctrine of the quintuple compounding of the primal elements, 377.

Paramārtha-sūtra, a work of the Kāshmīr Shaiva School of philosophy, by Abhinava-guṇṭa, 166.

Political Ideals, by C. D. Burns, 349.

Pragmatism, by William James, 53.

Praṇava-vāda, 40, 121, 166, 167, 186, 200, 235, 317, 370, 376, 391, 405, 438, 440, 453.

Prashna Upaniṣat, 50, 108, 268.

Principles of Science, by Jevons, 180.

Psychology, by Höffding, 7, 9, 11, 222, 227, 271, 380.

„ „ William James, 33, 53.

„ „ Herbert Spencer, 272.

„ „ James Ward, 27, 383, 339.

Psychology of Sex, by Havelock Ellis, 204.

Purāṇas, 'histories' of world-evolution and dissolution, by many Vyāsa-s, 76, 89, 115, 120, 159, 164, 235, 236, 239, 253, 263, 264, 271, 290, 315, 323.

Purusha-sūkta, the great Vēdic hymn to the Macrocosmic Man, the Supreme Self, 350.

Rahasya-traya, 251.

Rāmāyaṇa, the Epic of the History of the Solar Race of Kings, and especially of Rāma and of his war with Rāvaṇa, by Vālmiki, 235.

Rāmāyaṇa (in Hindī), by Tulasī Dās, 328.

Replies to Criticisms, in *Essays*, by Herbert Spencer, 69.

Response in the Living and the Non-Living, by Sir J. C. Bose, 336.

Rg-vēda, 148, 152.

Rubāiyāt, by Omar Khayyam, 12.

Sāṅkhya-kārikā, 41, 53, 235, 256, 260, 266.

Sāṅkhya-tattvā-kaumuḍī, 260.

Sankshēpa Shārīraka, a work on Védānta, by Sarvajña Muni, 81, 191.

Sankshēpa Tīkā, commentary on above by Maḍhusūdana Sarasvaṭi, 85, 191.

Sarva-sāra Upanishat, 15, 152.

Saundarya-Laharī, a hymn to Shakti, by Shankara, 148.

Science and the Infinite, by S. T. Klein, 312.

Science of Knowledge, by Fichte, 83, 174.

Science of Peace (First Edition), 121.

Science of Religion or Sanātana Vaidika Dharma, by Bhagavan Das, 142.

Science of Social Organization or The Laws of Manu, by Bhagavan Das, 142.

Secret Doctrine, by H. P. Blavatsky, 309, 322, 345, 375, 389.

Secret of Hegel, by Stirling, 43.

Shabḍa-kalpa-ḍruma, 268.

Shārīraka-Bhāshya, commentary by Shankara on the *Brahma-Sūtra* of Vyāsa, 8, 34, 49, 71, 84.

Shaiva Āgama, 236.

Shāṇḍilya, 271.

Shiva Purāṇa, 248.

Shiva-Sūtra-vimarshiṇī, a work of the Kāshmir Shaiva school of philosophy, by Vasu Guṇṭa and Kshémarāja, 165, 249, 257, 260, 262, 264.

Shvēt-āshvataṛa Upanishat, 153, 209.

Spaṇḍa-kārikā-vivṛti, by Rāma Kantha, 249, 262, 264, 269.

Story of Life's Mechanism, by H. W. Conn, 342.

Taittirīya Upanishat, 47, 93, 109.

Tantrāloka, 268.

Tantra-shāstra, a class of works dealing with 'secret' sciences and arts, 110, 233, 247, 370.

Tāra-sāra Upanishat, 109, 234.

Tātparya-prakāsha, commentary on Yoga-Vāsishtha, 147.

Tattva-saṇḍoha, 269.

Text-book to Kant, by Stirling, 65.

Theosophist, 29.

Thesaurus, by Roget, 142.

The Proposed University at Indore, by Patrick Geddes, 18.

Ṭilaka-Ṭikā, commentary on Ḍēvi Bhāgavaṭa, by Nilakantha, 252.

Ṭikā, on *Yoga-bhāshya*, by Vāchaspaṭi, 455.

Tripāḍ-vibhūṭi-mahā-nārayaṇa Upanishat, 377, 435.

Two New Worlds, by Fournier D'Albe, 391.

Upanishats, a class of mystical and philosophical treatises forming part of the *Vēḍas*, 96, 111, 120, 461.

Upaskāra, commentary on *Vaishēshika-sūtra*, by Shankara Mishra, 33.

Vairāgya-shaṭaka, by Bhartṛhari, 486.

Vaishēshika-sūtra, 33, 54, 261.

Vāyu Purāṇa, 455.

Vēḍānta-sāra, 9, 222, 252, 256, 282.

Vēḍas, 40, 54, 111, 115, 200, 243, 263.

Vinaya-pāṭrikā, a collection of hymns, in Hindī, by Ṭulasi Ḍās, 326.

Vishṇu-Purāṇa, 29.

What is Thought ?, by Stirling, 78, 81, 82, 89.

Yoga-sūtra, Aphorisms by Paṭaṅjali on the Yoga System of philosophy and practical or applied psychology, 109, 161, 184, 288, 333, 360, 378, 403, 435, 455.

Yoga-bhāshya, commentary on above, by Vyāsa, 33, 175, 259, 290, 301, 378, 462.

Yoga-Vāsishtha, a large work, in verse, ascribed to Vālmiki, on mystical and Vēḍānta philosophy, 2, 3, 32, 38, 75, 115, 147, 164, 180, 181, 213, 227, 262, 312, 342, 377, 391, 398, 435, 440, 461, 484.

Zadig et Micromegas, Voltaire, 376.

INDEX OF PROPER NAMES

- Abhinava-guṭṭa, 165.
Adamson, 79.
Aḍvaiṭa-Vēdāṇṭa, the name of a system of philosophy, 52, 6.
Agni, 250, 263.
Ahrimān, 9.
Albrecht, 94.
Ananṭa, 317.
Anirudḍha, 271.
Aristotle, 94.
- Bacon, 94.
Balarāma, 271.
Boehme, 94.
Bergson, 19, 214, 280, 281, 286.
Besant, Annie, 382, 399.
Bhagavaṭī, a name and form of Shakti, 115.
Bharṭṛ-hari, 486, 489.
Bhava, a name and form of Shiva, 2, 236.
Bhavānī, a name and form of the consort or shakti of Shiva, 237.
Bhim-āchārya, 300.
Bhushundi, 164.
Blavatsky, Helena Petrovna, 389.
Bose, Sir Jagadīsha Chandra, 336.
Brahmā, 2, 170, 193, 236, 238, 249, 251, 290, 318, 319, 323, 377.
Brāhmi, 249.
Bruno, 94.
Burns, C. D., 349.
- Caird, 69.
Capes, The, 291.
Carpenter, Edward, 440.

Carr, W., 281.

Chaldean votaries, 454.

Chandra, a name of the moon, 250.

Chandī, a name and form of the Shakti of Shiva, 167.

Charaka, author of a work on medicine, which is known by the same name; said by tradition to be another name of Patañjali, 28, etc.

Chatterji, J. C., 165.

Descartes, 22, 94.

Dolbear, 322, 382, 437.

Ḍurgā, 240.

Dvaita-Vēdānta, the name of a system of philosophy, 48, etc.

Eckhart, 94.

Ellis, Havelock, 204.

Eros, 271, 304.

Euclid, 40.

Fichte, 66, 67, 68, 77-88, 94, 95, 174, 403.

Fournier d'Albe, 391.

Fresnel, 386.

Gārgyāyana, 40, 121.

Garuda, 317, 318.

Gauri, 236, 249, 318.

Gāyatrī, the name of a Ṛg-Vēda-verse, being a prayer to or invocation of the Sun, 111, 243.

Geddes, Prof. Patrick, 18.

Goraksha, 250.

Gnostic Works, 112.

Greek Philosophers, 94, 410.

Green, 27.

Hamilton, 69.

Hamsa, 323.

Hara, a name and form of Shiva, 236.

Hari, a name and form of Vishṇu, 2.

Hegel, 66-68; his main thesis, 69-71; his *petitio principii*, 74-87; his great error, 151.

Hoffding, 7, 9, 11, 27, 214, 222, 227, 271, 380.

Hormuzd, 9.

Hübbe-Schleiden, Dr., 386.

Hume, 57, 160.

Huygens, 386.

Indra, 46, 263, 341, 486.

James, William, 33, 53, 217, 261.

Jevons, 180.

Jishṇu, a name and form of Vishṇu, 291.

Kabbalistic Works, 112.

Kabir, Indian religious reformer, saint and poet, 464.

Kāla, a name and form of Time and also of Shiva, 316.

Kālī, a name and form of the consort-Shaktī of Shiva, 237, 251, 318.

Kāma, 233; Kāma-Eros, 271, 304.

Kaṇāḍa, 467.

Kaṇḍarpa, a name and form of Kāma, 233.

