

## SECTION II.

### *Yoga-Prakāra-Prakaraṇa.*

#### THE METHODS OF THE CONJUNCTION OF THE THREE FACTORS.

---

The importance and the consequences of the knowledge of Brahman as tri-une.—Further illustrations of the triplicity.—Cognition, action and desire as corresponding to A, U and M.—The multifarious triplets arising under desire and action.

The manifestation of the trinity which constitutes the one or, rather, the numberless Brahman, is Samsāra, the World-process, so that we may say that Samsāra in its totality is Brahman; and the endless combinations and permutations of the three factors make the many ways or methods or laws of this manifestation or 'becoming' which is Samsāra.

These many methods have to be studied by every one who would understand the real significance of Brahman. And they have to be studied in the World-process itself, that is to say, by observation of it all around us. For there is no greater teacher than this World-process itself, and study thereof is the real and genuine *tapas* and *yoga*, austerity and self-development. To know *all* is to know Brahman. It should be borne in mind however that to know all, in the

totality of its endless detail, is not achievable in any limited space and time by any being limited by space and time. Only the *All* itself knows the *all*. Various sciences study only various aspects of Brahman or Samsāra. What is needed and is possible is that the student should secure a general idea of the whole and of its unity. Such knowledge is the source of that deliberate and true altruism which arises necessarily in the jīva which has attained to nivṛtṭi and universalism.<sup>1</sup>

Altruism and egoism, the gain of one and the loss of another, renunciation by one and acceptance by another, sin and merit, heaven and hell, destruction and protection, all have their own separate and proper places in the World-process, from the standpoint of the limited, though they all are as one from the standpoint of the One Self.

It is only when the jīva realises the illusoriness of the separateness of jīvas from each other, the separateness of many selves, which is the sole basis of the distinctions of sin and merit, that it becomes capable of the performance of desireless action, work without attachment, duty

<sup>1</sup> 'Universalism' is here used to indicate the position of one who has transcended both egoism and altruism, who knows no longer 'myself and others,' but sees himself and others as one with the Universal Self. (A. B.)

for the sake of duty, and so becomes a participant in mukṭi, liberation, the true deliverance of the soul, which is deliverance from selfish desire and so from all possibility of suffering.

The jīva that has realised this underlying unity of the diverse world transcends and transmutes selfishness and unselfishness into duty; the elations of health and the depressions of disease into the steady equability of perfect life; regularity and irregularity into living and flexible routine; deprivations and gifts into the justice that is ever adjusting the balance of all things by means of punishments and rewards. Such a jīva realises the synthesis, the unity, of the four objects of life, *viz.*, profit, pleasure, duty and deliverance. It knows that the opposites that make up the world are ever changing place, poison becoming medicine and medicine poison, with changing circumstances.

But before it can realise this unity it must have studied the diversity which is pervaded by that unity. The very transcendence, by Brahman, of time and number, implies time and number. The Beginningless and Endless is made up of the countless and incessant beginnings and endings, of the periods and cycles, which the world uses as the measures of time.

Here, again, we may notice the ever-present triplicity of the world. The beginning is the A, the end is the U, and the intervening middle

period of maintenance or preservation is the connecting M. So the present is the A, the future U, and the past M.<sup>1</sup> The unfinished beginning is the present; the remainder after its completion is the future; the remainder after the end is the past. The present includes both past and future. Divisor, dividend and quotient; multiplier, multiplicand and multiple; addition corresponding to growth or creation or origin, multiplication to preservation, and (subtraction or) division to destruction and end—all these are instances of the same triplicity.<sup>2</sup> The

<sup>1</sup> The curious transpositions of the letters of the *Praṇava*, as here given, seem to be of the nature of the transpositions often used in ancient works, to indicate certain successions within certain periods. Thus, while A U M would indicate the World-process ideally, the two factors having prominence, and the relation between them coming last, as being hidden, the anagram A M U would indicate the world really, the relation taking its actual place as between the Self and the Not-Self; and M A U would indicate by the necessary emphasis on the vowel sound and the equally necessary swift passage from the M, the relation of the past to the present, and the gliding passage from present to future. (A. B.) See *The Science of Peace*, p. 139.

