cause of the birth of vāyu from ākāsha, and of the origin of everything else successively, may be learnt from the Yajur.

The essence of kriyā is the ‘existence’ of the Eta in the I; first the identification, ‘I am This, and This, and This,’ and again the separation, ‘(I am) Not This, nor This, nor This, etc.’ It appears as the birth, preservation and dissolution of everything. These three are mutually cause and effect. Without any one of these the others are impossible. And hence they are always changing places, i.e., may be described in terms of each other. Death is also but a birth, for everything is indestructible and only changes form, so that death is the birth, the taking on of a new form, even as birth is the death of an old form. Maintenance is also birth, in a similar way; for it depends on birth, and birth is momentary, so that maintenance is a continuous series of births.

In kriyā also, as in jñāna, by combinations with jñāna etc., there arise twenty-four kinds.¹

The essence and truth of kāma, active desire, creative love, is also to be found here, in the Yajur-veda, by the combination, sāmārīvara-

¹ Or, in still later though as yet more unsettled and doubtful language, out of the primary elements

³ See p. 125 supra.
Ṭaṇa (?), of jñāna (with kriyā?, because of kriyā's coupling with jñāna?).

Thus are birth, maintenance and death and their summation all included here, and each being sub-divided into ten (?) we have the forty chapters of the Yajur.

In each atom do we observe incessant kriyā; it is the one means of accomplishing anything and everything. Hence it is necessary to study the nature of action as connected with desire, cognition and the summation.

Even after attaining mokṣha, work has to be done. From the point of view of transcendence and endlessness, none is bound and none free. True, it is said that such and such action should be done for the sake of mokṣha (the implication being that after mokṣha there is no more action to do). But this (in the outer sense) refers only to some particular condition from which specially is mokṣha or freedom to be gained. The inner significance of the counsel is that action should be performed always and in such a manner that universal mokṣha, eternal bliss, may be enjoyed always. To know that this is so is itself mokṣha; it is itself bliss. This constant restlessness and trouble of mind that we suffer from, viz., if I do so, such will be the result, I have omitted to do this, I am doing this, I have done this, etc. — to enable

jīvas to escape from this constant harassed is the one aim of all counsel. All is to happen, all will be done, and all will result therefrom, I have done everything, I am doing everything; all has been and is being and will be accomplished by ma, all is necessary, all is certain, nothing is done by the limited me or thee or another, I and thou and another are nothing, what thou art that same am I and another is the same too, all is done by all—this realisation itself is mokṣha and bliss.

Thus, then, action, motion or movement, is a transcendental fact belonging to all time, and mokṣha is not something separate by itself which may be left behind after eliminating all other things. It is rather an all-pervading fact, immanent and included and concealed inseparably within the process of the world, stretching everywhere, in all ways and in all time.

So long as the jīva does not attain universality, so long as it does not realise its own universality, the identity of its individual with the universal consciousness, so long it does not attain contentment; and so long as it does not attain contentment it cannot become free from joy and sorrow. It may be said that universality is something transcendent and beyond time, and hence the attainment of such peace and contentment, within time, at some time, is im-

1 See Bhagavad-Gītā, iii, 19, 20.
possible. But even this knowledge itself is based on contentment (i.e., the impossibility of contentment within time is not realised till the contentment beyond time has been touched, felt, sensed, by the self turning inwards and contrasting its own ever-abiding universality with the limitedness of all particulars).

One hears it said: 'This man is content; he is at rest; he has ceased from action; his business is finished; his work is done'. The meaning of contentment here is but this, viz., that that jīva possesses the knowledge that this World-process is endless and beginningless, past knowing (in completeness of details) and yet not past knowing (in all-comprehensiveness of universal law); that there is no real gain or loss, no honor or dishonor, nothing attained or unattained; that all that occurs is predestined from and for all time. Ceasing from action, again, is but ceasing from the belief that the result, the fruit, of action is for me or thee or another. Otherwise, indeed, action, motion, is a ceaseless fact.¹

¹In other words, whatever appearance of truth there is in the remark that is made from time to time by an individual as regards another individual, 'This man is content; he is at rest; he has retired from the worry and bother of incessant activity, (which is inseparable from the personal feeling), i.e., has nothing more to do, has achieved the end he had set before himself for the time,' is in reality a reflection, in the limited, of the real truth of the universal, that the Self is ever blissful, having nothing to do, at any time, being always Full and Complete and Wantless.

¹Current Samskṛt philosophical literature does not recognise the distinctions which follow in the text; it only distinguishes the jīva-n-mukta, 'one who is free while still in the body,' and viñeha-mukta, the same after the body has fallen away.
also is a mukta and his technical designation is vimukta; for even though he does not know the element of Bta or Samsara, still he knows it by implication, because he knows the nexus, even though he knows that nexus as the most important; and he also is free from doubt in his own way, having, for the time being, resolved all into Nothing. Finally, he who knows only this, viz., that I am or is Brahman, that the Atma alone is Brahman, and the Anatma nothing—he also is a mukta for similar reasons. But the non-recognition of the fact that the Anatma cannot stand without the Atma is the deficiency, the lack of completeness of knowledge (in all these cases, which lack ultimately creates doubts again and destroys the insufficiently grounded freedom therefrom). Free from all such defect is the triune unity-in-separateness of the Self, the Not-Self and the Negation, and he who knows this is the jivita-mukta.

