SECTION II.
Yoga-Prahāra-Praharāṇa.

THE METHODS OF THE CONJUNCTION OF THE
THREE FACTORS.

The importance and the consequences of the knowledge of Brahman as triune.—Further illustrations of the triplicity.—Cognition, action and desire as corresponding to A, U and M.—The multifarious triplets arising under desire and action.

The manifestation of the trinity which constitutes the one or, rather, the numberless Brahman, is Samsāra, the World-process, so that we may say that Samsāra in its totality is Brahman; and the endless combinations and permutations of the three factors make the many ways or methods or laws of this manifestation or ‘becoming’ which is Samsāra.

These many methods have to be studied by every one who would understand the real significance of Brahman. And they have to be studied in the World-process itself, that is to say, by observation of it all around us. For there is no greater teacher than this World-process itself, and study thereof is the real and genuine tapas and yoga, austerity and self-development. To know all is to know Brahman. It should be borne in mind however that to know all, in the
totality of its endless detail, is not achievable in any limited space and time by any being limited by space and time. Only the All itself knows the all. Various sciences study only various aspects of Brahman or Samsara. What is needed and is possible is that the student should secure a general idea of the whole and of its unity. Such knowledge is the source of that deliberate and true altruism which arises necessarily in the jiva which has attained to nivritti and universalism.¹

Altruism and egoism, the gain of one and the loss of another, renunciation by one and acceptance by another, sin and merit, heaven and hell, destruction and protection, all have their own separate and proper places in the World-process, from the standpoint of the limited, though they all are as one from the standpoint of the One Self.

It is only when the jiva realises the illusoriness of the separateness of jivas from each other, the separateness of many selves, which is the sole basis of the distinctions of sin and merit, that it becomes capable of the performance of desireless action, work without attachment, duty

¹ 'Universalism' is here used to indicate the position of one who has transcended both egoism and altruism, who knows no longer 'myself and others,' but sees himself and others as one with the Universal Self. (A. B.)

for the sake of duty, and so becomes a participant in mukti, liberation, the true deliverance of the soul, which is deliverance from selfish desire and so from all possibility of suffering.

The jiva that has realised this underlying unity of the diverse world transcends and transmutes selfishness and unselfishness into duty; the elations of health and the depressions of disease into the steady equability of perfect life; regularity and irregularity into living and flexible routine; deprivations and gifts into the justice that is ever adjusting the balance of all things by means of punishments and rewards. Such a jiva realises the synthesis, the unity, of the four objects of life, viz., profit, pleasure, duty and deliverance. It knows that the opposites that make up the world are ever changing place, poison becoming medicine and medicine poison, with changing circumstances.

But before it can realise this unity it must have studied the diversity which is pervaded by that unity. The very transcendence, by Brahman, of time and number, implies time and number. The Beginningless and Endless is made up of the countless and incessant beginnings and endings, of the periods and cycles, which the world uses as the measures of time.

Here, again, we may notice the ever-present triplicity of the world. The beginning is the A, the end is the U, and the intervening middle
period of maintenance or preservation is the connecting M. So the present is the A, the future U, and the past M. The unfinished beginning is the present; the remainder after its completion is the future; the remainder after the end is the past. The present includes both past and future. Divisor, dividend and quotient; multiplier, multiplicand and multiple; addition corresponding to growth or creation or origin, multiplication to preservation, and (subtraction or) division to destruction and end—all these are instances of the same triplicity. The curious transpositions of the letters of the Pranava, as here given, seem to be of the nature of the transpositions often used in ancient works, to indicate certain successions within certain periods. Thus, while A U M would indicate the World-process ideally, the two factors having prominence, and the relation between them coming last, as being hidden, the anagram A M U would indicate the world really, the relation taking its actual place as between the Self and the Not-Self; and M A U would indicate by the necessary emphasis on the vowel sound and the equally necessary swift passage from the M, the relation of the past to the present, and the gliding passage from present to future. (A. B.) See The Science of Peace, p. 139.