Kant, 58-66; fundamental defect of, 54, 213, 369, 469.

Kēshava, a name and form of Vishṇu, 326.

Klein, S. T., 312.

Kroeger, 83, 174.

Kṛṣṇa, 38, 194, 245, 271.

Krug, 73, 179, 354.

Ladd, Prof., 380.

Lakshmi, chief name and form of the consort-Shaktī of Vishṇu, 233, 251, 318, 319.

Lee, F. S., 194.

Leibnitz, 94, 180.

Mā, a name of Lakshmi, 234.

Maḍhu-sūdana Sarasvāṭī, 85.

Mahā-Kāla, a name and form of Shiva, the "Great Dark Time or Mover," 317.

Mahā-Kālī, 167.

Mahā-Lakshmi, 167.

Mahā-Sarasvāṭī, 167.

Mahésha, a name and form of Shiva, 2.

Maitréyi, 2.

Mansel, 69.

Manu, see *Manu*.

Mārkaṇḍéya, 164.

McTaggart, Prof. J. E., 83.

Mill, J. S., 88.

Miṭra, a name and form of the Sun, 263.

Mukunḍa, a name and form of Viṣṇu, 115.

Mystics, 94.

Nachikéṭā, 1, 2, 36, 108.

Nārāyaṇa, a name and form of Viṣṇu, 291.

Nayyāyikas, 300.

Neo-Platonists, 94.

Newton, 386.

Niḍāgha, 29.

Nīla-Kantha, 252, 318.

North Pole, 291.

Nyāya, name of a system of philosophy, 53, etc.

Omar Khayyām, 19.

Ostwald, 91.

Paṭañjali, 109.

Pearson, Karl, 47, 220.

Pflüger, 349.

Plato, 94.

Pradyumna, 271.

Prajāpati, 35, 47.

Prāṇava, a name of AUM ; Etymological explanation of the word, 109, 117, 233, etc.

Preyer, 348, 352.

Qarīn, a Sūfī poet, 465.

Rādhā, that form of Shakti, prāṇa, nerve force, vital energy, which energises the motor organs, 240.

Rāma, 2.

Rāma-Kantha, 249.

Rambhā, 436.

Rām Nārāyaṇa, Dr., 29.

Rbhu, 29.

Roget, 142.

Rosicrucians, 93.

Ruḍra, 236, 251.

Sankarshaṇa-Bala-rāma, 271.

Sāṅkhya, the name of a system of philosophy, 9, etc.

Sarasvatī, 231, 318.

Saṭya-kāma, 108.

Scheffler, 94.

Schelling, his statement of the law of relativity, 66, 68, 77, 79, 89.

Schopenhauer, 94.

Schwegler, 74, 83, 84, 89, 469.

Scripture, 91.

Sisyphus, 90.

Shakti, 49.

Shambhu, a name and form of Shiva, 291.

Shankara, a name and form of Shiva, 234.

Shankar-āchārya, 19, 71, 84, 148.

Shankara Mishra, 33.

Shésa, 317, 319.

Shiva, 170, 193, 236, 237, 244, 248, 251, 253, 290, 317, 318.

Shri-Harsha, 31.

Smara, name and form of Kāma, 304.

Spencer, Herbert, 69, 94, 272.

Spinoza, 94.

Stout, 27, 214.

Sūfi poets, 462.

Sūrya, a name of an aspect of the Sun, 250, 263.

Tantalus, 90.

Titans, 56.

Ṭulasī Dās, 326, 327.

Tunzelman, 390.

Ueberweg, 65.

Umā Haimavaṭi, a name and form of Mūla-prakṛti, 'that which is not and melts away like snow'; also a name and form of Shiva's consort, 341.

Vāchaspaṭi, 455.

Vaishēshika, the name of a system of philosophy, 33, etc.

Vaishṇavī, a name and form of the shakti of Viṣṇu, 249.

Varuṇa, 263.

Vasishtha, 2, 139, 324.

Vāsudeva-Kṛṣṇa, 271.

Vāṭsyāyana, 269.

Vēdānta, the name of a system of philosophy, 4, etc.

Verworn, Max, 194, 336, 342, 347, 354, 387, 409, 415.

Viṣṇu, 2, 47, 170, 193, 213, 238, 249, 251, 271, 291, 317, 318, 319.

Viśhvāmītra, 139.

Voltaire, 376.

Vyāsa, 328.

Ward, James, 27, 189, 383, 428.

Weismann, 24.

Yājñā-vaikya, 2.

Yama, 1, 46, 108.

Yoga, the name of a system of philosophy, 33, etc.

GLOSSARY OF SAṂSKṚṬ TERMS

- Ābhāsa, 'illusory appearance,' 11.
 Ābhāsa-vāda, 'the doctrine' that the world-process is an 'illusion,' another name for Aḍvaita-Vēḍāṇṭa, 11.
 Abhi-māna, 'egoistic desire, pride,' 266, 270.
 Abhimānī-dēvaṭā, the 'individualising' and ensouling 'deity,' the non-human jīva functioning as, or in, a nature-force or nature-phenomenon, 263.
 Abhi-nivēsha, tenacity, obduracy, clinging to separate individualised life, will-to-live, 233, 239.
 Abhi-saṇḍhi, determination, intention, 266, 271.
 Abhi-vyakṭa, clearly manifested, defined, distinct, 285.
 Abhyāsa, practice, perseverance, repetition, 195.
 A-chiṭ, 'un-conscious'; inanimate; material; matter, 49, 173.
 Aḍāna, taking back, 238.
 Aḍas, the somewhat distant 'this,' 41.
 Aḍhāra, 'that which supports,' 310.
 Aḍhi-aksha, overlord, oversee, 32.
 Aḍhi-bhauṭika, made of the physical bhūṭas, *i.e.*, sensible materials, 440.
 Aḍhikāri, the person entitled, having the right, 53.
 Aḍho-gamana, going downward, 381.
 Aḍhyāsa, 'super-imposition' or reflection of the attributes of one thing on or in another thing, 11, 204, 340.
 Aḍhyāsa-vāḍa, the doctrine that the world-process is a dream-image, 'super-imposed' upon the Universal Consciousness by Itself, 11.
 Aḍhyāṭma-vidyā, 'the science of the Self': subjective science; psychology, 47.
 Aḍhyavasāya, ascertained knowledge, 266, 270.
 Āḍi, 'beginning,' the 'first' ṭaṭṭva, 312, 376, 438.
 Āḍi-ṭaṭṭva, 'the first element' (of matter), next but one above ākāsha in gradation of subtlety, 376, 438.

- A-*dvaiṭa*, 'non-dual'; non-dualistic; monistic, 52, 84-88, 194, 238, 493.
- Āgama, 'that which has come down,' a traditional school of religio-philosophical worship, 236.
- Agni, 'fire,' the root-element of matter corresponding to the organ of vision, 411, 438.
- Aham, 'I'; Ego; Self, 119, 158, 191, 238, 285, 308, 332, 333, 337, 344-7, 351, 402.
- Aham-dhī, 'I-consciousness,' individualist-feeling, (as *shakti*), 264.
- Aham-Ētaṭ, 141, 392, etc.
- Aham-Ētaṭ-Na, 119, 139, 146, 200, 208, 225, 238, 325, etc.
- Aham-kāra, 'I-ness,' 'Egoism,' 'Ego-ising, self-referring, selfish desire,' 56, 191, 215, 228, 255, 256, 260, 264, 376, 432, 458.
- Ajñāna, non-Knowledge, 'nescience,' *ṭamas*, 257, 258.
- Ākāsha, 'space'; 'the luminous'; the root-element or plane of matter corresponding to the organ of hearing and the quality of sound, 85, 159, 173, 376, 377, 282, 389, 395, 398, 411, 438.
- Ā-kasmika, 'without a why,' causeless, accidental, 371.
- A-khanda, 'without parts,' 140, 285.
- Akshara-muḍrā, } a kind of acrostic, 112.
- Akshara-mushti, }
- Ākunchana, 'contraction,' 381.
- A-lasya, 'laziness,' 257.
- Ālochana, 'sensation,' 269.
- A-miṭra, 'non-friend,' foe, 175.
- Amsa-guṇa-kāla, 360.
- A-mukhya, 'not-chief,' minor, subordinate, 299.
- A-mukhya-kāraṇa, 'un-principal cause'; a minor or subsidiary cause, 299.
- A-mūrṭa, formless, 285, 290.
- An-aham, 'Not-I' Non-Ego, 119.
- Anāḍi-pravāha, 'beginningless (and endless) flow,' 181.
- An-āḍi-pravāha-satṭā, 'beginningless-flow-existence,' everlastingness, 34.
- An-āmaya, 'not-sick' 257.
- Ananda, 'bliss,' 167-169, 191, 238, 380-1, 383, 401.

