

CHAPTER XXIII.

THE COMPANIONS OF KRIYĀ.

The metaphysical nature of action.—The meaning of action.—Its manifest result, the triplet of birth-stay-death.—The definition of each.—The quartette of factors involved in each of the three.—No fixity of anything, anywhere and ever.—The five main kinds of action.—Three principals.—Illustration from day and night.—Endless variations of ways of action and evolution.—Supremacy of Self over all, great and little, success and failure.—Action as the result of desire and necessity.—The growth of joys and sorrows, friendships and hostilities, out of such necessities, and consequent emotional investment of the acts of going and coming, birth and death, as well and ill.—The unity of all in gamana.—Further considerations as to prasāraṇa.—Its sub-divisions.—The sub-divisions of kuñchana.—Health and disease.—Avoidance of excess.—Metaphysical transcendence of all movements by the Self.

The nature of kriyā may be described thus: Because the Self is present everywhere, and because it is a matter of necessity that its unity should be opposed at all possible 'wheres,' all points, sarv-āmshe, in all parts, therefore

the Not-Self too reaches out to and endeavors to be present in every part and at every point (of space and time); the Self and the Not-Self show themselves in opposition (affirmation-negation, identification-separation) everywhere, ever, everyway—this is kriyā.¹ And yet again, it is not a mere showing or seeing of each other to or by each other; but a yoga, a union, or conjunction of the two (including a vi-yoga or disjunction). Karma takes place everywhere as subservient to or in pursuit of this yoga. The actor is the Self; Its 'desired,' 'beloved,' the object of Its desire is the Not-Self, and that is karma, work, action (which, in Samskr̥t Grammar, means also the predicate, the word in the accusative case, the object of the activity, the kartā being the subject in the nominative case). In the conjunction of kartā and karma lies kriyā as the nexus between them.

The vyavasāya or purposeful effort throughout all kriyā is but this, viz., that the self secures what it desires; and it always desires a 'this'. 'May this and this spread forth,' 'May

¹In other words, the endeavor of every eṭaṭ to encompass the whole of Aham, in respect of all points of space and moments of time; and, *vice versa*, of every individualised aham to encompass all eṭaṭs similarly—this is kriyā.

this be achieved,' 'May I be in this,' 'May this be in me,' 'May this be in this,' and so on. 'Not this,' 'Not this' is also always within its purview and intention. Thus, therefore, in the projection or working out of the idea, 'I-This-Not' we have the threefold *kriyā* of *utpatti-sṭhiti-nāśa*, birth-life-death, creation-preservation-destruction, origin-persistence-end, anabolism-metabolism-katabolism. 'Becoming' is origin; the appearance to each other of *Aham* and *Etaṭ* is origin, production, birth. 'This is thus,' 'this comes after this'—such is the nature of preservation, maintenance, continuance. The appearance of I and This as one, their mergence and disappearance into each other, is death or destruction. In other words, the taking away and placing elsewhere, by means of action, of this which appears here—this is destruction. As the *Brahma-Sūtra* says: The disappearance of that which is in progress is destruction.

Under each of the three is a quartette: (a) the act of coming forth; the originator; the producer; and the progenition; (b) the act of preserving; the maintainer; the fostered; and the continued protection; (c) the destroyed; the dissolver; the disappearance; and the *upayoga* (? the use or purpose of the act of destruction).

Nothing in the world is stable, fixed for all time to one place; but rather, because all exists everywhere, because all have a use and purpose in all places, therefore everyone, atom or sun, is always going everywhen and everywhere. If objects were to stay for ever, each in one fixed place, then truly were *karma* meaningless. It may be said (by a lax use of the words 'one place,' that various kinds of activity are possible even in one place, but even so the universality of *karma* would remain unimpugned. Because this Self is not confined to any one place, because it is not tied to any one particular, therefore its activity is not restricted to one point of space or one moment of time or one way of motion.

