CHAPTER XXI.
THE MAIN PSYCHOLOGICAL FEATURES
OF THE JĪVĀTMA.

The reason why the Logion in terms of sound is so important for us.—The derivation therefrom of the three main constituents of the jīvātmā.—Cognition, desire and action.—The world-facts derived from these.—The order of succession of the three.—Their dual form, causal and effectual.—Special considerations as to desire.—Dual form of work, particular and universal.—Metaphysical negations.

It has been repeatedly declared before that the Logion is Brahma-Vākyā, ‘the utterance of Brāhma by Brahmā,’ and includes and expresses everything. The reason why this expression of Brāhma in terms of sound is so prominent with us is that in our world-system and at the present time, ākāśa is super-important and all-pervading, and the quality of ākāśa is sound. Otherwise, there are mahāt and budḍhī (in our own world-system) besides the recognised five elements, and subtler atoms and super-atoms endlessly.

1 The suggestion seems to be that these two in our own world-system and endless others in other
Out of the three words (i.e., the facts indicated by the words) of the Logion, now, we should see the derivation of cognition, desire and action.

The prātyābhasa, reflexion, mirroring, counter-appearance, picturing or imaging of the Aham in the Eta is cognition. The reflexion of the Eta in the Aham is kriyā.1

systems, have special sāsanā qualities also, (just as a kāshā has sound, vāyu touch, agni visibility, and so on), though with us, and just at this stage, they are serving as substrata or vehicles for certain ‘inner’ or ‘subjective’ processes principally.

1 Compare pp. 243 and 265, etc., of The Science of Peace. The descriptions there, of cognition and action, seem exactly to have changed places as compared with the descriptions here. On closer examination, it is possible to explain away the apparent difference (see p. 268 of The Science of Peace). One more or less current metaphysical view is that “I can know only my own self, perceive only my own conditions, modifications of consciousness, etc.” There is an element of exaggeration with an element of truth in this. The exaggeration consists in the word ‘only,’ for what is the significance of the words ‘my own self’ ‘my own conditions,’ etc., without a reference to something else other than my own; and if there is such a tacit reference to and distinction from ‘else than my own’ involved in the statement, does not the statement approxi-
asmi, I-this-not-am, makes up the samāhāra, summation, by the use of the verb as, 'to be', which is part of the perceiving self; the aural object, a vibration of the tympanum; a gustatory object, an ensalviation of the papillae of the tongue and so on. And this process is repeated in the subtler bodies as the centre of consciousness recedes inwards. Concrete thinking is shapings of mindstuff, mental matter. In this sense, it may well be said that the nature of the aham, its subjective quality, must be reflected in, be imposed on, the etat, in order that cognition may arise—and cognition of another, an object, and not only of 'my own states'.

So, on the other hand, it may well be said that the definite picturing of the etat in one's own mind, that is to say, of the objective state of things that is desired to be produced, before beginning to realise it in matter, is the subjective aspect of kriya, the reflection of the etat in the I.

This may suggest one way of 'bridging the gulf' between consciousness (in the sense of mind) and matter, of retaining the two as distinct and yet reducing them into terms of each other; in other words, in accordance with the nature of the Logos, all experienced, and therefore all thinking also, is but one or the other of two and only two ways of self-seeing, viz., either 'I am this' or 'I am not this'; no living being looks at any the most intimate object except in terms of 'mine and thine', i.e., as part of some self or other; there is nowhere

In other words, I-this is cognition, and This-I is action. Ittham and evam, 'such' and 'thus', have place here. There is no conjunction with another so long as there are no 'such' and 'thus'. 'I' can enter into another only by some prakāra, method. Without a method, entry is impossible. And the method is 'such' or 'thus'. For this reason, then, viz., that kriya is a matter of yoga, conjunction, and conjunction is possible only by a means, a device, is it said that the reflexion of Etaṭ in Aham is (the device which produces) kriya.

The appearance of the union of Aham and Etaṭ is (their mutual) negation, and that is a pure opposition only of subject and object; mind and matter are never separate, but only distinguishable. Of course, the real and final bridging is done only when the Logion 'negates' matter as such and makes it a mere 'supposition' of Consciousness something whose very substance is 'imagination' or thought.

