

## SECTION V.

### *Maṇḍavy-āmaṇḍavya-prakaraṇa.*

WHAT TO APPROVE AND WHAT TO DISAPPROVE.

Co-ordination of apparently conflicting views by considerations of relativity to time, space and circumstances.—Subservience to evolutionary ideal the one test of right conduct.—The 'example' of the hierarchs.—Can a jīva that has attained the knowledge of Brahman do wrong?—The moral bearing, distinguished from the purposive significance, of the sacraments.—Mutual love and service the one law for all.—The explanation of the fact of hate and mutual warfare.—The proper food of man.—The reconciliation of all opinions.

The summing up of all things whatsoever that form subject of speech or thought, the complete unification of all knowledge, follows upon a discussion of the details. Such discussion is possible only by means of question and answer, challenger and opponent, thesis and anti-thesis, briefly, the well-known 'two sides of every question.' That every question has two sides is the direct consequence of the fact that every affair to which a question can relate is made up of the Self and the Not-Self, the One and the Many. When we have examined both

these two sides and realised that they are inseparable, that the whole truth combines both, then only have we summed up the whole universe, then only do we know what to believe and what to not believe, what to accept and what to reject, what to do and what to avoid doing; then we know that there is really nothing that is inherently and absolutely praiseworthy or blameworthy, sinful or meritorious, true or false, right or wrong, approvable or condemnable; then we realise that we have to discard the erstwhile true and embrace the erstwhile erroneous and *vice versa*, all according to differences of time, place, needs and circumstances.

For this reason does the *Nyāya* say that the *śiddhānta*, the final conclusion, can be established only by means of the *dr̥ṣṭānta*, the example, wherein both the parties concerned, the challenger and his opponent, the layman and the expert, are equally agreed. (Every conclusion, every particular and practical proposition—and these are judgments as to causal relation—involves a psychological and metaphysical process, wherein the mind has risen from one or more particular instances actually experienced to a universal proposition and descends again from that universal proposition to a particular instance; in other words



it involves both induction and deduction ; and agreement is possible as to the final conclusion, the *siḍḍhānta*, only when there is agreement as to the particular instances actually experienced, the *ḍṛṣṭhānta*.)

Brahman is the *siḍḍhānta* in which all possible *ḍṛṣṭhāntas* are included, and all differences are merged. Herein we see that all possible sides of every question are equally present ; and the reconciliation is that what it is one's interest to believe and do in one situation it is another's interest to disbelieve and avoid doing in that situation, and *vice versa* ; reverse the situation and the belief or disbelief, the act or its avoidance, are all reversed.

Having arrived at this conclusion and conviction, the *jīva* should, for the practical purposes of his own life-journey, study and imitate as far as possible the precept and example of the *śiṣṭha*, 'the instructed,' 'those that have remained over' (from earlier evolutions, for the guidance of the newer).<sup>1</sup> These, the *śiṣṭha*, are the hierarchs that guide and govern evolution. Their *āchāra*, example, 'conduct,' 'activity,' is that which helps on the succession of events

<sup>1</sup> See *The Science of Social Organisation, or The Laws of Manu in the Light of Theosophy*, pp. 7, 8.

constituting the evolution that they are concerned with ; and it should be followed and imitated by the *jīvas* who have arrived at knowledge of Brahman. Among these hierarchs there is necessarily a unanimity of opinion, of precept and example, because they are governed by one predominant Unity. The discord, the sin, the ignoring and opposing of unity, that appears all around us in the world, even under the guidance of such unity-inspired hierarchs, is also all included within the unity, as the many, as an indispensable part of the whole scheme. For, truly, the *One* scheme is nothing else than the multiplication of the One into the Many, and the division and reduction of the Many into the One, the descent of spirit into matter, Self into Not-Self, and reascent thereof into itself, (or, it may even be said, of matter and Not-Self into spirit and Self).<sup>1</sup> To the limited and narrow view, the existence of sin and discord is an inexplicable disruption of and triumph over unity, a violation of times and needs that refutes and falsifies the statements made above ; yet, to the wider vision that recognises the transcendental infinitude of times and needs, the fact of cyclic necessity in short, they appear as servants of that unity, as humble

<sup>1</sup> See *Bhagavad-Gītā*, xiii. 30.



ministers of ever higher needs and laws and wider-reaching cycles—though, obviously, they are such servants and ministers *in and because of their aspect of or as sin and evil*, for that time, and cannot be called by any other name than sin and evil then.

