

SECTION III. (*Continued.*)

CHAPTER VII. Sub-Section (i)

THE SĀMA VEĀDA.

The nature of Shakti-Energy in general.—Distinction between Shakti, Ichchhā and Māyā.—Māyā and Brahman.—Mahā-māyā, and its sub-divisions, Yoga-māyā, Bhagavatī, Yoga-nidrā.

After the *Yajuh* comes the *Sāma*, descriptive of all desire; and as desire connects cognition and action, so the *Sāma* connects the *Rk* and the *Yajuh*. Ichchhā is the energy of Shiva. It indeed is the energy, force, power, of all and everything that has any power; and it is everywhere, omnipresent; without energy relation between two things is not possible. The being together of two things is their relation; and for such relation, such bringing and keeping and being together, of two things, a third thing as connecting link is indispensable, a third which may hold the two together. Ichchhā is this third which brings together cognition and action; and this coming together of these is all work, all (the external, objective, real) World-process, the cognition-element being (the internal subjective, ideal) *Veḍa* which

is the ideation of Mahā-Vishṇu. All the 'behavior,' the 'operation,' of time, space, and motion becomes possible only by means of Shakti, and the World-process is but the proceeding forth of these three. That they are considered separately at all is only to secure fullness of treatment; in reality the three are but one.¹ Hence too the One Shakti of the whole World-process is the Brahman-Shakti which only *appears* threefold as Brāhmī, Vaiṣṇavī, and Shaivī. It may be said that only two shaktis should be spoken of (those of cognition and of action, and not also a third, the shakti of desire, which would be tantamount to a 'power of power'), because desire is the one power divided in two by reference to cognition and action; still, because energy is definable only by its work, and because we *find* the three kinds manifesting in work, in the

¹ I have nowhere met in the *Praṇava-Vāda* a definite statement to the effect that space, time and motion are different forms or attributes of the negative aspect of the Na, and that Shakti, Energy, is its affirmative aspect, as is attempted to be shown in chapters xi and xii of *The Science of Peace*; but statements like these in the text here may be regarded as pointing to this. In the *Viṣṇu Bhāgavata* and Vyāsa's *Yoga-bhāṣya* also, such expressions are to be met with as *desha-kāla-kriyā*, or space-time-motion, and *desha-kāla-nimiṭṭa*, or space-time-cause.

world, as a matter of fact, therefore we also find them dealt with in the *Sāma-Veḍa*¹.

A indicates the Vaiṣṇavī, U the Brāhmī, and M the Shaivī energy. The Vaiṣṇavī energy is the complement, converse or opposite, of kriyā, and of the nature of and in accord with jñāna. The Brāhmī energy is of the nature of kriyā and the converse of viḍyā, knowledge. The Shaivī energy is of the nature of the nexus between the two and gives rise to ichchhā.

¹ We may justify the three kinds thus : (i) energy as manifesting in cognition ; (ii) as manifesting in action ; (iii) as in itself, apart from manifestation, as mere desire or emotion.

Because of the endless interplay of 'inseparability' and 'distinguishability' and of the unremitting operation of the law of psycho-physical parallelism, we have the appearances of different psychical processes being predominantly connected with different organs and different kinds and planes of matter, in the world around and in the constitution of human individuals. Thus cognitive consciousness works predominantly in one set of organs and one kind of matter, the desiderative in another, and the active in a third. See *The Science of Peace*, chapters xiii-xiv-xv; *The Trishikha-Brāhmaṇa Upaniṣat*; *The Secret Doctrine*, vol. III, last section, and *The Ancient Wisdom*, as to the predominance of one of the three aspects of consciousness in one plane of matter and corresponding sheath or body of the jīva.

