

CHAPTER XX.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE JĪVĀTMĀ.

Unification or mutual inclusion of opposites.—Love and Hate.—Two kinds of each, (a) General, latent and causal, (b) Special, patent and effectual.—The significance of 'organisation'.—Higher and higher organisms including lower and lower, endlessly.—Subsumption of all in P a r a m ā ṭ m ā.—Endless spiral progress or evolution of jīva through larger and larger worlds.—The meaning of 'death' of body and soul in terms of each other.—Continuous passing and repassing into and from each other, of egos and atoms.—S ū ṭ r ā ṭ m ā as means of such.—The connexion between the various subtler and coarser bodies of the jīva.—The principle of synthesis and antithesis, co-ordination and dis-ordination between various planes and worlds.—The practical utility of understanding these matters.—Right action follows only and surely on right knowledge.—Right knowledge followed by right action constitutes m o k ṣ h a.—Metaphysical views.

With reference to the opposition between A s m a ṭ, I, and Y u ṣ h m a ṭ, you, it should be noted that opposites are in the ultimate reality, one.¹

¹ The actual truth of this is illustrated all around us in every day life. Youth and maid love

Everything includes its opposite, carries it within itself as a limb, an organ, a constituent part of its own total organism. What do we mean when we speak of an angry man? The grow all in all to each other, marry—opposites become one; and have a large family—the one become many again. Then, the family, *born of the love*, now absorbs the care and time of each parent, in a different way, and they begin to be less than all in all to each other, gradually drift apart in interests, and may even suddenly find themselves disagreeing under the irritabilities produced by the too heavy strains of the family life. 'Like' had hidden within its womb the 'dislike' that now develops and manifests concealing within itself, in turn, again, as seed of future remorse, the 'like' out of which it grew forth—an endless rotation. A servant is treated kindly because he does his work and in order that he may be encouraged to do it better; the kindness, born of the good work, breeds sense of immunity, then carelessness, then impertinence and destroys the good work. A master is served well, because he is good and kind and in order that he may become more so; the assiduous service breeds in him habits of selfishness and luxury and destroys the kindness out of which the good service was born. Public honors are bestowed on a good public worker; they 'turn his head' and destroy the good work. Leaders, by excess of leading and commanding, alienate followers. Followers, by too much following, spoil their leaders. Armies, organised for purposes of offence

condition of anger is different from, is opposed and painful to, his normal condition, and yet is veritably included in his character, *sva-bhāva*, own-being, and is not separate and apart from and defence, to add to the strength of a State, become a burden on its finances, and a source of weakness and danger. Genius, the overflowing strength of one faculty, over-reaches itself, becomes unbalanced insanity, and destroying what it fed upon, dies in poverty of starvation, or in the lunatic asylum of disease. Unique fashions of dress, ornaments, styles, intended to act as ideals, to set the fashion, degenerate into the common, the common-place, and the vulgar, by too much multiplication. Schemes of religious ministration and self-sacrificing help, by too much systematisation, lose their essential vital power of spontaneous feeling, and ossify and die in foul corruption, and imbecile formalities. Procreation, in some forms of life, leads to death. Nourishment, by overfeeding, to disease. Chemical components, combining, realising their characteristic affinities, in the very realisation lose their original character and undergo entire transformation. Joy carries the seed of sorrow within itself, and sorrow of joy. Excessive love becomes jealousy and then hate. Excessive hate, preserving its object for continual gratification, becomes love. Fire hides water within its constitution; and water fire; oxygen and hydrogen nourish fire and make water; and yet water and fire extinguish each other. The densest and most resistant solids carry the possibility of

the man. The reconciliation of separateness, and yet non-separateness, unity despite opposition, oneness simultaneously with manyness, is 'interdependence,' 'relativity,' *sāpekṣhiṭaṭva*. becoming the most tenuous of gases; and *vice versa*. Everything, growing and multiplying, grows necessarily, inevitably, to excess, and so destroys itself. Even more immediately, anabolism is inseparable from katabolism, vital functioning means waste of tissue, living includes dying and dying includes living. Judged superficially, it will seem that this transformation from one into another and opposite is due to external circumstances. But looked at closely, it will be found that the word 'necessarily,' 'inevitably,' is the explanation of why these external circumstances themselves are present at all. The why, again, of this necessity is to be found in the nature of the absolute Consciousness, I-This-Not, which makes action and reaction necessary in the limited. (See *The Science of Peace*, ch. x. and xi.)