But, if this be so, would it not be permissible for jīvas to choose deliberately the path of selfishness and sin and discord, as much as that of service, harmony and merit? The answer is twofold. In the first place, such *choice* is not possible in the nature of things. True and complete and successful deliberation, and Brahman-knowledge, imply each other. (The wise and the good are the same). And the knowledge of Brahman, the realisation of Its being, the identification with or approximation to Its Nature, in any jīva, implies and preassumes that certain experiences have been gone through and certain conditions fulfilled. After the undergoing of such experience and fulfilment of such conditions, the inevitable result is an indefeasible and ever-increasing tendency in the jīva to walk on the nivr̥t̥ti-mārga, and always in the direction of unity and away from separateness; for belief and act, cognition and action, are inextricably related to each other, and every jīva must do what in its heart it knows to be truest and believes to be most

conducive to its happiness or pleasure. He who has achieved the *knowledge* of the All, the Whole, *after finishing* his course on the pravṛt̥ti-mārga must also *act* the All, the Whole, *i.e.*, behave unselfishly, altruistically, universally, and not selfishly and separately. This latter behavior is possible only to the jīva who is yet on the pravṛt̥ti-mārga, and cognises only the limited, the separate, who knows and feels himself as an individual opposed to other individuals, and not as the Universal embracing all individuals. We see thus that if sin and discord *are* included in the world-scheme, they are included *as the non-deliberate*, as the reasonless (irrational, non-ratio-cinated, relationless, law-less) many; therefore they cannot be chosen *deliberately* by any jīva *that knows*, but only blindly and under compulsion of personal desire by the jīva that does not really know. When we see a jīva that *speaks* as if he knew the All, and *acts* as if he felt only his little personal self, we are to infer that the *feeling* dominates, overwhelms and renders useless, abortive and as if nil, the *knowledge*; or rather indeed we are to infer that the true knowledge has not yet arisen in the jīva; briefly, that the passage from the path of pursuit to that of renunciation has not yet been effected, that the gateway of vairāgya which stands



at the junction-point between the two arcs of descent and reascent has not been crossed.

The second answer would be that even if such a deliberate choice of the life and line of sin and discord by a knower *were* possible, there would be no serious harm done; because that life and line carry unavoidably their own consequences of punishment and misery, and these also would be known to the knower, and he would walk towards and suffer them with open eyes, and so again wipe out his sin and discord.

Because of the facts embodied in the first answer is it ordained that, normally, *jīvas* should study the fourteen *Brahma-vidyās* during *brahma-charya*, as the first stage of life and then pass on to the other stages, successively.

The obvious dependence of one *jīva* on another is conclusive proof of their unity as well as separateness, this being the result of causeless *Svabhāva*. For while each successive particular event, each existence from non-existence, each non-existence from existence, has a cause, the whole endless series in its totality has no cause, but is only *Svabhāva*, the Absolute Nature of *Brahman*. This mixture of opposites, one and many, *is* the World-process; and out of this compound, this mutual relatedness and interdependence of smallest

and greatest, nearest and farthest, easiest and sternest, highest and lowest, arise the facts of sin and merit, of virtue and vice, absence of morality and false, conventional, adulterous or changeful morality, *āchāra*, *anāchāra*, *nirāchāra* and *vyabhichāra*, all having their proper places in the world-scheme together with their appropriate consequences.

The sacraments, *samskāras*, spoken of before, are included in *āchāra*, morality, ritual, rite, right conduct. As observed elsewhere they are indispensable in their *saṭ* or true form, for arousing and developing the mood and the faculty of introspection; their *asaṭ* or untrue form, or the external ceremonial, being, as it were, the *upāḍhi*, the sheath, of the former.