We find the seven svaras, musical notes, in the *Sāma*. In describing desire, the *Sāma* deals also with the sextette of jñāna and kriyā (mentioned before, through which desire manifests) and with their summation, the seventh; and the seven svaras correspond to these seven. At first, in the *Samhitā* portion of the *Sāma*, we find only three svaras, corresponding to the three energies. So too, in the *Rk* and the *Yajuh*, only the three svaras are employed. The seven are developed only in the course of the exposition of ichchhā through which alone all things are developed.

By studying the three viḍyās, sciences, of cognition, action and desire, *Rk*, *Yajuh* and *Sāma*, which are all again developed in a new aspect in the *Sāma*, by itself, as the sciences of the three shakṭis, and, finally, by studying the *Atharva*, the jīva secures the full fruitage of dharma, artha, kāma, and mokṣha, virtue, profit, pleasure and salvation, respectively.

Shakṭi is the necessity of the conjunction of Self and Not-Self, of A and U, of cognition and action. Nothing takes place without necessity. Necessity is all becoming, inherent in and outcome of the Svabhāva, the nature, of the Absolute. As the *Nyāya* declares: All becoming is necessity. (All becoming, all the World-

process, all possible conjunctions and disjunctions of Self and Not-Self, are contained in the Sva-bhāva, and hence necessary; that Absolute-Nature is the one necessity which is its own reason and the reason and cause of all facts and contradictions which are within it and are it.) Anything, anywhere, all, not-all, other, this, all sounds, all times, all spaces, all cognitions, all actions, the known, the unknown, the done, the undone, the born, the unborn, the present, the non-present, the essence, the non-essence—all this *is*, hence *becomes*: such is the significance of becoming. That which does not become never comes into reckoning at all; it has no word or name for it, there is no consideration of its significance, no remembrance, no forgetting, no recollection of it, no certainty and no uncertainty about it, no possibility and no impossibility of it. The 'not' itself also is or becomes, for unless it became, there would be no such expression as na-iṭi, (or na-a-sti), so-and-so '*is not*'; there would be no conjunction between na and iṭi. 'Not this thing', 'not this person', 'not another', not thou', 'not I', 'is not', 'not is', 'no end', 'no beginning', 'no beginninglessness nor endlessness'—in all these expressions we see the conjunction of the 'not' or 'no' with other words. This conjunction itself is the *becoming* of the 'not'. Without

such conjunction there is no knowledge and no expression of it.

As the *Brahma-Sūtra* declares: As (*i.e.*, is) is necessity. Beyond the *as* is the Soundless, the Timeless, the Spaceless, the Differenceless. For these reasons, then, 'becoming' is necessity. Hence *all* is necessary. As the *Vaiśeṣika* declares: There is not anything that is not necessary. The unnecessary, the contingent, is also fashioned by the necessary, is necessary, is part of the contents of the Sva-bhāva. Therefore whatever becomes, and the operation of becoming also, is necessary. The *Sāṅkhya* also declares similarly: Is-ness, a-stiṭva, is necessity. The necessity of the (conjunction of the) 'not' and the 'is', and of the 'I' and the 'This'—all this is inherent in the Negation. Because of the principle that Necessity is shakṭi (shak, to be able or possible), *might*, power, energy, do we see that everywhere action arises out of (some) necessity, (a special need). Everyone, imposing upon himself, imagining, feeling, realising some need or necessity, performs some act according to the extent of his knowledge of the means of satisfying that need. This fact may be observed in the movements of every single atom. We see that such first questions, preliminary to acquaintance, as, How do you happen to come here? For what purpose? What