<sup>2</sup> The book does not explain why subtraction is omitted. From one point of view it might appear that addition, including multiplication, would corres-

singular, the dual, the plural, 1, 2, and 3, also respectively correspond to A, U, and M. The cause and the summation and the tri-unity of them all is the cipher. By a process of reflexion of the trinity in each of these, each of the three primal numbers becomes triple, and hence we have the nine figures, for this world-system, the tenth being 'no-thing,' nothing new or further, and so made up with the zero.

The above observations shew the intimate connexion between number and time, the full application of which is found in the science of *jyotiṣha*, or 'the lights (of heaven),' i. e., (*Jyotiṣha*) astrology and astronomy, with its elaborate measurements and calculations, and considerations of good and evil times and proper and improper seasons; for, as there are right and wrong seasons for agricultural processes, so are there for all works and undertakings whatsoever.

Time corresponds to the Self, number to the Not-Self, and the *saṅkhyā*, the calculus of the numberless infinite, (or rather in-de-finite or pseudo-in-finite) to the relation between them.

There are three principal *grahas*, planets, and nine altogether (for our world-system, in correspondence with the nine numbers).

pond with creation; subtraction, including division, with destruction; and the 'rule of three', connecting the two, with preservation.

Nāstika, āstika, and māstika, atheism, theism, and polytheism, literally the believer that (a thing, a being, a deity) is not, the believer that it is, and the believer that the negation (or the negated many) is—this is another important trinity.

In considering these triplets we observe how the multitudinous Samsāra originates and is within the non-separate Brahman; how rest and effort, undertaking and completion, alternate within the Full and Changeless. All 'becoming' is effort, is accompanied with the sense of individual initiative and effort; and, at the same time, all 'becoming' is necessary also. As all the successive progression of inference is based on and included in direct cognition or intuition, so the corresponding procession of Samsāra, the before and after of which is connected together in our consciousness by inference after being separately gathered by direct cognition,<sup>1</sup> is based on and included in the direct cognition or intuition or single and partless consciousness of all the three factors of the primal trinity, 'I—Not-I—Not'. The *feeling of effort* is a necessary error. Truth and error are relative and both necessary, being both summed up in illusion.

<sup>1</sup> The latest way of describing this 'separate gathering' is that 'each presentation is new and unique.' (*Vide, Mind*, for January, 1906, p. 53).

Pratyakṣha, 'vision,' direct cognition, intuition, presentation, corresponds to the present; anumeya, what has to be inferred, to the past; and prayojana, the motive of the inference, to the future. Again, from the standpoint of Ātmā pratyakṣha corresponds to A; nirṇaya, judgment or decisive conclusion or deductive inference, to U; and anumāna, reasoning or inductive inference, to M. But, from the standpoint of Samsāra, nirṇaya corresponds to A, and pratyakṣha to U.

All the six padārthas, 'meanings of words', 'objects aimed at, or intended to be reached or expressed', things or categories, of the *Vaiśeṣhika* system, and the sixteen of the *Nyāya* system (for which definite numbers there are definite reasons) are respectively reducible to (i) bhāva, being (corresponding to matter and saṭ) and (ii) pratyakṣha, direct knowledge (corresponding to chit and spirit or consciousness), which, again, are in and are Brahman which is and wherein is (iii) bhavana, 'becoming' (connected with effort and desire and ānanda or bliss).<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Further details regarding the various systems of philosophy and the different 'points of view' of these darśhanas (*Darśhanas*), will be found later on in Section III. Ch. XIV., *et seq.*

As said before, all 'becoming' is necessary, from the standpoint of the All, and yet every particular 'becoming' invariably manifests by means of desire. This desire, self-determination, individual initiation of actions, is all illusory, technically, though an indubitable fact also at the same time.

