

Tarka, argument, reasoning from hypotheses, is connected with prayojana. Ūha, hypothesis, conjecture, theory, is made with reference to a purpose, an aim. 'How may this be secured,' 'how is this,' 'what is this,' 'if this be so, this other would be so,' 'if it were thus, such an inconsistency would result'—such is the form of tarka whereby a fact is determined to be 'so rather than otherwise'.

Vāda, discussion, falls under pramāṇa. It proceeds on the assumption that definite and provable facts, and knowledge of them, exist somewhere and in some one; and it aims at eliciting them. It is true that there are two kinds of discussion, saṭ or true and a saṭ or false.<sup>1</sup> But for the purposes of knowledge they are as one; it does not matter whether a fact is 'ascertained' to be true or false. (Both are 'ascertainments' and therefore useful. Destructive criticism has its uses as well as constructive).

Jalpa corresponds with pramēya. It is disputation or controversy for mere display of skill and pleasure of mental activity, with much

<sup>1</sup> What is meant seems to be that one kind of discussion aims mainly at proving that a certain fact or rather view or opinion is true; and another kind, at proving that a certain view is false. One proves 'This is so'; another 'This is not so'. In practice, both are mixed up and supplement each other.

turning and twisting about of permutations and combinations of arguments but without any real and radical opposition. In such a disputation, each person states insistently his own side, what he has seen (with an implied suggestion that that is the *whole* of the truth, and herein is the appearance of 'dispute'. But in reality, none necessarily contradicts the other.) Always (motions, movements of mind here) exist in all-space and all-time; and all possible opinions may be true, in their proper times and places. Because this world is always in procession, always changing, it is always happening that one 'way' prevails 'now' and another 'then'. These changes are taking place every moment. On this understanding, controversy also is seen to have a use. It conduces to a fuller and clearer comprehension of the siddhānta, the final truth.

Viṭandā, wrangling, altercation, aimless and systemless cavilling, belongs to 'Doubt'.

Nirṇaya, determination, decision, is prayojana. It is the one motive of all enquiry. And the nirṇaya of the Nature of the Self is the prayojana of all the World-process (—which is one incessant 'enquiry' into that Absolute Nature). In that final decision are determined the nature of the 'decider,' the 'decided,' the 'decision,' the 'relation' between



them, the 'ways in which separateness appears in the Tri-Unity'.

Jāṭi,<sup>1</sup> 'genus-species,' is the following up of the 'specific' separateness, the distinguishing marks of and as between atoms and atoms, things and things (species and species). The specification of denotations and connotations, the relating together of names or words with marks of and relations between things is the nature of jāṭi. It belongs to pramāṇa.

Chhala, 'deceit,' excuse, occasion, pretext, casuistry, sophistry comes under pramēya. "If it be so, (and it is so) we ought to act thus, because of this necessity"—such is the nature of chhala.

Heṭu, cause, reason, belongs to samshaya. All kāraṇas, causes, are called heṭu. It is the unknown, the hidden, to be searched for, to be disclosed, to be manifested.

<sup>1</sup>The interpretation in the text, of the principal terms and subjects dealt with by the *Nyāya* is more or less different, in all cases, from that given in the works now current. But it is wholly different in the case of Jāṭi and the succeeding three. It is not impossible to connect the two by means of a transition through gradual changes of shades of meaning and associations. Thus at the present day, Jāṭi is a kind of fallacy, 'founded on false analogies'; and 'analogies' are based on 'specific characteristics' of 'species'.

"What is the reason of all this appearance, this World-process?"—such is the nature of heṭu, the point in issue.

Ābhāsa pertains to prayojana. Whatever 'appears,' ābhāṭi, is its own 'motive,' because all is necessary. (Every fact is its own justification; every manifestation, every appearance, is its own end, from the standpoint of the Absolute Svabhāva).

Thus does the *Nyāya* 'determine' and 'prove' every thing coming within the sixteen classes or categories that exhaust all the facts of life, vyavahāra.

*Nyāya* also falls into three sub-divisions corresponding to A, U and M: *Tattva-nyāya*, *Lōka-nyāya*, and *Prashasta-nyāya*.<sup>1</sup>

In the first, corresponding to cognition, all things are examined and reduced to unity and 'identity'; I alone is, and there is no second. In the second, referring to action, 'the contradiction' and manyness inherent in the This is expounded; I is one, this is another, the relation between them is a third and so on. The third, of the nature of desire-negation, shows that All-is-Not, all undergoes change, the inner content and significance of all that appears and is affirmed, is Negation.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Not recognised by current *Nyāya*.