Five main kinds of *karma*, acts,¹ are declared in the *Vaiśeṣika*: (a) *utkṣhepaṇa*,

¹ A distinction is clearly intended between *karma* and *kriyā*. The former is the 'act;' the latter the 'action' or 'activity'. The former is more the visible acting; the latter, more the volition. It has been said just before, in the text, that *kriyā* is the nexus between *karṭā* and *karma*. But the distinction is not always rigorously maintained in common usage. It is a distinction between the psychical and the physical aspects of the same event. Cognition, desire and action may be regarded as the psychical aspects; and sensation, physical craving or appetite, and act or deed as the physical aspects.

up-throwing, ascent; (b) *apakṣhepaṇa*, down-throwing or descent; (c) *kuñchana*, contraction; (d) *prasāraṇa*, expansion; (e) *gamana*, going, motion generally. Because *karma* is Not-Self, and that is the opposite of the One, therefore five kinds of it are suggested (to indicate endless multiplicity in reality).¹

¹ No deeper reason for the quintuplicity is given here. It is probably the same, whatever it be, as that which gives us the other pentads—sensors, motors, fingers, toes, elements, extremities, the pentagonal form of the fifth race human being, 'the five pentads of consonants in the Samskr̥t alphabet, etc.—at the present day. For a discussion as to the main kinds of movement see *The Science of Peace*, p. 241. Compare the 'vibrating' lines recorded by the ergographs, etc., of psycho-physicists, for justification of 'ascent and descent' being included as prominent kinds of activity, besides 'going' and 'expansion-contraction'. These last require no special plea. Every breathing human being is himself, every moment of his life, proof of their importance. It is also interesting to compare, in this reference, the symbology of various ancient religions, which sum up the World-process in a few diagrams, a point within a circle; a diameter within it; and a cross of diameters within it. This symbology, besides its mathematical significance, acquires a most valuable psycho-physical one when we endeavor to interpret it in the

Gamaṇa is the chief; next in importance come expansion and contraction successively. They correspond respectively to A, U and M.

These three together make up all 'Becoming'. Look where we will in all the World-process, we can discern only these three; first a going forth, a stirring, then an expansion, then a contraction. Every morning, every evening, illustrates this. Every morning, *prāṭah*, is that wherein there is, *prakarṣheṇa*, in a high degree, *āṭah* or light. The time wherein light first comes forth, *ā-gachchaṭi*, that is moving. Then follows the *prasāraṇa* or expansion thereof, which makes the day. The contraction of that expansion makes the evening, the *sāyam*, from the verb-root *siy*, to sweep up, gather together, *ākaraṣhaṇa*, attracting or drawing in.¹ For, at that time, the expanded light is contracted, gathered in and packed up to be taken away elsewhere; and, in its place, darkness comes in here. The subsequent expansion, etc., of the darkness makes the night. For this reason, light and

light of the verses of *Bhāvaprakāśa*, (see *The Science of Social Organisation*; or *The Laws of Manu in the Light of Theosophy*, p. 223.)

¹ There follow here some very technical grammatical considerations which cannot be adequately or usefully translated.

darkness are the main determinants of night and day. Some hold that a new day begins immediately after midnight; others, just before sunrise. The underlying idea of both views is that the 'coming' of light makes the beginning of every day. So, one day and one night, *divā-rātri*, *i.e.*, one course of light and one of darkness, make one *divasa*, one date. In that, in accordance with the rules for the calculations of *mahā-manvantaras*, etc., *ṭīthi*s, *i.e.*, dates occasionally multiply, or disappear. Thus two or even three ordinary dates are counted as one; and *vice versa*; and so with the *nakṣatras* or asterisms (roughly, fortnights). Still the date proper does not vary, and seven of these make the *aḥan*, or week; and multiples of this, the fortnight, the month, the year, etc.¹ The full

¹ It may be noted in passing that the time-divisions and space-measures of the ancient Indians seem to have been strictly based on 'natural' processes, movements of atoms and suns and planets. Thus the *ṭruti*, the minutest division of time is the period taken by an atom—itsself the smallest measure of space—to move out of the space occupied by it. The day-night consists of thirty *muhūrtas*, each of forty-eight minutes, that being the daily difference in the time of rising of the moon. And so on. The 'natural' reason for the day of *twenty-four* hours, each of *sixty* minutes, is not so clear.

discussion, and the usefulness of these matters the precise significance and measure of the day, of 'to-day,' 'yesterday,' 'tomorrow,' *yāma*, or 'watch' (quarter of the day), etc., will be found in the sciences of *Jyotiṣha* or 'Astronomy,' *Shilpa* or 'Art-Construction,' generally, and *Itihāsa* or 'History'. In the meanwhile, we note a beginningless and endless repetition and rotation in mutual succession, of these definite beginnings and ends called day and night; which rotation is the inevitable consequence of the laws and principles embodied in the *Logion*. And we also note that where light ends, there darkness begins, and where darkness ends, there light begins (without any blank interval).

