

# LUCIFER.

VOL. XI. LONDON, DECEMBER 15TH, 1892. No. 64.

*The Theosophical Society is in no way responsible for any opinions, in signed or unsigned articles, that appear in this Magazine. Nor does the Editor necessarily agree with the opinions expressed in signed articles.*

## VARUNAKA XII.

OM! In this twelfth Chapter the Guru initiates through his grace his disciple into the mysteries of that partless One.

The Disciple: O Master, through the drift of the instructions conveyed by you in the foregoing eleven Chapters, the conception of the self-identification of "I" and "mine" with the five Sheaths beginning with (the gross) Body, etc., has vanished. I have also attained the Âtmic knowledge that I am no other than Brahm, that is, of the nature of Sachchidânanda, which illuminates our intelligence. All doubts respecting it have been dispelled. But there is still one more doubt which yet lingers in my mind. It has been stated that Âtmâ is of the nature of Sat, of the nature of Chit, and of the nature of Ânanda (bliss). These three words, which denote three different characteristics, seem to convey three different significations. While so, how can these three words be applied to the partless one?

The Guru: O Son,<sup>1</sup> know that the partless one is that non-divisible one, which is not subject to the limitations of place (or space), time and (one) substance<sup>2</sup> (viz., is infinite, eternal and absolute). All these three characteristics are necessary to be postulated of that partless one (Brahm). As the element of Âkâsha is all-pervading, it is not subject to the limitation of space. Hence we have to attribute infiniteness to Brahm, in order to remove the stain of (Ativyâpti) redundancy (and differentiate Brahm from Âkâsha). As Âkâsha has its origin and destruction, it is subject to the limitations of time. Therefore, there is no redundancy in it (Âkâsha), by making Brahm not subject to

<sup>1</sup> After initiation the disciple is newly born, and hence the Guru is the father of the disciple.

<sup>2</sup> Vastu is translated as substance, which should be taken in its literal sense as that one underneath which is the substratum of all.

space and time. If we say that Brahm is not subject to the limitations of space and time alone, then, too, there arises the redundancy in time. Time is not subject to the limitation of space, nor is it subject to the limitation of time (itself), as it is impossible that it can be circumscribed by itself. Therefore it is that Brahm is said not to be subject to the limitation of a substance (equal to it.) As time has things other than itself (existing), it has the limitation of substance (viz., is not absolute). Hence (if the three are attributed to Brahm), there arises no redundancy whatever. Therefore Âtmâ (or Brahm) is not subject to these three limitations. Therefore it is, that all these three characteristics are predicated (of Brahm or Âtmâ). Through these alone Âtmâ should be known.

The Disciple: Please demonstrate to me the existence of these three characteristics (as said before) as partless in Âtmâ, since Âtmâ is the partless one. But they are not found in Âtmâ, (since) we find all persons saying, "I am not in this country; I was not in that country." Through this experience (of men) Âtmâ is not free from the limitations of space. Then through the experience of men who say, "I was born in such and such a year; I shall die ten years hence," and so on, we find that Âtmâ is not free from the limitations of time. Then through the experience of men who say, "I am not a Brâhman, I am not a Kshatriya," etc., we find Âtmâ is not free from the limitations of (one) substance. Therefore how is it that it is said that Âtmâ is not subject to these three limitations?

The Guru: In the eleventh Chapter, when we expatiated to you upon the characteristics of Âtmâ and Non-Âtmâ, did we not tell you that Âtmâ is all-full (or impartite) and Non-Âtmâ is divisible, and that all others (than Âtmâ) are merely illusory? Albeit you now question us about the characteristics of Âtmâ. Therefore, a doubt has arisen in our mind as to whether you are a *bonâ fide* disciple or a mere wrangling disputant. If you are a disciple we shall again explain it to you. If you are our accuser then we have merely to observe silence through patience, or to curse you in anger. Of course since our blessing in the matter of the initiation of our disciple has its effect on him, it follows *à fortiori* that a curse also will take its effect on our accuser. Know also that there is really no difference between a Brahmajñâni (a knower of Brahm) and Īshvara (the Lord) in their powers to bless or curse another in this world.

The Disciple: O most holy Master, who are a God, treat me only as a faithful disciple, worthy of your grace. I put the question to you only through doubt and not through impertinence.