<sup>2</sup> This statement indicates that if the writer of the *Praṇava-Vāda* had to use modern technical language,



The unity running through these three *Nyāyas* is that they all represent distinct standpoints which all exist. From the point of view of cognition, the One I is the root and support of all the many. From that of action, there is a Multiplicity: 'Do this, and this, and this other; this is important, this is unimportant and so on'; the 'practical' conclusion belonging to this standpoint is: 'I exist only for the carrying on of the World-process'. From that of *pariṇāma*, the end, the denouement (desired or to be expected and sure to follow), change, transformation, the conclusion of both I and This is Not, of the Interplay of Self and Not-Self in any given world-system is dissolution and *pralaya*.

From *Nyāya* we come to learn, thus, how at one epoch, the idea, the law or the consciousness of the Not-This prevails in the World-process; at another, that of the Not-Self; again, of the I only; still again, of the This only; at one time, of the 'I-This'; at another 'This-Not'; at yet another, 'I-This-Not'; and so forth. In truth,

The Self is proved by Self and not by proofs.

It is not matter for proof or doubt,

he would speak of the Laws of Thought as Identity, Contradiction, and *Included* (rather than *Excluded*) Middle. More on this will be found in the note at the end of this chapter.

Or varied concept, premiss, syllogism,  
Deductive and inductive inference,  
Hypothesis, contention, argument,  
It feels no fact or motive but Itself,  
The One Assurance through all fallacies.  
One Unity, One only is the Self,  
Yet also 'Tis a second, third, fourth, All.  
All contradiction is within It hidden.  
By *Nyāya* and *Veḍānta* is It known,  
And all *Mīmāṃsā* is its dwelling-place,  
The Root of Being, Bliss and Consciousness,  
Itself enrooted in Transcendent AUM.

NOTE: The intelligence, outward-turned, distinguishing *rather* than synthesising, endeavoring to master the details of its own world, the world of intelligence, and looking at all facts in their aspect of 'objects of investigation,' groups these outer and inner facts for its special purposes, under sixteen heads, those mentioned in the text. Other systems, from other 'points of view,' *darśana-bheda*, 'leading off' from other 'points of departure,' *prasthāna-bheda*, behold and grasp the facts of life in other ways and aspects. Thus the *Vaiśeṣika* treats them not as 'objects of study and logical discussion,' but as in themselves, and so classifies them under six or, according to some, seven groups. The *Veḍānta*, as objects of enquiries subservient to the one enquiry after the Supreme. The *Mīmāṃsā*, as objects of and related to action. The Yoga, as means to the evolution of the Jīva, and indirect



(iv) *Vaiśeṣhika*.—The significance of the name.—The subject-matter of the system.—Its relation to *Nyāya*.—Its practical purpose.—The seven categories under which it groups all the phenomena and facts of the World-process.—Their significance.—Their origin in and correspondence with the primal triplet instruments of its Release. The *Sāṅkhya* (of the *Praṇava-Vāda*), as embodying the Infinite and the Eternal, always, everywhere.

The sixteen heads of *Nyāya*, given here, differ from those of the current system, so far as the names go, in one small respect: *hetu* and *ābhāsa* are treated as one by the current system and to make up the sixteen, another head *nigrahasthāna*, is added. There are differences of interpretation also, especially as regards the latter heads. For a fair account of the main doctrines of the six systems as now current, the reader may refer to Max Müller's *Six Systems*. With reference to the principles of Logic proper, which is studied mostly by itself in modern days, but forms only a part of the philosophical system of *Nyāya*, a few observations may be made. The Indian syllogism has five steps instead of three. It combines, in a certain sense, both induction and deduction. Its method of induction, *vyāptigraha*, is the same as the most approved modern one, *viz.*, of concomitant variations, *anvaya-vyati-reka*. Its proposition or judgment or syllogistic premiss is not equational, but associative. It does not say A is B, and B is C, therefore B is C. It will say A goes

and summation.—Special consideration regarding *abhāva* or non-existence.—The three kinds or sub-divisions of the system in correspondence with the Trinity.—The Absolute.

