

SECTION III. (*Continued.*)

CHAPTER VI.—Sub-Section (i).

THE YAJUR-VEĀ.

The *Yajur-VeĀ*.—The nature of its contents.—The nature of *kriyā*.—The relation of action to *mokṣha*.—The various kinds of *mokṣha*.

The *Yajur-VeĀ*, promulgated by Brahmā, is concerned with action. All the laws and methods of all actions whatsoever, from the origin to the dissolution of a world; the working of causes; the connexion of cause and effect, of actor and cause; the relations of actor, cause, effect and motive, with all of which every action is always conjoined; the necessity of all these—whatever, briefly, is included in U, the Eṭaṭ-factor of the Logion, that makes the contents of the *Yajuh*.

Thus, we hear: 'From ākāsha was born vāyu, air; from vāyu, agni, fire; from agni, āpah, water; from āpah, pṛthvī, earth; from pṛthvī, oṣhaḍhī, herbs; from oṣhaḍhī, anna, food or corn; from anna, reṭas, seed, germ-sperm; and from reṭas, all else'. Such is the course of procession, samsarāna or evolution. (In other words, from the elemental and mineral kingdoms arose the vegetable, and out of the latter, the animal kingdom).¹ Now the

¹ Or, in still later though as yet more unsettled and doubtful language, out of the primary elements

cause of the birth of vāyu from ākāsha, and of the origin of everything else successively, may be learnt from the *Yajuh*.

The essence of *kriyā* is the 'existence' of the Eṭaṭ in the I; first the identification, 'I am This, and This, and This,' and again the separation, '(I am) Not This, nor This, nor This, etc.' It appears as the birth, preservation and dissolution of everything. These three are mutually cause and effect. Without any one of these the others are impossible. And hence they are always changing places, i.e., may be described in terms of each other. Death is also but a birth, for everything is indestructible and only changes form, so that death is the birth, the taking on of, a new form, even as birth is the death of an old form. Maintenance is also birth, in a similar way; for it depends on birth, and birth is momentary, so that maintenance is a continuous series of births.

In *kriyā* also, as in *jñāna*, by combinations with *jñāna* etc., there arise twenty-four kinds.¹

The essence and truth of *kāma*, active desire, creative love, is also to be found here, in the *Yajur-veĀ*, by the combination, *samparivar-* was born the vegetable bacterial cell and out of that the animal cell or protozoon.

¹ See p. 126 *supra*.

ṭana (?), of jñāna (with kriyā?, because of kriyā's coupling with jñāna?).

Thus are birth, maintenance and death and their summation all included here, and each being sub-divided into ten (?) we have the forty chapters of the *Yajuh*.

In each atom do we observe incessant kriyā; it is the one means of accomplishing anything and everything. Hence it is necessary to study the nature of action as connected with desire, cognition and the summation.

Even after attaining mokṣha, work has to be done. From the point of view of transcendence and endlessness, none is bound and none free. True, it is said that such and such action should be done for the sake of mokṣha¹ (the implication being that after mokṣha there is no more action to do). But this (in the outer sense) refers only to some particular condition from which specially is mokṣha or freedom to be gained. The inner significance of the counsel is that action should be performed always and in such a manner that universal mokṣha, eternal bliss, may be enjoyed always. To know that this is so is itself mokṣha; it is itself bliss. This constant restlessness and trouble of mind that we suffer from, viz., if I do so, such will be the result, I have omitted to do this, I am doing this, I have done this, etc.,—to enable

¹ See *Bhagavad-Gītā*, iii, 19, 20.

jīvas to escape from this constant harassment is the one aim of all counsel. All is to happen, all will be done, and all will result therefrom, I have done everything, I am doing everything, all has been and is being and will be accomplished by me, all is necessary, all is certain, nothing is done by the limited me or thee or another, I and thou and another are nothing, what thou art that same am I and another is the same too, all is done by all—this realisation itself is mokṣha and bliss.

Thus, then, action, motion or movement, is a transcendental fact belonging to all time, and mokṣha is not something separate by itself which may be left behind after eliminating all other things. It is rather an all-pervading fact, immanent and included and concealed inseparably within the process of the world, stretching everywhere, in all ways and in all time.

