This combination of I and This is the only and the supreme māyā or illusion. Herein appear space, time, substance, transformation, non-transformation, evolution, beginning, end, middle, order, disorder, reconciliation, transcendence, non-transcendence, comprehension, existence, non-existence, illusion, realisation, oblivion, imagination, appearing, disappearing, becoming, etc. And hence is it said that there is nothing at all in the I taken separately by itself; though indeed such separateness is not possible. It is true the teaching is: Pass out of Samsāra and behold the Ātmā. But it means only this, viz., see not only the This but also the I and the Not, for without these two the Etaṭ cannot appear, indeed even the very word 'appear' could not be uttered. Passing out of Samsāra consists in beholding it under qualification by I and Not. So the Self too ought to be seen only as qualified by the Not-Self and the Not. By itself, Āham is not or nothing, Etaṭ is not, and Not is not, also.

It is true that we meet with such expressions as 'I am,' 'This is,' 'This is not,' 'I am not,' etc.

1 It may be said that Samsāra is transcended when the Āham—which had identified itself with the Samsāra and had acted as if it were the Samsāra—withdraws into itself and says: 'I am not This, I am I.' Then Samsāra loses its binding force and is seen as the Not-I. (A.B.)

wherein I and This are found separate, still on analysis we find that they are both there and as one. The I cannot stand for a moment without the This, nor is the This anything without the I. When a This is mentioned separately, or as separate, in appearance, even then there is an implicit reference to another I (as en-soul-ing en-liven-ing, that This, and also to another This as en-form-ing, en-sheath-ing, the previous I). Thus then Āham - Etaṭ - Na is ever one. In the science of language, for instance, we see that though each letter exists separately, still it is only when they combine together that they fulfil their purpose of forming words possessed of significance; otherwise they remain lifeless. In this same way the trinity in the primal Logion has a unity of meaning. Indeed, so pervasive is this tri-unity that there is a trinity in each of the words Āham, Etaṭ and Na. Āham is made up of three letters; A is the Self, ha is the world, m is that which is beyond both and connects both. Etaṭ is similar; E is the Self, ta is the world, and t

1 This sentence seems to refer to the fact that however much 'inwards' we go, whenever we think we have separated the I, as our inner self, from the body, as our outer sheath, we still find this inner I only as a subtler body, made of subtler matter, body within body, layer after layer, plane after plane. See The Science of Peace, p. 273 et seq.
(otherwise d) is the third or Negation. The Na being included in the Eta, there is no clear expression of trinity therein; yet even there, according to the rules of the being or constitution of letters, varna-sat, Na is made up of a, n, and m. There is a similar trinity in every letter whatsoever.

In this fact we find the explanation and justification of the declaration 'I am (or is) Brahman,' viz., that the Aham is also a trinity; otherwise, without the presence of the trinity therein, the identity of Aham with Brahman were impossible.

Thus understanding the significance of the Logion, the jiva comprehends the transcendent nature of all things. Without such understanding moksha is not possible. With this knowledge, moksha is gained, and it is seen that 'This-Not-I,' 'Not-I-This' and 'I-This' constitute the essence of all kriya or action implying creation, destruction and preservation; and then only does the creation of a new brahma and the due regulation of life in the ashramas become possible and proper.

All the dharmas, the duty, of all the castes and all the life-stages is thus included in the Prayana. Aham is brahmacharya; he alone who knows the I as the basis and support of all is the brahmachari. 'I-This' is the household, wherein the process of the world is carried on by the conjunction of the I and the This, and by the constant giving to the This-es, i.e., other-I's, other selves, of what is gained (out of the one I) by the I's, the selves. 'This-Not' is the forest life wherein the nothingness of the This is realised. Finally nourishment, evolution and further confirmation of the sheath of the soul; it is the consolidation of the manifesting world; it is maintenance and growth and preservation. 'Not-This-but-only-I,' is the withdrawing of the Self away from matter towards and into Itself; it is the gradual decay and dissolution of the outer body by the retirement of the consciousness which vivified it and held it together; it is the re-absorption, the pralaya, the death and destruction of the world-system, microcosm or macrocosm. This note should be read in connexion with the previous notes, at pp. 22 and 117 and may then help to show that the ringing of changes on the Logion with alterations of emphasis and order of the words brings out new and important meanings, 'methods' and 'laws of nature.'
This-Not-I is sannyasa, wherein is gained
the full knowledge that the This is the I and
the I is the This and that apart from the
This the I is Nothing, or, in other words, that
the This alone is Nothing, and the I alone is
Nothing, and that only the combination of
the three in one is the Truth and the whole Truth.

So, too, with the castes. Aham-Etat-Na—this full knowledge makes the brahma. ‘I-This’—this much knowledge only
is the mark of the kshatriya, viz., that the
etat or ‘this’ world is protected by aham or
‘me’ alone, and that this protection is the duty
of aham, or myself. ‘This-Not’ constitutes
the vaishya; he knows that this world is
nothing and by that knowledge controls, vaish-
karoti, his senses. ‘I-Not’ makes the
shudra; he forbids all egoism to himself and
knows that all that really is is the true I, the

1 Brahma means ‘the knower of Brahma,’ the priest, the teacher, the scientist, the
literary worker, the educator; kshatriya, ‘the protector from wounds’ the soldier, administrator, officer, ruler; vaishya, ‘the
appropriate and distributor, or pervader and provider,’ the business man, the merchant, the agriculturist, the
nattie-owner; shudra, ‘the remover or driver
away of care and sorrow,’ the thoughtless, un-think-
ing server, himself free of care, the servant and
laborer. See note at pp. 50-51 supra.

one Self, and thus performs his selfless work of
serving all beings. Hence the saying that, by
following the dharma or duty of varna or
caste and ashrama or life-stage, man attains
to the knowledge of Brahman.

In whom this knowledge of Aham-Etat-Na
arises, for him is the joy of moksha. He
who knoweth this, knoweth Brahman; he
verily becometh Brahman. He knoweth the
essence of his own Self, he knoweth all as
him-Self. This is the sacred hearing, this
is the sacred thinking, this is the sacred
meditating, shravana, manasa and nidhy-
asana; this is memory, this is yoga, this is
the whole of action. He who knoweth this,
he alone is the performer of duty, he is
liberated, he is the true brahma; he
knoweth himself as dwelling in all, as embracing
all, as being all.

Achieved by the AUM, the ever Free,
Yet ever Void of freedom, Bound in bonds,
Devoid of yoga, One eternally,
And birth and union and death in one,
The Self, the Essence and Prime Truth of all,
The This, the ever-shifting scene spread round,
The Not, negating yet affirming all;
The Atom, yet pervading all the worlds.

1 This is the spelling in the text, not the modern
nidadhyasa.
The One, and yet the Many, Guṇa-less,
Yet source of all the Guṇas ever known,
The Secret of all secrets, the One Source
Of all Self-posed appearances of Self,
Self-proven, Formless, Formed of Itself,
Bṛhman, Supreme Necessity of all.