- Ānanda-ghana, } 'compacted bliss.' } 139, 401.
 Ānanda-maya, } composed of bliss. }
 An-anyaṭ, 'not-other,' 457.
 An-arṭha-vāda, a counsel of evil, a mischievous doctrine, 291.
 An-ātma, 'Not-Self,' 148, 173.
 Āṇava-mala, 'atom-dust,' the 'stain' of 'atoms' created by desire, 264.
 Āṇḍolana, 'swinging'; revolving, weighing, pondering or balancing in the mind; cogitation; agitation, 381.
 An-īdam, 'not-this,' 115, 116.
 A-nirdeśhya, 'not to be pointed out,' indefinable, 139.
 A-nirvachanīya, 'indescribable,' 148.
 Aniṭi, 'breathes,' contracts and expands, 262.
 A-niṭya, 'impermanent,' 211.
 An-rta, 'not right'; false; untrue; unlawful; unrighteous, 173, 192.
 Anrta-jāḍa-duhkha, unreal-unliving-miserable, 192.
 Anṭa, 'end,' 315.
 Anṭah, 'inner,' 307.
 Anṭah-karaṇa, 'the inner instrument, 176, 260, 264, 438.
 Anṭah-karaṇa-chaṭushtaya, the four aspects, faculties, functions of the inner organ,' 261.
 Anṭara, 'interval'; middle; interspace; difference, 306.
 Anṭar-yāmi, 'inner watcher or ruler'; the Self, 164.
 Anṭya-sāmānya, the 'final' or highest genus, 468.
 Anṭya-viśeṣha, the final or lowest 'particular' or singular, 468, 470.
 Anu, 'ion,' atom, 81, 260, 262, 263, 264, 389, 398, 471, 475.
 Anu bhava, Anu-bhūti, presentation, experience, 'becoming like' the object, 32.
 An-uḍ-buddha, sub-conscious, or supra-conscious, not risen into waking consciousness, above or below the threshold of consciousness, dormant, un-awake, 285.
 An-upāḍaka, 'receiver-less'; the root-element of matter next above ākāśha, so-called because there is as yet no organ or 'receiver' developed by humanity for it, 376, 438.
 Anu-sandhāna, tracing, following out, connecting before and after, 270.
 Anu-vyavasāya, 'ap-perception,' 424.
 Anvaya, 'concomitant presence,' 473.

- Anyat-anyat, 'other of other,' 'other than other,' 150.
 Apakshepaṇa, 'casting away,' 381.
 Apra-pakṣha, 'other side or wing,' 306.
 Apra-pārshva, 'other side or flank,' 306.
 Aparā-prakṛti, 'other or un-higher, *i.e.*, lower nature,' 245, 263.
 Apra-vishéha, 'lowest particular,' 285, 470.
 A-pari-ṇāmī, 'unchanging,' 163.
 A-par-oksha, 'not away from the eye'; direct; immediate, 41, 202, 247.
 Āpas or āpaḥ, 'waters'; the root-element of matter corresponding to the organ of taste, 376, 382, 389, 390.
 Apa-sarpaṇa, 'moving away,' 322.
 A-paurushéya, 'non-human,' 'super-human,' 41.
 A-prakāsha, 'non-illumination,' absence of light, darkness, 257.
 A-pravṛtti, 'in-activity,' listlessness, 257.
 A-prīti, dis-satisfaction, 260.
 Ārambha, 'origin,' commencement, 257, 312.
 Ārambha-vāda, 'the theory or doctrine of a beginning,' *i.e.*, creation of the world by a Personal God, 7, 11, 222.
 Artha, 'desired substance' (and its equivalents and allies, *dravya*, *bala*, *bhakti*, *ichchhā*) 254, 255.
 Artha-vāda, allegory, parable, metaphor, 291.
 A-sādhāraṇa, 'uncommon,' special, 371.
 A-sādhāraṇa-nimitta, 'uncommon cause or condition'; special or chief cause or condition, 299.
 A-samavāyi-kāraṇa, 'non-concomitant cause,' 299.
 A-sat, 'non-existent,' 'un-true,' 'not-good,' 70, 182, 183.
 A-shama, restlessness, 257.
 Ashvattha, one of the three chief varieties of great Indian fig-trees, the *pīpal*, 415.
 Asmi, 'am,' 119, 208, 238, 239.
 Asmi-tā, 'am-ness,' the feeling that 'I am' a separate individual, sense of separate-self-existence, 229, 234, 239, 264.
 A-sura, a class of non-human beings; also a race of human beings; (some think the Assyrians were so named in the *Vedas*), 398.
 Aṭana, wandering, 381.

Aṭaṭi, 'goes about,' 262.

Āṭiṭa, 'past,' transcendent, 139.

Āṭi-vāhika, the 'transmigrating' body; ideal or mental body, made of thought or imagination, as opposed to the physical or ādhi-bhautika body, 440.

Āṭmā, Self (Gr. 'atom' or 'etymon'), 28, 59, 84, 85, 153, 160, 161, 164, 171, 261-265, 291, 292, 326, 338, 409.

Āṭmā-buddhi-manas, the Self—the Universal mind or pure reason—the individualising mind, 214, 291, 440.

Āṭma-dhārana, 'self-maintenance,' 367.

Āṭmā-nubhava, 'self-experience,' apperception, 424.

Āṭma-vasha, 'self-dependent,' 229.

Āṭma-vidyā, 'the Science of the Self,' 247.

Aṭra, 'here' 306.

Āṭy-anṭ-ā-saṭ, 'extremely non-existent', utterly non-existent, pure non-being, 87.

A-U-M, 1, 108, 117, 121, 200, 494, 495, 497.

Āvaraṇa, 'enveloping'; veiling, screening, covering up, blinding, 238, 239, 257, 258, 260, 271.

Āvarṭa-bhramāṇa, 'spiral motion,' 322.

Avasāna, 'end', completion, termination, 312.

Āvashyaka-tā, 'helplessness', necessity, 217.

Avasthā, state, condition, 247.

Avatāra, 'descent,' 'incarnation,' an incarnate deity, 264.

A-vidyā, 'non-knowledge'; nescience; ignorance; error, 168, 175, 218, 226, 234, 241, 242, 245, 246, 253, 258.

Avidyā-Vidyā-Mahāvidyā, error-truth-great-Science (or Wisdom), 254.

Avidyā-kāma-karma, 'Error-desire-action.' 67.

A-vikāri, 'immutable,' 164.

A-vyakṭa, 'unmanifested'; undefined; vague; unmanifested or root-Matter; (sometimes also) unmanifested Spirit, 159, 173, 194, 285, 458.

Āyāma, 'extent,' extension, length, 332.

Ayana, 'going,' motion, 302, 319, 332.

Āyu, 'lifetime,' 332.

A-yuga-paṭ, 'not two together,' 'not simultaneous,' at different times, successively, 285.

Baddha, 'bound,' fettered, 229.

- Bahih, 'outside'; outer, external, 307.
- Bahish-karaṇa, 'outer instrument,' the external or physical sensor and motor organs, 176.
- Bala, strength, power, 254.
- Baṇḍha or baṇḍhana, 'bondage,' 315.
- Bhakti, love, devotion, 254, 453, 459.
- Bhakti-Yoga, 'the path of devotion,' 255.
- Bhāva, existence, being, thought, emotion, feeling, thing, intention, 284, 378.
- Bhāv ādvaiṭa, realisation of non-separateness or unity of all life and all living beings in emotion, by universal love, 493.
- Bhāvanā-dārdhya, consolidation, condensation, 'hardening' of 'thought' or imagination, 228.
- Bhaviṣyaṭ, 'that which will be'; future, 313.
- Bhēḍa, 'dividing', division; separateness; difference, 173.
- Bhēḍa-mula, 'the root or source of separateness,' 173.
- Bhrama, Bhrāṇti, wandering, 'gyrating,' moving round and round, 159, 210, 233.
- Bhūh-bhuvah-svah, the three worlds or planes, physical-astral-mental, or physical-astro-mental-causal, 250.
- Bhūṭa, 'what has become'; being; creature; element, 284, 313, 376, 458.
- Bhūt-ādi, the 'first being' or 'the originator of the (material) elements,' 376.
- Bhūt-ādi, ahamkāra regarded as originator of the five ṭaṭṭvās, 256, 284, 376.
- Bhuvah, the astral world, 250.
- Bija, 'seed'; potency; 186.
- Bija-mantra, 'seed-idea,' principle, 285.
- Binḍu, 'point,' drop, 308.
- Boḍha, understanding, 270.
- Brahma-charya, the pursuit or storing, of (a) knowledge, (b) the vital seed, (c) the 'Infinite,' 108.
- Brahma, 'immensity, expansion, or extension'; the Absolute, the Supreme, 35, 41, 84-8, 93, 108-9, 113, 115-6, 138-40, 150-64, 167, 172, 176-7, 192, 202, 209, 210, 219, 264, 307, 318, 320, 350, 375, 401, 418, 458, 478, 487, 493.
- Brahm-āṇḍa, an egg of the infinite, an orb in space, a globe, a heavenly body, a solar system, 176, 291, 411, 438.