The book does not explain why subtraction is omitted. From one point of view it might appear that addition, including multiplication, would corres-
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singular, the dual, the plural, 1, 2, and 3, also respectively correspond to A, U, and M. The cause and the summation and the tri-unity of them all is the cipher. By a process of reflexion of the trinity in each of these, each of the three primal numbers becomes triple, and hence we have the nine figures, for this world-system, the tenth being ‘no-thing,’ nothing new or further, and so made up with the zero.

The above observations show the intimate connexion between number and time, the full application of which is found in the science of jyotisha, or ‘the lights (of heaven),’ i.e., (Jyotisha) astrology and astronomy, with its elaborate measurements and calculations, and considerations of good and evil times and proper and improper seasons; for, as there are right and wrong seasons for agricultural processes, so are there for all works and undertakings whatsoever.

Time corresponds to the Self, number to the Not-Self, and the saṃkhya, the calculus of the numberless infinite, (or rather in-de-finite or pseudo-in-finite) to the relation between them.

There are three principal grahas, planets, and nine altogether (for our world-system, in correspondence with the nine numbers)

pond with creation; subtraction, including division, with destruction; and the ‘rule of three’, connecting the two, with preservation.
Näṣṭika, āṣṭika, and māṣṭika, atheism, theism, and polytheism, literally the believer that (a thing, a being, a deity) is not, the believer that it is, and the believer that the negation (or the negated many) is—this is another important trinity.

In considering these triplats we observe how the multitudinous Samsāra originates and is within the non-separate Brahmaṇ; how rest and effort, undertaking and completion, alternate within the Full and Changeless. All ‘becoming’ is effort, is accompanied with the sense of individual initiative and effort; and, at the same time, all ‘becoming’ is necessary also. As all the successive progression of inference is based on and included in direct cognition or intuition, so the corresponding procession of Samsāra, the before and after of which is connected together in our consciousness by inference after being separately gathered by direct cognition,¹ is based on and included in the direct cognition or intuition or single and partless consciousness of all the three factors of the primal trinity, ‘I—Not-I—Not’. The feeling of effort is a necessary error. Truth and error are relative and both necessary, being both summed up in illusion.

¹ The latest way of describing this ‘separate gathering’ is that ‘each presentation is new and unique.’ (Vide, Mind, for January, 1906, p. 53.)

Pratyakṣa, ‘vision,’ direct cognition, intuition, presentation, corresponds to the present; anumeyā, what has to be inferred, to the past; and prayojana, the motive of the inference, to the future. Again, from the standpoint of Ātmā pratyakṣa corresponds to Ā; nirṇaya, judgment or decisive conclusion or deductive inference, to U; and anumāna, reasoning or inductive inference, to M. But, from the standpoint of Samsāra, nirṇaya corresponds to Ā, and pratyakṣa to U.

All the six padartha’s, ‘meanings of words’, ‘objects aimed at, or intended to be reached or expressed’, things or categories, of the Vaiṣeṣhika system, and the sixteen of the Nyāya system (for which definite numbers there are definite reasons) are respectively reducible to (i) bhaveya, being (corresponding to matter and sat) and (ii) pratyakṣa, direct knowledge (corresponding to chit and spirit or consciousness), which, again, are in and are Brahmaṇ which is and wherein is (iii) bhavāna, ‘becoming’ (connected with effort and desire and ananda or bliss).¹

¹ Further details regarding the various systems of philosophy and the different ‘points of view’ of these darshanas (Darshanas), will be found later on in Section III. Ch. xiv., et seq.
As said before, all 'becoming' is necessary, from the standpoint of the All, and yet every particular 'becoming' invariably manifests by means of desire. This desire, self-determination, individual initiation of actions, is all illusory, technically, though an indubitable fact also at the same time.

Âtmā, and Samsāra, Self and the World-process or the Not-Self, are determinant of, are so to say causes or motives for or to, each other, and are always in inseparable connexion with each other. And hence jīva, individualised self, soul, or spirit, and dēha or body are interdependent and mutually relative, even as north and south and east and west are. 'This is thine,' 'this is mine,' means temporary connexion. 'Thou art I,' is permanent connexion.