The *Vaiśeṣhika* is the fourth *Upāṅga*. That which is 'left behind' after the marking off of

with B, this is B, therefore A will be found accompanying this. The so-called Laws of Thought, it does not formulate in their modern form. It would probably regard them as very barren and prohibitive of all really useful or even logical operations. If A is A only and never Not-A, how can any one ever say that A is B and B is C and therefore A is C? A can be only A and never B or C, which are obviously different from A? If it were questioned as to the laws of thought it would probably refer for the answer to its sister *Vedānta*, who would again very likely say that the so-called laws of thought apply only to the transcendental or metaphysical thought of or about Brahman: The Self is Self alone and never Not-Self; that they are, all three, summed up in the one phrase I Not-I Not. In the region of empirical thought, on the other hand, we find everything becoming something else, moment by moment; whatever of continuity anything has, and which continuity makes any induction possible at all, is only a shadow, a reflexion, of the continuity and Unity of Brahman. And the mention of the induction, and of the reason for it, in every syllogism, is intended as a standing reminder of



all others, that by which a thing is separated, distinguished, specialised from others is *vi-śheṣha*. That which proceeds from or is concerned with *vi-śheṣha* is *Vaiśeṣhika*. The enumeration of the objects of the World-process with specification of their distinctive features or

this fact, and as an incentive to correction of any error there might be in the induction or generalisation. The semblance of absolute completeness which appears in the major or minor premiss of modern syllogisms, and which is against fact,—since no generalisation regarding concrete particulars, by an individual human being of limited capacities, can ever be absolutely universal—is also avoided thereby. No multiplication of the finite will yield the infinite. No amount of ‘repetition’ of an experience can give a universal law. The reasoning is not, ‘Because many times therefore always,’ but ‘Because once therefore always’. *Universality* of generalisation lies in the *Unity* of each instance, not in manyness. Repetitions only help us to eliminate accidental factors.

It has been claimed that Aristotle improved upon the ancient system when he reduced its five steps of a syllogism to three. This is a hallucination. He has, indeed, increased its five steps to six, for the five, as said above, include the inductive as well as the deductive syllogism.

attributes is the work of the *Vaiśeṣhika* system.

It has been repeatedly observed before that all (things and thoughts) are based ultimately on the quartette of cognition, desire, action and summation. But the preliminary groupings and combinations of these primarily give rise to seven. The sixteen categories of the *Nyāya* are universal or general. The *Vaiśeṣhika* deals with the special differentia or propria.<sup>1</sup> Without the ‘general’ knowledge conveyed by the former, the ‘special’ knowledge offered by the latter is not possible to grasp. After mastering the knowledge of those sixteen, the ‘special methods’ of *samsāra* should be studied. In this particular *brahmānda* of ours, only seven *padārthas* are necessary (to deal with). For the knowledge of universals, *Nyāya* should be studied; for that of particulars, *Vaiśeṣhika*. This is all the difference between them; otherwise, as is well-known, they are but one. Distinctions exist only as between the parts of a whole. Because of this we have the statement: Having studied the whole of *samsāra* according to

<sup>1</sup> The distinction is not quite clear. Perhaps what is meant is that the *Nyāya* categories are ‘subjective,’ and each and every thing may appear under all of them in succession, in various situations; while the categories of the *Vaiśeṣhika* are ‘objective,’ and what belongs to one head cannot belong to another.



the *Nyāya* and then the *Vaiśeṣhika*, create a *brahmāṇḍa*.

The *Vaiśeṣhika* is thus the means of creating a *brahmāṇḍa*. Seven things are dealt with here: *dravya* or substance, *guṇa* or attribute, *karma* or motion, *sāmānya* or genus, *viśeṣha* or specifying and particularising (to the extent of singularising) characteristic (of species and individual), *samavāya* or relation and *abhāva* or non-existence. Of these, the first three are the chief and respectively correspond to desire (Negation), the Self and the Not-Self.

Substance is the root and locus of all relations (which are brought about by desire). There is an apparent inversion of the usual order here. This is due to the reversal (which is unavoidable in the 'reflexion' of the attributes of Self and Not-Self in or on each other). Without substance, nothing can appear or manifest. Hence it is placed first in order. Hence too the statement that the whole of the World-process is supported and upheld by desire, which is *māyā*. Hence all substance is of the nature of, or is compact of, Energy, *Shakti*. All energy, desire, necessity, resides in and about substance.