Ātmanā, and Samsāra, Self and the World-process or the Not-Self, are determinant of, are so to say causes or motives for or to, each other, and are always in inseparable connexion with each other. And hence jīva, individualised self, soul, or spirit, and deha or body are interdependent and mutually relative, even as north and south and east and west are. 'This is thine,' 'this is mine,' means temporary connexion. 'Thou art I,' is permanent connexion.

The inner identity of past, present, and future is the real cause of the conviction that what *was*, *is*, and also *will be*. So too are possible and impossible identified (in the conditional). Bheḍa or separateness, abheḍa or non-separateness, and anabheḍa or non-in-separateness; aṣṭi, nāṣṭi, anāṣṭi, is, is not, not is; aboḍha, sambodha, vibodha, ignorance, knowledge, special knowledge, etc.; are other such triplets.

Some idea of the general principle of tri-unity and the method of development and multiplication by mutual reflexion having been supplied as above, a few special considerations as regards

ichchhā or desire and jñāna or cognition may be entered upon, the discussion of kriyā or action being left over for the next section.

While the whole is always full and complete, each part is not such. We thus have an absence of fullness, an imperfection, noticeable in any and every part, howsoever we take it, of Samsāra. At the same time, every jīva, being identical with the Self, is identical with the whole, and contains all within itself. The result of this double identity of the jīva, with the whole (Self) on the one hand and with a part (of the Not-Self) on the other, is, that there is necessarily and inevitably an incessant progression in each part towards the fullness of the Whole. And, as said before, the constant co-efficient of this necessary evolution is desire.

The main significance of all blessings, etc., is to be found in this fact of inevitable progress. He who blesses knows that the desire having arisen, in the person blessed, for a certain higher condition, that condition *will* evolve in him in the course of time, and *declares* this fact in his blessing.

By mutual reflexions, cognition, desire and action become triple, each of them, in their turn.

Ichchhā,<sup>1</sup> desire, is subdivided into kāmanā kāṅkṣhā, and āśhā; and cognition into

<sup>1</sup> Etymologically it would be better to translate ichchhā by 'wish,' both words being derived from

saṅkalpa, vikalpa, and adhyavasāya.<sup>1</sup> It must be borne in mind all along, however, that all these are sub-divisions of one and the

the same root iṣh. But usage in western treatises on psychology has made 'desire' technically the more appropriate. As a general rule, it is difficult to assign exact English equivalents to Samskr̥t philosophical terms. The different sub-races which have built up the technical terminologies of philosophy in the different languages, have looked at the things, the same things, from different standpoints, and so caught and embodied into words *different aspects* of these things. The equivalents used in this translation are therefore only suggestive. Uniformity in their use will not be possible to observe always, though, of course, it will be striven after. It is well-known that definiteness of language grows hand-in-hand with definiteness of ideas, and as the one is often a very lengthy process, so must be the other.

<sup>1</sup> All these terms are dealt with more fully, later on, in the text, with the exception of the last, adhyavasāya, in place of which anukalpa is substituted as the third of the triplet. The psychological distinctions made here between the four aspects of desire are not to be found at all in current Samskr̥t works; nor is anukalpa to be met with there in the sense assigned to it here. Saṅkalpa, vikalpa, and adhyavasāya are current, however, in the sense, generally speaking, of plan or resolve, doubt or alternative, and final determination, respectively.

same consciousness, and are, hence, identical in essence.

