

SECTION III. (Continued.)

CHAPTER XIX.

THE JĪVĀTMĀ.

The jīvātmā a compound of I and Not-I.—Etymological significance.—Its main characteristics.—Atomicity and continuity.—Embodiment of oppositions and contradictions.—Its psychological stages: nescience, science, omniscience.—Its grades, one within another, endlessly.—Progress and regress, evolution, etc., the reflexion of the simultaneous All in the successive.—Philological illustrations.—The origin of I, You and He.—Correspondences of various deities, hierarchical and divine Powers and Intelligences, with various letters of the alphabet.

The jīvātmā is a mixture of 'portions' of the I and the This. That wherein the Ātmā, the Self, plays, jīvaṭi, kriḍaṭi—that is the jīvātmā. This jīvātmā is the reflexion, the image, the praṭi-bimba of the Īshvara who is the sūtrātmā. It is true that the jīvātmā is declared to be Brahman also. But this is so only when it has achieved knowledge of its-Self, when it knows the essential and true and whole nature and character of the World-process, the I, the This, the Becoming, the To-Be, etc. Then difference between jīvāṭ-

mā, Praṭyagātmā, sūtrātmā, Paramātmā, aṇu, paramāṇu,¹ etc., ceases; all merge into Brahman. An element of Na, the Negation, is also present in the jīvātmā, working within the elements of I and This, as the *Brahma-sūtra* says. It is because of this that we see existence and non-existence, birth and death, succeeding one another, in it. This jīvātmā is an aṇu, an atom, and also partless, at the same time. Its atomicity is praṭyakṣha, 'before the eye,' patent; and it may be said, in consequence, that it is impossible for it to be partless; yet this partlessness belongs to it by virtue of its Ātmā-nature.² This-ness, eṭaṭ-tva, is nothing else

¹ It will be noticed that some of these words are commenced with capitals and others with small letters, although in this context all signify principles. The reason is that some of the words mean only principles, and are always used in the *singular number* only; these begin with capitals. The others indicate principles as well as concrete embodiments, and occur in the plural number too.

² This is another of those frequent instances in which the work draws, from certain data, conclusions exactly the reverse of those that might be expected, *prima facie*, by the inalert reader! The reason is, of course, that the author sees, in the data, elements which the unprepared reader does not. "Everything contains within itself its own

than the opposite of the unity of the I. This opposition is a matter of the Necessity of the Sva-bhāva of the I. Because of it the Universal I acquires and puts on individuality. 'I' is or am one I; 'You' is or are another I; 'He' is another I. And so on, endlessly. Because each I, as I, is a continuum, an unbreakable thread or line of consciousness, the jīvātma is partless and indivisible. Because, on the other hand, eṭaṭ is the opposite of unity, there arises in it atomicity, limitation, parts. Atomicity is the embodiment of the opposition between Aham and Eṭaṭ.

It must be remembered, however, that 'opposition,' 'an opposite,' cannot *really* arise in the Full and the Eternal. It is only hypothesised, postulated, imagined, fancied, dreamed, supposed, assumed for the moment, for purposes of argument, so to say, only in order to be the more effectually refuted, negated, abolished, proved to be non-existent. Duality is a necessary hypothesis *within* the One, for the sole and very purpose of emphasising the Oneness

opposite"—this is the governing law of logic and thought, and of fact and the whole World-process. The 'reconciliation' of the 'paradox' in the text is that the indivisibility of the atom is comparative, relative to one world-system, plane, etc., no concrete particular atom being really absolutely and finally indivisible.

of the One, in and by and through its, the duality's, own refutation and repudiation.

We see in the jīvātma pleasure and pain, joy and sorrow, also that it is born, lives, dies. But all this is illusion, bhrama. The act called birth and the power of achieving it; the act called death and the power of achieving it; the act called living and the power of achieving it—all these are in the One Paramātmā. How do these variations arise? Thus:¹ It knows Itself as partless, conditionless, universal, transcendent; and It says to Itself, "I-This-Not". Such is Its very Nature. As I, It is unborn, undying, unopposed, unopposable, One without a second. As Eṭaṭ, It is doer, actor, sufferer, Many, diverse. As Not, It merges I and This into One or rather the Numberless. Thus indeed are all possible natures, characters, constitutions, and all power to do or not to do, or to do otherwise, already and always in the Supreme Self. Indeed the Paramātmā may be said to be the Totality of all these Powers. (All these are simultaneous in the Absolute). The life of the jīvātma is governed by this same Supreme

¹ The argument may not appear quite clear; it is put in very compressed form with steps omitted. If the reader is interested in entering into the subject fully, he may perhaps find it useful to look through pp. 125, 126 et seq. of *The Science of Peace*.

Notion, I-This-Not (in the succession of its parts, however). As *alpa-jñā*, 'little-knower,' (at first, when *identifying* itself with an *etaṭ*) it thinks and believes to itself, "(I am mineral; I am plant; I am animal; I am human); I am glad; I am sad; I am good; I am virtuous; I am poor; I am nothing at all;" etc. This is the condition of *a-jñāna*, non-knowledge. Dissipating this error, this ne-science, and producing *jñāna*, knowledge, science, there arises, (in the second half of the *jīva*'s life, when it begins to apply and realise the Not to and in the This) the reflexion: "All this world-happening is by Nature, by Necessity; I am nothing; thou art nothing; there is nothing mine or thine or another's; there is no difference between me, thee and another; all are and is One I".

