SECTION III. (Continued.)
CHAPTER XIX.
THE JIVAṬMĀ.

The jivaṭmā is a compound of I and Not-I.— Etymological significance.—Its main characteristics.—Atomicity and continuity.—Embodiment of oppositions and contradictions.—Its psychological stages: nescience, science, omniscience.—Its grades, one within another; endlessly.—Progress and regress, evolution, etc., the reflexion of the simultaneous All in the successive.—Philological illustrations.—The origin of I, You and He.—Correspondences of various deities, hierarchical and divine Powers and Intelligences, with various letters of the alphabet.

The jivaṭmā is a mixture of ‘portions’ of the I and the This. That wherein the Ātman, the Self, plays, jivaṭ, kr̥ṣṭi—that is the jivaṭmā. This jivaṭmā is the reflexion, the image, the praṭi-bimba of the Ishvara who is the sūtraṭmā. It is true that the jivaṭmā is declared to be Brahma also. But this is so only when it has achieved knowledge of its Self, when it knows the essential and true and whole nature and character of the World-process, the I, the This, the Becoming, the To-Be, etc. Then difference between jivaṭ-

mā, Praṭyagaṭmā, sūtraṭmā, Para-
mātmā, anu, paramānu, etc., ceases; all merge into Brahma. An element of Na, the Negation, is also present in the jivaṭmā, working within the elements of I and This, as the Brahma-sūtra says. It is because of this that we see existence and non-existence, birth and death, succeeding one another, in it. This jivaṭmā is an anu, an atom, and also partless, at the same time. Its atomicity is praṇyaक्षन, ‘before the eye,’ patent; and it may be said, in consequence, that it is impossible for it to be partless; yet this partlessness belongs to it by virtue of its Ātmanature. This-ness, cetaṭva, is nothing else

1 It will be noticed that some of these words are commenced with capitals and others with small letters, although in this context all signify principles. The reason is that some of the words mean only principles, and are always used in the singular number only; these begin with capitals. The others indicate principles as well as concrete embodiments, and occur in the plural number too.

2 This is another of those frequent instances in which the work draws, from certain data, conclusions exactly the reverse of those that might be expected, prima facie, by the insert reader! The reason is, of course, that the author sees, in the data, elements which the unprepared reader does not. “Everything contains within itself its own
than the opposite of the unity of the I. This opposition is a matter of the Necessity of the Sva-bhāva of the I. Because of it the Universal I acquires and puts on individuality. ‘I’ is or am one I; ‘You’ is or are another I; ‘He’ is another I. And so on, endlessly. Because each I, as I, is a continuum, an unbreakable thread or line of consciousness, the jīvātmā is partless and indivisible. Because, on the other hand, etat is the opposite of unity, there arises in it atomicity, limitation, parts. Atomicity is the embodiment of the opposition between Ahām and Etaṭ.

It must be remembered, however, that ‘opposition,’ ‘an opposite,’ cannot really arise in the Full and the Eternal. It is only hypothesised, postulated, imagined, fancied, dreamed, supposed, assumed for the moment, for purposes of argument, so to say, only in order to be the more effectually refuted, negated, abolished, proved to be non-existent. Duality is a necessary hypothesis within the One, for the sole and very purpose of emphasising the Oneness opposite”—this is the governing law of logic and thought, and of fact and the whole World-process. The ‘reconciliation’ of the ‘paradox’ in the text is that the indivisibility of the atom is comparative, relative to one world-system, plane, etc., no concrete particular atom being really absolutely and finally indivisible.

of the One, in and by and through its, the duality’s, own refutation and repudiation.