Brahma-vidyā, 'the 'Science of the Infinite,' Metaphysic, 41, 247.

Brahmā-Vishṇu-Shiva, 251, 318.

Bṛh, 'to grow or expand,' 307.

Buddhi, 'apprehending'; consciousness; knowledge; determining intelligence; reason; the pure or determinate reason; universal mind, supra-consciousness, 44-5, 116, 144, 159, 160, 174, 213-15, 239-41, 244, 246, 255, 260, 280, 283-25, 382, 424, 428, 432, 438-40, 458.

Buddhi-boḍha, 'cognition of cognition,' apperception, 424.

Buddhi (mahat)-ahankāra-manas (and their equivalents and allies), 'intellection-emotion-volition,' 255, 256, 260-22, 269-71, 283-5, 289-290.

Buddhi-manas, 'Universal mind and individual mind' and allied or derivative pairs of opposites, 285, 290, 296.

Buddhi-ṭaṭṭva, another name for the anupāḍaka-ṭaṭṭva, 376, 382, 438.

Chakra, circle, cycle, 200, 316, 322.

Chakra-vaṭ, 'like a disc,' rotatory, 316, 322.

Chalana, 'going,' movement, 319.

Chānchalya, restless motion, 260.

Chāra, application, practice, 285.

Chētanā, consciousness, 270, 285.

Chēṭayaṭi, brings or calls to mind, remembers, 190, 270.

Chid-ākāsha-chiṭṭ-ākasha-mah-ākāsha, the space of Consciousness and the space of mind and the great space, 398.

Chid-ghana, 'compressed or compacted consciousness'; plenum of consciousness, 139, 400.

Chiṭ, consciousness, 'awareness,' 49, 167-9, 189-91, 238, 270, 400.

Chiṭi, Universal Consciousness, 189, 270.

Chiṭṭa, the individual mind as summation of buddhi-ahamkāra-manas, 45, 189, 213-5, 258-64, 269-71, 282, 285, 290, 447.

Chiṭṭa-vimukṭi, the emancipation of (or from the individual) mind; change of attitude from egoism to altruistic universalism, 453.

Daiva, 'divine,' ordained by the divine, destiny, fate, 228-9.

Daivi, 'divine,' 245-6.

Daivi-māyā, 'divine illusion,' 245.

Daivi-prakṛti, 'divine nature': energy, 245-6, 263.

Dama, restraint of the senses, 12, 202.

Darshana, 'seeing,' view, point of view, doctrine, philosophy, 5, 364.

Déha, body, 285.

Désa, 'that which is pointed out'; direction; space; place; country, 147, 301.

Désa-Kāla-avasthā,	} time-place-circumstance,
Désa-Kāla-Kriyā,	
Désa-Kāla-nimitta or heṭu,	

149, 247, 301, 331.

Désh-ātiṣa, 'beyond space,' transcending space; spaceless, 140.

Déva, 'shining being,' 'deity,' a (non-human) spirit, 41, 84, 185, 263, 398, 448.

Déva-chaṇ, 'place of the gods,' the heaven-world, 448.

Dharma, 'the holder,' 'the supporter'; law; duty; religions; function; attribute, 54, 371.

Dharma-mégha, a mystic condition of tranced and blissful meditation in which knowledge of the laws which govern and hold together the world-process, rains in upon the soul, (compare, "the cloud over the Sanctuary" of the mystics), 441, 457.

Dhāraṇā, holding the mind to one selected object and place (in the body), 285.

Dhṛiti, retentiveness, 291.

Dhyāṇa, incessant contemplation, 285.

Dīkshā, initiation, consecration, dedication, 258.

Dishta, the 'destined,' 229.

Dravya, 'the movable' or 'the liquifiable'; substance; thing, 191, 193, 254, 369, 379, 381-3, 389-90, 394, 395, 413, 467, 475.

Dravya-guṇa-Karma, 'substance-quality-movement,' 191, 193, 246, 247, 369, 370, 385, 387, 388, 390, 402, 406, 413, 467, 474, 477.

Duhkha, pain, 192, 257.

Dvaiṣa, 'duality,' 47-49, 172.

Dvan-dvam, 'two and two'; pairs; opposites; the relative; the opposed; struggle; war, 158, 173, 178, 179, 199, 200, 280, 297, 298, 400.

Ḍvaṇḍv-āṭīṭa, 'beyond duality'; the transcendent; the Absolute, 139.

Ḍvesha, hate, 233-4, 239-41, 266.

Ḍvy-aṇuka, 'di-atom,' 389.

Eka, 'one,' 284.

Ek-ākāram, 'one-formed'; uniform; never-changing form; partless, 263.

Eshaṇā, ambitious effort, ambition, 270.

Eṭaṭ, 'this,' 41, 119, 191, 207, 237-8, 307-9, 312-16, 319-22, 332-37, 339, 341, 344, 345, 347, 350, 351, 361, 367, 381, 387-90, 394, 398, 402, 417, 418, 430, 468, 475, 479, 481.

Eṭaṭ-Na, 'This-Not,' 264.

Evam, 'thus,' 382.

Gaṇḍharva, a class of non-human beings or spirits of a high order, devoted to music, 398, 419.

Garva, arrogance, 270.

Gaṭi, 'going,' movement, 319, 381.

Gauṇa, 'pertaining to guṇa or quality (and not to substance)'; secondary; non-essential, 271.

Gāyaṭrī, 'that which protects its utterer,' the most sacred manṭra of the Veda, an invocation of the Sun, 110-11, 243.

Ghōra, violent, vehement, dire, 260.

Gola, 'sphere,' 308.

Guhya, secret, 115.

Guṇa, 'attribute, property, quality,' 166, 190-93, 238, 283, 301-3, 369, 370, 374, 378, 381, 382, 395.

Guru, 'heavy, weighty'; teacher, 382.

Hālā-hala, the deadly venom thrown up at the churning of the Ocean, in the Purāṇa-legend (symbolical of the Hate, Inseparable from the struggle for existence in the Ocean of Life), 461.

Hamsa, *i.e.*, aham saḥ, 'I am that'; the swan; the sun; the jīvā, 210, 323.

Heṭu, reason, cause, motive, 247, 297, 300.

Ichchhā, 'desire, wish,' 56, 167, 169, 189, 193, 236, 239, 255, 266, 310, 317, 318, 367, 402.

Iḍam, 'this,' 41, 208, 382, 402.

Iḍā-pingalā-sushumnā, names of three principal nerves not yet clearly identified; but probably iḍā means the chief motor nerves and pingalā the chief sensor-nerves; sushumnā may stand for the spinal canal and corresponding hollows in the other nerve-tubes and nerve-cells in which desire plays, 250.

Indriya, sensor or motor organ, 284, 458.

Ishta-deva, the 'beloved god,' the deity who is the object of devotion, 407.

Īshvara, 'ruler'; the Ruler of a cosmic system, or planet, or kingdom, etc.; a Jiva who has passed on to the nivr̥tti-mārga, and so become a ruler of his sheaths, 49, 160, 169-172, 241, 328, 412, 429, etc.

Iṭṭham, 'such,' 382.

Jaḍa, 'inert'; unconscious; matter, 173, 193, 280, 400, 432.

Jagaṭ, 'that which goes or moves incessantly'; the world, 265.

Jāgraṭ, 'waking,' 285, 344.

Jagraṭ-svapna-sushupti, waking-dreaming-slumbering, 344.

Jala, water, same as Āpaḥ, 411.

Jāti, 'gens,' genus, type, species, 285.

Jāti-āyur-bhoga, 'genus (species, type)—life-period—experience, 333, 360.

Jiva or **Jiv-ātmā**, 'a living being'; an individual ego; one evolving unit or line of consciousness, 3, 6, 7, 12, 22, 33, 39, 45, 48, 50, 56, 81, 152, 158, 159, 160, 163, 179-182, 209, 210, 213, 263, 315, 321, 324, 331, 360, 378, 399, 431, 466, 480, 482.

Jiva-atom, 472, 477, etc.

Jīvā, radius, 308.

Jiva-kosha, the core-body of the jiva, the jiva-cell, the jiva-capsule, (the auric egg), 23, 345.

Jivan-mukṭa, liberated, emancipated, freed (while still in the body, from narrownesses, bigotries, superstitions, sectarianisms; illiberalities, etc., as well as from doubt and fears in respect of the soul's 'immortality' and infinity; also, it may be, from the bonds of the flesh in the mystic sense of ability to consciously separate and reunite the subtler body and the denser), 459.