At first sight, the modern Hegel's statement, that Being is Nothing, might seem to be the same as the Ṛṣhi's, that opposites are one. The illustrations given above could perhaps be drawn from Hegel's statement also. But there is a slight difference—which makes all the difference between conviction and doubt. As Stirling, one of Hegel's profoundest exponents, himself confesses, this first statement of Hegel's, which is the foundation of the whole of his system, remains perplexing, doubtful, un-

In this fact may be found the true origin and significance of *rāga* and *dveṣha*, Love and Hate. Because the Self is, and is felt, everywhere, and everywhere knows and realises its convincing. And yet it is also true that the bulk of the system is deeply thoughtful and true, and in agreement with the conclusions of the *Veḍānta* and those set forward here. What is the explanation? If the foundation is wrongly laid, the rest of the building ought to be awry? The explanation seems to be that Hegel *felt* the truth, but did not see it yet quite clearly—natural in the circumstances, it being exceedingly wonderful that he even saw as he did—and therefore could not express it clearly. Hegel says “Being is Nothing;” and that, being the same, they yet pass into one another and make becoming; in other words, in terms of consciousness, “I is Not-I,” and the two passing into each other make the World-process. When Hegel’s statement is thus made significant and brought home to ourselves by translation into terms of consciousness, we at once see the difficulty, the error or ‘slip of the pen,’ if we may so call it, into which Hegel seems to have fallen. Instead of saying “Being is Nothing” he should have said “Being is *Not-Nothing*,” *i.e.*, “I is not Not-I”. Then, later on, by mutual *adhyāsa* (see *The Science of Peace*, ch. xiii., it would have been possible for him to say “Partial being is partial nothing;” which would be a description of becoming; as Fichte better put it, ego in part=non-ego and *vice versa*.

unbroken unity and thread-continuity, therefore is there Love between all, by all, for all, in all places. So too, on the other hand, because the *eṭaṭs*, ‘this’s,’ not-selves, the sheaths in which the Self manifests, are many and separate, therefore is there hate between them all. All this is matter of Necessity. With whom we have no necessity (to associate), no needs and interests bound up, with him there is no possibility of hate; or of love either; the two go together.

In a general sense, however, because all are

When *Gārgyāyana* says “Opposites are one,” he *seems* to say the same thing almost as Hegel—but what he means, as is obvious from all the work, is that “Opposites *taken together*, are one,” make one, inhere in one. Of course in a certain sense Pure Being is the same as Pure Nothing; but then, such a ‘same’ cannot pass into or out of the ‘same’ to make something else, *i.e.*, Becoming. On the ‘view’ propounded by *Gārgyāyana*, the explanation of the Universe is that when the totality of the *pairs of opposites* that make up the World-process is summed up, the result is a Nothing in which all the opposites have mutually abolished each other; and this nothing is negated, within Itself, by the Self which is Being; and, finally, as the net result of this negation we arrive at the Absolute, ‘I—Not-I—Not,’ where in all specific consciousness of all individual I’s and particular Not-I’s is merged and lost.

connected with and have necessity and need for all, therefore *rāga*, love, exists everywhere, *i.e.*, in the mind of every *jīva* and for everything whatever. We want to see things of which we have no particular need at all. We are curious to know about all things whatsoever. We walk along the road and look inquisitively at the things of the wayside. We wish to hear and overhear all kinds of talk (when not in real life, then in tales, at least). All this is the result of *rāga*.

The Self is everywhere and includes everything. I am the Self and wish to encompass everything too; I like everything; I like to own everything.

