facts are overpoweringly dominated by and enveloped in the Negation. (It should be remembered that argument and analogy are also all ultimately founded on and start from a basis of some pratyaksha, some sensuous fact, or other.)

Because the human is entitled, as well as subject, to karma and phala in the special sense, therefore is the direction or advice given to him to strive after, to achieve, Brahaman.

Human karma may be sub-divided into two kinds: (1) the (self-seeking) karma that binds, (2) the (self-sacrificing) karma that frees. The former is all action done with the consciousness of and tending to strengthen further the connexion between the I and the This; the latter is that which is performed under the consciousness of the Negation. In other words, the one is performed under the consciousness of the separateness of jiva, each being regarded as indissolubly connected with its upadhi or enveloping sheath; the other is performed with the consciousness of the Oneness of all.

From one standpoint, that of effectiveness or the successful achievement of the purpose immediately aimed at, either of these two kinds may be sub-divided further into (1) exactly appropriate or yukt, (2) inappropriate or a-yukt, (3) helpful orupa-yukt. But a far more important sub-division for practical, i.e., ethical, purposes is that already briefly alluded to before, viz., of the karma that binds into (1) pada or sin, corresponding to U and (2) punya or merit, corresponding to A, the third of the triplet being (3) the karya or duty that frees, corresponding with M. In terms of the legion, I-This-I is punya, This-I-This is pada, and Not-This-I is moksha.

The consequence of punya or meritorious action is sukha, pleasure, joy or happiness, to the actor; whereas that of pada or sin is dukkha, pain, sorrow or misery. Ordinarily of course pleasure and pain, joy and sorrow, are opposed to each other, as much as sin and merit; but, in the ultimate essence, they are forms or transformations of each other, even as sin and merit are; by the metaphysical law, each hides its opposite within itself, and is therefore in a sense identical with it. This may be inferred from the fact that the very same circumstances that are pleasurable to one person at any one time are painful to another person at that same time and again painful to that same person at another time. The explanation of all this is to be found in the fact of the underlying unity of the Self, temporarily broken up by the manyness of the bodies. The jiva.
that gives a pleasure to another jīva gives the pleasure to himself; so the pain also, which he gives to another, he gives in reality to himself; and therefore the pleasure and the pain come back to him at a later time. These very facts of the Unity of the I, and the identification of the I and the This, and the This and the I, are the reason why there is a reaction to every action.¹

But how is it possible for the Self ever to find any satisfaction in giving pain to itself, and how, therefore, do any evil actions take place at all? How should the Self even bear the sight, the thought, of pain to itself, much less cause it?

¹ The carrying out of this metaphysical law in terms of matter is effected, it would seem, by means of the registration in the superphysical bodies corresponding with the supraliminal consciousness, of the parties concerned, of their mutual debts and assets and the readjustment of the latter, from the Central Chief Court in the heart of the Sun, (the Hiranyagarbha, the Ruler of our System, whose Individuality unifies us all, as cells in an individual organism), or corresponding lower centres in the various planets (like the nerve-ganglia whence reflex action takes place—the brain being the overlord of them all—as our Yama, judge of souls, is a son of the Sun) by means of a special class of rays, rashmi, referred to in the Upamāṅgas. (See the commentary called Paramārtha-prapā, by Śrīya Daivajña on the Bhagavad-Gītā).

Should not compassion and sweet sympathy alone prevail everywhere, in all circumstances? True; but it is just because and when the Self is excessively identified with a sheath, a body, a piece of the Not-Self, and therefore loses the consciousness of its unity with all jīvas and regards itself as separate from them, that hate and selfishness and sin arise; such a self feels that its pleasures can be secured only by snatching from, and not derived by sharing with, others; to it the pain of another is a means to its own pleasure. It is such jīvas, when at the climax of their egoism, that are described as “the asaj-jīna, dur-jīna, who by their causeless hatred are a source of terror to all beings, and in whose mouth the cruel and injurious word of evil power ever dwells, as venom in the fang of the serpent”.