We may now return to the proposition that birth-life-death are one inseparable-triplet, and in their combination make *sṛṣhti*, evolution, manifestation, emanation. Endless variations of these occur in the various *sṛṣhtis*, world-creations or systems, details of which may be learnt from the cosmological portions of history, *sraishṭika-itihāsa*. Indeed, such 'variations' in evolution, by difference of time, place and need or circumstance, occur abundantly even within each *brahmānda* or world-egg, with endless growth and decay of each of the endless forms of the Self, in correspondence with Its infinity. That the Self, is

infinite, is proved by this consideration: we could say that It was not infinite, but limited here and here, only if there were any existence, any *aṣṭiṭva*, apart from or independent of the Self. As it is, we talk and can talk of all things or any things only on the basis of the Self. Where our Self is there only can our consciousness travel. All else is as naught to us and therefore is not. We cannot speak or think of it at all. But we can talk and think of all things and anything because our Self is infinite and in touch with every possible *Eṭaṭ*, and includes all within Its consciousness; (and the 'successive' manifestation or unfolding of this content of the Self's Consciousness which includes all possible kinds of *eṭaṭ*-forms, types and archetypes, genera, species and individuals, and all possible ways of their evolution and involution, spontaneous generation, as well as gradual selection amidst spontaneous variation—which is nothing else than spontaneous generation of forms—makes the endless variations and varieties of the World-process).

Knowing this the *jīva* becomes equal, equable, tranquil. He knows himself as ever the same, not liable to growth and decay, outside greatness and littleness, and so passes beyond sorrow and rejoicing. To feel oneself as less than another is sorrow. As greater—joy. And the alternation

of these two feelings alone constitutes *bandhana*, bondage.

It is true that from the standpoint of the successive and limited, this gradation of great and little is an inevitable fact. And for 'practical' purposes, it is fit and proper to strive after an ever greater and greater ideal or status. (But even in the region of empiricism, 'practice,' the memory of the prospect beheld from the transcendental standpoint has its use. It gives us encouragement to renewed effort and consolation against failure in particular instances, and unshaken peace of mind generally, and enables us to) remember what the proverb says: "What blame is there, where is the fault, in the failure, if due effort has been made?" and (thereafter to endeavor to find out quietly where the flaw lay which prevented success, in the light of the fact) that the Whole can never be encompassed and accomplished by any one, at any time or place, by any single effort.

It has been said above that beginning and end, expansion and contraction, are included in *gamana*. Everything is 'going,' moving, always, everywhere and ever. *Samsāra*, *samsarāṇa*, is only a synonym for *gamana*. The distinction that is made between *gamana* and *āgamana*, going and coming, is only a

matter of succession and special condition or convention. In the general sense, *ga mā na* is the one universal fact, divested of all specialisations—an infinite progress and regress. The same process may be regarded as going or as coming, regress or progress, evolution or involution, birth or death, according to the point of view taken.

As all goings and comings are dictated by the all-necessity, so particular goings and comings, the particular actions of particular individuals are governed by the particular needs and necessities of the individuals concerned; and out of such arise joys and sorrows, satisfactions and disappointments. Ordinarily people do not go where there is no necessity for them to go. But if one were needed by another for the satisfaction of some requirement of his, and came not as desired and expected, then the latter suffers disappointment: 'This need of mine could be satisfied by him alone and he comes not'. Where the need is small, the thought is different and the feeling indifferent: 'If he comes, well and good; otherwise it does not seriously matter; the main event will take place, the general idea carried out, even without him or any one else in particular.' To the *jīva* which has attained to the knowledge of *Brahman*, the latter is the permanent mood,

in a more comprehensive form: 'The comers will come and the goers will go; births and deaths will take place endlessly; and the All-Necessity will ever surely fulfil Itself. There is no need to rejoice or to grieve overmuch over any particular coming or going.'