So, on the other hand, we experience *dvēṣha*, hate, dislike, aversion, without necessity, *i.e.*, with or by an opposite necessity; without any patent particular necessity, but because of the necessity of asserting the separate existence of the sheath we inhabit. 'I am so and so, but this fellow is not.' 'I am great, but this creature is contemptible.' 'I cannot associate with that low fellow.' 'Why *did* he talk thus of his betters?' etc.—such are only the grosser forms of that necessity of separate *upādhis*, sheaths, without which individualised existence, however subtle and glorious, were impossible.

Where we have particular and obvious needs

and necessities, there special loves and hates, likes and dislikes, friendships and feuds, necessarily arise. He that helps to satisfy our needs is our friend. He that prevents their fulfilment, our enemy. He that balances both is impartial and equal or equable or indifferent. And so on.

We thus have two kinds of love and hate. One is of the nature of cause; the other is of the nature of effect. The former bases on the latent general all-pervading dual-necessity; the latter, on the patent special necessities of daily individual life.

The result of this interplay, the reconciliation of this opposition, of unity and manyness, love and hate, is *avayav-āvayavībhāva*, 'the condition of organs and organism, parts and whole, attributes and substratum,' organisation of 'many' parts into higher and higher 'wholes' or 'ones' or individuals. And it is the duty of the student to bring home to himself, in terms of self, *svam*, and of love, this fact that the whole of the World-process is so *organised* in the *Paramātmā*, which is himself—a *ham ev-āsmi sarvam*, 'I myself am (or is) all.'

To return to particular loves and hates. These correspond with our knowledge. As our knowledge is, so is our action. It is true that we sometimes seem to act against our convictions; but the fact is in such cases that the convictions

are not deep enough, are not truly *realised*. As the expansion of knowledge is endless, such too is the expansion of activity. Never can activity, motion, cease, as all the sciences agree.

'Many' atoms are summed up in an individual *brahmānda*. 'Many' *brahmāndas* make up the oneness of a *jagaṭ*. 'Many' *jagaṭs* are subsumed in the individuality of a *vishva*. When a *jīva* has exhausted all the experiences and gained all the knowledge possible in and from his one *brahmānda* he goes on to the next higher and larger, and so on endlessly, on all possible scales, even beyond the *samsāra* of Mahāviṣṇu. It goes out of one atom and into another; and atoms change their condition (*avasthā*) from time to time, also, on all scales, moment to moment and *muhūrta* to *muhūrta* and *mahāmanvantara* to *mahāmanvantara* and so on, in incessant growth and diminution, *vr̥ddhi* and *saṅkṣhaya*, expansion and decay, and gradually become *Brahmā*, *Viṣṇu*, *Shiva*, Mahāviṣṇu, and greater than these, endlessly.

By opposition to the Unity of the Self appears the many This. And, again, by juxtaposition with the many This, the Self appears as many selves or *jīvas*. And *jīvas* and *upādhis* are inseparable. Yet there

must be incessant change also, and on all scales. Therefore *jīvas* are always passing from *upādhi* to *upādhi*, atom to atom, the atom vacated by one being instantly occupied by another (all this being possible because, being indeed only the translation in terms of time and space and limitation, of the one constant fact that all atoms and all *jīvas* exist in eternal conjunction in the Absolute Consciousness).

For familiar illustration, witness the new-born babe and its gradual growth in body and in mind (and then decay and death and passing into another body).

The destruction or dissolution of atoms also takes place. But they are generally spoken of as indestructible on the general ground that nothing is really ultimately destructible. For practical purposes, according to the *Vedas*, the slowing down or the intensification of the vibration (*manḍatā* or *ākraśhtaṭā*), for or by the storing of energy, *śakṭi*, (and *vice versâ*?) makes the beginning and the end (? the end and the beginning), the destruction and the birth (in their case).¹ Although atoms are *mūla-prākṛtika*,

¹ See *The Secret Doctrine*, i, 545. This portion is very difficult to translate, for lack of continuity of traditional learning on the subject of atoms, in

(i.e., belong to that the characteristic of which is concreteness, particularity) yet there is no possibility of an increase (of numbers? amongst them). Because they are endless (pseudo-infinite) once for all, by correspondence with the Infinite Self which they oppose everywhere and always. In fact this itself is Mūla-prakṛti. Hence aham and atom are interdependent. In every aham an atom, in every atom an aham. For this reason also is it said that all ānūs atoms, are similar, are equal (ultimately).