The inner identity of past, present, and future is the real cause of the conviction that what was, is, and also will be. So too are possible and impossible identified (in the conditional). Bhe da or separateness, a bhe da or non-separateness, and an abheda or non-in-separateness; aṣṭi, nāṣṭi, anāṣṭi, is, is not, not is; abodha, sambodha, vibodha, ignorance, knowledge, special knowledge, etc.; are other such triplets.

Some idea of the general principle of triunity and the method of development and multiplication by mutual reflexion having been supplied as above, a few special considerations as regards ichchā or desire and jñāṇa or cognition may be entered upon, the discussion of kriyā or action being left over for the next section.

While the whole is always full and complete, each part is not such. We thus have an absence of fullness, an imperfection, noticeable in any and every part, howsoever we take it, of Samsāra. At the same time, every jīva, being identical with the Self, is identical with the whole, and contains all within itself. The result of this double identity of the jīva, with the whole (Self) on the one hand and with a part (of the Not-Self) on the other, is, that there is necessarily and inevitably an incessant progression in each part towards the fullness of the Whole. And, as said before, the constant co-efficient of this necessary evolution is desire.

The main significance of all blessings, etc., is to be found in this fact of inevitable progress. He who blesses knows that the desire having arisen, in the person blessed, for a certain higher condition, that condition will evolve in him in the course of time, and declares this fact in his blessing.

By mutual reflexions, cognition, desire and action become triple, each of them, in their turn.

Ichchā,1 desire, is subdivided into kāma, kānkṣā, and āśā; and cognition into

---

1 Etymologically it would be better to translate ichchā by 'wish,' both words being derived from
sāṅkalpa, vikalpa, and aṅhyavarṣāya.\footnote{Modern Sanskrit would say naishākāmya.}

It must be borne in mind all along, however, that all these are sub-divisions of one and the same root िष्ठ. But usage in western treatises on psychology has made ‘desire’ technically the more appropriate. As a general rule, it is difficult to assign exact English equivalents to Sanskrit philosophical terms. The different sub-traces which have built up the technical terminologies of philosophy in the different languages, have looked at the things, the same things, from different standpoints, and so caught and embodied into words different aspects of these things. The equivalents used in this translation are therefore only suggestive. Uniformity in their use will not be possible to observe always, though, of course, it will be striven after. It is well-known that definiteness of language grows hand-in-hand with definiteness of ideas, and as the one is often a very lengthy process, so must be the other.

\footnote{The distinction implied between āsti-ṭva and saṭṭā is worth noting. In current Sanskrit philosophical literature, Prashastapāda’s Vaiśeṣika-Bhāṣya assigns āsti-ṭva to all six pañcaarthas and saṭṭā to only the first three. Available commentaries and modern pandits do not explain the difference, at least not satisfactorily.}
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Kāmanā corresponds to aṣṭi-ṭva, existence, is-ness; it is the desire to ex-is, to manifest outwards. Niṣkāmya, on the other hand, corresponds to saṭṭā, being, inwardsness, absence of desire (to manifest outwards). Kāmanā appears as syāt, syāh, syām, ‘may be be, may thou be, may I be (or become such and such).’ The three correspond to M, U, and A respectively. But from another standpoint, the root a, to exist, (which is the root of both saṭṭā and aṣṭi-ṭva) includes all the three forms, syāt, syāh and syām, of kāmanā; and in this root, the letter a corresponds to the Ātmā; and the letter s to the baḥu, the Many, the world or U; while M or the Negation is represented by saṭṭā, being, which is the underlying meaning of the root a and the connecting link between the Ātmā and the Many. The primal wish, as embodied in the Veda-text, is therefore baḥu-syām, ‘May I become many.’
In the general sense, kāmanā may be said to correspond to the Self, to be the desire for self-manifestation, self-realisation, self-assertion. And if it is thus looked at, we see that all the other sub-divisions fall within it.

Kāṅkṣā may be distinguished from kāmanā thus: kāmanā is the mere naked wish for self-realisation; kāṅkṣā is the wish for such by means of the many. The reference to the many, the desire to manifest in and through the many, is the speciality of kāṅkṣā. In kāṅkṣā is present the striving for the fruit; kāṅkṣā is only for the sake of fruit. In what way, by what means, can this object be gained—such wishful cogitation is the work of kāṅkṣā. That shākṭi, energy or power, that self-effort, the form or nature of which is the becoming, the coming about, or the bringing about, of the fruit or the wished-for result, the gradual securing of the object—that is kāṅkṣā, (conation).