So, *guṇa*, quality, is cognition (or cognisable; as substance is the object of desire, so quality is the object of cognition); and cognition

is *Ātmā*; hence *guṇa* is, *i.e.*, corresponds to *Ātma*.

Finally, what is done (created) is *karma*; and doing is action which is, *i.e.*, corresponds to Not-Self. Thus do the three *padārthas* correspond to M, A and U.

Then follow *sāmānya*, sameness, equality, similarity, the common element, genus, type; and *viśeṣha*, speciality, diversity, particularity, individuality, singularity. *Sāmānya* is of the nature of the *samāhāra* or summation and resides in the triad of substance, attribute and motion. Because Desire, the Self and the Not-Self are all of them universal and necessary and yet one, therefore do we find that all is *sāmānya*, *i.e.*, is possessed of a unity in diversity which is, and is the origin of, the fact of genus. Hence people speak of a common spirit, a common desire, a common work, and, again, of so-and-so being a common or universal rule or law.

*Viśeṣha*, the singular or particular, arises in and by the *sāmānya*, the universal or general, and is therefore said to be included in the latter. *Viśeṣha* is a part of *sāmānya*, as *sāmānya* is the whole of *viśeṣhas*.

The relation with each other, connexion or nexus between, general and special, substance and attribute, motion and motion, or motion and

any of the others, is *samavāya*, 'going together,' juxtaposition, interconnexion, immanence, interdependence.

The unity of all inter-related facts, their reduction to oneness, the abolition of all differences and distinctions, is *abhāva*, non-existence, non-becoming, non-being. Ordinarily, it is true, a totality, an agglomerate of inter-related facts implies the continued separate existence of those facts. But when the totality or unity is that of the Universal Substrate, Being, the reduction to unity will amount to non-separate-existence, *i.e.*, non-existence, *abhāva* (wherein all the opposing differences, the pairs of opposites, the contrasts, of which and which alone, the manifested world consists, abolish themselves mutually and leave behind only Pure Being, which may equally well be called Pure Nothing.) The *abhāva* which is the unity or summation of the Three is 'Not-any-thing'. All this multiplicity of this, that, the other, which, who, someone, somewhere, you, I, he, etc., is possible only during *bhāva*, the existence of an inter-relation of separates. Where all is one there is neither speaker, nor speech, nor spoken to or about. *Abhāva* is generally described as 'is not'. Four kinds of this are usually distinguished, with reference to 'whole' and 'part'. They are: (i.) Previous, preceding or 'past non-existence' *i.e.*, the non-

existence of a thing in the past, before that thing came into existence; (ii.) the subsequent, succeeding or future 'non-existence of or by destruction,' the non-existence of a thing after it has been destroyed; (iii.) utter, or absolute or 'extreme non-existence'; and (iv.) 'mutual non-existence.'<sup>1</sup> A little consideration shows how all these are but variations of non-existence, the absence of separateness, absence of distinct manifestation, latency in the One Unmanifest. Thus 'previous non-existence' implies a consciousness, a memory, of a still earlier existence of the particular thing under reference, from which earlier existence it had passed into latency and has now reappeared. 'Non-existence by destruction' implies also that the thing has passed into the non-manifest condition out of which it will some day emerge anew into patency, for no-thing can be annihilated and every-thing must continue 'to be' in Universal Being in some way or other, and what 'becomes' or 'comes forth,' surely disappears, and what disappears as surely 'comes forth' again. 'Utter non-existence' also means only that the thing is non-existent, non-manifest to

<sup>1</sup> The Samskr̥t names are, *prāg-abhāva*, *prādhvams-ābhāva*, *aṭyanta-ābhāva*, and *anyony-ābhāva*. See in this connexion the last paragraphs of Section II. in Vol. I.



the senses; as a *padārtha*, a 'meaning of a term,' a concept, a notion, an idea, it always is. Finally, 'mutual non-existence' means that the destruction or disappearance of one thing causes or goes together with the destruction or disappearance of another; or that the birth of one causes the death of another—as we see all about us.

Thus, then, in essence, the absence or disappearance and destruction of separateness is the real significance of non-existence.