Kāmanā corresponds to aṣṭi-tva, existence, is-ness; it is the desire to *ex-ist*, to manifest outwards. Niṣhkāmya,<sup>1</sup> on the other hand, corresponds to saṭṭā, being, inwardness, 'absence of desire (to manifest outwards).'<sup>2</sup> Kāmanā appears as syāt, syāh, syām, 'may he be, may thou be, may I be (or become such and such).' The three correspond to M, U, and A respectively. But from another standpoint, the root a s, to exist, (which is the root of both saṭṭā and aṣṭi-tva) includes all the three forms, syāt, syāh and syām, of kāmanā; and in this root, the letter *a* corresponds to the Ātmā; and the letter *s* to the bahū, the Many, the world or U; while M or the Negation is represented by saṭṭā, being, which is the underlying meaning of the root a s and the connecting link between the Ātmā and the Many. The primal wish, as embodied in the *Veda*-text, is therefore bahū-syām, 'May I become many.'

<sup>1</sup> Modern Samskr̥t would say naiṣhkāmya.

<sup>2</sup> The distinction implied between aṣṭi-tva and saṭṭā is worth noting. In current Samskr̥t philosophical literature, Prashastapāda's *Vaiśeṣika-Bhāṣya* assigns aṣṭi-tva to all six padārthas and saṭṭā to only the first three. Available commentaries and modern pandits do not explain the difference, at least not satisfactorily.

In the general sense, *kāmanā* may be said to correspond to the Self, to be the desire for self-manifestation, self-realisation, self-assertion. And if it is thus looked at, we see that all the other sub-divisions fall within it.

*Kāṅkṣhā* may be distinguished from *kāmanā* thus: *kāmanā* is the mere naked wish for self-realisation; *kāṅkṣhā* is the wish for such *by means of* the many. The reference to the many, the desire to manifest in and through the many, is the speciality of *kāṅkṣhā*. In *kāṅkṣhā* is present the striving for the fruit; *kāṅkṣhā* is only for the sake of fruit. In what way, by what means, can this object be gained—such wishful cogitation is the work of *kāṅkṣhā*. That *śakṭi*, energy or power, that self-effort, the form or nature of which is the becoming, the coming about, or the bringing about, of the fruit or the wished-for result, the gradual securing of the object—that is *kāṅkṣhā*, (conation?).

*Icchhā*, wish, desire, is the suggestor of the method. May it be, it may be, that this result 'becomes' or is brought about by this means—such is its form. ("The wish is father to the thought," "Necessity is the mother of invention".)

*Āshā*, hope, refers to the future—because such an object is being secured now by such means, and has also been gained similarly in the

past, therefore it *will be* gained in the same way in the future also.

The cognition corresponding to *āshā* is *saṅkalpa*. Its form is: I shall do this, or let me do this, or I am doing this, with the knowledge and in the belief that thereby such a result will be obtained. *Āshā* and *saṅkalpa* are related as effect and cause<sup>1</sup>. The former is of the form of or corresponds to the *Nyāya*-category of *nirṇaya*, decision, deduction; and the latter to that of *siḍḍhānta*, established and settled conclusion.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>It may at first sight seem that the reverse is the case, that hope is the cause and resolve the effect, that we resolve to do something only when we hope that it will produce the wished-for result. This would be so if the words hope and resolve are taken in their exact English sense. But in that sense they are not exact equivalents of *āshā* and *saṅkalpa*. The latter should be taken here more as "plan" than resolve; then it becomes easier to see that we hope for a certain occurrence in *consequence* of our plan; without the plan for the realising of it we would not have the hope of the occurrence.

<sup>2</sup>The endless interlacing of these moods of consciousness is at first sight very perplexing, but as the reader proceeds further with the work and realises how this endlessness of detail within detail is the normal condition of all things everywhere, he will become reconciled to this particular perplexity also.

In other words, May I be—is *kāmanā*; I am—is *kāṅkṣhā*; I was—is *ichchhā*; I shall be—is *āshā*.