- Jñāna, 'cognition, knowledge,' 56, 167-69, 189, 193, 213, 214, 215, 239, 261, 285, 316-18, 402, 453, 461, 474.
- Jñāna-bhakti-karma, 'knowledge devotion-works,' 453, 493.
- Jñāna-ghana, 'compressed, compacted, composed of knowledge,' 139.
- Jñāna-ichchhā-kriyā, 'cognition-desire-action,' 55-7, 167-70, 189, 193, 239, 246, 247, 251, 255-7, 269-71, 304, 318, 370, 406, 417, 476, 493, etc.
- Jñāna-yoga—Bhakti-yoga—Karma or Kriyā-yoga, 'the paths of knowledge-devotion-works,' 255, 447.
- Jñāna-vairāgya-bhakti, 'illuminated vision-detached aloofness-love of the supreme in all,' 67, 458.
- Jñānendriya, sensor organ, 240.
- Jñeya, 'cognisable, knowable,' 173.
- Kaivalyam, 'One-ness,' 'sole-ness,' realisation that all Life is but One, in the Life of the One Self, that there is no-other-than-I, 116, 328, 457.
- Kāla, 'the mover'; time; death; the black, 88, 147, 301, 316, 317, 318.
- Kāl-ātīta, 'beyond or transcending time,' 263.
- Kāl-ātīta-tā, 'transcendence of time'; timelessness, 88.
- Kalpa, 'arrangement'; a cycle, 316, 492.
- Kamandalu, a water-bowl, 323.
- Kanda-Jñāna, partial knowledge, knowledge of particulars, 285.
- Karaṇa, 'means of doing'; instrument, 246, 284, 410.
- Kāraṇa, 'cause,' causal, 219, 251, 297, 300, 344, 420.
- Kāraṇa-sharīra, 'the causal body' (which is the cause or the origin of the others), 416, 435, 439.
- Karma, movement; action; human action regarded as meritorious or sinful and resulting in pleasure or pain to the doer, 48, 51, 191, 193, 229, 257, 369, 379, 380, 382, 392, 467, 474, 486.
- Karma-yoga, the path of works, 255.
- Karm-endriya, motor organ, 239.
- Kartā, 'doer, actor,' 297, 299.
- Kārya, 'the to-be-done'; work; act, effect, 283, 299.
- Kāryā-vimukti, a particular kind of liberation, or yoga-accomplishment, 453.
- Kāshāya, 'bitter' worry, melancholy reverie, "fit of the blues," 239.

Kevala-*ṭā*, same as *kaivalya*, 116.

Khyāṭī, understanding, perception, 165.

Kinnara, a variety of non-human or sub-human spirits, (possibly also some now extinct race of high anthropoids), 419.

Kosha, 'sheath, case', *passim*.

Karma, succession, 310.

Kriyā, action, 56, 167-70, 189, 193, 239, 260, 299, 301, 316, 403, 474.

Kriyā-*advaita*, realization of the one-ness of all life by means of philanthropic and self-sacrificing deeds, 493.

Kriyā-yoga, the path of works; a special yoga discipline, 447.

Kṛtya, duty, application, practice, 285.

Kṛtyā, an elemental, a spirit-force artificially created, 263.

Kṛti, volition, conation, effort, innervation, 229, 266, 270.

Kṣaṇa, moment, 316.

Kṣhetra, 'field'; field of consciousness; the body wherein consciousness manifests, 283, 285, 333.

Kūshmānda, a low order of non-human spirits, 419.

Kūta-sṭha, 'rock-seated'; motionless; eternal, 164, 302.

Kūta-sṭha-saṭṭā, 'rock-seated being', changelessness, 35.

Kūta-sṭha-niṭya, 'rock-seatedly permanent'; changelessly eternal, 161.

Laghu, 'light' (the opposite of heavy), small, 382.

Lakṣhaṇa, 'sign,' mark; characteristic; attribute, 371.

Lakshya, object, 285.

Laukika-*dr̥ṣṭī*, the common physical (or worldly) vision, (or view), 285.

Laya, 'dissolution'; mergence, 238-41, 258.

Laya-sṭhāna, the junction point or place of disappearance, the point of break or gap of consciousness, between waking and dreaming, for instance, 283.

Līlā, 'play,' pastime; 207, 221, 325, 328, 491.

Liṅga-*deha*, 'type-body'; etheric double, 433.

Lobha ('love'), greed, 257.

Loka, 'light' (luminous); 'visible'; world; plane, 309, 399.

Maḍa, 'pride,' 258.

Maḍaṇa, 'maddener,' Cupid, 258.

Madhya, 'medium,' middle, 306, 312.

Maḍhyāmā, the sound of the astro-mental plane, 250.

Mahā-bhūta, 'great-being,' primal elements of matter, 390, 411, 446.

Mahā-kalpa, 'a great cycle,' 376.

Mahā-kāraṇa-sharīra, 'the great causal body,' the buddhic body, 326.

Mahā-kāsha—chittā-kāsha—chidā-kāsha, the space of the physical senses, the space of the mind, and the space of the Universal Consciousness, 398.

Mahān-ātmā, the great self as universal mind, 174, 213, 264, 283, 290, 291, 378, 428.

Mahān-purusha, 'great men,' 352.

Mahā-samvit, 'great or universal consciousness,' 400.

Mahā-sat, the great existence, 401.

Mahā-shilā-saṭṭā, 'great rock-being'; rockboundness, 484.

Mahaṭ, the 'great' universal mind, the principle of pure (because unmotivated by selfish egoism) all-comprehending reason, 45, 160, 174, 213, 271, 282, 289, 290, 291, 360, 378, 382, 428, 432, 438.

Mahaṭ-taṭṭva, 'the great-element'; same as the ādi-taṭṭva, and possibly so called because, as the primordial root, it includes in its greatness all the others, 376, 382.

Mahaṭ-buddhi, 174, 256, 285, 438.

Mahā-vākya, 'great sentence,' logion, 85.

Mahā-vidyā, 'great knowledge'; perfect knowledge; wisdom; a name of an aspect of Shakti, 241-3, 246.

Mala, stain, dirt, 258.

Mama, mine, 402.

Māna, 'measure'; mental measuring, weighing, inference or reasoning; thinking in high measure of oneself, pride, 404.

Manah, Manas, 'mind,' 56, 57, 142-5, 159-60, 213-5, 246, 260, 261, 264, 266, 280, 282, 283, 285, 288, 289, 432, 440.

Manana, 'mentation,' revolving in mind, 263.

Manas-buddhi, 285, 289, 290.

Māndya, 'dullness, slowness,' 381.

Mano-maya-kosha, sheath or body of astral or emotional or lower mental matter, 256.

Manṭra, 'that which, being thought of 'protects,' a charm, an incantation, 263, 285, 377.

Manvanṭara, 'the interval between two manus, the period of the reign of a Manu, 438.

Mati, intelligence, 290, 291.

Mātrā, 'matter'; measure; 'matrix'; that which measures out, *i.e.*, manifests spirit, 173, 233, 234.

Māyā, 'that which is not'; illusion; the Energy or force of illusion, which causes the illusory appearance of a successive world-process, 49, 50, 51, 87, 145, 159-61, 218, 222, 223, 233, 234, 237, 238, 239, 324, 350, 427.

Māyā-shabalam, 'tinged with māyā,' 160.

Mithyā, 'mythical'; false, 183, 285, 290.

Moha, perplexing, 'fainting,' 257-260.

Mohana, 'perplexer,' fascinator, enthraller, enchanting, 258.

Moksha, } 'emancipation, liberation, deliverance' from the

Mukṭi, } pains of the world-process, 14, 53, 76, 116, 195, 214, 241, 254, 282, 315, 447-9 482.

Mūḍha, 'perplexed,' 260.

Mukhya, 'facial,' chief, principal, in the forefront, at the head, 371.

Mukhya-kāraṇa, 'principal cause.'

Mukṭa, 'the freed, the liberated,' 17, 228, 315, 355, 493.

Mūla-prakṛti, 'root-nature'; primal matter, 41, 111, 113, 119, 159, 172, 173, 179, 182, 189-94, 238-45, 246, 263, 302, 315, 323, 332-4, 338, 347, 368-70, 379, 400, 401, 406, 407, 418-25, 437, 458, 467-73, 476, 481, 485.

Mūla-sūtra, root-principle, 285.

Mumukshā, 'the desire for deliverance,' 18.

Mūrṭa, having form, 285.

Mūrṭi, form, 290.

Na, 'not'; negation, 191, 238, 302, 316.

Nāga, an order of non-human spirits: also, serpent, elephant, etc., 419.

Nāma-rūpa, name and form, 285.

Nāna, the many which are 'not,' 173.

Nareshvara, 'lord of men,' 171.

Naya, theory, rule, principle, 285.

Nidṛā, sleep, 257, 266.