Because they are part of *āchāra*, therefore they come under the category of the *manṭavya* or the believable, the desirable, the advisable, the acceptable, the right and proper—the relative conditions of appropriate time, place, circumstances, being always premised.

After initiation by means of the sacraments, and the acquisition of knowledge consequent thereon, the ideation, the consideration of alternative plans, and finally the formation, materialisation or realisation, *saṅkalpana*, *vikalpana*, and *prakalpana*, of new worlds becomes not only possible but a duty.



It may be noted that while the details of the sacraments differ with differing times, places and circumstances, the result, the purposive significance, is always the same. Thus, the significance of the sacrament of marriage is multiplication. We find this sacrament (mechanically, naturally,) undergone by minerals also, in the mineral kingdom downwards from the human. And in all these kingdoms the result is multiplication. But, of course, in the human kingdom, the significance is recognised self-consciously as it is not elsewhere; and from this fact there accrues an added excellence in the progeny of holy wedlock—to say nothing of the special perfections derived from the use of mantras—which is absent in the progeny of unconsecrated marriages. This is the real reason of the shame and blame attaching to illegitimacy; otherwise, indeed, all creatures, howsoever born, are forms of Brahman.

In all this we see that what is in accord, assonance and consonance, with the nature, the prakṛti, of a single jīva, or a community, or a nation, or a race, what helps on the feeling of the unity and continuity of the self of that jīva or community etc., is manṭavya, believable, proper, lawful, good, to it; while that which is opposed to its nature, threatens to disrupt its unity and continuity is a-manṭavya,

unbelievable, unacceptable, improper, unlawful, evil, wrong. Karṭavya and a-karṭavya, fit to do and to avoid, good act and evil act, duty and breach of duty—these follow upon the manṭavya and a-manṭavya. Actions in accordance with knowledge are duty; against it, opposed to and condemned by it, are the opposite.

All this is included in the AUM and classifiable under cognition, desire and action. For all shāstras, teachings, sciences, though all dealing with knowledge primarily, are yet subdivided according to these (as intellectual and scientific, or devotional and artistic, or ethical and practical). Thus, the sciences that are concerned with the determination of the nature of the Self are pre-eminently cognitional or intellectual; so others with regard to kriyā, or icchhā, are of the other kinds.

To the jīva that knows all this, service of all beings is the only and the inevitable activity or occupation left, and such service is indeed the Sanātana Dharma, the one Eternal Law—the law of love and service of all beings.

It is true that hate also exists, and the sense and fact of separateness, in consequence of which one jīva does and indeed must devour another if it is to maintain its own life. But here also Necessity and Nature are ever turning evil into



good and manufacturing new upādhis, by propagation and multiplication of the nourished with the help of those destroyed for the nourishment of these others. The preliminary slaughter is evil, but the subsequent assimilation is good; and each brings with it its own appropriate consequences. Thus closely are good and evil allied. The vegetable eats the vegetable (and the mineral), the animal eats it as well as the animal, the human eats these again, in turn. The series of anna, eatables, is thus unbroken.<sup>1</sup> The

<sup>1</sup> The series may be extended by saying, as is said in some of the more mystic passages of the *Upaniṣads*, that the human is food for the *deva*, and so on. To understand this, we should have to think in terms of planes other than the physical, of a way of eating less patent than swallowing bodily. We do not find this subtler way of nourishment absent even from the physical plane. The vegetable nourishing the animal with the oxygen it gives off and the animal in turn nourishing the vegetable with the carbonic acid gas it throws out are illustrations of this unbroken series of mutual anna and nourishment, in accordance with the metaphysical law that an *etaṭ* is rejected by one *aḥam* and taken up by another, and *vice versa*. The exchange between the human and the *deva* is apparently in terms of astral and mental matter. The lower and grosser *devas*, *yakshas*, *rākshasas*, *pishāchas*, incubi and succubi, that crowd the noisome dens of

true law thereof is that that which helps on the work, the natural and proper function, of a creature, and does not hinder it, is that creature's proper anna or food. Proper and improper