Vikalpa, doubt, alternative, is the negator, the opposite of *saṅkalpa*. Doubt, uncertainty,

As a general rule, it may be said, for psychological purposes, that the order of succession is, first cognition, then desire, then action; and that the sub-divisions of these follow the same order. Thus if cognition is C and sub-division of it c, and so with the others, then taking only one set of sub-divisions, the order of succession would probably be; Cc, Dc, Ac, Cd, Dd, Ad, Ca, Da, Aa, or Cc, Cd, Ca, Dc, Dd, Da, Ac, Ad, Aa, or all three at a time (in three different degrees), and so on. Looked at thus, the fact appears to be that where we say that the wish is father to the thought which results in such and such an action, or that necessity is the mother of invention, the 'thought' or 'invention' is not a cognition following after a desire, but is either the Ca, or the Ac, a *plan of action*, a mixture of cognitive and active elements, which follows Dd and precedes Aa. In the realm of the successive, in actual daily life, it does not seem easy to find a case of simple and specific cognition, Cc, coming after and arising out of a simple and specific desire, Dd. The latter *pre-supposes* the former; the former entails the latter.

The growth of these complications, the opening up of these ramifications, in the individual, under the stress of the outward-going desire for the

attaches to everything; I am or I was or I shall be so and so—all this has an element of uncertainty about it; we are never positively sure even of the accuracy of our present experience, less so of our recollection of the past, much less

revivification of 'stale pleasure,' or the enhancement and elaboration of pleasure by complex arrangements of objects of pleasure, is the growth of memory, intelligence, etc.; it is evolution generally. Compare the simple satisfaction of the primal appetites for food and sex in the animal with the complex satisfaction of those *same* appetites by civilised man with the help and subservience of all the apparatus of modern civilisation. After the middle stage, that of satiation and self-consciousness, there sets in the inward-turning of the desire, the negation of these things; and the *apparent* superiority of the *nivṛtṭi*-condition as such consists in *remembering* the experiences of *pravṛtṭi* and yet deliberately rejecting them, 'rising superior' to them. At the stage of self-consciousness (not all-self-consciousness) *karma* and punishment become substituted for cause and effect—a change of *names* only. See Section VI, *infra*. The rotation of the three aspects of consciousness is also repeatedly touched upon in the work, and the difficulty is solved by distinguishing between 'generic' and 'specific' forms of each. For concrete illustrations of Cc, etc., we may tentatively take the following:—

(Cc) Cognition-proper, definite knowledge, *adhyavasāya*, 'This is a fruit' 'I see this fruit.'

of our future. This is due to the presence of the Negation everywhere.

The potential *syām*, 'may I be,' as Time, includes all the other three, am, was, and will be, or present, past and future.

These four divisions of desire occur in every possible variation of *krama*, order; but the natural one is *kāmanā*, *ichchhā*, *kāṅkṣhā*. and *āshā*. The others are the opposite of

(Cd) Cognition-desire, *vikalpa*, doubt, 'Is it worth tasting?' 'It seems to be nice?' 'May I have it?' 'It is probably good to eat?'

(Ca) Cognition-action, resolution, determination, *saṅkalpa*, 'I ought to be and am taking it.'

(Dc) Desire-cognition, *kāṅkṣhā*, 'It seems to be obtainable,' 'It looks as if I could get it.'

(Dd) Desire-proper, *kāmanā*, the longing for it, 'I want the fruit'.

(Da) Desire-action, *āshā*, hope, expectation and volition, 'I expect I will secure it as soon as I try, and I will take it'.

(Ac) Action-cognition, *vyavasāya*, preparation, determination, initiation of effort 'the co-ordination, orientation or direction of the muscles and their movements'.

(Ad) Action-desire, *yaṭna* or *kṛti*, effort, endeavor, conation, 'the inception of movement in the muscles'.

(Aa) Action-proper, *kriyā* or *karma*, 'the seizing of the fruit'.

*krama*; they are *vyāṭi-krama* or disorder, which also is necessary however.

The endlessness of these four, as of the *Ātmā*, is illustrated in all the multitudinous activities and relations of the world.