I cchhā, wish, desire, is the suggester of the method. May it be, it may be, that this result ‘becomes’ or is brought about by this means—such is its form. (‘The wish is father to the thought,’ “Necessity is the mother of invention”.)

Āśā, hope, refers to the future—because such an object is being secured now by such means, and has also been gained similarly in the past, therefore it will be gained in the same way in the future also.

The cognition corresponding to āśā is saṅkalpa. Its form is: I shall do this, or let me do this, or I am doing this, with the knowledge and in the belief that thereby such a result will be obtained. Āśā and saṅkalpa are related as effect and cause. The former is of the form of or corresponds to the Nyāya-category of nirṇaya, decision, deduction; and the latter to that of siddhānta, established and settled conclusion. It may at first sight seem that the reverse is the case, that hope is the cause and resolve the effect, that we resolve to do something only when we hope that it will produce the wished-for result. This would be so if the words hope and resolve are taken in their exact English sense. But in that sense they are not exact equivalents of āśā and saṅkalpa. The latter should be taken here more as “plan” than resolve; then it becomes easier to see that we hope for a certain occurrence in consequence of our plan; without the plan for the realising of it we would not have the hope of the occurrence. The endless interlacing of these moods of consciousness is at first sight very perplexing, but as the reader proceeds further with the work and realises how this endlessness of detail within detail is the normal condition of all things everywhere, he will become reconciled to this particular perplexity also.
In other words, May I be—is kāmanā; I am—is kānkṣāḥ; I was—is iṣṭaḥ; I shall be—is āsāḥ.

Vikalpa, doubt, alternative, is the negator, the opposite of saṅkalpa. Doubt, uncertainty,

As a general rule, it may be said, for psychological purposes, that the order of succession is, first cognition, then desire, then action; and that the sub-divisions of these follow the same order. Thus if cognition is C and sub-division of it c, and so with the others, then taking only one set of sub-divisions, the order of succession would probably be; Ce, De, Ac, Cd, Dd, Ad, Ca, Da, Ac, or Ce, Cd, Ca, De, Dd, Da, Ac, Ad, Ac, or all three at a time (in three different degrees), and so on. Looked at thus, the fact appears to be that where we say that the wish is father to the thought which results in such and such an action, or that necessity is the mother of invention, the 'thought' or 'invention' is not a cognition following after a desire, but is either the Ca, or the Ac, a plan of action, a mixture of cognitive and active elements, which follows Dd and precedes Aa. In the realm of the successive, in actual daily life, it does not seem easy to find a case of simple and specific cognition, Ce, coming after and arising out of a simple and specific desire, Dd. The latter pre-supposes the former; the former entails the latter.

The growth of these complications, the opening up of these ramifications, in the individual, under the stress of the outward-going desire for the
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attaches to everything; I am or I was or I shall be so and so—all this has an element of uncertainty about it; we are never positively sure even of the accuracy of our present experience, less so of our recollection of the past, much less

revivification of 'stale pleasure,' or the enhancement and eloboration of pleasure by complex arrangements of objects of pleasure, is the growth of memory, intelligence, etc.; it is evolution generally. Compare the simple satisfaction of the primal appetites for food and sex in the animal with the complex satisfaction of those same appetites by civilised man with the help and subservience of all the apparatus of modern civilisation. After the middle stage, that of satiation and self-consciousness, there sets in the inward-turning of the desire, the negation of these things; and the apparent superiority of the nivṛtti-condition as such consists in remembering the experiences of pravṛtti and yet deliberately rejecting them, 'rising superior' to them. At the stage of self-consciousness (not all-self-consciousness) kāma and punishment become substituted for cause and effect—a change of names only. See Section VI, infra. The rotation of the three aspects of consciousness is also repeatedly touched upon in the work, and the difficulty is solved by distinguishing between 'generic' and 'specific' forms of each. For concrete illustrations of Ce, etc., we may tentatively take the following:—

(Ce) Cognition-proper, definite knowledge, ahyāna-
vasāya, 'This is a fruit' 'I see this fruit.'
of our future. This is due to the presence of the Negation everywhere.