When an element of aham, ego, pursuing its due course of activity, passes from one piece of eṭaṭ, 'this,' to another, the former eṭaṭ is said to die, to become non-existent, to perish, i.e., to merge and disappear into deeper existence. This former eṭaṭ then goes back into its original element, ākāśa, etc., and staying

Sanskṛt. The literal translation of the text would perhaps be: "For the sake of providing energy, or storing up energy, by the succession of slowness and intensification, the beginning and end—this only is destruction and origin, as is declared by the *Vedas*." Whatever alteration or addition of idea may appear in the *paraphrase* above as compared with this, may perhaps be seen to be justifiable on reading later statements in the text.

there, matures its work;¹ and then again develops activity in association with another element of aham. The jīva also, on the other hand, for the maturation of its work and faculty, takes another suitable atom² to

¹'Its original element' apparently means the large masses of it which form the sheath of the corresponding cosmic deva, and are ensouled by his aham, a personality, the same in kind, but very different in degree of 'separateness'. This would be needed to fulfil the law that spirit and matter, aham and eṭaṭ can never be apart, that there is nowhere any such thing as inanimate matter. 'Matures its work' seems to mean that it digests and assimilates the experiences of vibrating in response to the more acutely personal consciousness which it underwent when attached to a more 'personal' jīva, that it further ripens and perfects its capacity for being the means and instrument for that kind of activity of aham-life which it subserved formerly.

²The word atom here should be understood in a comparative sense, as meaning rather the whole astral sheath or egg; so, the physical eṭaṭ which is dropped is also not the permanent physical atom, but the body as a whole. That the general statement of the text is correct however, with regard even to atoms, we may gather from the fact that the Dharmakāya Buddha, the vidēhamukṭa, drops even the permanent physical atom.

itself and dwells in Kāmaloka, etc., for a time, and then spreads out its work again (on the physical plane). Such is the close and inseparable connexion between 'pieces' of aham and pieces of eṭaṭ. There is no atom, no super-atom, no this, no that, without an ensouling element of aham. So neither can any element or feel of aham anywhere be specified, described, spoken of,

But yet again, the severance of connexion can never be quite complete—for the whole World-process is one unbreakable continuum. (See *The Science of Peace*, pp. 124, 129, 186, etc.)

Moreover, size is nothing. The original 'hole in space,' or bubble in the æther of space, in our—or any—universe, made by the breath of the Īshvara of the universe, is an aham; definite numbers of these, definitely arranged, form the 'atom' of each plane, and this again is an aham; these 'atoms,' in turn, form molecules, and molecules tissues, and tissues bodies, and each successive aggregation is similar in principle though not in bulk, so that there is no essential difference in meaning whether the word 'atom' or the word 'body' is used in this connexion. From the standpoint of the eṭaṭ, bulk and interrelation and number are important differences; from the standpoint of the aham it is all one, himself and 'this'. [A. B.]

indicated in any way, without a piece of eṭaṭ. All conventions, all the behavior of individualised life, all recognition and use of time and space, depends upon a combination of these two.

In the name jīvātmā, the element of eṭaṭ, i.e., the aṇu or atom is the jīva, and the element of aham is the ātmā. It is true that when the two are separated, the former is called aṇu, atom, and the latter jīva;¹ but this is a matter of usage. As a