The excessive predominance of the This, the body, is the general cause of the nature becoming so full of hate that special causes are no longer needed to excite it; this is the significance of the adjective causeless here. But even such natures are not wholly bereft and abandoned of the benignity of the Self. For have they not also friends amongst congenial jīvas? It is true that because of their trustless and untrustworthy nature they make no friends amongst the good men, and the
world at large regards them as unfriendly; but evil men are the friends of evil men, for
the fulfilment of each other's needs; and though the mutual help and association be for nefarious
purposes only, yet, still, as mutual help and association it indicates that ruling majesty, that
gracious mercy, of the Self which alone makes human life and intercourse, indeed any life, possi-
ble, and transmutes evil into good. For, surely, so far as evil men help each other they are good
to each other. On the other hand, the This, the Not-Self, too, will not be ignored, and as the Self
produces good out of all evil things, so this creates a semblance of evil in the good.
Thus the men whom the world recognises as good
men, the ṛṣhis, māhā-ṛṣhis, munīs, brāhma-
maṇas, etc., have to set themselves against
the evil ones and thwart their wishes and cause them pain, regarding them as separate; so that
to the evil the good behave as evil. So, again,
if a physician, in endeavoring to cure a patient,
administers in good faith a medicine which un-
fortunately happens to have too strong an effect
and to kill him, the physician incurs no sin
although he has given pain, but rather gains puṇya because of his endeavor to cure. On
the other hand, to give food to those who have
already eaten their fill is in reality an act of sin
though apparently one of charity. Yet again,
no person dies till his time comes in accordance
with his own past karmas, but if he should die
by the deliberate act of another, be slain wrong-
fully by another, though that slaying be in
accordance with that karma, yet that other
will have incurred sin also. Natural death is
called māṇa, unnatural death hāna. The difference between the two is simply this, that the one is brought about by subtle and
less-known causes, and the other by gross and
known ones. To take one more instance: tears
overflow out of the excess of joy as well as sorrow.
In the one case the pity is for others who are
not so happy as ourselves and with whom we
would like to share our joy; in the other, the
pity is for our own unhappy inferiority which
needs to be and may be helped by others who
have more than we. Thus intricately interlaced
are the opposites everywhere, always passing
by invisible gradations, the one into the other,
always eluding and evading the close scrutiny,
although, to the superficial view, they appeared
to have well-marked differences.  

1 Compare the Bṛhadāraṇyaka-Upaniṣad, verse 2.8: “The
beginning and the end, the birth and the death, the
source and the mergence, of things are, and are in
the, in-de-finite. Their middle condition only is ap-
parently definite.” “From the great deep to the
great deep he goes”.
From all the above it is obvious that, generally speaking, joy, love, virtue, altruism, and svarga or heaven go together; and sorrow, hate, vice, selfishness, and nāraka or purgatory form the opposite group; while mokṣha, peace, nish-kāma karma or desireless duty (i.e., duty which is free from all selfish desire) and all-inclusiveness are different from both.

It has been said that sin and merit both bind the jiva to the World-process. This probably requires a brief word of explanation. For, apparently, acts of merit may be regarded as having the effect of emancipation. But this is not so. Even in the act of merit (as distinguished from the act of duty) the sense of separateness is present. It is much more present in the act of sin, truly; but it is present in the other also. It is predominantly present in sin; subordinately so in merit. The sense of the unity of the Self, which prevails in the latter, does so instinctively, sub-consciously, so to say; not deliberately, with conscious realisation, as in mokṣha. Hence, while this fact shows how virtue is the indispensable threshold of the abode of mokṣha, it also shows that virtue is not identical with mokṣha. In the act of merit, the helper, the giver, feels that he is giving to another; and the helped, the receiver, similarly feels that he has received from another. This is the manifest feeling on both sides; and corresponding to it is the unmanifested, the sub-conscious feeling—due to the Necessity of Unity and balance in supersession and rectification of the illusion of separateness, ‘the feeling of another’, and the disturbance of the balance—that ‘I shall get back, later on, what I have given now,’ on the one side, and that ‘I shall pay back, later on, what I have taken now,’ on the other; and these saukalpas, inner resolutions, bind both parties to the chain of karma. The binding in the case of acts of sin is obvious. In mokṣha, on the other hand, (the conscious and the sub-conscious have merged into one, and) the deliberate feeling is that I give only to my-Self and take only from my-Self; and thus no new karma, in the special human sense, is created by the muktā, and the chain of the old prārabdha is gradually exhausted and worn out.