- Nija-boḍha, 'self-knowledge,' apperception, 424.
 Nimajjana, 'immersion, mergence,' 319.
 Nimiṭṭa, 'condition,' reason, cause, instrumental cause purpose, 147, 246, 299.
 Nir-añjana, 'stainless,' 140.
 Nir-guṇa, 'attribute-less,' 148, 218, 242, 254.
 Nir-mala-ṭva, 'freedom from impurity,' 257.
 Nirvāṇa, the extinction of the selfish divine, 440.
 Niroḍha, 'control,' 'restraint,' 'inhibition,' 162, 214, 285.
 Ni-rūpa, 'form-less,' 140.
 Nir-upādhi, 'without receptacle,' without a sheath, limitation, or distinction.
 Nir-vikāra, 'immutable,' changeless, 140.
 Nir-viśeṣha, 'without speciality,' without distinguishing marks, 140.
 Nishchaya, 'certainty,' 270.
 Nisheḍha, negation, forbiddal, 199.
 Niṣh-kriya, 'actionless,' 140.
 Niṭya, 'permanent,' 28, 161, 211.
 Niṭya-pralaya, constant dissolution,' 212.
 Niṭya-sarga, 'constant creation or emanation,' 212.
 Nivṛtti, 'inversion,' 'reversion'; return; renunciation, 171.
 Nivṛtti-mārga, 'the path of renunciation,' 211, 417.
 Niyama, fixed rule, vow, 260, 279.
 Niyati, 'the fixed,' 'destiny,' necessity, 217, 228.
 Nyāya, 'leading, guiding'; logic; justice; a school of philosophy, 90, 261, 271, 287, 298, 389, 394, 399, 410, 467.
 Paḍa, 'position,' 'foot'; word, term; concept, notion, 404.
 Paḍ-ārtha, 'the meaning of a word,' thing, 33, 467.
 Pakṣha, 'wing, side,' 306.
 Pañchi-karaṇa, 'quintuplication,' 377.
 Parā and Aparā-Prakṛti, the Transcendental and the Empirical Nature (of the self), 263.
 Parā-āpara-jāti, species, 468.
 Para-Brahman, 'supreme or absolute Brahman,' 114, 152.
 Para-chchanda, subject to the will or caprice of another, 228.
 Parā-ḍhina, dependent on another, 228.
 Parā-jāti, *summum genus*, 468.
 Param, 'supreme,' highest, 152.

- Param-āṇu, 'extreme or smallest atom,' 398, 435, 471, 475.
 Param-ātmā, the 'Supreme Self,' Brahman, the Absolute, 35, 84, 152, 160, 243, 307, 315, 320.
 Pāramārthika-dṛṣṭi, the metaphysical or transcendental point of view, 228.
 Parā-prakṛti, 'highest or supreme nature,' 245, 263.
 Parārtha, 'for another's sake,' altruism, 183.
 Parā-samvit, 'supreme or absolute consciousness,' 139.
 Para-sāmānya, highest genus, 285.
 Para-ṭantra, at the order, or the disposal, or the service of another, 228.
 Para-vasha, under the control, or at the mercy of another, 228.
 Pārśva, 'side or flank,' 306.
 Pari-bhramaṇa, 'moving all round,' 322.
 Parimāṇa, 'measure all round,' magnitude; size, 332, 333.
 Parināma, change, transformation, 9.
 Parināma-vāda, 'the theory or doctrine of transformation,' viz., of the formation of the world by gradual change and evolution (by the interaction of Puruṣha and Prakṛti), 9, 10, 222.
 Parināmi-niṭya, 'changingly permanent,' everlasting, 161.
 Paroksha, 'away from the eye'; indirect; mediate; hidden, 41.
 Parō-rajās, 'that which is beyond all action and motion,' 401.
 Pashyanṭi, the sound of the causal plane, 250-1.
 Pindānda, small egg, a living organism or human unit, 411.
 Pingalā, a nerve, 250.
 Pradhāna, 'the substrate, or reservoir'; matter, Prakṛti; chief, main, principal, 173, 432.
 Prajñā, 'intellect,' 291.
 Prakāsha, light, clear appearance, 257, 260.
 Prakāsha-chān-chalya-āvaraṇa, 'light-restlessness-veiling,' 260.
 Prakāsha-pravṛtti-moha, 'illumination-action-perplexity,' 260.
 Prakāsha-pravṛtti-niyama, 'light-movement-fixed rule,' 260.
 Prakhyā-pravṛtti-sṭhiti, clear knowledge—restless activity—steady clinging, 260.
 Prākṛta-jñāna, knowledge by common physical means, ordinary knowledge, 285.

- Prākṛt, 'natural'; the name of a vernacular (as distinguished from Saṁskṛt, 'the perfected' language), 53, 60, 78.
- Prakṛti, 'nature,' 'that which is made or makes,' matter, 9, 11, 41, 50, 115, 116, 174, 199, 203, 235, 236, 243, 245, 280, 283, 285, 432, 474.
- Prākṛtika, 'natural,' 371.
- Prakṛti-laya, 'mergence into Nature,' 457.
- Pralaya, 'reabsorption,' the dissolution of a world, 145, 202, 208, 212, 214, 236, 316.
- Pramāḍa, carelessness, madness, inadvertence, 257, 258.
- Prāṇa-maya-kosha, 'sheath or body of etheric or vital or biotic matter,' 256.
- Prāṇa, 'breathing,' vital-force, nerve-force, 240, 244, 255.
- Pranava, the sacred sound or word *Aum*; (pronounced *Om*), 109, 117, 233.
- Prapancha, 'the quintuplicated,' 'the multiplied,' the multifarious, 192.
- Prasāda, placidity, cheerfulness, calmness, 285.
- Prasāraṇa, extending, stretching out, 380.
- Prasarpaṇa, 'moving forth on all sides,' spreading, 322.
- Praṭyag-ātmā, 'the inward or abstract Self,' the universal Self or Ego, 33-8, 43, 81, 84, 111, 113, 152-162, 167-173, 179, 189-93, 237-47, 263, 296, 302, 308, 315, 320, 323, 332-4, 338, 355, 362, 369, 370, 379, 400, 401, 406, 418-29, 437, 467-82, 485, 489, 490.
- Praṭibhā, insight, 285.
- Praṭika, symbol, nature-force as symbol of the supreme, 263, 285.
- Praṭimā, image, 285.
- Praṭi-paṭṭi, approach, apprehension, perception, 33.
- Praṭishedha, denial, prohibition, refutation, 199.
- Pravṛtti, 'pursuit,' engagement, 171, 257, 260, 491.
- Pravṛtti-mārga, 'the path of pursuit,' 211, 417.
- Praṭyabhijñā, recognition, 266.
- Praṭyāhāra, 'drawing back,' abstraction, 474.
- Praṭyak-chétanā, intuned consciousness, subjective consciousness, 161.
- Praṭyaksha, direct or immediate cognition, presentative knowledge, intuition, perception, 31, 32, 33, 266.
- Praṭyavamarsha, recognition, 266.

Pratīyaya, idea, thought, belief, faith, 285.

Pratyay-ānupashyañ, 'awareness of psychoses,' apperception, 424.

Prayaṇa, effort, volition, conation, 228, 271.

Prayoga, practice, application, employment, bringing into use, 285.

Prayojana, 'motive,' 53, 300.

Prthakṭva, separateness, 279.

Prṛthivī, 'earth'; the densest root-element of matter known to present humanity, 376, 382, 389, 411.

Prīti-aprīti-vishāda, 'pleasure-pain-depression,' 260.

Pumān, 'masculine,' person, subject, 33.

Puruṣa, the Sleeper in the body'; man; Spirit, Self, 9, 10, 11, 33, 41, 50, 116, 203, 228, 235, 352, 474.

Puruṣa-Kāra, 'manly effort,' will (as opposed to destiny), liberty (enterprise as opposed to necessity), free initiative 228.

Rāga, 'tinge,' stain, colouring, love, affection; (also a musical tune), 234, 239, 257, 266, 282.

Rajas, 'movability,' one of the three attributes of Mūla-prakṛti; passion; stain; blood; colour; dust, etc., 174, 190-4, 238-9, 379, 384.

Rājasa, 'belonging to or made of the element or principle of rajas, activity,' 18, 284.

Rahasya, 'belonging to solitude,' secret, 115.

Rakshas, an order of non-human beings; a kind of microbe or bacillus, 264.

Rākshasa, allied to or composed of rakshas, a race of human-beings (Atlanteans?), 264.

Rasāsvāda, 'tasting the sweets' of imagination, building castles in the air, pleasant reverie, 239.

Rju, 'right'; 'di-rect,' straight, 322.

R̥ṣhi, one who has 'seen' or 'arrived' at the Supreme, 315, 458.

Saḍ-asaḥ, existent-and-non-existent; false; illusory, 82, 183, 234.

Sādhāraṇa, 'common,' 371.

Sādhāraṇa-nimitta, 'common cause,' 298.

Saḍ-ghana, 'compacted being,' 139.