But, in this sense, strictly speaking, *abhāva* is not to be counted amongst the *padārthas*; and the manifest World-process contains and consists of only six, *dravya*, etc., in which is included the whole of this ever-moving or manifest *brahmāṇḍa*, devoted to *Kriyā* or *Karma*.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> It is said elsewhere that the two principal subdivisions of *Karma* (as mere movement, not as the ethico-psychological deeds which are the cause of pleasure or pain) are *ākuñchana* or contraction and *prasāraṇa* or expansion. On this point, compare the following: "Response, in whatever manner expressed, resolves itself into two simple and well-defined factors, namely, contraction and expansion." *Knowledge*, October 1906, p. 567—Review by G. Mason of Dr. J. C. Bose's book entitled *Plant Response as a means of Physiological Investigation*. See also *The Science of the Emotions*,

These six are divided into triplets in the usual way. (The first three with the fourth or *sāmānya* as summation have been already mentioned. Of the second three, *sāmānya* may be regarded as corresponding to *A*, *viśeṣha* to *U* and *samavāya* to *M*, the seventh or *abhāva* becoming the summation.) The actual concrete kinds or instances of *karma* and all the other *padārthas* are to be seen and understood only in the concrete or 'real' transactions and events of the World-process.

The *Vaiśeṣhika* system is also threefold like the others, *Ātma-Vaiśeṣhika*, *Kriyā-Vaiśeṣhika* and *Apara-Vaiśeṣhika*.<sup>1</sup> The aim of the first is to unify all *guṇa*, the attributes of all *padārthas*. The object of the second, to unify all *karma* residing in 'the separate,' *karma* which is the basis of and is in turn based on separateness. The third deals with the completion or fulfilment, satisfaction or extinction, of all desire (*dravya*) in the one primal and eternal endeavor of Self-realisation (by means of the counterfoils of particularised substance, matter, Not-Self). These

2nd edition, pp. 165-166; and *Spinoza*, by J. Caird, Blackwood's Philosophical Classics, ch. xiii., p. 234, "Consciousness of self-enlargement is pleasure".

<sup>1</sup> Current Samskr̥t philosophical literature does not know of these.



three correspond respectively to the A, U and M.

The *Vaiśeṣhika* should be studied as a means to the realisation of the unity of Substance, Attribute and Movement, in the All-Self, and, thereafter, the mastery of the special methods of creation under the guiding principle of AUM. But in reality,

No worlds and no World-process is this Self,  
Nor universal all-embracingness,  
Nor special and particular is It,  
But ever, every way, pure Consciousness;  
No substance and no attribute is It,  
Nor motion is It, nor the opposite,  
But all equality, summation, One,  
Awareness pure, ever and every way;  
Nor is nor is not, but the sum of both,  
Nor part, the positive, nor whole, the naught,  
Its substance, plenitude of partlessness,  
Its attribute, wareness of blessed Being,  
Its movement, the eternity of rest,  
Its common genus, Universal Self,  
Its utmost, atomic selves, singular  
Its all-embracing nexus, Unity,  
And Non-Existence, Its Abode of Peace.

(v) *Yoga*.—The significance of the name.—The purpose of the science.—Its subject-matters.—Its technicalities and their interpretation.—The three kinds of *yoga*.—The Absolute.

All things 'conjoin,' 'fit together,' into each other and into One in succession—such is the significance of *yoga*. And how the whole World-process, in all its parts, appropriately fits together and is inter-related—the exposition of this synthesis, this unity, this co-ordination, is to be found here. 'This enters into or exists in or comes after this, and for such and such a reason'—such is the nature of the synthesis. The projection, the fitting in, of one's own self into the Universal Self, the inspiration and motivation of the former by the latter—is the object of the science of *Yoga*. This I that seem separate, am really seated and established in and identical with the Universal I—this is the form and nature, substance and essence, of *yoga*; and the practice and securing of *yoga* is recommended only for the realisation of this fact. The duties, functions, operations (of all beings and forces of nature), ordained and pointed out separately (elsewhere), are all summed up and unified here; and the One is seen in all and all in One; this is the sole fruit of *yoga*. The methods of these various functions and operations, and of their unification, are all described here.

The technical words of *Yoga*, *prāṇāyāma*, etc., should be interpreted in accordance with these principles. This 'control of breath,' metaphorically and superphysically, means, essentially



the realisation of all the pseudo-infinite vital currents underlying the activities of all objects, vastest and minutest, as (being the same in nature as the operation of the life-breaths) in one's Self.