It may be questioned how, when the three are declared to be inseparable and triune, is it possible to know any one of them singly and by itself and attain moksha thereby. The answer is that because knowledge falls within the law of succession, this appearance of successive knowledge of one only at a time does take place as a fact; and as all the trinity is Brahman, the knowledge of any one may also not improperly be said to be knowledge of Brahman and so to constitute moksha. The consequence is that all jivas may be regarded as baddha, bound, all as mukta, free, all as sidhi, perfect, indifferently and simultaneously.  

Like the distinctions of jivita-mukta, vimukta, and mukta, there are other dis-

1 This is only another illustration and application of the fact and law of the continuum, the inseparability, of all things and conditions. The ordinary intelligence, 'understanding' as it is called by some of the German philosophers, corresponding to the manas of the Nyaya instinctively endeavors to separate, to analyse and divide and distinguish, to grasp only one thing at a time, to cut off objects from each other as with a razor. But this is impossible; there is no such division and separation in the World-process; it is emphatically a continuum; and the baddha, the reason, recognises this higher fact and synthesises accordingly. The lower mind wishes to tear apart the abstract and the concrete, universal and particular, back and front; it is the very principle of the particular, the concrete, the separate; it is the false self, the self as identified with a this; its one yearning and craving and straining is to delimit, to define, to impatiently and discontentedly and incessantly ask:

But what is the universal, the abstract, the pure Self? I do not recognise what it is; give me something tangible; what you say is mere words,
tinctions too, e.g., mahaṭ mā, sā ṣā ṝu, yogī, yogoshvara, sāntu, praviṣhta, siddha, paraṃ-siddha, etc. These appellations mark definite stages of attainment in an indefinitely progressive series, according to the grade of knowledge, and of cessation from ahaṅkāra, i.e., the personal feeling of initia-

cere air! It will not see that the universal, the abstract, the pure Self cannot be explained to it in terms of the senses, as ‘It is this that you can see and touch and taste, etc.,’ without losing its character of universality and abstractness. The reason recognises that such pure Self is, as a fact and as a law, indeed as the fact of all facts and the law of all laws, as the very principle of connexion between all discrete facts; it recognises that universality is present, immanent, in all ‘particulars;’ that without this inadmible, intangible, invisible, untasteable, unsmellable element of continuity, the audible, the tangible, the visible, the tasteable, the smellable would have no mutual connexion, no coherence, no meaning; it sees that this whole everlasting World-process itself is one continuous, ever-renewed and ever-futile effort to define the abstract Self in terms of the concrete Not-Self. If we thoroughly realise this fact, then such paradoxical-looking statements of the Prapāvā-vāda,—and they are very frequent—as that all jīvas are bound as well as free, that freedom may be gained by realising only one even of the three factors of Brahman, etc., become intelligible.

There are four principal sub-divisions under mokṣha, viz., sālokya, sāyojya, sāmīpya, and sā rápya, based on (the nature of the) kriyā (belonging to each). Sālokya is of the nature of samsāra, connected with U; the ‘realisation’ corresponding to it is, ‘with the world’, i.e., that there is nothing outside the loka, the world. Sāyojya, again, is knowledge including both the Self and the Not-Self; this samsāra exists, surely, but it does so in conjunction with the Aṭmā; it implies that the Self and the Not-Self, A and U, are both accepted as mutually inseparable from and dependent on each other. As the sālokya-mukta, believing in the Aṇāṭmā only, labours under the defect of not knowing the Self and the Nexus, so the sāyuṣya-mukta, believing in the Self and the Not-self, suffers from the deficiency of not knowing the Nexus. Sā rápya is connected with name and form; with the Self, the Not-Self and the Negation; it is based on the M, on the svarūpa of the AUM, (i.e., its form and not its real significance).

1 The spelling in the Prapāvā-vāda is sāyojya, and not sāyuṣya, as now-a-days. Bhaṭṭacaryya-Purāṇa, III, iv, ch. 7, has the spelling sāyojya.
Sāmīpya, ‘nearness’, ‘approximation,’ is the unity of all three. With reference to the transcendental, only an endless approximation is possible. It is true that in a certain sense even an atom is muktā, a trinity possessing sālokya, sāyoja, and sāmīpya, and based on the AUM; yet, because the universal AUM is transcendental, the definite and particular atom can make only an incessant and endless approximation to it. Because all are small and all are great comparatively, from the standpoint of Mahā-Viśṇu an atom is only approximate to muktī; and so too is Mahā-Viśṇu, from the point of view of another higher being, also only approximately muktā. This gradation extends endlessly. Sāmīpya is the true mokṣaḥ; he who has achieved it is the jīvātmā-muktā; it is born of perfect achievement, sarva-siddhi-jā.