So long as the jīva does not attain universality, so long as it does not realise its own universality, the identity of its individual with the universal consciousness, so long it does not attain contentment; and so long as it does not attain contentment it cannot become free from joy and sorrow. It may be said that universality is something transcendent and beyond time, and hence the attainment of such peace and contentment, within time, at some time, is im-

possible. But even this knowledge itself is based on contentment (*i.e.*, the impossibility of contentment *within* time is not realised till the contentment *beyond* time has been touched, felt, sensed, by the self turning inwards and contrasting its own *ever*-abiding universality with the limitedness of all particulars).

One hears it said: 'This man is content; he is at rest; he has ceased from action; his business is finished; his work is done'. The meaning of contentment here is but this, *viz.*, that that *jīva* possesses the knowledge that this World-process is endless and beginningless, past knowing (in completeness of details) and yet not past knowing (in all-comprehensiveness of universal law); that there is no real gain or loss, no honor or dishonor, nothing attained or unattained; that all that occurs is predestined from and for all time. Ceasing from action, again, is but ceasing from the belief that the result, the fruit, of action is for me or thee or another. Otherwise, indeed, action, motion, is a ceaseless fact.¹

¹In other words, whatever *appearance* of truth there is in the remark that is made from time to time by an individual as regards another individual, 'This man is content, is at rest, has retired from the worry and bother of incessant activity, (which is inseparable from the *personal* feeling), *i.e.*, has nothing *more* to do, has achieved the end he had set before himself for the time,' is in reality a *reflexion*, in the limited, of the real

Hence even after *mokṣha*, the performance of *paramārtha*-work, the acts of duty, remains of necessity; and thus it comes about that *jīva*-*mukṣas* become the regulators, guides and hierarchs of world-systems.

The expression, *jīviṭa-mukṣa*¹ or *jīva*-*mukṣa*, the 'living-free,' implies a specific kind of *mukṣi*, and also the existence of non-*jīviṭa-mukṣas*. A *jīviṭa-mukṣa* is he who knows Brahman in all its tri-unity; whereas one may be a *mukṣa* who knows even but one of the three factors of the Absolute. Thus he who knows, *i.e.*, fully believes that the *Samsāra*, the World-process, is eternal and must always be kept up, that we have nothing to do with anything else, that there is no *Ātmā* and nothing like a nexus, between Self and Not-Self—even such a *jīva*, knowing the U only, is also called *mukṣa*, free from doubt in his own way. Again, he who declares that Brahman is identical exclusively with pure Negation only, devoid of all and everything, he

truth of the universal, that the Self is ever blissful, having *nothing* to do, at any time, being always Full and Complete and Wantless.

¹Current Samskr̥t philosophical literature does not recognise the distinctions which follow in the text; it only distinguishes the *jīva*-*mukṣa*, 'one who is free while still in the body,' and *viḍeha*-*mukṣa*, the same after the body has fallen away.

also is a mukṭa and his technical designation is vimukṭa; for even though he does not know the element of Eṭaṭ or Samsāra, still he knows it by implication, because he knows the nexus, even though he knows that nexus as the most important; and he also is free from doubt in his own way, having, for the time being, resolved all into Nothing. Finally, he who knows only this, viz., that I am or is Brahman, that the Ātmā alone is Brahman, and the Anātmā nothing—he also is a mukṭa for similar reasons. But the non-recognition of the fact that the Anātmā cannot stand without the Ātmā is the deficiency, the lack of completeness of knowledge (in all these cases, which lack ultimately creates doubts again and destroys the insufficiently grounded freedom therefrom). Free from all such defect is the triune unity-in-separateness of the Self, the Not-Self and the Negation, and he who knows this is the jīviṭa-mukṭa.

It may be questioned how, when the three are declared to be inseparable and triune, is it possible to know any one of them singly and by itself and attain mokṣha thereby. The answer is that because knowledge falls within the law of succession, this appearance of successive knowledge of one only at a time does take place as a fact; and as all the trinity is Brahman, the knowledge of any one may

also not improperly be said to be knowledge of Brahman and so to constitute mokṣha. The consequence is that all jīvas may be regarded as baḍḍha, bound, all as mukṭa, free, all as siḍḍha, perfect, indifferently and simultaneously¹.