Japa, repetition, recitation, of the AUM<sup>1</sup> etc., is prescribed for the same purpose. It means reflexion on, realisation of, the meaning of that which is thus uttered repeatedly. The strenuous thinking out of the universal principles included in and signified by the AUM is its japa. There is an order, a law, in the World-process; and the discovery of that universal law and order of all manifestation constitutes the real import and importance of the 'repetition'. And the highest end and aim of the science and art, theory and practice of *Yoga*, is the unification of all the parts in the Whole, the parts which all fall under and are also all inter-related to Unity within and by means of the AUM. The Whole and the parts are both obviously necessary. And hence are both of them but one, even though appearing as separately distinguishable during processes of description and manifestation, in language and in existence—for things which are necessary to each other are part of each other's being.

<sup>1</sup> The aphorism quoted here in the text, and explained, is the same as i. 28 of the current *Yoga-Sūtras*; the explanation is slightly different.

The three kinds of *yoga* are *rāja* *hatha*, and *lakṣhya*. The first refers to cognition, knowledge, and is the source of all 'enlightenment'. The second consists in the 'persistent practice' of various processes and methods, as means. The third is the realisation of the 'aim' of the unity of all things. These respectively correspond to A, U and M. In truth, however,

Not *Yoga* and not *Yogin* is the Self,  
Not union nor disunion knoweth It,  
'Not' is the I the means of any ties,  
Nothing to be conjoined or to conjoin,  
But e'er the Self abiding in the Not.  
This Self pursueth naught, renounceth naught,  
Is not perfected by oft-uttered sounds,  
Or image contemplated in the mind,  
Or vows and vigils, fasts, observances,  
Or restful seat, or ceasing of the breath  
And movement of the ever-restless mind,  
Or surge of lordliness and powers divine,  
Or rapt intentness, trance or ecstasy—  
'Tis but the One Summation of them all.

(vi) The *Sāṅkhya*.—The etymological significance of the name.—The teaching of the system.—The Absolute.

Lastly, we come to the sixth *Upāṅga*, the *Sāṅkhya*. The numberlessness, the infinity, of all and everything is explained by it. The word



sāṅkhyā means absence or transcendence of sāṅkhyā or number.<sup>1</sup> 'Not-this,' 'not-another,' 'not-all'—such is the universal sāṅkhyā, the abolition of all to which number applies. The contradiction, the opposition, the traversal and refutation of all enumeration and calculation, of all beginning and end and limitation—this is Self-knowledge according to the *Sāṅkhya*. Before me, behind me, within me, above, below, beyond—Infinity stretches everywhere.

Thus does the *Sāṅkhya* teach the transcendence of the Parāmātmā, the Self, beyond all the states of Mahāviṣṇu, etc. Endlessness is the very essence of this darśana, this 'view' of the World-process—without count or end in number, as also in object, aim, motive. (Nothing has in reality anything else for end and aim; all are ends to each other;<sup>2</sup> for everything is its own end, its own motive, because everything is

<sup>1</sup> The current explanation is different: That which carefully recognises, explains, 'enumerates,' saṃyāk khyāti, the principles, tattvas, of the universe, is *Sāṅkhya*. A thing is known, is understood finally when it is 'numbered out,' interpreted in terms of mathematics; therefore sāṅkhyā comes to mean 'number,' though primarily meaning 'good knowledge'.

<sup>2</sup> Thus, the sensor and motor organs are means to the nutritive apparatus, and that in turn to these; and both to the organism as a whole and that to

within and is the outcome of the One Absolute, Svabhāva, Self-realising Self.) Succession is ignored by this science; and, consequently, Īshvaras and Mahāviṣṇus and the endless grades beyond are all passed by, and only the Self-based, all-free Brahman as the Self embodied in the AUM is recognised.

Infinite all around, before, behind,  
Above, below, within, without, beyond,  
The Soul, the Self, of all the moods of Being,  
Devoid even of voidness, the One Self,  
One Computation in minute or vast,  
An endless sigh and surge of Countlessness,  
A Consciousness unconscious of all bounds.

---

these; and all together to the ensouling consciousness which the organism subserves as instrument of experience; and the consciousness, in turn, to the organism, for without it, the latter breaks up—and so on.