¹For the 'metaphysic' of this see *The Science of Peace* ch. xv., p. 291. Of any and every 'pair,' in the domain of the Limited, one will masquerade as spirit, as subtler inner core, and the other as matter, as denser outer crust or body; and there will also appear a third, between, as nexus. In Theosophical phrase, in the 'metaphysical' or 'universal' interpretation, as *principles*, Ātmā is the Universal I, Manas, the individual 'atom,' chittā-aṇu, inspired by the I which is individualised thereby; Buddhi is the nexus between. This should hold good of all planes, and all worlds and all systems. But in 'physical' or 'particular' and empirical interpretation, for 'practical' purposes, 'Ātmā' corresponds to, has its location or centre in, appears as a film of, ātmic-plane matter, or ākāśa; Manas as a sheath of mental-plane matter, agni-ṭaṭṭva; and Buddhi

fact, in view of the sūtrātmā, because the element of eṭaṭ is bound up in that 'thread,' therefore, reciprocally, the element of continuity, the 'thread-I' always pervades it, *i.e.*, the atom. And, *vice versa*, the (pseudo-) thread-eṭaṭ permeates the element of a ha m.¹

comes between, as vāyu or buddhic-plane matter. Coming lower down, it would probably be correct to say that, from the Theosophical standpoint, for the vegetable kingdom, our mental plane-matter would stand for Ātmā, our astral for Buḍḍhi, our physical for Manas. So, again, lower down, and so higher above; thus the āḍi, anupāḍaka and so-called ātmic planes would make a triplet of Ātmā, Buḍḍhi and Manas.

It may be noted that in the Yoga system the a ha m always includes all the sheaths in which the man is not self-conscious, *i.e.*, has not separated himself from the body in which he is working. At a low stage of evolution the a ha m is everything above the physical; later, everything above the astral, and so on step by step. Parts cannot be perceived in the 'invisible,' so the whole is conceived as a unit, a one. [A. B.]

¹The notable inference from the text here ought not to be overlooked, *viz.*, that the jīva passes and can pass from one eṭaṭ to another, only along the lines of the sūtrātmā in which it and both the eṭaṭs concerned are

The above is the aspect of samaṣṭi, totality, the whole. In the partial or successive, one work or activity only being prominent at one time, there arises the appearance of a contradiction of the unity of the thread, of successive conjunction and disjunction. These two appearances occur in every atom, every moment.

Even in a single body, where unity is so prominent, we constantly see disruption thereof. During sleep the jīva 'contradicts' its unity with the sṭhūla or physical body, and works in the līṅga-body. Again 'opposing,' denying, its unity with the latter and disjoining itself therefrom, it works in the sūkṣhma. And disuniting with that, it goes into the kāraṇa. From that it goes still higher or deeper or subtler. Yet because the Ātmā and

included. Continuity as well as discreteness is needed for every world-activity, in eternal paradox; and this is secured by the device of the sūtrātmā, which means not only a single straight thread, but also that thread worked up into many knots and meshes and network. It means 'thread-soul' as well as group-soul and over-soul, 'web of life,' 'reticulated net-work,' 'nervous system,' and 'prāṇic web,' and 'buḍḍhi,' etc., etc., various things in various contexts and situations, from various points of view, as mentioned in previous footnotes.

the bodies are all threaded together, there never is a complete break. Even after reaching the *kāraṇa*, *sūkṣhma*, etc., when it 'wakes,' it begins to do all the work of the *sthūla* again, *because* it has all along remained 'near' to, retained touch with, the physical body too.

In this sense has it been said that all atoms go everywhere, that all *brahmāṇḍas*, all *samsāras*, are literally connected together, differing only in grades of size, as larger and smaller.

And herein we discern the principles of *sāmān-ādhikarāṇya* and *vai-yādhikarāṇya*, co-ordination and disordination, synthesis and antithesis, parity and disparity, coherence and incoherence, relevance and irrelevance. That which is next to or continuous with another, not hidden or interrupted and suppressed by it, is co-ordinate with it. That which is screened off, superseded, opposed and abolished by another, is disordinate or disparate with it.¹

¹ In other words, when two things can be seen simultaneously as in continuation of each other, as helping and supporting and forming part of each other, then they are coherent; when it is necessary to turn away from one in order to see the other when they negate each other, cannot be fitted in with each other, to their mutual support, then they are irreconcilable, separate, disparate.