do you want? Who are you? Where do you live? all these really signify, What is the need or necessity that brings you here? By what necessary means have you come here? By what necessity are you staying in the place where you have put up? etc. For residence in any particular place has also its necessary reason, as, otherwise, the Self dwells everywhere and supports all. There is a necessity implied also in the question Who are you?, viz., What is the necessity for your being what you are; why *you* in particular; there must be a reason, a need, a necessity for the knowing, the recognising of, the making of acquaintance with, you; otherwise, multitudes of people see and pass each other every day, and everyone does not ask every other such questions. In the question, For what purpose, *pra-yojana*? the reference to necessity is express. *Pra-yojana* means, etymologically, that wherein the self is engaged, conjoined; and that is necessary, otherwise the self would not be so assiduously engaged therein. Or, by another etymological explanation, that whereby one is impelled to or engaged in some activity is the *pra-yojana*; here 'that whereby' signifies 'by this necessity.' Otherwise, from the standpoint of *Brahman*, all is always 'impelled,' and there is no need for any specification of the impellor as 'he', 'which', 'that

one', 'which one', 'I', 'thou', 'all'. Hence, then, we must recognise necessity everywhere. As the *Brahma-Sūtra* says repeatedly: Every question looks to a necessity, every question bases on a necessity (a reason, a compelling motive).

Therefore are all sounds or words necessary. Without necessity there is no thinking and no utterance of words—this is the view of the science of language, grammar, which further enjoins that the unnecessary, or redundant, and the irrelevant, or inconsistent, word should not be used, but only the well-directed, the necessary, and the easy to follow in thought. Let us consider further that no word exists for which there is not a necessity in its own proper time and space; the irrelevancy and undesirability lie only in the use of the word without due necessity; otherwise, *śabdā* being *Brahman*, all words are relevant, correct, and of universal application. Hence does the *Āṅga-Sūtra* say: The word should be regarded as based on necessity. And the science of *Chhandah*, metre, rhythm or prosody, declares: The word should be selected according to the needs or the necessity of the subject, i.e., the subject-matter dealt with in the work, and of the order of the thought or meaning. The *Kalpa-Sūtra* again avers thus: Thinking is, and is about the,

necessary. And that is the arṭha, the idea, the subject-matter thought about, the sense or meaning intended to be expressed. And, finally, the expressor of that arṭha is the word, the śhabḍa. Hence is it declared everywhere that the action, aim or purpose, of 'ornaments of language' and 'ornaments of thought' is one and the same.¹ The 'ornament of thought' is the real, inner, necessity, *i.e.*, aim and purpose; the ornament of language is only an additional means of emphasising it. The poet who indulges in mere ornaments of language without an inner substantial ornament of thought is condemned by the science of poetry. Hence does the *Sāhitya-Sūtra*, the aphorisms of rhetoric, say: The ornaments of language and of thought are inter-connected.

So is there the same reference to necessity in the advice that time should not be 'made useless' *i.e.*, wasted, which means that only that should be done at any particular time which it is *necessary* to do at that time; to do anything else is to make time useless, to waste it, and so is

¹In English, the expression 'figures of speech' seems to cover both, 'ornaments of language,' *e.g.*, alliterations, onomatopœia, deliberate selection of soft-sounding or harsh-sounding words, and 'ornaments of thought,' *e.g.*, similes, metaphors, hyperboles, antitheses, etc.

reprehensible. Otherwise, indeed, time is without beginning and without end, and it is not possible to waste it; it is always passing, whether this thing be done or that other, your work or mine, and it can never be exhausted. But this *transcendental* consideration is not appropriate where *particular* business is in hand, in individual life; for, there, time once passed comes not back again, and even though time be indefinite or transcendent, taken as a whole, yet *within* it is a constant succession of definite 'appointed times,' *i.e.*, moments, periods, cycles, æons, assigned to and fixed for particular purposes. The 'appointed' is the necessary. *Within* the transcendent is the particular time, *this* time, appointed for each 'this.' If *this* does not become, *i.e.*, is not completed, within *this* period, beginning here and ending here, then that time has been wasted, and after it has lapsed, regret remains behind, for the necessity, the need, has not been fulfilled. If, on the other hand, the necessity has been fulfilled, then the lapse of the time leaves behind no regret, but a great satisfaction. Hence too is it clear that joy and sorrow also attend on necessity.