Matter is really non-existent from the standpoint of observation. It consists merely of holes in ether (see Occult Chemistry, Appendix on 'Ether of Space'), maintained by the will of the Logos, and if He withdraws this will, matter vanishes, every form of it being ultimately reducible to these holes. Modern science is beginning to reach after this idea, sometimes speaking of matter as 'spaces', sometimes as 'strains'. [A. B.]
desire. The Scripture says: Whatever is like, similar or equal to another, that desires that other. ‘May I be synthesised, co-ordinated, related, united with that other.’

The permutations and combinations of these three, cognition, desire and action, take place in Accordance with (i.e., in terms of) time, space and substance.

1 It is obvious that desire is that which ‘brings together’ and unites subject and object, more or less changing or ‘negating’ the original character of each, which, among other reasons, is why it is characterised as ‘negation.’

2 Compare the English expressions ‘I like this’ and ‘I do not like, or I dislike this’ and ‘This is not like him to do so or so,’ and the current Sanskrit saying, समानानेत्रत्रत्तापशीच्यं सत्यं, ‘Friendships arise between persons of like tastes and temperaments.’ This is exactly the ‘paradoxical’ nature of Desire. It is affirmative as well as negative. I ‘like’ what is more or less ‘like’ me, is to my taste; yet at the same time I ‘want,’ is proof that I am ‘not’ content with exactly what I am; I ‘want’ to be something else, something more than, I am; and when I am that else, then I shall ‘negate’ that also and want something else again, endlessly.

The Prāṇya-Vāda nowhere definitely assigns the triplet of time, space and motion, to the negation in the same way as it does sāt-chiṣ-
Out of these facts arise such pairs as ‘actor and inspirer,’ ‘employer and employed;’ and the facts are universal and common to all time. If activity were minutely recorded from the very beginning of the viniihiata-cycle and down to the present moment, even then nothing new in principle or radically different from these processes that we observe around us to-day would be discovered. But, of course, the concrete detail differs within individual and each act of each individual, so that each cognition and each action may be said to be unique, in one sense.

Further, out of these same facts arise necessarily the periodic growth and decay, contraction and expansion, of everything in the World-process, with an intervening appearance of stability, permanence, unchangingness, that reflects or imitates the state of Brāhma. And this periodicity extends endlessly in time and ranges over all possible scales. For the All never begins at one time; nor ever ends at one time. Only limited beginnings, begin-nings of limited things and worlds, take place at particular times, in particular places, and

to M, in the triplet of substance-quality-action; but in the triplet of space-time-motion, motion corresponds to M, all three being sub-divisions and attributes of the higher M.

are matched by similarly limited endings. Whatever has a beginning must necessarily have an end also.

In this wise may the essential nature and bearings of kriyā be ascertained. But as to desire, because it is the foundation of all and inheres in all, and is of the nature of negation, because it involves reciprocity, mutual dependence (and circular definitions), therefore is it hinted or even declared expressly that it is not fit object for knowledge (in a sense; for in that sense it is ‘unreason,’ the opposite of reason; the impelling force that throws out of balance, out of equilibrium, whereas reason restores just proportion and equilibrium; but of course desire is as much object or part and aspect of consciousness as knowledge and activity). It is true that desire is stated to arise from knowledge, but that statement has reference to the effect-form of desire. In its causal form, it is behind (particular) knowledge (of the nature of effect), for without (the vague, general, desire to know, there can be no knowledge, as is made clear in the Abhava.\(^1\) Nor is desire the object of itself, *i.e.*, of desire,

\(^{1}\) Said by Pandiṣṭ Dhammāja to be the name of a Bhāṣya or commentary by Bhāskara on the real Brāhma-sūtras (ten thousand in number, the current being only five hundred and fifty-five).

To the argument itself, it may be replied, in
any more than it is of knowledge. (We do not desire desires). When we say we know desires, we only mean we feel desires, are aware of desiring, in the same sense in which we are aware of knowing and of acting. Such awareness is pure consciousness, or self-consciousness, which includes all three aspects and cannot be particularly identified with any one only.

Work is dual, (1) partial, (personal), relating to a part, and (2) general, (impersonal), relating to the Whole, or a whole. By practice of the former, in course of time, the nature of and the capacity for the performance of the latter is learnt and acquired. And this is the proper fruit of the knowledge of Brahma.

But in reality,

I am not either space, or time, or motion,
Nor here, nor there, nor home, nor lands unknown,

Nor known of script, nor missed of ignorance,
Nor co-existence, nor successiveness,
Nor action, nor cognition, nor desire,
Nor both nor all at once, nor one by one,
But am I ever One, and One Alone.