vice, that revel in places of slaughter and hover ever round the sinful and the criminal, absorb and thrive on the astral effluvia that are the result of every surge of evil emotion and its accompanying nerve-vibration and nerve-dissolution. The higher tribes correspondingly subsist on the finer emanations of the better emotions. The highest gods subsist on 'devotion'. As the Marāthi proverb says *देव भाव का भूखा*, 'the *deva* is hungry for emotion,' craves after 'feeling'; and the whole of Samskr̥t theology is full of the fact that the higher gods are nourished by 'sacrifice'—in the higher and nobler sense. The human derives similar material from the *deva*, as the *Gītā* says, *परस्परं भावयन्तः* etc. iii. 11. Strictly speaking, the highest gods, the Chiefs of the hierarchs, belong to another kingdom, not the ordinary *deva* kingdom, and if they are helped by devotion, the significance is somewhat different, but not altogether. Wars, epidemics, crimes, as well as waves of religious feeling, of science, of new civilisations, it will be seen in view of the above, profit directly, and may well be instigated and brought about by, the *devas* of high and low degree, as is stated in the *Purāṇas*.

The paragraph of the text is a brief but sufficient statement of the practical application of the moral



food, eatable and uneatable, are thus again relative to special circumstances—as is most unmistakably seen in the case of illness. Therefore, to the human being who has realised that his main object in life, his one sole end and aim, his *summum bonum*, is the achievement of *mukṭi*, the eating of animals is as much inappropriate as the eating of fellow-humans; for the double reason that there is specially-evolved *prāṇa* or life in them which ought not to be destroyed, and that the eating of animal food breeds animal tendencies in the eater and animalises his progeny. For out of the food are formed the sperm and the germ, the *reṭas*, and thence whole races, and so inappropriate food may hinder the fulfilment of the proper function of man, alluded to above.

(But would not the same arguments apply to the consumption of vegetable food? No, because vegetables have not *so much* life, nor *such* life as animals have. The element of *eṭaṭ* predominates over the element of *aḥam*, in them, only a little less than in the minerals. They have not yet evolved to the same extent and in the same manner as animals. Their consciousness significance of the 'Struggle for existence and survival of the fittest,' in their most elementary and *fundamental* forms, in respect of food, on the two paths, of pursuit and of renunciation.

is yet a sub-consciousness, their sensitiveness is yet vague and latent; they have not yet so much separate individuality as the animals, for they have not yet broken loose from the surface of mother earth as the animals have done, and do not possess an independently moving life to the same degree. They have not the pointedly selfish appetites and passions that the animals have, in whom the *aḥam* has begun to predominate over the *eṭaṭ*; and the nature and quality of their life or *prāṇa*, in its power to nourish other life, is yet not far removed from the nature and quality of the general *prāṇa*-store of nature, *i.e.*, of the earth-globe. Hence the consumption of vegetable food by humans will not breed in them intense animal appetites and passions as the consumption of animal food will, and causes less pain, while it supports the life of the human body with equal effectiveness. Vegetable food is therefore the best food, next after the deriving of sustenance direct from the 'stores of nature, the earth and the sun'<sup>1</sup>—always, with the

<sup>1</sup> Instances of this direct sustenance are our breathing, and the incessant circulation through our bodies of the elements of *tejas* and *ākāśa*, which we do not even feel. The body made up of the five elements requires to be nourished incessantly by fresh supplies of them. Solid, liquid and gaseous foods correspond to *prṥhvi*, *jala* and



qualification, 'for the seeker of mokṣha.' To humans having other objects in view, aggrandisement on the physical plane etc., and prepared to bear the consequences, other foods

vāyṇ. The need of sunlight for healthy growth is also recognised. By analogy, ākāśha must be even more indispensable. The subtler the food, the more incessantly and absolutely it is needed. In cases of trance, when even breathing stops, presumably ākāśha keeps up life.