(The first stage of the *jīvātma* has been described as that of the *alpa-jñā*, the 'little-knower,' of *a-jñāna*, ignorance; and the second stage, by contrast, as of *jñāna*, knowledge, science. Is this science equal to omniscience, then?) In the strict sense, the *jīvātma*, as [such, must be always *alpa-jñā*, 'little-knowing,' and only the *Paramātmā*, all-knowing. In the latter only is present the Whole of the I and the Whole of the This; never in any one *jīvātma*. (But, generally speaking, so far as the *jīvātma* is and realises

itself as *Paramātmā*, it takes on the potential omniscience belonging to the latter.)

For this same reason, from another standpoint and in another aspect, it appears and happens that what is eternal, simultaneously all-including, ever-present, immediate knowledge in the universal *Paramātmā*, unfolds as time-governed, successive, and partial memory in the *jīvātma*.

This op-position and non-opposition, *viroḍha* and *a-viroḍha* (separation and identification between I and This) is an endless process. We find here the root, the seed, the germ and primal principle of all *an-avaśthā*, 'non-finality,' *progressus et regressus ad infinitum*. There are atoms within worlds, and worlds within atoms, pseudo-infinitely,¹ (in Space). And within each atom ever goes on the process, first, 'I (am) this' and then '(I am) not (this)'.

Yet again, every *jīva* has to work out and realise this Idea of the Logion, I-This-Not, in every atom, which is another source of yet another pseudo-infinity (in Time).

Yet again (because there are *jīvātmas* within higher or larger *jīvātmas*, *i.e.*, *sūtrātmas*), we have knowledge within knowledge, memory of memory, word inside word, dialect through dialect, language out of

¹ See Fournier's *Two New Worlds*, (1908).

language, meaning hiding meaning—and so on, endlessly (in Motion), an infinity of infinities.

All this regulation and demarcation of time and space that we see, the divisions into cycles and orbits, and yugas and manvantaras and mahā-manvantaras—all this is only from the standpoint of the successive, of single world-systems only.

In verity, there is no succession and no number, but only the One, Ever-present, Universal Thought everywhere; and truly is each and every jīvātmā eternally seated, omnipresently, in all samsāras. Only when it believes itself limited, does it endeavor to progress step by step by expanding its knowledge, its consciousness, little by little.

Ever and everywhere and every way, in every point of time and space, in every atom, shines the Self. Nothing is anywhere without the Self, dead, uninspired by It. And thus, again, we see there is no difference. The 'you' is 'I,' and the 'I,' 'you'. Whatever even hints at any separateness is but mere words that passingly deal with the possibility of a break in the Self's unity.

(An illustration of how the idea works out in the science of sound-language, grammar, may be given). The pronoun A smat means Ātmā; U ṣhmaṭ is the Eṭaṭ born from it (in modern

Sanskṛt, Yu ṣhmaṭ, because of the inclusion of the letter 'I,' signifying Shakti, in it, I-U ṣhmaṭ becoming Yu ṣhmaṭ by the rules of coalescence). (The letter) 'I' is the Necessity that stands between the two, with a special abode in the Eṭaṭ. Hence there is a coalescence between the 'I' and 'U'-ṣhmaṭ.¹ But, then, why is not this fact brought out in the constitution and 'appearance' or form of the sacred sound, AUM, itself? Because, in the ultimate reality, Necessity belongs to and is *hidden* in the All, and not attached to any one of the Three in particular. Hence, the *Veda*-grammar, *Prāṭishākhya*, separates the 'I' out of both A and U. (The peculiar manner in which the 'I' is included in the AUM brings out the underlying principles of metaphysic.) अ, A, followed by इ, I, coalesces with it into ए, É. That followed by उ, U, merges with it into अय, Ay. But here the य, Y, disappears in accordance with the rules of *Veda*-grammar and leaves behind only the अ, A, again, and this

¹ If the reader remembers Paṇḍit Dhanarāja's early doubts and queries as to why the Sanskṛt alphabet was arranged as it was in Pāṇini's *Sūtras*, he will find here an illustration of the kind of answer needed. The paragraph in the text explains why the first aphorism *should* run in the order it does. The reader may consult the *Shiva-sūtra-vimarśinī*.

merges with the succeeding, ॐ, U, into O; so that AUM, is pronounced as OM. It is true that, ordinarily, a second coalescence does not take place after a lopa, disappearance, of a letter; but this rule applies to secular speech, not vaiḍika, scriptural.

With reference to such etymological considerations as these has it been said that A is Viṣṇu, 'I' is Shaṅkara, U is Brahmā and M the Negation of all. Here 'I' is declared to be Shiva only because Shiva is connected with ichchhā, desire, which is Shakti. Elsewhere, A is Ātmā, jñāna, cognition, high and low; 'I' is Shakti; U is all kriyā over which Brahmā presides; while Shaṅkara is M. As the four letters A, U, M and I have been here successively shown to be present in the AUM, so the *Kalāpa-Vyākaraṇas*, Encyclopædic Grammars (?) systematically explain and derive all letters, all words, and all 'meanings' and concepts out of the AUM; and the *Shilpas*, practical sciences or arts, expound all substances or paḍārthas, and their actions, activities, movements, functions and all natural processes too, as derived from it.¹ Truly is the AUM all-

¹ Thus, if we had these old works, we would probably find that the manifestation of the 'I' after the 'A'; their coalescence into Ē; then the manifestation of U; and their coalescence into Ay; then the dis-

comprehending. This world, and the world beyond, and the one beyond that again and so on ever endlessly, all these are present in it. None is there to compass and describe its Greatness in its entirety. What is said here is only some of the main Ideas comprised within it.

appearance of the Y, etc., etc., all corresponded with stages and formations and lapses, etc., in the processes of embryological and cosmological development and evolution, on the microcosmic and macrocosmic scales. And so with all the letters. (See the Introduction to the *Bhagavad-Gītā*, by Annie Besant and Bhagavān Dās, and the *Science of Peace*, pp. 160-161).