The science of *Jyotiṣha*, astrology, also declares that the calculation of time depends on the necessity of the work for which that calculation is required.

Thus do we see that all becoming is necessity; and becoming is nothing else than conjunction, inter-relation; and conjunction exists or subsists in a pair only; hence the necessity of the conjunction of the two, the *fact*, the deed-act,¹ of becoming (or the being and existence of the fact or process of becoming) is the third to these two. It is *Shakṭi*, *might*, energy, which is therefore called the *cause* of *Samsāra*.

This *Shakṭi* is the originator, reverser, and permuter of beginning, middle and end, and it inheres in the Logion, I-This-Not. The *svārūpa*, the own-form, of this *Shakṭi* is *aś*, 'is.' Its manifestations are the affirmations: I am, I am this, I am not this, I am such, I am not such, how am I, why am I, why am I not, how am I not, I verily am, etc. Without the *aś*, *is* or *am*, the Logion I-This-Not is nothing at all, is meaningless. (Thou) 'art' and (he) 'is' are also based on, derive their significance from, (I) 'am.' It is only on the strength of and with the consciousness 'I am' that one *jīva* says to another: Thou art, thou art this, thou art thus, etc. The case of 'is' is similar. Without the 'am' there is no speaker of the 'art' or 'is'; without a speaker there is no employment

¹ Compare Fichte's "Thatsache," and "That-Handlung" (Kroeger, xix). Professor Harris' introduction is very interesting in the light of the following (E. H. B.).

of the second or the third person (of grammar)¹. In one sense, indeed, because the *Aham*, I, exists everywhere, and *aś*, *is*, is everywhere inherent in it, therefore everyone becomes, in turn, according as he is the speaker, or listener or spoken about, the first, the second, or the third person. Thus, in truth, all is but *aś*, *is*, Necessity, and first, second, and third persons are nothing.

The 'am' is the Self, the 'art' is the This, the 'is' is the Not. This difference of persons arises because the thought or knowledge, I-This-Not, is present in everyone and everywhere, so that each one thinks 'I (am)-not-this,' and thus separates himself away as 'I,' including all the rest in 'this' and 'not'. Otherwise, indeed, all *ḍhātus*, verb-roots, roots of action, are but one, *viz.*, to be, to become; and all action proceeds from and because of the root; hence all action is one². That is to

¹ All this is only another but fresh and suggestive way of saying that *my*-consciousness, and, because there are ever so many *my*-consciousnesses each cognisant of others, therefore the one universal *My*-Consciousness or All-Self-Consciousness, is the necessary foundation of all individual consciousnesses whatsoever; it is the one sole proof and testimony of the existence of any and everything.

² The text is very obscure here and I am not quite sure of the accuracy of my translation.

say, there is but one noun, the 'I,' but one verb 'to be,' and but one unbroken action or motion in the whole of the world-process, *i.e.*, 'becoming,' the self-assertion of the Self in endless ways.

(The primal trinity has been repeatedly declared to consist of three factors, I, This, and Not. What is this Shakti, then; is it a fourth?') It would seem as if it was outside the three. Yet this is not so. It is only the Necessity of the three and so included in them and not anything apart from them. That which is necessary to anyone is included in that one, is part of his being. In the moment that anyone is feeling the

¹ The question of the place of Shakti in the Logion is dealt with in a slightly different aspect, here, from that in which it is treated in the *The Science of Peace*. Possibly the reader may find it easier to follow the text here if he is familiar with the idea put forward there, *viz.*, that the *relation* of Negation between Self and Not-Self, because of the limitedness of the Not-Self, which makes *simultaneity* of affirmation and negation impossible, necessarily becomes a *successive* affirmation-negation; and this *necessary succession*, of affirmation and then Negation, is the real nature and form of Shakti, so that Shakti may be regarded as one aspect and Negation as the other of the third factor, *i.e.*, the Relation, which is immanent in the Self and Not-Self, or rather is immanent together with the Not-Self, in the Self.