We see in the jīvātmā pleasure and pain, joy and sorrow, also that it is born, lives, dies. But all this is illusion, bhrāma. The act called birth and the power of achieving it; the act called death and the power of achieving it; the act called living and the power of achieving it—all these are in the One Paramātmā. How do these variations arise? Thus:¹ It knows Itself as partless, conditionless, universal, transcendent; and It says to Itself, “I-This-Not.” Such is Its very Nature. As I, It is unborn, undying, unopposed, unopposable, One without a second. As Etaṭ, It is door, actor, sufferer, Many, diverse. As Not, It merges I and This into One or rather the Numberless. Thus indeed are all possible natures, characters, constitutions, and all power to do or not to do, or to do otherwise, already and always in the Supremo Self. Indeed the Paramātmā may be said to be the Totaity of all these Powers. (All these are simultaneous in the Absolute). The life of the jīvātmā is governed by this same Supreme

¹ The argument may not appear quite clear; it is put in very compressed form with steps omitted. If the reader is interested in entering into the subject fully, he may perhaps find it useful to look through pp. 125, 126 et seq. of The Science of Peace.
Notion, I-This-Not (in the succession of its parts, however). As alpa-jña, ‘little-knower,’
(at first, when identifying itself with an etat)
it thinks and believes to itself, “(I am mineral; I
am plant; I am animal; I am human); I am glad;
I am sad; I am good; I am virtuous; I am poor;
I am nothing at all;” etc. This is the condition
of ajñāna, non-knowledge. Dissipating
this error, this non-science, and producing
jñāna, knowledge, science, there arises, (in
the second half of the jīva’s life, when it
begins to apply and realise the Not to and in
the This) the reflexion: “All this world-hap-
pening is by Nature, by Necessity; I am nothing;
thou art nothing; there is nothing mine or thine
or another’s; there is no difference between
me, thee and another; all are and is One I”.

(The first stage of the jīvātmā has been
described as that of the alpa-jña, the little-
knower, of ajñāna, ignorance; and the
second stage, by contrast, as of jñāna, knowl-
dge, science. Is this science equal to omni-
sience, then?) In the strict sense, the jīvātmā,
as such, must be always alpa-jña, ‘little-knowing,’ and only the Paramātmā, all-knowing.
In the latter only is present the Whole of the I and the Whole of the This; never in any one jīvātmā. (But, generally
speaking, so far as the jīvātmā is and realises

itsel itself as Paramātmā, it takes on the poten-
tial omniscience belonging to the latter.)

For this same reason, from another standpoint
and in another aspect, it appears and happens
that what is eternal, simultaneously all-includ-
ing, ever-present, immediate knowledge in the
universal Paramātmā, unfolds as time-
governed, successive, and partial memory in the
jīvātmā.

This opposition and non-opposition, virodha
and avirodha (separation and identification
between I and This) is an endless process. We
find here the root, the seed, the germ and primal
principle of all anavaśthā, ‘non-finality,’
progressus et regressus ad infinitum. There are
atoms within worlds, and worlds within atoms,
pseudo-infinity, in Space. And within each
atom ever goes on the process, first, ‘I (am) this’
and then ‘(I am) not (this).

Yet again, every jīva has to work out and
realise this Idea of the Logos, I-This-Not, in
every atom, which is another source of yet
another pseudo-infinity (in Time).

Yet again (because there are jīvātmās
within higher or larger jīvātmās, i.e.,
sūtraśītām, we have knowledge within
knowledge, memory of memory, word inside
word, dialect through dialect, language out of

1 See Fournier’s *Two New Worlds*, (1908).
language, meaning hiding meaning—and so on, endlessly (in Motion), an infinity of infinites.

All this regulation and demarcation of time and space that we see, the divisions into cycles and orbits, and yugas and manvantaras and mahamanvantaras—all this is only from the standpoint of the successive, of single world-systems only.

In verity, there is no succession and no number, but only the One, Ever-present, Universal Thought everywhere; and truly is each and every jīvātmā eternally seated, omnipresently, in all samsāras. Only when it believes itself limited, does it endeavor to progress step by step by expanding its knowledge, its consciousness, little by little.

Ever and everywhere and every way, in every point of time and space, in every atom, shines the Self. Nothing is anywhere without the Self, dead, uninspired by It. And thus, again, we see there is no difference. The ‘you’ is ‘I,’ and the ‘I,’ ‘you.’ Whatever even hints at any separateness is but mere words that passingly deal with the possibility of a break in the Self’s unity.