From another standpoint it may be said that while pāpa or sin implies svārthā or selfishness in the fullest sense, namely, of the sense of separate personality narrowed down to its extreme point, puṇya or merit or parārthā, i.e., altruism or unselfishness is only the larger selfishness that works for the well-being of a whole ‘group-soul’, (whence we have such phases and phrases as parochialism, provincialism,
patriotism, nationalism, humanism, etc., all contrasted with, and yet possessing a common feature also with, individualism). The fact of the spreading of karma is brought about by the presence of this group-soul. Within the limits of each such sūtra, each and all are responsible for the good and evil acts of each and all, and the father’s sins are visited on the children, or the latter reap the reward of the former’s good deeds. It is the existence of this group-soul also, with its consequent action and reaction on many of the acts of one, which makes mutual advice, counsel, instruction, consultation and remonstrance, and the formation of alliances, etc., not only possible but necessary, as more than once stated before. Hence also the reiterated injunction to seek good and avoid evil company, except when there is a need to cure the evil and

one’s ability to do so is certain. Mokṣha, on the other hand, is the universalism which includes both individualism and limited communism; it is the paramārtha which assimilates both sva-artha and para-artha.

It has been said before that sva-arga and nara-ka correspond to pleasure and pain, to merit and sin, respectively. In one sense, therefore they are both only ‘internal’, like the others. In terms of the Logion, merelessness, ādhikya, the predominance of the I over the This is sva-arga; and conversely, the merelessness or predominance of the This over the I is nara-ka. But, in another sense, because there is always an external corresponding to an internal, therefore they are definite localities also, Kāma-loka etc. Ordinarily, it is true, the consequences are expressed in the same terms as the acts, śhūla of śhūla, sūkshma of sūkshma; the rewards or punishments of physical merits or sins are enjoyed or suffered in a physical birth, and so on; yet because in each such act of the physical body all the other bodies are also involved and brought into play in some degree or other, therefore consequences in that degree have to be undergone in the exarnate lives of those bodies. And, by special arrangement, while evil actions are expiated in Kāma-loka,
good deeds are reap in Svarga. The details and sub-divisions here, as elsewhere, are endless. There are two main divisions of Kāma-loka,

\[\text{1) The ideas contained in the text here and those of current theosophical literature may be made to supplement each other somewhat as follows: (1) The actor as such, of a sin or merit, is one, and he as one organic whole performs the act, the whole of his being comes into play in each such performance—this from the outer standpoint of the spectator, the third party. (2) But the actor is dual in nature, an inner core and an outer sheath, a conscious jīva, and a material body. And the conscious jīva, again, is represented by a material body at that stage of human evolution when sin and merit, kārma in the special sense, the sense which implies bondage and emancipation, alternatives and choice, compelling motives and free-will, have become possible. (See The Science of Peace, p. 273.) But sin means predominance of the ētāt-consciousness, and merit—of the l-consciousness; and both are inseparably present in each jīva. Therefore this inner core-body is again subdivided into a liṅga and a sūkṣṭha, or a lower sūkṣṭha and a higher sūkṣṭha, or an astral and a mental, a kāma-lokika and a svargika—however we may prefer to word it. (3) In every act of sin, though the whole man is engaged, yet, also, the ētāt-portion of the inner core, the liṅga or lower sūkṣṭha or astral or}