When two necessities join into one, and become a mutual necessity, then relationships and friendships arise, and 'wel-comings' and 'ill-comings'.¹ Where the want of visitor and receiver is a common one, there occurs 'wel-come'. Where it is otherwise we have 'ill-come,' 'ill-omen'. The contradiction of the unity of the well and good, the *śubha*, is the ill or evil, the *a-śubha*.

The triplet here is *ga mā na* (? in the sense

¹ To the modern reader all this ringing of changes on 'coming' and 'going' in connexion with metaphysic may appear trivial. It is the 'manner' of the book and it has a significance to the sympathetic reader. It will enable him to see how the principles of metaphysic govern the so-called little and trivial as well as the so-called great and important. 'Comings' and 'goings' are the 'births' and 'deaths' of worlds also. The very purpose of this chapter will have been missed by the reader if he does not see that to raise his mind above thoughts of the conventional 'little' and 'great,' words have to be used which apply indifferently to both.

of ā-ga-ma-na or coming), an-ā-ga-ma-na or non-coming, and pra-ga-ma-na or strenuous going—corresponding to A, U and M, respectively. Ga-ma-na is the summation of them all. It is the whole of karma, eternal and universal. All sub-divisions of it, and oppositions distinguished between these sub-divisions are nothing else than itself. The going of light is darkness; and the going of darkness is light; both are relative; and indeed, looked at thus, the two are one, for there must be an underlying unity wherever there is a relation. The general principle has been expounded before* that everything includes, and therefore is, its opposite. By that principle are all separates ever threaded together and they ever interpenetrate each other. Hence the saying that night and day, evening and morning, sun and moon, all exist everywhere, and that there is darkness in the sun and moon as well as light.¹

To dwell for another moment on prasāraṇa, expansion, which may be regarded, in one

¹ These may be regarded as statements of particular, concrete facts as well as metaphysical or abstract principles. Fournier's "Two New Worlds" speaks of supra-light and infra-light. X-rays and N-rays are nearer to us. That sunset in one place means sunrise in another, every school-boy knows.

sense, *i.e.*, from the point of view of our progressive evolution, as of most importance to us. It has been said before that it is a sub-division, a kind, of ga-ma-na. The stretching out or spreading forth of 'this definite something' that is 'now here' as 'such-and-such,' (into something more that is at other times and elsewhere also)—this is expansion. The *Mīmāṃsā* says, no doubt, that a thing is (and must therefore always be) as it is, and stretching or spreading forth of it is not possible.¹ (But this is so only from one

¹ यो हि यादृशः स तादृश एव, 'A thing is as it is.' This is the nearest Samskr̥t statement available, so far as I am aware, of the 'law of thought' so current in modern logic since Aristotle, 'A is A'. Other and less bare aspects of it are very frequently to be met, *e.g.*, *Bhagavad-Gītā*, ii. 16, "The existent cannot perish, the non-existent cannot become existent," etc. But in its precise modern form this Law of Identity, with its two companion Laws of Contradiction and Excluded Middle, is not to be met with in Samskr̥t—apparently because of their utter barrenness for all practical purposes. This sterility of theirs was emphasised by Hegel and is being recognised by logicians generally now in the West, and they are being more or less thrown aside—by another extreme of reaction. They, that is to say, the essential idea they embody, *has* a most distinct value—but for

standpoint.) From the standpoint of the Inner Self, *Pratyagātmā*, such expansion of everything is necessary and unavoidable, in order that the Unity of that Self may be opposed and realised (by means of that false, futile and ever-refuted opposition) at all points of time and space. As the *Vaiśeṣhika* says: The *viśāra*, spreading out of objects, is *prasāraṇa*. Or as the *Brahma-Sūtra*: The feeling, the experiencing, of the unity of the elements of I and This is *prasāraṇa*.¹ That is to say,

purposes of transcendental metaphysic. Because our inmost soul feels that "A is A," and not only now, but always; that A is not only not not-A now, but can never become anything else than A; therefore are we able to rise to the Logion which is the solution of the riddle of the universe. But Aristotle, if we may judge by results, seems to have missed this most important significance of these laws—when he probably received the original forms of them from India, at the time of the Alexandrian invasion and tried to apply them to the uses of the "understanding," instead of the "Reason," to *manas* instead of *buddhi*, to *manas* which would lose its vocation if A remained A and was not constantly becoming something more or something other than A, becoming not-A, (and yet remaining A!).