It is said sometimes that sālokya is the first and sārūpya the last and highest kind of mukti; but the true fact is that from the standpoint of samsāra, sālokya comes first; then,

1 Compare the expression in The Secret Doctrine ‘the great day, Be-with-us’ and the Samskṛta word upāsadā, ‘sitting near,’ ‘waiting or attending on,’ commonly used to mean worship. See also Light on the Path, “It is beyond you, because it for ever recedes. You will enter the light, but you will never touch the flame.”

by recognition of the Self, sāyoja, wherein are combined both Self and Not-Self; and the third is sārūpya which implies that the Self and the Not-Self are ‘one-formed’ or one. From the standpoint of sārūpya, all is ‘similarity,’ same-formed-ness; all is free and all is bound, etc., and hence, in a way, sārūpya is capable of being regarded as the highest. But beyond that is the sāmīpya which includes all the trinity, viz., the Self and the Not-Self and the Nexus between them. The triune AUM itself is sāmīpya including the other three. The four together are Brahman in which the jiva merges.

‘Merged’ in Brahman, līna, here means nothing more nor less than the clear realisation that the I is the Other, the Other is the I, and that the I and the Other, in the relation of Negation, are the Supreme; all appearance of separateness being the illusion of imagination, to the removal of which all endeavour is directed, as taught by the shāstras.

1 That is to say, the consciousness in this condition is a consciousness which does not make distinction between Self and Not-Self, regarding both as not only inseparable but the same. In this sense it promotes the sense of unity; but—without clear and correct knowledge of the circumstances; the consciousness of unity here is confused, vague, non-discriminative. In the last there is clear knowledge of the unity in diversity.
Sāmīpya, as the highest knowledge, is nirguna and beyond time, space and motion, while the other three forms of mukti are saguna and within space, etc. In this highest state only dwell all true brāhmaṇas, etc. It is the fruit of all sciences and all actions; and all actions and all sciences are the fruits of it. In it is no pleasure and no pain, no joy and no sorrow, but ever unsullied purity and the necessity of all things.

The atom of a system regards the Mahā-Viṣṇu of that system as the limit of achievement. So, too, the Mahā-Viṣṇu regards some one else, some other being, as such limit. The achievements of such limited goals are called the achievement of sāyoja-mukti, freedom of the nature of identification with the being who marks the limit. But sāmīpya is the universal, all-supporting and timeless consciousness expressed by the Logion, that includes all Self and all Other-than-Self.  

1 These remarks help us to understand the element of truth that there also is in the current interpretations of the various kinds of mukti. According to these, sālokyā means attaining to and residing in the same world as the deity who has been made the ideal and the object of devotion; sāmīpya means constant nearness to and attendance on him; sārupya is attaining to his form and appearance; while sāyuja is emergence in and identity with

him. Sometimes a fifth kind is added to these four, viz., Sārṣṭi, sameness of powers with the object of devotion. If the law of analogy is true, illustrations should be found in the surroundings of the physical plane familiar to us, of the facts of the subtlest plane that we can think and talk about—for the subtlest planes are here, interpenetrating the familiar physical, and are not things far distant and unapproachable. Accordingly, we may endeavour to bring these kinds of deliverance a little nearer home to ourselves by thinking of the case of an ambitious human aspirant who gradually succeeds in (i) obtaining access to the precincts within which the sovereign of his country resides, (ii) becoming one of his court, his entourage, and donning his uniform, (iii) becoming his confidential advisor and co-worker, (iv) becoming one of his family, by marriage, etc., (v) occasionally officiating for him and exercising his functions. If we substitute for the greater mutual resistance and exclusion of physical bodies, the greater intercommunication of subtler ones,—comets’ tails are known to science to pass through each other—; for the intense egoism of the lower bodies, the greater ‘universalism’ of the buddhis and higher bodies; the prevalence of love—such as makes the ‘many’ billions of separate living cells ‘one’ single organic individual—over the separateness, the hate, that breaks up joint families into pieces; then we may have a fair working idea of what various grades of moksha are in the technical ‘superphysical’ sense, as distinguished from the metaphysical one
of 'freedom from doubt and consequent utter peace of mind'.

The theosophical student will probably be able to trace correspondences between the various 'technical' kinds of mukti mentioned here, (viz. Jivan-mukti, viđe ha-mukti, vimukti, etc., and sa loka ya, etc., considered independently, or as sub-divisions of jivan-mukti, etc.) and the various stages of superphysical achievement and existence mentioned in the other religions, e.g., arhaṭ, aṣekha, buḍḍha, pacheka-buḍḍha, nir māya-kāya, sambho ga-kāya, dharma-kāya, etc., in Buḍḍhism; 'glory,' 'beatitude,' etc., in Christianity; mera j in Islām—and so on.