

SECTION III. (*Continued.*)

CHAPTER XXXI.

TRIPLETS.

I-This-Not.—Pratyagātmā-Jivātmā-Daivī-prakṛti.—Saṭ-chiḍ-ānanda, and its sub-divisions.—Manas-buddhi-ahankāra.—Sensation, perception, imagination; apprehension, comprehension, ambition; position, composition, supposition.—Expansion of the small into the Great Self.—Relation of subtle and gross between primary and secondary, radical and derivative, triplets.—Saṭṭva-rajas-tamas.—Dravya-guṇa-karma.—Twelve factors included in four triplets, corresponding with twelve logia.—Correspondences and reflexions.

All the siddhāntas, established conclusions, perfected ends, final or ultimate facts of the World-process, have been outlined in the foregoing chapter under the aspect of marks, līṅga, characteristics, qualities of the Self. As the *Nyāya* points out, a siddhānta is ascertained by means of a dṛṣṭānta, illustration, analogy, instance, example; and an analogy is that wherein the minds of the expert and the commoner are analogous, that is, co-incide and agree. The outward, plain, familiar and unmistakable facts of the world

afford such analogies. And by means of them we have established the triune nature of Brahman. This tri-unity or triplicity appears everywhere, and all the world may be 'resumed,' summed up, in such triplets. Thus:

The primal trinity is of course I, This and Not. Next in order of importance are four triads: Jīvātmā, Praṭyagātmā and Daivī-prakṛti,¹ make one triplet. In Praṭyagātmā, again, we find the important triplet of saṭ, chiṭ and ānanda. Here saṭ, corresponding to kriyā, is mentioned first, because as the *Brahma-Sūtra* says: From the point of view of Praṭyagātmā, kriyā appears (first). The general rule of course holds good, that cognition occurs first, and then desire and then action. But the point here is that cognition and desire are, so to say, *within* Praṭyagātmā, and the readiness, the endeavor, to act in accordance with them, *appears outside*, as it were. Again, because on and by action being performed,

¹ Apparently, for some special reason, the word jīvātmā, the individualised or materialised self—capable of and possessing plurality, whereas the word Praṭyagātmā is always only singular and is never to be met with in the plural—has been substituted for Mūla-prakṛti.

new knowledge is gained (as *e.g.*, by going to a new country), therefore chiṭ is mentioned next after saṭ. After chiṭ, comes ānanda. Then again saṭ, then chiṭ, then ānanda, and so on endlessly. In terms of the Logion, we may say that when the saṭ-ṭā, being, of the I is in or is reflected in the This, then the eṭaṭ has or is or becomes saṭ, existent or existence; and conversely, when the saṭ-ṭā, existence or pseudo-being, of the This is reflected in the I, then the prayoga, the projection, combination, employment, of the two saṭ-ṭā-s is chiṭ;¹ and, finally, 'Not-I, Not-This,' 'This-Not-I,' 'Not-This, Not-I' is the experience of ānanda, that is to say, in ānanda, the being of This and the being of I are both gathered up and projected into the Not, and conflict and opposition and even trace of difference cease, and the Not permeates the I and the This and appears as infinite (un-conscious) bliss (*oblivious* of all particulars).

Changes of order in this triplet occur here or in other world-systems in reference to other triplets. And within each of these three the primal triplet is repeated over and over again. Thus in Aham, 'a' means the immortal, 'ha' the mortal, and 'm' that which is other than both.

¹ See *The Science of Peace*, p. 265.

So, too, e, ṭa, and ṭ, respectively in eṭaṭ. So saṭ breaks up into s, a, ṭ; chiṭ into ch, i, ṭ; ānaṇḍa, into ā, na, ṇḍa, similarly.¹

This triplet of saṭ, chiṭ and ānaṇḍa reappears transformed as the triplet of manas of the nature of kriyā, buddhi of the nature of chiṭ, and ahaṅkāra of the nature of ānaṇḍa and desire.² These three, manas, etc., exist and operate in every atom, but they are illustrated most fully in humans, amongst whom we find the capacity for apprehending universals. The functions of the three may be described as below.

All appearance of separateness is, or is the work of, manas.³ Manas cognises by means

¹ See Vol. I, pp. 119, 120, *supra* and compare *Chhāndogya*, VIII. iii. 5 and *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* V. v. i. for a similar analysis of saṭyam. There is much more in the text here of a similar nature, but is not translatable in any useful and effective manner. What is given is only by way of sample. The original text would be full of suggestion to those acquainted with Samskr̥t.