¹ The next sentence of the text gives the immediately relevant aspect of the sense of this pronounce-

the endless experiences of the *jīvātmā*, 'this is so and so and such and such and he and I and they are so and so and such and such'—all this multitude of experience makes the complexity, the quintuplicity, *pra-pañcha*, of the World-process; and this *pra-pañcha* itself is *pra-sāraṇa*.

We may distinguish four forms of it: (i) *vi-pra-sāraṇa*; (ii) *sāraṇa*; (iii) *vi-sāraṇa*; and (iv) *pra-sāraṇa*, corresponding respectively to A, U, M and the Totality. The first is 'expansion in an excessive manner'; it is the ideation of all work in an unlimited, un-de-termined and comprehensive fashion. The second is ordinary movement. The third is withdrawal from movement or movement in an opposite direction: 'What is the use of this (particular) effort? (let us try another).' The fourth includes all the others.

The opposite of *pra-sāraṇa* is *kuñchana*.
ment. For other aspects we might consult other parts of the text, and independent works also, e.g., the *Mahā-Upaniṣhaṭ*, chapters v. and vi., where different kinds of *aham-kāra*, 'I-ness,' are described, and how the I-ness which is identified with this handful of flesh and blood and bone which is our passing dress but which we identify ourselves with, makes for bondage, while certain other forms of I-ness make for liberation, one being 'I am all'.

It is the reduction of all things to unity, contraction, shrinking up, re-absorption. It is pralaya. It also has four sub-divisions. (i) Pra-kuñchana; (ii) vi-kuñchana; (iii) ava-kuñchana; and (iv) kuñchana, corresponding respectively to A, U, M and the Totality. The first refers to the highest, the transcendent Unity. The second to particular diminutions. The third is present at all times, in all actions, with every work (as katabolism in all vital functioning). Ālasya, indolence, unwillingness, disinclination or indisposition to work, fatigue and laziness, regardless of the need for exertion and careless of propriety and opportuneness or otherwise—this is the characteristic of the third or ava-kuñchana, ‘what is to happen, will happen,’ ‘let what will, take place’. Activity, the feeling of fitness and energy, the eagerness for work, is its opposite. Both these are present and needed in the World-process for the work of the Self. In consequence of the unwillingness to act which characterises ava-kuñchana, there arises the feeling that to rest inactive is happiness, as when people say: ‘Happy is he to sleep so peacefully, relieved of restless action’.¹ But it is not possible to remain in this condition

¹Compare Shakespeare’s line: “After life’s fitful fever he sleeps well.”

either, permanently. When the time for it comes round the power of prasāraṇa impels the jīva irresistibly again. Too much of ‘sleeping’ has its own obvious evil consequences. As medical science, forbidding excess of every kind, of activity as well as laziness, points out, diseases arise from too much sleep as from too much waking. Vāṭa-pramī (nervous disorders) are thus caused, says Dhanvantari. The *Samhitā-Sūtra* says: Too much sleep and unwillingness to move, sedentary habits, cause prameha (albuminaria) and so on. The fourth, kuñchana is the summation of all.

The need of, the ‘looking’ by, the I *for* the eṭat is gamana. The necessity, the energy, of the I *in* the eṭat is prasāraṇa. ‘This-not-I,’ the negation of the eṭat, the negation of the Aham—this is kuñchana. The whole of the Logion-fact, ‘I-This-Not’ is karma. In other words: ‘I-(am) this-thus’ is gamana. ‘This (more am)-I-(and) not thus (only)’ is prasāraṇa. ‘This-(am) not-I thus, nor thus, nor otherwise’—is kuñchana. In these ways is the whole of the World-process carried on.

But verily:

This Self is not expanse of spreading light,
Nor point of concentrated darkness is It,

Nor scale of time, day, month and year and
age,
Nor space measured by suns and vaster suns,
Nor knows It any ascent or descent,
Nor evolution, involution, arc
Of growth, decay, or going anywise,
Expansion and contraction It knows not,
Nor joy elating, nor depressing grief—
Ever at rest, eternally complete.