\[vīś, A-kāma and Sa-kāma, and each of these has seven sub-divisions, and those again may be graded. So, also, Svarga has two main divisions, Sa-rūpa and A-rūpa, and each of these kāma-lokika body is in more intense operation, while the other, the l-portion or higher sūkṣṭha or kāraṇa, is in comparative abeyance—on the psychic side belonging to the inner consciousness; the physical side, belonging to the outer body, being the external act of sin. Conversely, in every act of merit, the sūkṣṭha or higher sūkṣṭha or mental or svargika body is in operation while the other is in abeyance. (4) The result is that, in the endless chain and complication of causes and effects, events succeeding events, (a) while that portion of the act which is performed by the whole man is rewarded or punished in the next physical life of the whole man, (b) the psychic element of sin is punished in Kāma-loka, and (c) the psychic element of virtue rewarded in Svarga; and (d) all this, again, it must be remembered, is true only of the human entity whose normal life at this stage is the physical life, its post-mortem conditions being special conditions passed in specially prepared portions of the other worlds corresponding to his psychic bodies—even as jails or palaces on the physical plane are specially assigned to specially-qualified individuals. To other entities, normal inhabitants of those worlds, there is no such exclusive
is sub-divided seven times and each of these has finer sub-divisions, and so on endlessly. All these are enumerated in the Vedas, but are in reality innumerable. The only thing that is possible is to form some vague idea of the less-suffering or exclusive luxury; to those to whom those planes are their normal habitat, as the physical plane is to us, pain and pleasure, good and evil, sin and merit, are both possible, yet actual, on each of their respective planes, as to us on the physical.

With regard to the sub-divisions of planes or worlds mentioned in the succeeding sentences of the text, we may see that, if the views propounded in the preceding paragraph of this footnote are correct, they correspond to the physical and etheric sub-divisions of the physical plane or world, on the one hand, and the continents and countries of the physical world (and presumably similar sub-divisions of the etheric world) on the other. Animat and inanimate, or civilized and uncivilised, or earthly, aquatic, aerial etc., etc., and similar endlessly complicated sub-divisions have in all probability also their parallels on all the other planes. We have scores of names for these various planes and parts of planes, in the Purāṇas: Bhūlīka, Bhuvah, Svah, Mahah, Janah, Tapah, Satyam, Go-loka, Vaikuntha, Shiiva-loka, Rudra-loka, Pitṛ-loka, Preṣṭa-loka, Agni-loka, Vāyu-loka, Indra-loka, Varuṇa-loka, Sūrya-loka, Chandra-loka, Nāga-loka, Gandharva-loka, Ațala, Vițāla, Suțāla, Talāta, Rașāta, Mahāta, Pāțalā, Śvipas, Varṣhas, Āvarṭas, etc., etc.

known with the help of and by reasoning from the better-known. For those who wish to enter into this matter further and achieve the calculus of the in calculable, the study of Bīja-gaṇita or algebra is prescribed.

But above and beyond and around all these endless details is the infinity and eternity and motionless calm of mokṣha, which, from Time's standpoint, is always being realised in part by the feeling of universal love, and in the remaining parts by corresponding thought and action. The more fully the three main appetites of the jīva fall away from him, the lōk-eśaṇa, the appetite for the world, for life amidst our fellow-beings and for recognition by them, the vitteśaṇa, the appetite for wealth, for enhanced bodily and material life, and the pūtra-śaṇa, the appetite for multiplication, for the perpetuation of the individual life in and by progeny; corresponding to cognition, desire and action;—so more and more fully does the consciousness of peace and of emancipation grow towards perfection, till all separateness is negated and the Self alone is seen always and everywhere to reign supreme,
And joy and sorrow, acts of sin and merit, 
Virtue and vice, and truth and falsity, 
Goodness and evilness, and love and hate, 
Friendship and enmity, and mine and thine, 
Heaven and hell, reward and punishment, 
Bondage and liberation—all are lost
In One continuum, One shoreless vast, 
One cented plentitude of Consciousness, 
In One immensity of boundless Being, 
In One eternity of Bliss, peace, AUM!

Peace to all Brings.