² See Ch. xxvii, *supra*. Sometimes, from another point of view, ahaṅkāra is said to correspond with kriyā, as I-making, self-assertive, and then manas is regarded as a phase of ichchhā.

³ Intellectually, as discrimination, distinction, analysis; ethically as egoism, selfishness; practically as individualistic activity, self-assertion, aggression, etc.

of the proximity or contact of the senses and their objects (with each other, and of the manas or mind with one sense at a time). As the *Nyāya* says: The non-occurrence of yuga-paṭ-jñāna, simultaneous cognition, is the mark of manas.¹ (That is to say, the fact that we cannot cognise more than one thing, or receive or perceive more than one, or one kind of, sensation clearly at a time, is due to manas). Here yuga-paṭ means '(two) as if one,' 'as one'. This 'as-one-ness' is a universal fact and unity ought and has to be known, learnt, cognised, realised. But because manyness arises out of unity, the result is that all particular knowledge or cognition is dual; it is (a) a matter of manyness or separateness, which is (b) always based on a unity. Now, the non-recognition, the forgetfulness, of the second element, the basis in unity, and the exclusive and excessive recognition of the first element, that of manyness and separateness—this is the characteristic mark, the differentiating proprium, the result of the operation, of manas. Saṅkalpa and vikalpa, 'resolution and doubt' or alternative vacillation, appear in the manas only. As the *Brahma-Sūtra*

¹ *Nyāya-Sūtra*, I. i. 16. Cf. the modern psychologist's 'retinal yellow spot' and 'the hot point of consciousness'.

says: Separateness appears or is realised only by means of these two, *viz.*, saṅkalpa and vikalpa. Also: The mark of the lower mind is the recognition of separateness and the absence of unified and unifying knowledge. The *Mīmāṃsā* also says: The non-recognition of unity is manas. For such reasons, the recognition or accentuation of separation being the function of manas, and the manifestation of manyness, multiplication, being the main business of kriyā, and, yet again, kriyā being the result of vikalpa and saṅkalpa, we may well conclude that the nature of manas is kriyā. The non-separateness, unity, connexion, relation or interdependence that appears in and through all-separateness—that is the work of buddhi, (the reason or higher mind which *ratio*-cinates, sees relations, while the understanding or lower mind sees single facts only). That by which *all* is *com*-prehended is buddhi. Boḍhana, comprehension, is essentially the seeing of the many as linked together by a unity. For this reason the *Nyāya* declares: The birth of yugapaṭ-jñāna, simultaneous cognition, is the mark of buddhi.¹ Yugapaṭ-jñāna, means knowledge of two's, many's, as pairs, as

¹ Not current. Cf. 'Field of vision,' 'fringe of thought,' 'continuum of consciousness'.

one, as unified. And the *Brahma-Sūtra* declares: Non-separateness is recognised by means of buddhi. It is true the *Mīmāṃsā* says: Buddhi is bahu-varṭinī, many-dwelling, residing in the many; but this statement refers to the operations of buddhi in conjunction with manas, (that is to say, it means that manas cognises the many, and buddhi also undoubtedly dwells amid that many, but it does so as a unifying and organising thread).¹ Out of the conjunction of one and many, buddhi and manas, arises the appearance, manifestation or recognition, of one in many and many in one.

Aham-kāra is of the nature of desire and bliss. It is only when a jīva believes or regards himself as a 'substantial' something, that desire becomes possible. I am so and so and have arrived at this condition by having done this and this; such is my present position, status, dignity, and I have to achieve so much more; when I have secured it I shall become so and so; then I will attain so much more, etc.—all this endless architecture of desire is based on or is ahamkāra. And ānanda, bliss, happiness, pleasure, is present herein alone. For the essence of supreme

¹ Compare the theosophical views as to the buddhic web of life.