The Guru: Then we shall again explain the matter to you. The three limitations of space, time and substance, apply only to Body, and not to the all-full Âtmâ. We will first illustrate that the limitations of space do not hold in the case of Pratyajâtmâ (the self), the

all-full Brahm. As (from the use of such sentences as): "pot is, wall is, picture is, and granary is; as also, the earth is, water is, Tejas (fire) is, Vāyu is, and Ākāsha is"—this universe composed of the Elements is enjoyed as Sat; therefore, Ātmā (from which the universe originates) is infinite. Thus the all-pervading Ātmā is not subject to the limitations of space. Similarly from the above mentioned illustrations it can also be inferred that Ātmā is beginningless. As it is eternal, it is not subject to the limitations of the future. Thus as Ātmā is the same in the past and the future it is not subject to the limitations of the present, too. As Ātmā is the Ātmā (or Self) of all objects, it is not subject to the limitations of substance (or is absolute).

The Disciple: Then how are substances divided?

The Guru: There are three kinds of differences in substances: difference in the same kind, difference in different kinds, and difference in the self-same (object). One tree (as contra-distinguished) from another tree, illustrates the first. A stone (as contra-distinguished) from a tree illustrates the second; while a tree, as contra-distinguished from its leaves, flowers and fruits, ripe or otherwise, illustrates the third. As Ātmā has not these three kinds of differences it is differenceless. Hence it is absolute.

The Disciple: (So far as I can see), it cannot be said that the above-said three differences do not apply to Ātmā. The one Consciousness appears as that of Brahm, Īshvara (Lord), Kūtaṣṭha (Higher Self) and Jīva (the Ego). Therefore, there is a difference in the same kind (in Ātmā). As the real nature of Ātmā is Brahm, and as the real nature of Non-Ātmā is the universe, there is difference in different kinds. There is also difference in the self-same thing. As Brahm has the three (attributes of) Sat, Chit, and Ānanda (bliss), therefore, whilst these three differences exist (in Ātmā), how then can it be said that it has not such differences?

The Guru: There is not difference in the same kind. Though the all-pervading Ākāsha is really one, yet it assumes different names by virtue of its environments, such as the great Ākāsha, the cloud Ākāsha, the pot Ākāsha, the reflected Ākāsha in water, pot, and so on. Likewise though consciousness is one, it manifests itself as Brahm and Īshvara, through the medium of Māyā, and as Kūtaṣṭha<sup>1</sup> and Jīva through the medium of Avidyā. On a close investigation we find there is not the difference in the same kind between them (but they are identical). Then to the difference in different kinds. Without rope there cannot arise the misconception of it for a serpent; without Ākāsha there cannot arise the appearance of blueness (in it). So without Ātmā there cannot be Non-Ātmā. Except the primal seat (or cause), all else which is the result of attribution is merely illusory.

<sup>1</sup> Here Kūtaṣṭha is applied to Brahm itself from the standpoint of man and not of Cosmos.

That which is illusory is that which does not exist during the three periods of time, like the son of a barren woman, the horns of a hare, and so on. As no reality of existence can be predicated of Non-Âtmâ, therefore Âtmâ has no difference in different kinds. Then to the last difference. Such positive names of Âtmâ as Sâkshî (witness), Kûtastha (Higher Self), Paramârhika, Prajñâ, Brahm, Sachchidânanda, the eternal, the one, and the all-full; and such negative names of Âtmâ as the grossless, atomless, the secondless, the changeless, destructionless, actionless, and cause-to-act-less, all these point only to a right cognition of the one-attributeless Âtmâ, but do not signify a difference of reality, since it (Âtmâ) is the supreme and partless one. Therefore there is no difference in the self-same substance.

The Disciple: As the words Sat, Chit, and Ânanda convey three different meanings, and as they are not synonymous, like the words Hastha, Pâni, and Kara (which all mean hand), there is the third kind of difference in Âtmâ denoted by those words (Sat), like the leaves, fruits, etc., which can be differentiated from the tree in which they have their origin.

The Guru: Just as the redness, heat, and glare of a light cannot be differentiated from the light, so are Sat, Chit, and Ânanda non-different from Atmâ. Hence there is not the difference of the third kind. But it cannot be said that the third kind of difference does not exist in the case of a tree with reference to its leaves and flowers. The whole tree is not said to be the leaves or flowers; but it is in some of its parts of the form of leaves, in others of the form of flowers, and in some others of many other forms. Therefore there is not in this case difference of the third kind. Where it is said that Âtmâ is of the nature of Sachchidânanda, it is meant that Âtmâ is in all its aspects of the nature of Sachchidânanda, just as in a light which has redness, heat, and glare, it (the light) is in all its aspects of the nature of redness, heat, and glare. Therefore there is in Âtmâ no difference of the third kind.