(An illustration of how the idea works out in the science of sound-language, grammar, may be given). The pronoun Āsmaṭ means Ātmā; Uśhmaṭ is the Bṛhaṭ born from it (in modern

Samskr̥ta, Yuśhmaṭ, because of the inclusion of the letter ‘I,’ signifying Shākti, in it, I-Uśhmaṭ becoming Yuśhmaṭ by the rules of coalescence). (The letter) ‘I’ is the Necessity that stands between the two, with a special abode in the Bṛhaṭ. Hence there is a coalescence between the ‘I’ and ‘U’-śhmaṭ. But, then, why is not this fact brought out in the constitution and ‘appearance’ or form of the sacred sound, AUM, itself? Because, in the ultimate reality, Necessity belongs to and is hidden in the All, and not attached to any one of the Three in particular. Hence, the Veda-grammar, Praṇāthākhyayu, separates the ‘I’ out of both A and U. (The peculiar manner in which the ‘I’ is included in the AUM brings out the underlying principles of metaphysis.) अ, A, followed by ॐ, I, coalesces with it into त, थ. That followed by ॐ, U, merges with it into अ, य. But here the अ, य, disappears in accordance with the rules of Veda-grammar and leaves behind only the अ, य, again, and this

1 If the reader remembers Pandit Dhanaraja’s early doubts and queries as to why the Samskr̥ta alphabet was arranged as it was in Pāṇini’s Sūtras, he will find here an illustration of the kind of answer needed. The paragraph in the text explains why the first aphorism should run in the order it does. The reader may consult the Sūtra-sāstra-vimarshini.
merges with the succeeding, \( \text{AUM} \), into \( O \); so that \( \text{AUM} \) is pronounced as \( \text{OM} \). It is true that, ordinarily, a second coalescence does not take place after a \( lop \)a, disappearance, of a letter; but this rule applies to secular speech, not \( \text{vaidika} \), scriptural.

With reference to such etymological considerations as these has it been said that \( \text{A} \) is \( \text{Vishnu} \), 'I' is \( \text{Shaũkara} \), \( \text{U} \) is \( \text{Brahma} \) and \( \text{M} \) the Negation of all. Here 'I' is declared to be \( \text{Shiva} \) only because \( \text{Shiva} \) is connected with \( \text{Ichchha} \), desire, which is \( \text{Shaũkta} \). Elsewhere, \( \text{A} \) is \( \text{Atma} \), \( \text{jñana} \), cognition, high and low; 'I' is \( \text{Shaũkta} \); \( \text{U} \) is all \( \text{kriya} \) over which \( \text{Brahma} \) presides; while \( \text{Shaũkara} \) is \( \text{M} \). As the four letters \( \text{A}, \text{U}, \text{M} \) and \( \text{I} \) have been here successively shown to be present in the \( \text{AUM} \), so the \( \text{Kalpa-Vyakaranas} \), Encyclopaedic Grammars (?) systematically explain and derive all letters, all words, and all 'meanings' and concepts out of the \( \text{AUM} \); and the \( \text{Shilpas} \), practical sciences or arts, expound all substances or \( \text{padarthas} \), and their actions, activities, movements, functions and all natural processes too, as derived from it. Truly is the \( \text{AUM} \) all-

Thus, if we had these old works, we would probably find that the manifestation of the 'I' after the 'A'; their coalescence into \( E \); then the manifestation of \( U \); and their coalescence into \( AY \); then the dis-

appearance of the \( Y \), etc., etc., all corresponded with stages and formations and lapses, etc., in the processes of embryological and cosmological development and evolution, on the microcosmic and macrocosmic scales. And so with all the letters. (See the Introduction to the \( \text{Bhagavad-Gita} \), by \( \text{Annie Besant \& Bhagavan Dasi} \), and the Science of Peace, pp. 100-101).