bliss is the uttermost conviction, and nothing else, that 'I alone am or is all,' that there is naught above or below, before or after, behind or beyond I or me. While there is the feeling that there is any such other anywhere, so long there is the feeling of absence of finality and stability and indisputable sovereignty and permanence. It is this blissfulness of the Supreme I which, by reflexion, makes the pleasure of the egoism of the individual I also; otherwise, indeed, from the standpoint of the Total Universal, egoistic aham-kāra is wholly irrelevant and improper and, indeed, is the very cause of bondage, the enslaving of the soul to desire. From the standpoint of worldly expediency also, it is useless to indulge in egoism and egotism, when we see every moment that we are helplessly dependent on others and not self-complete, and are related to them in an endless gradation of higher and lower. For such reason, the *Brahma-Sūtra* says: Let aham-kāra rise into the generalisation of the Svam, the Universal Self, out of all selves, and into the performance of the work of that Self. In other words, be not overwhelmed by the mutual relatedness of many selves, and the consequent feeling of dependence, and think not of the personal

results of actions, but think only of the Inner Self and do your due work with the might and desire and knowledge of that Self, with all the best power and the noblest aspiration and the deepest knowledge that you have. And therefore should such knowledge be diligently secured as will indefeasibly establish self-knowledge within the self and give to the jīva that true, free and Unbounded Egoism which will make him always feel the I and only the I that exists ever and everywhere in limitless blissfulness.

In terms of the Logion, 'I-I-I' is aham-kāra; 'I-I-This' is buddhi, or also 'This-This-I,' both being the experience of chit; and 'This-This-This,' or 'This-This-I' also, is sat, i.e., manas. Therefore has the svarūpa, form, nature, of manas, been described as 'I-This-I-This-This-This-This-I-I-I'. The experience of buddhi, on the other hand is 'Not-Not-Not-I-This-Not-This-Not-This-Not-This-This-Not-I-I-I-alone'. The form of ahamkāra is 'Not-This-This-Not-I-I-I'. (?)¹

¹All this cannot be wholly without meaning. The depth and weight of the whole work forbid such a light and superficial assumption. But it is impossible, with the means at our disposal, to fix the significance. May these descriptions

Such, in brief, is the ternary of *manas*, *buddhi* and *ahamkāra*, being the *sthūla* or gross form of that of which the *sūkṣhma* or subtle form is the ternary of *saṭ*, *chit* and *ānanda*. Its sub-divisions and modifications are many with reference to general and special experiences (as may be gathered from the observations recorded in Section II, *supra*).¹

be indicative of the ways of vibration of the *ātma-buddhi-manas* atoms, to use theosophical phraseology?

¹It may not be amiss to attempt here, in a footnote, to compare the statements in the text of *manas*, etc., with modern *Nyāya*-doctrines. The aphorism quoted in the text as to the mark of *manas* is to be found exactly in the same words in the current *Nyāya-Sūtra*. It is explained variously. One set of interpreters understand thereby that two things even when belonging to the same sense, cannot be cognised simultaneously; I am not cognising the seven flowers in the bouquet before me simultaneously, with the sense of vision, but only successively. Another and the larger school hold that the aphorism means only that objects belonging to different senses cannot be cognised simultaneously, *e.g.*, the color and form of flower, its fragrance, and a note of music, can be perceived only in succession. And the reason is, they say, that the *manas* is an atom and each sense-

The next important triplet is that of *Mūla-prakṛti*, *viz.*, *saṭtva*, *rajas*, *ṭamas*.

organ proper, *indriya*, is also an atom, and cognition arises only when an *indriya*-atom contacts an object and is contacted itself, at the same time, by the mind-atom. As to how we are able to talk about armies and hosts and the five sense-organs and make comparisons, etc.—this is explained very elaborately by the assumption of *samskāras*, impressions, left by each cognition on the mind and so forth. But the result is not satisfactory. The difficulty is only removed one step. Modern *Nyāya* does not own the supplementary aphorism descriptive of the work of *buddhi* which is quoted in the text here. And yet on the general principle that there must be some element of truth in every opinion, the argumentation of even the modern *nayyāyika*, though he has strayed far from his true home, cannot be wholly futile.

The reconciliation may be found in combining the general principles of the metaphysics expounded here with the superphysics to be found in theosophical literature. The one and the many can never be separated. Now the one predominates in consciousness; now the other. And principles are not to be found and held apart from embodiments, as pointed out in an earlier note. While the *Nyāya*, as current now, knows of no intermediaries between the *manas* (which, to it, is practically the individual soul or *jīva*)