The potential sām, ‘may I be,’ as Time, includes all the other three, am, was, and will be, or present, past and future.

These four divisions of desire occur in every possible variation of krama, order; but the natural one is kāmana, ichchā, kānkṣa, and āshā. The others are the opposite of

(Cd) Cognition-desire, vikalpa, doubt, ‘Is it worth tasting?’ ‘It seems to be nice?’ ‘May I have it?’ ‘It is probably good to eat?’

(Ca) Cognition-action, resolution, determination, sankalpa, ‘I ought to be and am taking it.’

(De) Desire-cognition, kānkṣa, ‘It seems to be obtainable,’ ‘It looks as if I could get it.’

(Dd) Desire-proper, kāmana, the longing for it, ‘I want the fruit’.

(Ds) Desire-action, āshā, hope, expectation and volition, ‘I expect I will secure it as soon as I try, and I will take it’.

(Ac) Action-cognition, vyavasāya, preparation, determination, initiation of effort ‘the co-ordination, orientation or direction of the muscles and their movements’.

(Ad) Action-desire, yaṭna or krṛti, effort, endeavor, exaltation, ‘the inception of movement in the muscles’.

(An) Action-proper, kriyā or krama, ‘the seizing of the fruit’.
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krama; they are vyāti-krama or disorder, which also is necessary however.

The endlessness of these four, as of the Ātmā, is illustrated in all the multitudinous activities and relations of the world.

Pleasure and pain lie in the fulfilment and the defeat, respectively, of kānkṣa. Both are summed up in ānanda. Pleasure corresponds

In the illustrative expressions belonging to the first six sub-divisions, the use of the word I, ‘I see,’ ‘I want,’ etc., should not be understood to indicate apperception, self-consciousness; it has been used only for concreteness and brevity.

The above are only samples of an endless complexity. Precise tabulation is nearly impossible, at least for some time to come. Only the general outlines of the ‘scheme’ are intended to be indicated. Such facts and experiences as are noted by modern psychologists (Vide, e.g., W. James’ Principles of Psychology, II, xxvi, pp. 522 et seq.) under the names of ‘kinesthetic sensation,’ ‘feeling of innovation,’ ‘fiat,’ ‘idea-motor action,’ ‘muscular sense,’ ‘sensations of the movements of the joints of the body,’ ‘sensations of weight,’ ‘feeling of temperature, external or internal,’ ‘of chills of fear at the heart,’ ‘heat of anger in the blood,’ ‘bowl of compassion,’ ‘tinglings, thrills, creeps, horripilation,’ etc., should all be capable of reduction into such a scheme of sub-divisions proceeding by triplets.
to kāṅkṣā and A; pain to iĉchā and U; and ānanda, bliss, peace, the disappearance of both pleasure and pain, to kāmāna and M. The inner identity of nature of pleasure and pain, the fact that both are rooted in ānanda and both caused by kāmāna, may be realised through the fact that they are always changing place; what is pleasant at one time becomes painful at another, and what is painful at one time becomes pleasant at another.

All these three, pleasure, pain, and peace, are summed up in the AUM, the true name of Brahmā, which, because of this fact, is always used at the beginning, the middle, and the end of all mantras or sacred chants.

The other words, yāt, 'which,' tāt, 'that,' etc., used to denote Brahmā, as, for instance, in the Gāyatrī, are so used only to indicate its tri-unity and all-inclusiveness (which is the characteristic of relative pronouns).

Sub-divisions appear again under each of the four, kāmāna, etc., thus: āśā, ġurāśa, nirāśa, etc. Nirāśa, absence of hope, sums up āśa, good hope, and ġurāśa,

1 Obviously, iĉchā, here, corresponds to U only when treated as a sub-variety, distinguishable from the other sub-divisions and aspects, kāmāna, etc., of desire in general. When desire in general is spoken of, side by side with cognition or action, then it is made to correspond with M.