श्रवणमोक्ष वर्जनवादम्
सर्वं भ्रमणि पश्यवृ
लोकः समस्त: हुँञिनो भवन्ति ||

IN MEMORIAM

अहह देवर्तरं व किमाचर्म, 
दुर्गितमंतरिन् प्रिय येन ते ||

नासनं नुसं सततंभितं 
वदनके मम दुर्भेयङ्कुणो: || ॥ ॥

नाहि पदा पदेवकमथावः-
सुमु सहार्युलोकि भरातः ||

अहह दूरसं हि महासत्वनाभ, 
कथविषोदिति विहृत्य सहार्यः || ॥ ॥

किसु मदारितेहुर्नारे: 
क्रुःकौमारोन्धित विख्यातिः: ||

भवि क्रुःः रूजा कमळामन्द 
मयमेघान्नि स्वतः गतः: || ॥ ॥

प्राप्यि ते हदवं प्रतिचाँद्विन: 
नाहि सामस्यतां पितरी वत: ||
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अपरक्यर्थर्थै कृपृहस्यकाः
वितित न प्रस पितामहेमनि
|| 4 ||

दर्शति बितमपूर्वोऽहते मनः
चर्घति बुढ़िरहि नन्तु नस्यति
अपुसरागमनाय गतस्य ते
समुज्जुष सर्वतोऽसर्वसुदर्स्य
15 11

गमनश्चात्ममस्वस्वाक्षरितम्
तव शाह्तेन सर्वस्तिकारस्य
सत्तित्वुद्दृढ़सारस्वाक्षरितम्
कथमिव सर्वतोऽसर्वायते मनः
16 11

कदयित्तानवपंड्यपेभवम्
ञ्ज्ञिताकस्फलपुर्वशायूरुति
तव सदा सर्वतोऽसिद्धोगकम्
नाहि दूति सुधुते मनः आवोधः
17 11

विद्ययुक्त शास्त्रवेषत्व तेषामको
वधुकि बिन्धा देहु गमेऽनि
जयसि न श्रुतते यपितानि नौ
प्रति न कृत्वा न सायसेपि वा
18 11

अहह कोमशुचितुंतुतत्तमः
प्रत्तितुध्वेकुस्मितमात्माचितम्
19 11

शुचिकृं शुचीदीमश्वदानाम्
शुचिकृं शुचिदान शुचिर्धम्

शुचित्वापित्वा नवशुचितम्
नरुचित्वा नवनमुन्योपमम्
19 11

दर्शिते सुमनामुकुटे वचि
अद्यकालवशशापितक्षितं
नाहि कः तस्मात यद्यप्यि
स्तुतिविपश्चते तद्ध यंते
11 11

अधितजीवितस्माकस्मानाय
कारण्युतिमहर्ष्यति: स्थिता
अधि तथा तस्मात बाल तव स्तुतिम्
अधितिद्यमश्च यथा कथान्यिनित
12 11

अभितं हि सुनेश्वरेऽद्वा
स्वरुति दीनाशिंहोपकथम्
प्रथमतः कथं विवधां कथाम्
स्थिरय मूढःमनः: शम्भैनामपि
नाति तत्व ज्यायं द्यायमपि
श्लोकाभावात् भावुजीवाति

नन्दु कुलानि गुहाणि गनासि नी
भगवतो ब्रह्मत: प्रियकरः।
भम समीपमयि तथा पापिनो
द्रष्टिः पाजेने समातातः।

भक्तिविवधात् हृदितेजायम्
परमावान्समवयुनितानि
गृहजनः स्तत एव विवधाय यम्
ानमदर्शवृत इति ब्रवम्

भिष्मी त्रिवेशस्ते भृत्वापि
क्षिप्र रुजः स्वप्तति परमाङ्गा
निन्ये भवतंत्वेनकाव्यात्
कपृथि दिव्यजनं जानिनी तदा

शुक्लदेशशाश्वे रजनम्भो
भम तापू दुर्गृहलोकपथाः।
प्रायावा-वधा

मथे जने महिनेपुष्पित: पुनः
गत इति न समाच्छ समान्तयम् ॥ २१ ॥

tव समागभोन पवित्रिते
मम गहे मुनिनेव चराशिषा ।
प्रणववाद इति श्लुतिपावनः
चिरविभुजम: पुनरम्युदैत ॥ २२ ॥

अनुविष्णव महेश्वरिदेशितम्
परमपवनश्चात्मसमापनम् ।
प्रतिविन्द्र इमाणाः प्राप्तभायाः
सदय पावित्र: पुनराब्रजे: ॥ २३ ॥