The oneness of all that is, is *saṭṭva*.¹
The name of (the principle of) *parivartana*,

and the *ātmā*, the further developments of thought in the other systems make it clear that this *manas* has three aspects, *buddhi*, etc., besides a summing fourth or *chitta*; and Theosophy enables us to add that in practical embodiment these three aspects become the triple individual *ātmā-buddhi-manas*, *ātmā* here corresponding with *ahāṅkāra*. This *manas*-atom is the singularising atom; the *buddhi*-atom (probably by means of still subtler and smaller super-atoms constituting it) is the many-comprehending one; and the *ātmā*-atom would be the unifying, self-referring, organising one giving being to the whole. When, by processes of meditation, etc., the centre and seat of consciousness is shifted upwards and the *manas*, mind, 'cast off' into the category of sheath, then it develops into a mental body proper, losing its characteristic of singularising; another subtler atom (that which is *buddhic* to us probably) then takes up the work of *manas*, the *ātmic* or *ākāśhic* that of *buddhi*, the *anupādic* that of *ātmā*, and so on endlessly. The metaphysical principle or scheme of triplicity remains ever the same. Its embodiment is ever differing. Compare the latest Theosophical views as to personality, individuality, Ego, spirit, monad, etc., etc., corresponding with various graded sheaths.

¹These three are often translated into English

changes, transformations, turns and returns, is *rajas*. *Tamas* is that which is different from (and binds together) both. As usual, there are endless minor triplets within each of these.

In terms of the Logion: the reflexion of the I in This and This is *saṭṭva*; of the This in I and I is *rajas*; of the This in This and This and of the I in I and I is *ṭamas*.

Finally because the *jīvātmā* is a compound of both *Pratyagātmā* and *Mūlaprakṛti*, therefore the triplet belonging to each is present therein, in a transmuted form, viz., as *jñāna-ichchhā-kriyā* of the former, and *dravya-guṇa-karma* of the latter.

as rhythm, mobility, and inertia. Strictly speaking these three are the sub-divisions of *rajas*, rhythm being *sāṭṭvika* activity, mobility being *rājasa* activity i.e., activity pure and simple, and inertia being *ṭamasa* or persistent activity. The sentence of the text '... oneness ... is *saṭṭva*' explains how rhythm comes to be *sāṭṭvika*. For rhythm, on analysis, is seen to be *uniform* repetition. Similar sub-divisions are distinguishable under *rajas* and *ṭamas*. The nearest and fullest equivalents for the three in English, seem to be cognisability, mobility, or motility, and substantiality. See *Sāṅkhya-Kārikā*, verse 13, and *The Science of Social Organisation*, p. 53.

These are the four more important triplets comprising twelve factors, corresponding to the twelve *Mahāvākyas* or *logia*. With each factor again, goes its negative aspect, because of the inseparability of the negation, giving another twelve, the net result of the whole being of course always Unity.

The order within each triplet may be considered now, from a new point of view.

To begin with *saṭ-chiḍ-ānanda*. It has been stated before that the reflexion of the I in the This¹ is *kriyā* (action, *saṭ*);

¹ What was before stated was rather the other way, *viz.*, that the reflexion of the This in the I is *kriyā*, and an attempt was made in a foot-note there, to reconcile that view with the one put forward in *The Science of Peace*, p. 265, by difference of standpoint. It may be added here that, in modern times, Fichte has put the view that the self becomes aware of an objective world by activity. The element of truth in each view will be easily discovered by any one who dwells on the significance of the Logion. The Universal Self postulates, asserts, assumes, the Not-Self, and so far, gives existence to the Not-Self. We may, therefore, say that the appearance, the reflexion, the picturing of the This in the I, (*by the I*) is *Kriyā*. But from the standpoint of the small self, the individual I, (independently of its will) this amounts to cognition. Of course, for such cognition too, there must be

and of the I in the *Eṭaṭ*, which is (or corresponds to) *saṭ*, is *chiṭ* (cognition, *jñāna*); and that the unity, the mutual mergence, of the two, the shining forth of the negation, is *ānanda* (desire, *ichchhā*). Now this (appearance of distinction where in reality there is none) is the result of the (illusory, superimposed, false) manyness of the I. But if so, then it might be asked why the I, *i.e.*, *chiṭ* (which corresponds to the Self of the primal Trinity) does not come first. The answer is that the cause or actor is hidden or included in the effect, *i.e.*, action, and hence is *mentioned* after the result, *i.e.*, manyness or action, has been mentioned; that is to say, *Aham* is mentioned after *Eṭaṭ*, *chiṭ* after *saṭ*. And after the experiencing of the manyness (and the realisation of it as false), there comes again the restoration to the original condition of unity, which is *ānanda*. For pleasure and pain belong only to the condition wherein manyness is felt. Outside that condition is bliss. As the *Brahma-Sūtra* says: Before and after—is

attention on the part of the individual, a coming into the position where the object can be reflected in his mind, and so far, again, we may say that the process of reflexion is (or is at least *due to*) action. And so on, round and round.

bliss.¹ That is to say, Bliss surrounds, envelopes, contains within it pleasure and pain.