- Sa-guṇa, 'with attributes,' 160, 218, 242, 253.
- Sa-guṇa Brahma, 'Brahma with attributes,' *i.e.*, Pra-
ṭyag-ātmā possessed of three attributes, Saṭ-Chiḍ-
Ananda, in contrast with its opposite Mūlaprakṛti and its
three attributes, Rajas-Saṭṭva-Tamas, 170.
- Saha-bhāva, 'co-existence,' 305.
- Saha-chāra, 'co-movement,' 305.
- Sahakāri-kāraṇa, 'concomitant' or instrumental 'cause,' 299.
- Saha-aṣṭiṭā, 'co-existence,' 305.
- Sama, 'same'; equal; even; balanced.
- Samādhi, focussed meditation, 289, 290, 405.
- Sāmānya, 'sameness or equality of measure,' commonness;
genus, species, generality, 284, 285, 467, 481.
- Samashti, 'whole,' 285.
- Samavāya, 'juxtaposition'; intimate or inseparable relation,
285, 467, 481.
- Samavāyi-kāraṇa, substantial or material cause 'combined
with or including which' the effect is produced, 299.
- Samaya, 'that which comes (and goes)'; time; condition,
316.
- Sam-bandha, 'bond,' connection, 467.
- Sam-hāra, 'gathering in'; re-absorption; dissolution, destruc-
tion, 239.
- Sam-majjana, 'mutual mergence,' 319.
- Sam-sāra, the World-'Process', 116, 141, 147, 181, 184, 192,
209, 216, 224, 244, 322, 324, 419, 426.
- Sam-saraṇa, 'procession,' 319.
- Sam-shaya, doubt, uncertainty, 266.
- Sam-shaya-vi-marsha, doubt and pondering, 270.
- Sams-kāra, 'impression,' 'training,' inclination. tendency,
(cultivated, acquired, imparted, or impressed) disposi-
tion, cultural effect, proclivity, predisposition, bent,
proneness, propensity, 34, 44, 187.
- Sam-skṛt, 'the perfected' language, 10, 29, 53, 54, 78, etc.
- Sam-rambha, excitement, passion, emotion, actional initia-
tive, 270.
- Sam-ūha, collection, 435.
- Sam-viṭ, 'con-sciuousness'; (vision; wit), 33, 145.
- Sāmya, 'sameness,' equilibrium, balance, homogeneity, 238,
239, 264.

Sam-yama, control, restraint, self-controlled meditation, focusing, 214, 285.

Sam-yoga, 'con-junction,' 345.

San-dhi coming together,' coalescence, 235.

San-ghāṭa, 'striking together,' binding together, an articulated organism, 183, 435.

San-kalpa-vi-kalpa, resolve and alternation, 270.

Sāṅkhya, a school of philosophy ; that particular outlook upon life, that view of the World Process, which is expounded by that school, 9, 10, 44, 50, 60, 116, 174, 183, 203, 245, 261, 264, 280, 283, 284, 337, 350, 376, 390, 432, 438.

Sarga, 'surge', emanation, creation, 145, 208, 212.

Sarva, 'all'.

Sarva-dā, 'always'.

Sarva-hiṭā, 'the good of all,' 285.

Sarva-taḥ, 'from or on all sides,' 307.

Sarva-tṛa, 'everywhere'.

Sarva-vyāpī, 'all-pervading,' 163.

Sārvika, 'universal,' 'pertaining to all.'

Saṭ, being ; existence ; true, real ; good, 70, 167, 169, 182, 183, 191, 237, 379, 380.

Saṭ-Chiḍ-Ānanda, triad of universal subjective principles of 'action-knowledge-desire,' or, rather, omnipresence-omniscience-omnipotence, 167, 170, 190-3, 237, 238, 246, 247, 250, 251, 301, 304, 331, 370, 379, 400-4, 406.

Saṭ-tā-sāmānya, 'universal or common being, 80, 468, 475.

Saṭ-tva, 'cognisability,' one of the attributes of Mūlaprakṛti ; being ; existence ; energy ; goodness, 116, 174, 190-4, 238, 239, 318, 384.

Saṭṭva-Rajas-Tamas, the universal objective principles or attributes of Mūla-prakṛti, *i.e.*, Root-Matter, or Root-Nature, *viz.*, the attributes or properties of cognisability, mobility, and desirability ; they are also substituted, in connection with the individualised subject, for Chiḍ-Saḍ-Ānanda, and then mean the subjective principles of cognition-intellection, motion-action, desire-volition, 174, 190-4, 238, 239, 246, 247, 250, 253, 256-60, 262, 269-71, 301, 318, 331, 370, 379, 383, 401, 406.

Sāṭṭvika, made up of, or belonging to, Saṭṭva, 18, 192, 193.

Sāttvika-rājasā-tāmasa, 18, 192, 193, 283, 284.

Sāttviki-rājasī-tāmasī shaktis, the three powers of cognition, action, and desire, 246, 247.

Saṭyam, 'true', having being, 113, 160-1.

Shabala, 'spotted,' 'brindled,' 159.

Shak, 'to be able, 237.

Shakti, 'Might, Ability'; power, force, Energy, 41, 49, 51, 116, 142, 165, 186, 199, 218, 225, 233-48, 250-4, 263 264, 279, 300, 301, 318, 319, 334, 338, 383, 402, 422, 475.

Shama, 'restfulness,' 'peacefulness,' 12, 202.

Shānta, 'peaceful'.

Shānta-ghora-mūḍha, 'peaceful-violent-confused,' 260.

Shānti, 'peace,' 241.

Shāstra, teaching, science, theory, 285.

Shīghraṭa, 'quickness,' 'rapidity,' 381.

Shīla, character, characteristic function, 261.

Shloka, verse; praise, 75, 116.

Shuddha, 'pure,' 213, 401.

Shuddha-aḍvaita, 'pure monism,' 493.

Shūnya, vacuum, emptiness; cipher, zero, 148, 149.

Shūnya-vāḍī, 'holder of doctrine of emptiness, viz., that all is born from and goes back into Nothing, 149, 202.

Shvasana, breathing, 381.

Siddha-dṛṣhti, 'vision of accomplished' seer or yogī, 285.

Siddhānta, established or accomplished conclusion, 5, 228, 229.

Siddhi, 'accomplishment,' 214.

Smarāṇa, recollection, remembrance, 270.

Smṛti, memory, 266, 291.

Snéha, 'love, affection'; oil, lubricant; water, 437.

Soham (=Sah aham), 'That am I,' 209-10.

Spanda, } 'vibration,' 332.

Sphuraṇa

Sprhā, envy, 257.

Sṛṣhti, same as Sarga, 142, 238-9.

Sṭhira, 'steady,' stable, 382.

Sṛṣhti-sṭhiti-laya, manifestation-preservation-disappearance, 239, 246, 251-3, 331.

Sṭhiti, 'steadiness,' staying, standing, maintenance, 238-9, 260, 279.

Sṭhūla, 'solid'; heavy; gross; dense, 343, 420.

Sṭhūla-bhūṭa, 'gross (or compound) element,' 395.

Sṭhūla-sharīra, 'gross body,' the physical body, 231, 435, 439.

Sṭhūla-sūkṣma-kāraṇa, 'gross-fine-causal,' 'dense-tenuous-causal,' large-small-causal, physical-astro-mental-causal, 250-1, 344, 420, 435, 439.

Sukha, pleasure, joy, 257.

Sukha-ḍuhkha-moha, pleasure-pain-perplexity, 260.

Sūkṣma, 'subtle'; small, 344, 420.

Sūkṣma-sharīra, 'subtle body,' 231, 256, 408, 416, 432-5, 439, 440.

Suṭṭa, sleeping, dormant, latent, 285.

Su-ṣhupṭi, 'good sleep,' deep and dreamless slumber, 161-3, 344.

Sūtra, 'thread,' aphorism, 'that which ties together,' that which 'suggests,' 261, 285, 323.

Sūtra-ātmā, 'thread-soul', group-soul, 'over-soul'; 'web of life,' 296, 429.

Sushumnā, a nerve, (or the spinal canal), 250-251.

Sva-bhāva, 'own-being'; nature; character; constitution, 146, 185, 191, 199-200, 212, 244, 425.

Svā-bhāvika, 'natural,' 371.

Sva-chhaṇḍa, 'self-willed,' 228.

Sva-a ḍhīna, 'self-dependent,' 228.

Svah, the mental plane, 250.

Sva-hiṭa, 'the good of self,' 285.

Sva-lakṣhaṇa, 'self-marked,' 'thing-in-itself,' 'characterised by itself,' 59.

Svapna, dream, 266, 344.

Svarga, heaven-world (in which the soul has 'gone to the self'), 454.

Svaṭah-pramāṇa, 'self-proven,' 23, 41, 96.

Sva-tantra, 'self-controlled,' 228.

Sv-ātmaka, 'thing-in-itself,' 59.

Svayam-siddha, 'self-evident,' 23, 88, 96.

Tā or tva, '-ness,' '-ship,' '-hood,' 474.

Tamas, 'desirability,' an attribute of Mūla-prakṛti; inertia; substantiality; dullness; resistance; darkness, 174, 190-4, 238-9, 279, 379, 382.

Ṭāmasa, belonging to or abounding in or made up of *ṭamas*, 18, 283.