Pleasure and pain lie in the fulfilment and the defeat, respectively, of *kāṅkṣhā*. Both are summed up in *ānanda*. Pleasure corresponds

In the illustrative expressions belonging to the first six sub-divisions, the use of the word I, 'I see,' 'I want,' etc., should not be understood to indicate apperception, self-consciousness; it has been used only for concreteness and brevity.

The above are only samples of an endless complexity. Precise tabulation is nearly impossible, at least for some time to come. Only the general outlines of the 'scheme' are intended to be indicated. Such facts and experiences as are noted by modern psychologists (*Vide, e.g., W. James' Principles of Psychology*, II, xxvi, pp. 522 *et-seq.*) under the names of 'kinesthetic sensation,' 'feeling of inner-  
vation,' 'fiat,' 'ideo-motor action,' 'muscular sense,' 'sensations of the movements of the joints of the body,' 'sensations of weight,' 'of temperature, external or internal,' 'of chills of fear at the heart,' 'heat of anger in the blood,' 'bowels of compassion,' 'tinglings, thrills, creeps, horripilation,' etc., should all be capable of reduction into such a scheme of sub-divisions proceeding by triplets.

to *kāṅkṣhā* and A; pain to *ichchhā*<sup>1</sup> and U; and *ānanda*, bliss, peace, the disappearance of both pleasure and pain, to *kāmanā* and M. The inner identity of nature of pleasure and pain, the fact that both are rooted in *ānanda* and both caused by *kāmanā*, may be realised through the fact that they are always changing place; what is pleasant at one time becomes painful at another, and what is painful at one time becomes pleasant at another.

All these three, pleasure, pain, and peace, are summed up in the AUM, the true name of Brahman, which, because of this fact, is always used at the beginning, the middle, and the end of all mantras or sacred chants.

The other words, *yaṭ*, 'which,' *ṭaṭ*, 'that,' etc., used to denote Brahman, as, for instance, in the *Gāyatrī*, are so used only to indicate its tri-unity and all-inclusiveness (which is the characteristic of relative pronouns).

Sub-divisions appear again under each of the four, *kāmanā*, etc., thus: *āshā*, *ḍurāsha*, *nirāṣhā*, etc. *Nirāṣhā*, absence of hope, sums up *āshā*, good hope, and *ḍurāshā*,

<sup>1</sup> Obviously, *ichchhā*, here, corresponds to U only when treated as a sub-variety, distinguishable from the other sub-divisions and aspects, *kāmanā*, etc., of desire in general. When desire in general is spoken of, side by side with cognition or action, then it is made to correspond with M.

bad, evil, gloomy or dark, hope or despair. Hence the counsel that action should be performed with *nirāṣhā*, with no-hope, without hope of fruit or reward.

*Saṅkalpa*, planning, resolving, and *vikalpa*, hesitating, vacillating, alternating between two different courses, 'halting between two opinions,'—the two together being known as *vikāra*, transformation or change—appear in connexion with *āshā* (and *ḍurāshā*?). The third, which connects together these two, is *anukalpa*. 'I do this, I shall do this'—such is the form of *saṅkalpa*. But in view of the arising of new or other possible causes, new or other possible circumstances, second thoughts arise, 'this should not be done by so-and-so, or I shall not do this (*vikalpa*), but, in place of this, this other is the proper thing to do (*anukalpa*).' Because all time and all causes and all effects are not within any one individual's cognisance and power, therefore nothing can be said by any individual to be positively certain; and, consequently, an alternative resolution is also always kept before itself by a thoughtful *jīva*, 'if so-and-so happens, I shall not do this but do this other thing instead'—this is *anukalpa*.

In the *Veda*-logion *Aham-bahu-syām*, 'I-many-may-become,' *Aham* corresponds to *saṅkalpa*, *bahu* to *vikalpa*, and *syām*