

CHAPTER XXI.
THE MAIN PSYCHOLOGICAL FEATURES
OF THE JĪVĀTMA.

The reason why the Logion in terms of sound is so important for us.—The derivation therefrom of the three main constituents of the jivātmā.—Cognition, desire and action.—The world-facts derived from these.—The order of succession of the three.—Their dual form, causal and effectual.—Special considerations as to desire.—Dual form of work, particular and universal.—Metaphysical negations.

It has been repeatedly declared before that the Logion is Brahma-Vākya, 'the utterance of Brahman by Brahmā,' and includes and expresses everything. The reason why this expression of Brahman in terms of sound is so prominent with us is that in our world-system and at the present time, ākāśha is super-important and all-pervading, and the quality of ākāśha is sound. Otherwise, there are mahat and buddhi¹ (in our own world-system) besides the recognised five elements, and subtler atoms and super-atoms endlessly.

¹ The suggestion seems to be that these two in our own world-system and endless others in other

Out of the three words (*i.e.*, the facts indicated by the words) of the Logion, now, we should see the derivation of cognition, desire and action.

The *pratyābhāsa*, reflexion, mirroring, counter-appearance, picturing or imaging of the *Aham* in the *Eṭaṭ* is cognition. The reflexion of the *Eṭaṭ* in the *Aham* is *kriyā*.¹

systems, have special *sensuous* qualities also, (just as *ākāśa* has sound, *vāyu* touch, *agni* visibility, and so on), though with us, and just at this stage, they are serving as substrata or vehicles for certain 'inner' or 'subjective processes principally.

¹ Compare pp. 242 and 265, etc., of *The Science of Peace*. The descriptions there, of cognition and action, seem exactly to have changed places as compared with the descriptions here. On closer examination, it is possible to explain away the apparent difference (see p. 268 of *The Science of Peace*). One more or less current metaphysical view is that "I can know only my own self, perceive only my own conditions, modifications of consciousness, etc." There is an element of exaggeration with an element of truth in this. The exaggeration consists in the word 'only,' for what is the significance of the words '*my own self*' '*my own conditions*,' etc., *without* a reference to something *else than my own*; and if there is such a tacit reference to and distinction from 'else than my own' involved in the statement, does not the statement approxi-

The reflexion of the two, *Aham* and *Eṭaṭ*, in the *Na* is (dual) desire. *Aham-Eṭaṭ-na-*

mate in nature to that famous statement, of the Cretan who declared that all Cretans were liars? To put it from another point of view, the exaggeration consists in ascribing to the individual self what is true of the Universal Self. And this indicates the element of truth also in the statement. The Universal Self, indeed, can know nothing else than modifications of Itself, for there is 'Nothing Else,' 'No Not-I'. And each individual self knows and can know only in and by means of the knowledge of the Universal Self. The 'working out' of this metaphysical necessity in the details of the Limited, is one of the reasons for the existence of endless *suṭrātmās*, individuals within and over individuals; also the existence of sense-media, *ākāśa*, *vāyu*, etc., in modern terms, air, light saliva, particles, etc.); also the existence of *adhishthāṭṛdevas*, 'gods,' with peculiar plastic and elastic forms and degrees of the feeling of 'personality,' ruling the *indriyas* and the masses of sensuous-elements which make up their bodies and so on. In still more minute detail, the working out of the necessity results in the fact that, in the individual self, before anything can be cognised, it has to be reduced into the semblance of identity with the perceiving self, to become a state, a mood, a modification of it or its consciousness; thus the visual object must become a pictured shaping of the retinal purpurine

a s m i, I-this-not-am, makes up the s a m ā h a r a, summation, by the use of the verb a s, 'to be'.

which is part of the perceiving self; the aural object, a vibration of the tympanum; a gustatory object, an ensalivation of the papillæ of the tongue and so on. And this process is repeated in the subtler bodies as the centre of consciousness recedes inwards. Concrete thinking is shapings of mindstuff, mental matter. In this sense, it may well be said that the nature of the a h a m, its subjective quality, must be reflected in, be imposed on, the e ṭ a ṭ, in order that cognition may arise—and cognition of *another*, an *object*, and not only of 'my own states'.