The Disciple: Then why should the Shrutis teach us again and again that Atmâ is of the nature of Sat, is of the nature of Chit, and is of the nature of Ânanda? Cannot Âtmâ be cognized through one characteristic alone?

The Guru: Please hear what the rationale of such instructions is in the Shrutis. People in this world commit most monstrous blunders through conceiving this universe itself to be the reality (or Sat) of Âtmâ, this inert (lower) intelligence of ours to be (Chit) consciousness proper, and the pleasures of wife, sons, etc., to be Ânanda (bliss) itself. Conversely, they regard the Sachchidânanda of Âtmâ as no other than the unreality of the universe, the inertness of intelligence, and the pleasures of wife, sons, etc. Consequently all people are deluded in saying, "I am impermanent, I am (merely) inert (or material), I am

full of pains"—being under the false impression that this universe is real, Manas, etc. (which pertain to the lower mind), is consciousness *per se*, and then son, wife, etc., are of the form of bliss. It is only to eradicate this delusion of the people that the Shrutis inculcate upon all saying: "O men of the world, in order to impress upon you that you are no other than Sachchidânanda, I say (in the books) that Âtmâ is Sat (reality) and not unreality, it is Chit (consciousness) and not inertness, and it is Ânanda (bliss) and not pains." Thus it should be known that the Shrutis teach people in this manner in order to dispel their delusion. Again the Shrutis, through the (compound) word Sachchidânanda, indicate the oneness of Âtmâ. But some disputants in this world hold that Sat, Chit, and Ânanda are merely the attributes of Âtmâ, and that Âtmâ is not itself Sachchidânanda. In order to remove this (conception also) the Shrutis say that Âtmâ is Sachchidânanda.

The Disciple: How did you learn that this only is the drift of the Shrutis (with reference to the interpretation of Sachchidânanda)?

The Guru: Know that the real significance of the partless nature (of Brahm) should be determined according to the Shrutis through the six means of Upakrama, etc., (as described in the fifth Chapter of this book).

The Disciple: O God, now that the partless nature (of Sachchidânanda) has been proved through the (authority of) Shrutis, I hope you will be pleased to prove its partless nature through inference.

The Guru: Now Sat should either be self-shining or should be shining through another. If the former, then Sat only is Chit. But should it shine through another, then is that other different from Sat (in nature), or is it another Sat? If it is other than Sat, then it must be Asat (unreality) which is as unreal as the horns of a hare. Therefore that other which is unreal (viz., Asat) cannot have the power to illuminate Sat. But if there is another Sat then the question arises is that (another) Sat self-shining, or is it illuminated by another? In the former case Sat only should be Chit. If the latter, then it will again and again be producing unlimited unrealities. Through this process there will arise the many (faults or)<sup>1</sup> stains such as those clinging to Âtmâ, those mutually interdependent, those recurring, and those arising from absence of finality or conclusion. Therefore Sat is self-shining. It has been already said that that which shines of itself is certainly Chit. Therefore Chit alone is Sat and Sat alone is Chit. Both are one. Moreover it is nowhere stated in the Vedas that there is another Sat. Therefore it is certain that Sat also shines of itself.

Then comes the further question. How comes it that bliss (Ânanda) can be predicated of Sat which is self-shining? As Sat is

<sup>1</sup> The four stains as stated in the original in Sanskrit are Âtmâshraya, Anyonyâshraya, Chackrâpatti and Anavasthâ.

secondless there is (in it) bliss all-full. In a small part there cannot be all-fulness. Therefore this all-fulness is (or does belong) to non-duality and not to duality.

Then how is Sat non-dual? O Son, if the question is raised whether the power of Sat associating with another Sat is due to another Sat, or to one different from it in characteristics (we find both are not possible, and) it is not due to another. As through the evidence of the sacred books, inference and experience, it cannot be proved that there is another Sat, the first position will not hold. Nor will the second position also hold, since a thing different from Sat has no reality, being like the horns of a hare. Besides these two unrealities there can be no other unreality. Therefore as the one Sat is secondless and non-dual it is certain that it is also all-full. Through it, it is also certain that the self-shining Sat alone is Ananda (bliss). Thus, therefore, through inference should be known the partless nature of the words Sat, Chit and Ananda.