It may be asked why, in a chapter on ethics, out of all possible subjects the subject of food-stuffs is selected for special discussion, a subject which is not even distantly touched in modern text-books on morals. The answer is that ethic is essentially concerned with giving and taking, appropriation and surrender, and the absorption or yielding up of life is the very essence of giving or taking. That the subject is ignored by modern text-books is due to the fact that their outlook on life is very different as a whole from that of a work like this; and, as a special case, the giving and taking with which they concern themselves, is what takes place between human and human at the most, sometimes the lower races of mankind being also excluded. But as that outlook changes, as the sweep of evolution is seen to include worlds invisible as well as the visible, as physical sciences are found to subserve the superphysical and metaphysical, as the inter-relation of physiological and psychological

would probably be more appropriate and effective.) The sin of himsā, conscious and deliberate slaughter, is directly proportionate to the amount of the Aham-element manifest in the organism slain.<sup>1</sup> Such slaughter by conscious human beings obstructs the normal evolution of the jīvas, slayer as well as slain. And whatever obstructs normal evolution, or the will of Brahmā, is sinful; and the opposite meritorious. To say that such slaughter must also be within the scheme of evolution and the will of Brahmā,

conditions is recognised more and more, the importance of 'diet' will also be realised more and more for psychical purposes as well as for those of physical health. The purer and finer the life that is sought to be lived, the body to be inhabited by the soul, the purer and finer must be the diet by which it is nourished. As said in *Light on the Path*: "He who desires to be karmaless" (in a comparative sense) "must look to the air for a home; and after that to the ether". Because the two appetites, for food and for progenition, are at the very root of the material life of the path of pursuit, great stress is laid on the gradual control and restraint of these, in the systems of yoga and practical metaphysics which deal with the path of renunciation.

<sup>1</sup> See *The Science of the Emotions*, 2nd edition, p. 227; and *The Science of Social Organisation, or The Laws of Manu in the Light of Theosophy*, p. 293 and p. 299.



otherwise it would not take place, and therefore is not sinful—is not enough; the reply is that, if we must talk in such phrases, we can equally say that sin and obstruction and punishment must also then be within the same scheme and will.

All such considerations, of proper and improper, good and evil, right and wrong, sin and merit, harmony and discord, duty and failure, doṣha and praḍoṣha, puṇya and pra-puṇya, dharma and aḍharma, svārtha and parārtha, selfishness and altruism—are all summed up in the words pravṛtti and nivṛtti and anuvṛtti,<sup>1</sup> pursuit and renunciation and continuance. He who ponders diligently on these words will find all problems of practical ethics cleared up for him. So also will he find illumined and reconciled all theories whatsoever, for instance—to name only the more wide-reaching ones—the ārambhavāda or the view that the world was created by an extra-cosmical personal deity; the pariṇāma-vāda, the view that it is the result of changes and transformations and evolutions in primitive substance due to chance or to the force of its own nature; the vi-varṭa-vāda, that it is an illusory appearance which is the

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Bhagavad-Gītā*, iii. 16, एवं प्रवर्तितं चक्रं नावृत्तं यतीह यः

‘reverse,’ the antithesis, of the Real; and the vi-pariṇāma, pari-varṭa, sam-pari-varṭa<sup>1</sup> and other vādas without number. The jīva that has realised the endless round of pravṛtti and nivṛtti will see what the truth of each such view is, and at what stage in the jīva’s cyclic life each necessarily arises. For he knows that all the *Shāstras*, all the ancient teachings, are in uttermost accord with one another, being only ideations of the different parts of one and the same world-plan, ideations by the different hierarchs, vested with different offices and functions, of one and the same Great Hierarchy of the Guides and Rulers of Evolution, all inspired unceasingly by and with the One Consciousness of Unity.

<sup>1</sup> The exact significance of these is not now known; only the other three views are mentioned in modern Samskr̥t works. See *The Science of Peace*, ch. xi, p. 133. Also compare the English words, theism, deism, atheism, agnosticism, monism, materialism, spiritualism, idealism, realism, naturalism, henotheism, monotheism, polytheism, hylozoism, absolutism, etc., etc., as indicating various “views” of the World-process, all simply ringing changes on the Primal Trinity, viz., the Relation (between) Self and Not-Self.