So, on the other hand, it may well be said that the definite picturing of the e ṭ a ṭ in one's own mind, that is to say, of the objective state of things that is desired to be produced, before beginning to realise it in matter, is the subjective aspect of k r i y ā, is the reflexion of the e ṭ a ṭ in the I.

This may suggest one way of 'bridging the gulf between consciousness (in the sense of mind) and matter,' of retaining the two as distinct and yet reducing them into terms of each other; in other words, in accordance with the nature of the Logion, all experience, and therefore all thinking also, is but one or the other of two and only two ways of selffeeling, viz., either 'I am this' or 'I am not this'; no living being looks at any the most inanimate object except in terms of 'mine and thine', i.e., as *part* of some self or other; there is nowhere

In other words, I-this is cognition, and This-I is action. I ṭ ṭ h a m and e v a m, 'such' and 'thus,' have place here. There is no conjunction with another so long as there are no 'such' and 'thus'. 'I' can enter into another only by some p r a k ā r a, *method*. Without a method, entry is impossible. And the method is 'such' or 'thus'. For this reason, then, viz., that k r i y ā is a matter of y o g a, conjunction, and conjunction is possible only by a means, a device, is it said that the reflexion of E ṭ a ṭ in A h a m is (the device? which produces) k r i y ā.

The appearance of the union of A h a m and E ṭ a ṭ is (their mutual) negation, and that is a pure *opposition* only of subject and object; mind and matter are never *separate*, but only distinguishable. Of course, the real and final bridging is done only when the Logion 'negates' matter as such and makes it a mere 'supposition' of Consciousness something whose very substance is 'imagination' or thought.

Matter is really non-existent from the standpoint of observation. It consists merely of holes in æther (see *Occult Chemistry*, Appendix on 'Æther of Space'), maintained by the will of the Logos, and if He withdraws this will, matter vanishes, every form of it being ultimately reducible to these holes. Modern science is beginning to reach after this idea, sometimes speaking of matter as 'spaces,' sometimes as 'strains'. [A. B.]

desire.¹ The Scripture says: Whatever is like, similar or equal to another, that desires that other.² 'May I be synthesised, co-ordinated, related, united with that other.'

The permutations and combinations of these three, cognition, desire and action, take place in Accordance with (*i.e.*, in terms of) time, space and substance.³

¹ It is obvious that desire is that which 'brings together' and unites subject and object, more or less changing or 'negating' the original character of each, which, among other reasons, is why it is characterised as 'negation.'

² Compare the English expressions 'I like this' and 'I do not like, or I dislike this' and 'This is not like him to do so or so;' and the current Sanskrit saying, समानशीलव्यसनेषु सख्यम्, 'Friendships arise between persons of like tastes and temperaments.' This is exactly the 'paradoxical' nature of Desire. It is affirmative as well as negative. I 'like' what is more or less 'like' me, is to my taste; yet at the same time I 'want,' is proof that I am 'not' content with exactly what I am; I 'want' to be something *else*, something more than, I am; and when I am that *else*, then I shall 'negate' that also and want something *else* again, endlessly.

³ The *Praṇava-Vāda* nowhere definitely assigns the triplet of time, space and motion, to the negation in the same way as it does saṭ-chi-

The changes of time give rise to day and night, waking and sleep, birth and death, creation and dissolution, and all the endless world-cycles, yugas, kalpas, etc. In space we have, 'this is here and thus,' 'this is not here, thus,' etc., plena and vacua, systems and empty spaces, objects of consciousness and lacunæ. In *kriyā*, motion, we have 'this is born out of that, thus,' or 'not thus,' or 'not out of this,' 'this is possible,' etc., *i.e.*, causes and effects, patence and latence, (of things and thoughts).¹ Numbers arise also out of succession, two, three, etc., to pseudo-infinity.