Ṭan-mātra, 'measure of That' or 'that only'; 'thing-in-itself,' primordial root-elements corresponding to sensations; primal *consciousness* of sensations, which, constituting the *facts* of sound, touch, etc., gives rise, on one hand, to the elements which serve as their substrates, and, on another, to the sense-organs which serve as their 'receivers,' 59, 262, 284, 372, 376, 395.

Ṭantra, an 'exposition,' a 'spreading out,' science, art, 233-4.

Ṭapas, 'burning,' 'glowing,' 'suffering heat, self-denial,' asceticism, 459.

Ṭarka, argument, inference, 285.

Ṭaṭ, 'that,' 41.

Ṭaṭra, 'there,' 306.

Ṭaṭṭva, 'that-ness'; 'thing-in-itself'; root-element; essence; principle, 59, 153, 376, 377, 389, 390, 395, 411, 458.

Ṭéjas, 'fire or light,' the root-element corresponding to vision, 382, 389, 411, 413.

Ṭri-guṇā, 'three-functioned,' possessed of three properties, 247.

Ṭiryag-gamana, oblique-motion, 381.

Ṭri-bhuvanam, 'the triple-world,' 332-4, 341, 349.

Ṭri-jyā, 'radius,' 308.

Ṭrika, triad, 'triplet,' 'trinity,' 364.

Ṭrika-darśaṇa, 'doctrine of Trinity,' 364.

Ṭrai-lokyam or Ṭri-lōki, 'the three worlds,' 420, 438.

Ṭrasareṇu, 'tri-atom,' or 'tri-diatom,' 389, 399.

Ṭrshṇā, 'thirst,' 'will-to-live,' 214, 228, 257.

Ṭuriya, 'fourth,' 439.

Uḍ-buddha, awakened, risen into consciousness, 285.

Uḍ-ḍeshya, 'aim'; object, 299.

Uḍ-gīṭa, (also Uḍ-gīṭha) the 'out-sung,' the Aum (Om) sound, 152.

Un-māḍa, 'madness,' 258.

Un-majjana, 'emergence,' 319.

Up-ādāna-kāraṇa, 'material cause,' 299.

Upa-ḍéva, a minor *ḍeva*, 84.

Upādhi, sheath ; limitation ; body ; title ; 'addition,' 208, 341, 342, 409, 431, 446.

Upa-labdhi, comprehension, 270, 291.

Upa-sarpaṇa, 'approach,' 322.

Ūrdhva-gamana, 'up-going,' 381.

Uṭ-kshépana, 'up-flinging,' 381.

Uṭ-pāḍa, 'up-rising,' manifestation, 283.

Vaidyaka, the science of medicine, 199.

Vaikārika-ṭaijasa-ṭāmasa, same as sāṭṭvika-rājasa-ṭāmasa, 256, 283-4.

Vaikhari, the sound of the physical plane, 250.

Vairāgya, 'absence of desire for, or attachment to, the pleasures of this world or the next'; dispassion, 18, 67, 194, 202, 211, 241, 282, 285-6, 458.

Vaishēshika, one of the systems of Indian philosophy, dealing particularly with 'species, genera,' etc., 81, 369, 376, 389, 394, 395, 399, 467, 475.

Vāk, speech, 'talk,' 438.

Vākya, 'speech'; sentence ; proposition, 404.

Vana-māla, wreath of forest-flowers, 317.

Vartamāna, 'existent'; present, 313.

Vāsanā, 'pervasive' desire, wish, craving, inclination, 214, 228.

Vāsanā-ghana-ṭā, 'condensation,' 'consolidation,' materialisation, of desire, 227-8.

Vayam, 'we,' 285.

Vāyu, 'air,' the root-element corresponding to touch, 376, 382, 389, 395, 411, 438.

Vēdana, experiencing, awareness, 33.

Vēdānta, 'end or crown of Vēda or all-knowledge'; the chief philosophical system of India, having many subdivisions, 4, 5, 10-12, 34, 44, 47-50, 52, 59, 67, 83, 84, 85, 95, 96, 145, 161, 167, 202, 203, 238-41, 261, 264, 282, 287, 342, 345, 350, 389, 401, 411, 433, 461.

Vēdānti, a holder of Vēdānta philosophy, 85-8, 160, 192.

Vēga, 'velocity,' 381.

Vi-bhu, pervading, 'being in an especial degree, i.e., everywhere,' 28, 163, 412.

Vi-chāra, thought, reflection, cogitation, 12, 194, 222.

- Vi-déha, 'without body,' 'bodiless', 459.
 Vi-déha-mukṭa, bodiless-liberation, 459.
 Vidyā, knowledge; ('witting,' 'idea,' 'vision'), 168, 218, 241, 245, 246, 254.
 Vijñānamaya-manomaya-praṇamaya koshas, higher mental-astromental-etheric bodies, 256.
 Vi-kalpa, 'imagination,' alternative, 266.
 Vi-kāra, 'change of form of a substance,' 222, 283.
 Vi-kāra-vāda, same as pariṇāma-vāda, the theory of change or transformation (*i.e.*, that the world-process is a series of transformations of matter and motion), 9, 222.
 Vi-kṣhepa, 'distraction,' repulsion, 238, 239, 238, 271.
 Vi-kṛtī, transformation, 285.
 Vi-paryaya, error, perversion, 206, 266.
 Vi-paryāsa, misapprehension, 206, 266.
 Virāt-Puruṣha, 'the World-Man'; the Macrocosm, 350, 359, 398, 493.
 Vi-sarga, 'throwing out or up,' 'letting go,' 239.
 Vi-shāḍa, depression, perplexity, 260.
 Vi-śhaya, 'object'; domain, 173, 285.
 Vi-shéṣha, 'speciality'; characteristic; distinguishing feature, 284, 285, 378, 468, 475, 481.
 Vi-shishta-aḍvaita, 'non-duality with a distinction,' a form of Vēdānta which regards consciousness or Spirit and unconsciousness or Matter as two aspects of one Eternal Substance, 49, 85, 86, 172.
 Vishva-sṛj, 'World-maker,' 84.
 Vi-varṭa, 'reversal,' 85, 203, 211, 222.
 Vi-varṭa-vāda, 'doctrine of reversal'; metaphysical or transcendental view of causation. Advaiṭa-Vēdānta is so called because it regards the 'Object' as 'reverse' or 'perversion' of Subject; also because it *reverses* all ordinary conceptions and outlooks of life; that which was real is now seen to be unreal, and *vice versa*; that which was 'many' is seen to be 'one,' and *vice versa*; that which was 'without' is seen to be "within," and *vice versa*; that which was 'plenium' is seen to be 'vacuum,' and *vice versa*, 11, 222.
 Vi-vēka, 'discrimination' (between Permanent and Impermanent), 12, 67, 194, 211.

- Vi-yoga, 'disjunction,' separation, 345.
 Vṛtti, mood of mind, psychosis, 'way of existence,' 'way of manifestation,' 285.
 Vyakti, 'manifestation,' specification, individualisation; a particular individual, 284, 285.
 Vy-āpta, 'pervaded,' 307.
 Vy-āpti, 'pervasion'; an induction, a generalisation, 473.
 Vyāsa, diameter; expansion or amplification; the name of a Sage.
 Vyās-ārḍha, 'the half of the diameter,' radius.
 Vyashti, part, 285.
 Vy-aṭirēka, concomitant 'absence,' 473.
 Vyāvahārika-dṛṣhti, empirical or experiential standpoint or view, 228.
 Vy-āvarṭaka, 'distinguishing'; differentia, 371.
 Vy-avasāya, determination, that which 'remains' (as certain, after scrutiny), resolve, 228, 266.
 Vy-utthāna, up-rising, 'ex-hibition,' 162, 285.
- Yajña, sacrifice, 458.
 Yaksha, an order of non-human spirits; a sub-human race, 419.
 Yaksham (pl. yaskshāṇi), an 'eater,' (a 'phagocyte' bacillus), 284.
 Yā-Mā, 'that which is not,' (anagram of Mā-Yā), 233, 234.
 Yoga, 'junction,' 'en-gage-ment,' 'con-juga-tion'; union; harmony; balance; skill; attention, *i.e.*, union of mind to an object; a form of practice for superphysical development, 77, 78, 83, 84, 89, 116, 161, 214, 230-1, 233-4, 239, 241, 261, 264, 282, 285-90, 342, 389, 403, 405, 416, 417, 435, 444, 447, 461, 493.
 Yoga-ja-jñāna, knowledge by yoga-meditation or superphysical means generally, 285.
 Yoga-samādhi, yoga-meditation, 405.
 Yoga-siddhi, yoga-accomplishment, perfection of mindpower, . . . 214.
 Yogi, one practised in yoga, *i.e.*, in mind-control, 486.
 Yuga, a 'junction' or 'coming together' of two; a pair; a cycle, 316.
 Yuga-paṭ, two together, simultaneously, 285.