necessity, the need, for anything, in that moment he is feeling himself as nothing else than, as nothing without, the object of his desire. (This is the inner significance of the ordinary expressions, 'his soul, his very being, is bound up with the loved object, without it he dies, is nothing.') It is true that from the position of the necessary or desired object, *i.e.*, when it has been attained, there will appear still another necessary or desired object further on in the distance, and this endlessly, but for the time being the consciousness of the desiror rests there, in the first desired object. (Consciousness is *sam-viṭ*, that which 'knows well'). That which knows another well is itself knowable by that other; on this principle, the Ātmā, the desiror, the Lover, becomes included in or with and non-separate from the desired object, the Beloved. Because the reality is one even when it appears as separate, because the necessity is its own necessity, therefore its own light or life is included, is present, in that which it thinks to be necessary to its own being; and hence only the pursuit of the desired by the desiror becomes possible and results actually. By the union of man and woman, progeny arises. The man is the first, the woman the second, the child the third. The *necessity*-bond of this triplet is *kāma*, love. This *kāma* is included in the three, and not outside of and apart from

them; it is *understood* when the three are referred to. Of course, in a verbal enumeration, *kāma* would be mentioned separately, but in reality, the whole of its existence is included in the existence of the three.

This one and the same Energy, in its supreme and universal aspect, is called *Shakṭi*; in its non-supreme or subsidiary, particular, concrete, aspect it is called *icchā*; in its all-transcendent, absolute aspect, *Māyā*. When we say that *Māyā* is nothing, we should remember that the 'no' belongs of necessity to *Māyā*.¹ The form and nature of necessity is no-thing determinate, but always indeterminate and transcendent, for necessity is all-transcending, beyond space, time, and action or motion. (That is to say, necessity being the changeless nature or *Svabhāva* of the Absolute, which is *Self-determined into all possible forms* in the World-process, there being no other determinor—it follows that this absolute necessity is absolute freedom or indeterminateness also; and again because it is essentially the negation of all affirmation of any and all possible particulars, therefore is it truly *no-thing* too).

¹ It may be that *Māyā* is the equivalent of what is described in *The Science of Peace* as 'Shakṭi-energy as condition,' or time-space-motion. These three are emptinesses and *Māyā* is by Samskr̥t etymology *यामा*, 'that which is not'.

But it may be asked: A difference is made everywhere between *Māyā* and *Brahman*; the counsel is constantly given that we should free ourselves from *Māyā* and become *Brahman*, that *Māyā* is the maker of separateness and we should therefore abandon it and realise *Brahman*; (how then can we say that *Māyā* is the necessity, the very nature of *Brahman*)?. The reply is: In this counsel, the word *Māyā* means something else than the Supreme Necessity; it means the separate, personal and particular forms of desire, the feelings of mine, thine, etc., created necessarily by the Self by means of nescience (the half-science, half-truth or error, included in the Whole Truth, *Vidyā*), the fixed ideas that this only should be done, this avoided, this has been gained, this lost, this is certain and permanent, this uncertain, this desirable, this undesirable, and so on. The counsel means that we should rather think that (from the totality of all standpoints) all is desirable, all is thine, I am thou, (there cannot be anything that is exclusively) mine or thine, thou art I, another is I, I am another, all is necessary and preordained, all should be done, all is one, one is all, there is no one and many, all is everywhere and everywhen and everyway, all belongs to everything and everything to all; abandon that primitive *māyā* that is the personal desire of mineness and creates

separateness, and embrace instead the Supreme Māyā that is identical with Brahman, the one Necessity, the unified Trinity.¹