ānanda to Pratyagātmā and saṭṭva-rajas-tamas to Mūla-prakṛti. No characteristic triplet of qualities or attributes is assigned to Shakti or Daivī-prakṛti either, like creation, preservation and destruction; only jñāna, ichchhā and *kriyā* are spoken of as three shaktis. But such triplets may well be inferred. Chap. xviii. above speaks of the energies of integration, disintegration and manifestation.

¹ Just before, the triplet mentioned is time, place and *substance*, vastu. In the detail, here, substance is replaced by *kriyā*, action or motion, which goes more naturally and normally with time and space. The intention of such ringing of changes is to induce the reader to discover for himself correspondences and changes of aspects from different standpoints. 'Substance' corresponds

Out of these facts arise such pairs as 'actor and inspirer,' 'employer and employed;' and the facts are universal and common to all time. If activity were minutely recorded from the very beginning of the vinihiṭa-cycle and down to the present moment, even then nothing new in principle or radically different from these processes that we observe around us to-day would be discovered. But, of course, the concrete detail differs with each individual and each act of each individual, so that each cognition and each action may be said to be unique, in one sense.

Further, out of these same facts arise necessarily the periodic growth and decay, contraction and expansion, of everything in the World-process, with an intervening appearance of stability, permanence, unchangingness, that reflects or imitates the state of Brahman. And this periodicity extends endlessly in time and ranges over all possible scales. For the All never begins at *one* time; nor ever ends at *one* time. Only limited beginnings, beginnings of limited things and worlds, take place at particular times, in particular places, and to M, in the triplet of substance-quality-action; but in the triplet of space-time-motion, motion corresponds to M, all three being sub-divisions and attributes of the higher M.

are matched by similarly limited endings. Whatever has a beginning must necessarily have an end also.

In this wise may the essential nature and bearings of *kriyā* be ascertained.

But as to *desire*, because it is the foundation of all and inheres in all, and is of the nature of negation, because it involves reciprocity, mutual dependence (and circular definitions), therefore is it hinted or even declared expressly that it is not fit object for *knowledge* (in a sense; for in that sense it is 'unreason,' the opposite of reason; the impelling force that throws out of balance, out of equilibrium, whereas reason restores just proportion and equilibrium; but of course desire is as much object or part and aspect of consciousness as knowledge and activity). It is true that desire is stated to arise from knowledge, but that statement has reference to the *effect*-form of desire. In its *causal* form, it is behind (particular) knowledge (of the nature of *effect*), for without (the vague, general, desire to know, there can be no knowledge, as is made clear in the *Ākara*.¹ Nor is desire the object of itself, *i.e.*, of desire,

¹ Said by Pandit Dhanarāja to be the name of a *Bhāṣya* or commentary by Bārḥaṇa on the real *Brahma-Sūtras* (ten thousand in number, the current being only five hundred and fifty-five).

To the argument itself, it may be replied, in

any more than it is of knowledge. (We do not desire desires). When we say we know desires, we only mean we *feel* desires, are aware of desiring, in the same sense in which we are aware of knowing and of acting. Such awareness is pure consciousness, or self-consciousness, which includes all three aspects and cannot be particularly identified with any one only.

Work is dual, (1) partial, (personal), relating to a part, and (2) general, (impersonal), relating to *the* Whole, or *a* whole. By practice of the former, in course of time, the nature of and the capacity for the performance of the latter is learnt and acquired. And this is the proper fruit of the knowledge of Brahman.

But in reality,
I am not either space, or time, or motion,
Nor here, nor there, nor home, nor lands unknown,

coin, that there cannot be any even general and vague desire to know without some pre-involved vague and general knowledge of 'something' to be desired; in other words that a particular desire to know, means only and always a desire to know more or better than before. But all this is discussed more fully elsewhere, in the work, and the final truth is that in the 'causal' form, from the transcendental point of view, all three are simultaneous, and in the effect-form, as particular experiences, they rotate endlessly.

Nor known of script, nor missed of ignorance,
Nor co-existence, nor successiveness,
Nor action, nor cognition, nor desire,
Nor both nor all at once, nor one by one,
But am I ever One, and One Alone.