Then through experience we shall prove the partless nature of Sachchidānanda. Though this subject was treated of in the eleventh Chapter (of this book), yet we shall dwell upon it again to convince you all the more. There is a happiness enjoyed by all men in their dreamless sleep. That happiness is not manifold, like (or is continuous unlike) the one in the waking and the dreaming states. It is one without a medium for its enjoyment. Therefore this bliss is one only. As the bliss of the dreamless sleeping state shines (or is enjoyed) without the aid of sun or other lights, there is in that state Chit (or the self-shining consciousness). Now the proof that there is the self-shining (Chit) (existent) in the bliss of that state is found in the fact that there arises in man on awaking from sleep the reminiscence that he slept soundly till then. As it is an unerring law that every thought is generated by a previous enjoyment, we have to postulate of the bliss in the dreamless sleeping state a previous enjoyment. But inasmuch as there are no organs of sense, etc., then existent to produce an enjoyment, know that the enjoyment of the bliss of the dreamless sleeping state should emanate only from self-light (or Chit). In the dreamless sleeping state, bliss (Ananda) shines as well as Ajñāna (non-wisdom). Which of these two is the self-shining light? On a proper investigation we shall find it is Ananda (bliss) that is the self-shining light. As Ajñāna has the envelope of Avarana (centripetal force or individuality) it is not self-shining. Therefore it is Ātmā alone that shines as bliss in the dreamless sleeping state and illuminates Ajñāna also, which is falsely attributed to it. Therefore bliss is the self-shining light (or Chit). Therefore through experience also it is certain that the Sachchidānanda (of Ātmā) is of partless nature. Thus through the holy books, inference and experience, it has been proved that Ātmā has no difference in itself.

Therefore it is clear that *Âtmâ* is all-full, having not the three differences mentioned before. Therefore it is also clear that *Âtmâ* is partless, non-dual and the essence. O Son, to this *Âtmâ* that is all-full and blissful, pains are merely the accretions. Having known that pains are merely the result of Body, Body the result of Karma, Karma the result of *Râga* and other desires, *Râga*, etc., the result of *Abhimâna* (reference of all objects to self), and *Abhimâna* the result of *Aviveka* (non-discrimination), and non-discrimination the result of *Ajñâna* (non-wisdom); having understood that *Jñâna* only will remove *Ajñâna* through *Vichâra* (spiritual intuitive meditation) and having practically known through right enquiry that *Âtmâ* is *Sachchid-ânanda*, that Body and the Universe are only inert and of the form of pains, and that this Universe is merely an illusion, one should cognize that most transcendental Wisdom through its direct cognition generated by the Sacred Sentences such as "I am Brahm." That exalted personage who is in that intuitive spiritual direct Cognition of that Supreme Wisdom is really a Guru, be he a *Chandâla* (low caste personage) or a *Brâhman*. That such is the indubitable opinion of that most holy *Shankarâchârya* is clear from some verses in one of his works. May you—after being convinced of the fact that this personage is no other than a *Paramahamsa*<sup>1</sup> ascetic who should be revered far above *Behuthaka*, *Kutichaka* and *Hamsa* ascetics, and after contemplating and meditating upon *Âtmâ* according to my instructions—become that non-dual Brahm that is the unconditioned, immaculate, the intelligent, the emancipator and the true and supreme bliss. Hereafter there is nothing more which I have to teach you.

Thus ends the last Chapter of the meditations of *Vâsudeva*, a *Paramahamsa* ascetic. OM-TAT-SAT.

---

### Gem from the Rig Veda Sanhita.

THOU whose ears hear all things, listen quickly to my invocation; hold in thy heart my praises; keep near to thee this hymn, as it were (the words of) a friend.

Who will give us the great *Aditi* [the Cosmic Mother, *Buddhi*], that I may again behold my father and my mother.

Let us invoke the auspicious name of *Agni* [Higher *Manas*], the first divinity of the immortals, that he may give to us the great *Aditi*, that I may again behold my father and my mother [*Âtmâ* and *Buddhi*].

---

<sup>1</sup> There are six degrees of asceticism, called *Behutaka*, *Kutichaka*, *Hamsa*, *Paramahamsa*, *Turiyâtita* and *Avadhâta*.