To the deeper view, there is always synthesis, higher and higher, between all atoms, all worlds, all *jīvas*, in the endless unity and continuity of the thread of the Being of the Self. From the standpoint of the particular, on the other hand, there is always the appearance of disunion, discreteness, disorder, breach of law within law, and so on. For the practical purposes of life it is necessary to know such 'mediacies' and 'immediacies;' 'limits' and 'continuations;' 'antitheses' and 'syntheses;' to know that this (thing, cycle or system) begins and ends within these limits and also again is part and a continuation of this other (thing, cycle, etc.); to know that this fact is, in one view, incongruous with this other, and that, from another view, it is perfectly congruous with it, by the means of a larger and more wide-reaching fact. The repeated statement that atoms are included in worlds and worlds again in each of these atoms should be reconsidered in the light of this principle of synthesis and antithesis.¹ It will appear then,

¹ See Fournier's *Two New Worlds*. That book, and what we can see around us with our physical eyes, leaves behind the impression that there are only two kinds of 'concretions,' 'formations' of matter, 'bodies,' *viz.*, globes and spheres or the heavenly bodies, and atoms and electrons, etc.,

how they are all graded together in reality, though appearing, to the cursory view, to be entirely independent, and even inconsistent with each other.

This principle too explains how all have need

moving, self-supported, freely in space, on the one hand, and "creatures" of many more or less irregular forms, men, animals, trees, living on those globes or spheres or atoms, on the other. From the metaphysical standpoint too, it is true that the spherical form is the most 'complete,' 'all-inclusive,' 'the same from all points of view' and is the nearest imitation in form of the Formless, and therefore most fitted to act as substratum and support of all other forms, while itself self-supporting—thus further imitating the attributes of the Attributeless. But there does not seem to be, from that standpoint, any sufficient reason for the *universal* reign of any *particular* ratios and proportions, such as are mentioned in the book. They may well hold good of a particular world-system. But probably in different worlds, 'infra' and 'supra,' different ratios between 'atoms' and 'creatures' and 'globes' etc., prevail. Metaphysic requires that there should be all possible shapes and all possible sizes of beings, in all parts of space, on all possible planes, etc., emerging out of and merging back into the spherical, for otherwise there would be arbitrariness, lack of sufficient reason, which lack is intolerable to metaphysic.

of all, everywhere, always; and what the further and fuller significance and justification is, of interdependence and independence, prayer and self-sufficiency, veneration and opposition, friendship and enmity, possibility and impossibility, association, desire for company, desire for solitude, compassion, ambition, competition, charity, dharma or duty, japa or meditation by repetition and recitation of sounds and meanings, yajña or sacrifice, etc.

Out of such understanding of the essential significance of world-facts, out of such knowledge of Truth, Self, Brahman, arises mokṣha. To know the truth and to regulate conduct in accordance therewith—this is the fruit of true knowledge, and this is mokṣha. Hence the saying, mukṭi results from tatṭva-jñāna. Out of that knowledge arises the conviction that pleasure and pain, joy and sorrow, are nothing real, are only passing phases and appearances in the jīva and belong not to the inner Self; that all are really one and all abide everlastingly in the peace of Saṭ-chiḍ-ānanda. All sciences too but endeavor, ultimately, to indicate this Unity as underlying the diversity of the objects they deal with specially and respectively.

Because of the essential connexion between knowledge and action do we find the advice

given everywhere, in every language, “ Think before you act,” “ Study the subject and acquire all available information about it, before beginning practical operations ”. Even Mahāviṣṇu, as said before, completes his *ideation*, embodied in the *Veḍas*, before beginning the work of creation. In further illustration of the same principle of succession, we have again, within each treatise too, at first only a leading up or introduction to, an indication of, the nature of the subject-matter, and then follows a description of the processes whereby it may be secured.

Therefore, everywhere, in every department of life, ought we to have right knowledge first, and then it should be and will be followed by right action. Perfect knowledge followed by perfect action constitutes *mokṣha*. And perfect knowledge consists in realising the Infinite Unity in endless Diversity : All is within all, transcendence beyond transcendence, endlessness after endlessness, beginninglessness before beginninglessness, beginnings and ends behind beginnings and ends, succession above succession, synthesis over synthesis, Infinity around Infinity.