As Shakṭi is sub-divided into Viṣṇu's jñāna-shakṭi, Brahmā's kriyā-shakṭi and Shiva's ichchhā-shakṭi, so is Māyā also sub-divided into Yoga-māyā, Bhagavatī, and Yoga-nidrā, corresponding to Viṣṇu, Brahmā and Shiva respectively. The necessity whereby the conjunction of Aham with Eṭaṭ is brought about is yoga-māyā, the maker of the worlds, for without this conjunction there is no possibility of the existence of samsāra, and indeed the conjunction itself is called samsāra. Bhagavatī is connected with kriyā; bhaga is aishvarya, lordship, sovereignty, the wealth of action. It is the necessity of Eṭaṭ (which, because of the inherent limitedness of each eṭat, gives rise to succession). Yoga-nidrā is the necessity of the Negation which brings about the disjunction of Aham and Eṭaṭ, and so the dissolution of

¹ In the language of practical social ethics, 'Do not remain passionately wedded to particular opinions, holding all others in error—which egoism is the quintessence of prejudiced bigotry; but learn to take broad-minded and tolerant views, seeing that even the most divergent opinions and doctrines have some element of the One Truth in them. See *The Secret Doctrine*, Vol. I, p. 282, foot-note.

worlds; it is that which *sleeps* in or brings to sleep the conjunction of I and Not-I. The summation of these three is the Mahā-māyā (in a general metaphysical sense; but it has a particular sense also, *viz.*,) it or she is the shakṭi of Mahā-Viṣṇu the lord of the mahā-manvantara, the cycle of this samsāra. Strictly, of course, this shakṭi is not a possession, a private belonging, of Mahā-Viṣṇu. There is only one Necessity or energy which receives various graded names of great, small, etc., according to the grades of the various agents through whom it manifests. All other similar names (and metaphysical words) should also be interpreted similarly, everywhere and always, as having a double significance, one personal and particular and the other impersonal or universal and transcendental.¹

¹ In connexion with Mahā-Māyā, apparently to illustrate the two meanings mentioned in the text, the author quotes a shloka, from the current *Durgā-Sapta-shaṭī*, as to how by the special grace of Mahā-Māyā, Śavarṇi became the eighth Manu and the ruler of a manvantara. In commenting upon the verse the ṛshi makes a number of statements as to occult cycles, etc., which are very obscure. Some figures have been given before, in the 2nd chapter of the 3rd Section as to cycles and worlds and world-rulers; they too, it will be remembered, are not easy to synthesise. Making a rough guess as to the author's meaning, it seems to be that

7th manvanṭaras or 7th mahā-manvanṭaras make the vinihiṭa-cycle which is the lifetime of our Sun (?), who is the body of Mahā-Viṣṇu; that in this particular mahā-manvanṭara of fourteen Manus,—the 7th of which Manus, *viz.*, Vaivasvata is now ruling us in the 4th Vaivasvata-manvanṭara and the 28th viyuga,—by some special ordainment of the individual goddess Mahā-Māyā, the consort of Mahā-Viṣṇu, Sāvarṇi becomes the 8th and most important Manu, apparently exercising some authority over the whole of the seven manvanṭaras, retrospective and prospective, and over all the other thirteen Manus, being in some special manner, the special son of Sūrya, the Sun. It may be asked what is the difference between Shakti and its three sub-divisions of jñāna-shakti, kriyā-shakti and ichchhā-shakti (or, as they are called in their personal aspect, Vaishṇavī, Brāhmī, and Shaivī), on the one hand, and Māyā or Mahā-Māyā and its three sub-divisions of Yoga-māyā Bhagavatī and Yoga-nidrā, on the other. Apparently only the difference between dynamic and static aspects of the same energies; the former series of names gives prominence to the active or manifested aspect; the latter to the potential and self-contained one. Or, it may be said that the difference is that between the universal and the particular, the generic and the specific; somewhat like that between saṭ-chiḍ-ānanda and kriyā-jñāna-ichchhā, or between saṭṭva-rajas-tamas and guṇa-karma-dṛavya. See the opening sentences of the next chapter also.