Like the distinctions of jīviṭa-mukṭa, vimukṭa, and mukṭa, there are other dis-

¹ This is only another illustration and application of the fact and law of the continuum, the inseparability, of all things and conditions. The ordinary intelligence, 'understanding' as it is called by some of the German philosophers, corresponding to the manas of the Nyāya instinctively endeavors to separate, to analyse and divide and distinguish, to grasp only one thing at a time, to cut off objects from each other as with a razor. But this is impossible; there is no such division and separation in the World-process; it is emphatically a continuum; and the buddhi, the reason, recognises this higher fact and synthesises accordingly. The lower mind wishes to tear apart the abstract and the concrete, universal and particular, back and front; it is the very principium of the particular, the concrete, the separate; it is the false self, the self as identified with a this; its one yearning and craving and straining is to delimit, to define, to impatiently and discontentedly and incessantly ask: 'But *what is* the universal, the abstract, the pure Self? I do not recognise what it is; give me something tangible; what you say is mere words,

tinctions too, *e.g.*, mahātmā, sādhu, yogī, yogeshvara, sānta, praviṣṭa, siḍḍha, parama-siḍḍha, etc. These appellations mark definite stages of attainment in an indefinitely progressive series, according to the grade of knowledge, and of cessation from ahaṅkāra, *i.e.*, the personal feeling of initia-

mere air!' It will not see that the universal, the abstract, the pure Self cannot be explained to it in terms of the senses, as 'It is this that you can see and touch and taste, etc.,' without losing its character of universality and abstractness. The reason recognises that such pure Self *is*, as a fact and as a law, indeed as *the* fact of all facts and *the* law of all laws, as the very principle of connexion between all discrete facts; it recognises that universality is present, immanent, in all 'particulars,' that without this inaudible, intangible, invisible, untasteable, unsmellable element of continuity, the audible, the tangible, the visible, the tasteable, the smellable would have no mutual connexion, no coherence, no meaning; it sees that this whole everlasting World-process itself is one continuous, ever-renewed and ever-futile effort to define the abstract Self in terms of the concrete Not-Self. If we thoroughly realise this fact, then such paradoxical-looking statements of the *Praṇava-vāda*,—and they are very frequent— as that all jīvas are bound as well as free, that freedom may be gained by realising only one even of the three factors of Brahman, etc., become intelligible.

tion of acts by oneself and the desire for fruit of action, and according to the perfection of the peace and contentment attained.

There are four principal sub-divisions under mokṣha, *viz.*, sālokya, sāyojya¹, sāmīpya, and sārūpya, based on (the nature of the) kriyā (belonging to each). Sālokya is of the nature of samsāra, connected with U; the 'realisation' corresponding to it is, 'with the world', *i.e.*, that there is nothing outside the loka, the world. Sāyojya, again, is knowledge including both the Self and the Not-Self; this samsāra exists, surely, but it does so in 'conjunction' with the Ātmā; it implies that the Self and the Not-Self, A and U, are both accepted as mutually inseparable from and dependent on each other. As the sālokya-mukṭa, believing in the Anātmā only, labours under the defect of not knowing the Self and the Nexus, so the sāyujya-mukṭa, believing in the Self and the Not-self, suffers from the deficiency of not knowing the Nexus. Sārūpya is connected with name and form; with the Self, the Not-Self and the Negation; it is based on the M, on the svarūpa of the AUM, (*i.e.*, its *form* and not its real significance).

¹ The spelling in the *Praṇava-vāda* is sāyojya, and not sāyujya, as now-a-days. *Bhaviṣya-Purāṇa*, III, iv., ch. 7, has the spelling sāyojya.

Sāmīpya,¹ 'nearness', 'approximation,' is the unity of all three. With reference to the transcendental, only an endless *approximation* is possible. It is true that in a certain sense even an atom is mukṭa, is a trinity possessing sālokya, sāyojya, and sāmīpya, and based on the AUM; yet, because the universal AUM is transcendental, the definite and particular atom can make only an incessant and endless approximation to it. Because all are small and all are great comparatively, from the standpoint of Mahā-Viṣṇu an atom is only approximate to mukṭi; and so too is Mahā-Viṣṇu, from the point of view of another higher being, also only approximately mukṭa. This gradation extends endlessly. Sāmīpya is the true mokṣha; he who has achieved it is the jīvita-mukṭa; it is born of perfect achievement, sarva-siddhi-jā.