The second triplet is, similarly, the result of the manyness of the Eṭaṭ. Here (from another standpoint it appears that) the manyness of the This arises and appears in and is supported by the I only and is included therein. Hence the I takes precedence and the This follows. 'This in I' is saṭṭva, which comes first; 'This and This in I' is rajas which comes next;² the Negation combining the two comes last as tamas. It might be said that tamas, which indicates the connecting ichchā, should have come immediately after saṭṭva and before rajas, so as to be between them, as nexuses come between the factors they link together. But the special order given here is due to the fact that cognition and action on the one hand

¹ Compare को ह्येवान्यात् कः प्राप्यात् यद्येष आनन्दो न स्यात् *Taittirīya Upaniṣat*, II. vii. 1.

² 'This in I' has to be interpreted apparently as meaning 'This as included in the I,' 'I as including and setting its stamp on all This'—in order to reconcile the present text with the statement made shortly before that "the reflexion of the I in This and This is saṭṭva". The present description of rajas has to be manipulated similarly to bring it into line with the preceding one.

and action and desire on the other are constantly and inseparably connected together; and the manyness of the Eṭaṭ, which is kriyā on the one hand and Mūlaprakṛti on the other—Mūlaprakṛti obviously occupying the middle position in the Logion—is the fact kept most prominently in view in this particular reference.¹ Besides, the other possible permutations, saṭṭva-tamas-rajās, rajās-saṭṭva-tamas, tamās-saṭṭva-rajās, etc., are also there, in endless time and motion and countless detail. Here only the universal principles connected with A U M are stated.

As to the other two triplets:

The preceding This in its reflexion in the succeeding I (of the saṭ-chiḍ-ānanda, becomes or is) dṛavya, substance. So the

¹ All this ringing of changes is to be explained, as said before very often, by change of standpoint, and helps to fill out our understanding of the whole scheme. The order of saṭṭva-rajās-tamas is the order of I-This-Not. If we think of the factors to be connected as the two balls of a dumb-bell, then, naturally, the connecting bar has to come between. But if we think of the nexus as a common co-efficient then, as in and algebraical expression, (a+b)c, it may well be placed third, or outside the two, as a vinculum, a+b.

preceding I in its reflexion in the succeeding This (of the *saṭṭva-rajas-tamas*, becomes or is) *guṇa*, attribute or quality. Finally, the preceding Not in its reflexion in the succeeding Not (becomes) *karma*, movement. It may be asked how it is that these last two Negations do not leave behind only destruction, and how *karma* can arise out of them. The reply is that I and This are inseparably attached thereto, and hence *karma* arises, out of the Negations, in the shape of birth, stay and death, and not of death only.

The case of cognition, desire and action is the converse of that of substance, etc. The succeeding This in its reflexion in the preceding I (of *saṭṭva-rajas-tamas*, becomes or is) *jñāna*, cognition; the succeeding I in its reflexion in the preceding This (of *saṭ-chiḍ-ānanda* becomes or is) *kriyā*, action; the succeeding Not in the preceding Not is *ichchhā*, desire. This is why desire stands between cognition and action. That is to say, the Negation that accompanies the succeeding (I), when it enters into the I through the doorway of the This, is reflected in the preceding *eṭaṭ*, and is finally included in or placed between the This and the I, becomes

manifest as *ānanda* and *ichchhā*.¹ Hence the scripture-text that "having done all (his work, the *jīva*) attains happiness, becomes happy".

For practical purposes the triplet of substance-quality-movement is treated as arising first, being the grosser, although (from another standpoint) cognition-desire-action are spoken of as first. But, of course, it should be always borne in mind that these orders and arrangements and successions are only matters of speech and appearance and manifestation. The real co-ordination and underlying simultaneity of mutual relation between and through the triplets is obvious. And a corresponding co-ordination constantly exists between all the countless transformations that arise out of these, the worlds or emanations or evolutions, *sṛṣṭis*, of *manas*, of *buddhi*, of *aḥamkāra*, of knowledge, of error, of love, of hate, of 'pictures' or reflexions and shadows, of fortuitous and accidental experience, of deliberate achievement, etc.

¹ It must be obvious to the reader from the nature of the translation that the text here is exceedingly elusive. Parentheses have been added freely; and yet the determination of the sense must be left largely to the intuition and the industry of the reader. That things become inverted in reflexion, and I and This are opposite and reflecting each other—is a good general clue.