It is said sometimes that sālokya is the first and sārūpya the last and highest kind of mukṭi; but the true fact is that from the standpoint of saṁsāra, sālokya comes first; then,

¹ Compare the expression in *The Secret Doctrine* 'the great day, Be-with-us' and the Samskr̥t word upāsana, 'sitting near,' 'waiting or attending on,' commonly used to mean worship. See also *Light on the Path*, "It is beyond you, because it for ever recedes. You will enter the light, but you will never touch the flame."

by recognition of the Self, sāyojya, wherein are combined both Self and Not-Self; and the third is sārūpya which implies that the Self and the Not-Self are 'one-formed' or one. From the standpoint of sārūpya, all is 'similarity,' same-formed-ness¹; all is free and all is bound, etc., and hence, in a way, sārūpya is capable of being regarded as the highest. But beyond that is the sāmīpya which includes all the trinity, viz., the Self and the Not-Self and the Nexus between them. The triune AUM itself is sāmīpya including the other three. The four together are Brahman in which the jīva merges.

'Merged' in Brahman, līna, here means nothing more nor less than the clear realisation that the I is the Other, the Other is the I, and that the I and the Other, in the relation of Negation, are the Supreme; all appearance of separateness being the illusion of imagination, to the removal of which all endeavour is directed, as taught by the śāstras.

¹ That is to say, the consciousness in this condition is a consciousness which does not make distinction between Self and Not-Self, regarding both as not only inseparable but the same. In this sense it promotes the sense of unity; but—without clear and correct knowledge of the circumstances; the consciousness of unity here is confused, vague, non-discriminative. In the last there is clear knowledge of the unity in diversity.

Sāmīpya, as the highest knowledge, is nir-guṇa and beyond time, space and motion, while the other three forms of mukṭi are sa-guṇa and within space, etc. In this highest state only dwell all true brāhmaṇas, etc. It is the fruit of all sciences and all actions; and all actions and all sciences are the fruits of it. In it is no pleasure and no pain, no joy and no sorrow, but ever unsullied purity and the necessity of all things.

The atom of a system regards the Mahā-Viṣṇu of that system as the limit of achievement. So, too, the Mahā-Viṣṇu regards some one else, some other being, as such limit. The achievements of such limited goals are called the achievement of sāyojya-mukṭi, freedom of the nature of identification with the being who marks the limit. But sāmīpya is the universal, all-supporting and timeless consciousness expressed by the Logion, that includes all Self and all Other-than-Self.¹

¹ These remarks help us to understand the element of truth that there also is in the current interpretations of the various kinds of mukṭi. According to these, sālōkya means attaining to and residing in the same world as the deity who has been made the ideal and the object of devotion; sāmīpya means constant nearness to and attendance on him; sārūpya is attaining to his form and appearance; while sāyujya is mergence in and identity with

him. Sometimes a fifth kind is added to these four, viz., Sārṣhti, sameness of powers with the object of devotion. If the law of analogy is true, illustrations should be found in the surroundings of the physical plane familiar to us, of the facts of the subtlest plane that we can think and talk about—for the subtlest planes *are here*, interpenetrating the familiar physical, and are not things far distant and unapproachable. Accordingly, we may endeavour to bring these kinds of deliverance a little nearer home to ourselves by thinking of the case of an ambitious human aspirant who gradually succeeds in (i) obtaining access to the precincts within which the sovereign of his country resides, (ii) becoming one of his court, his entourage, and donning his uniform, (iii) becoming his confidential advisor and co-worker, (iv) becoming one of his family, by marriage, etc., (v) occasionally officiating for him and exercising his functions. If we substitute for the greater mutual resistance and exclusion of physical bodies, the greater intercommunication of subtler ones (—comets' tails are known to science to pass through each other—); for the intense egoism of the lower bodies, the greater 'universalism' of the buddhic and higher bodies; the prevalence of love—such as makes the 'many' billions of separate living cells 'one' single organic individual—over the separativeness, the hate, that breaks up joint families into pieces; then we may have a fair working idea of what various grades of mokṣha are in the technical 'superphysical' sense, as distinguished from the metaphysical one

of 'freedom from doubt and consequent utter peace of mind'.

The theosophical student will probably be able to trace correspondences between the various 'technical' kinds of *mukṭi* mentioned here, (*viz.* *Jivan-mukṭi*, *viḍeha-mukṭi*, *vimukṭi*, etc., and *salokya*, etc., considered independently, or as sub-divisions of *jivan-mukṭi*, etc.) and the various stages of superphysical achievement and existence mentioned in the other religions, *e.g.*, *arhat*, *asekha*, *buddha*, *pachcheka-buddha*, *nirmāṇa-kāya*, *sambhoga-kāya*, *dharmakāya*, etc., in Buddhism; 'glory,' 'beatitude,' etc., in Christianity; *merāj* in Islām—and so on.