

# *Lust, Jealousy, and Physical Love*



## Lust is the Mother of Jealousy

From Bhagavan Das. *The Science of the Emotions*. Adyar: Theosophical Publishing House, 1924 (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.), pp. 165-67. A searchable PDF of the 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. of 1908 can be found in our Constitution of Man Series.

**The kind of Love that is mostly responsible for the feeling of Jealousy is that which is best denominated Lust.**

To refined natures it would probably at first sight look impermissible and improper to call Lust a kind of Love at all. Yet there is something in common between them. Later and evil associations, and natural and inevitable consequences, have made the present connotation of Lust a truly evil one. That it was not so always is apparent in the use of the expression “lusty Youth,” where only physical vigour and capacity for physical Love are meant, without any depreciatory significance.

As Love is desire for union by exchange and equalisation, generally, so Lust is desire for union by exchange and equalisation in the physical self or body pre-eminently.

**Satiety, exhaustion, weariness, dreariness, and unhappiness are some of the evil consequences of Lust.**

As marriage-unions based on Lust only lead invariably to exhaustion and satiety of the physical nature in a more or less short time, and, the higher mental and other superphysical selves or bodies not having been cultivated, the higher forms of Love lasting even through rebirths and long aeons of time, remain impossible; unhappiness is the logical consequence of such marriage unions, and, far more, of unions which are not sanctified by even the formalities of marriage — formalities which have at least a shadow of religion and spirituality, *i.e.*, the higher and wider consciousness, about them.

It then appears that the evil consequences of Lust, its resultant satiety, exhaustion, weariness, dreariness, and unhappiness, make it evil; otherwise, it were not evil; otherwise, its consanguinity to Love proper were undisputed. It is the same with other moods of mind to which the word Love is even less hesitatingly applied by mankind. We read that Roman and other epicures “loved” the cooked tongues and brains of nightingales and other delicate birds. The present constitution of the majority of the human race is such that it gladly sanctions the use of the word love in this connection, and entirely fails to see the horror of the wholesale murder involved. In the strict and abstract sense of the word, however, even this use is perfectly correct;<sup>1</sup> it is only the “consequences” involved that throw this gloom over the word in this reference. As Bhīshma said:

Flesh groweth not on grasses, nor on trees, nor on stones; it is obtained only by killing a living creature; hence only the sin of eating it.

<sup>1</sup> *Mahābhārata Anushāsana Parva*, cxv, 26

It may be noted here that the more love is confined to the physical self, the more it is lust; and the more lust approximates to a mere “appetite,” a pure sense-craving, the less it has of the character of emotion proper.<sup>1</sup>

## The riddle of physical love unriddled

From Bhagavan Das. *The Science of the Emotions*. Adyar: Theosophical Publishing House, 1924 (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.), pp. 168-73. (A searchable PDF of the 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. of 1908 can be found in our Constitution of Man Series.)

### Separateness is the cause of bondage as well as of freedom.

The so-called mystery of physical Love may not inappropriately be considered here. The question, of course, belongs, as usual, to Metaphysic, the Metaphysic of the jīva in the procreative aspect. But a brief statement may perhaps throw some light on that aspect of it which is more immediately dealt with here.

Amongst the primary so-called lowest organisms, procreation, self-multiplication, is a-sexual. A cell absorbs nourishment and grows; it appropriates other matter (and all matter is animate); it expands itself at the expense of something else, another self (in the general sense). Its own oneness grows. But the mass of *matter* that makes up its “oneness,” its “individuality,” carries within itself the principle of manyness inherently. It therefore necessarily, inevitably, falls apart into two, sooner or later.

---

<sup>1</sup> This may be said to be more or less the case in asexual reproduction and in what is called self-abuse, which may be regarded as a degenerate, *i.e.*, mistimed and misplaced and therefore infructuous or even harmful reversion to the primeval type of asexual reproduction. The facts involved here constitute another illustration of how extremes meet, how vice and virtue are inextricably tied to each other, how they are continuations and prolongations and excesses of each other, how the seeds of all the vices and all the virtues are always present in every one, how the “highest” and the “lowest” merge into each other at critical junction-lines.

Getting pleasure out of one’s own body, one’s outer self, in the way alluded to, is called self-abuse, and, generally speaking, is abuse. Getting the bliss of peace out of one’s Inmost Self by uniting, *i.e.*, identifying it with the Universal Self, is called, and rightly called, Divine Ecstasy and Moksha. Getting joy out of one’s middle self, the mind, by means of stimulated emotions, stimulated by means of one’s own imagination in day-dreams, phantasies, reveries or by another’s (the novelist’s, playwright’s, actor’s, cinema-showman’s) may be either debilitating waste of psychic energy, as in physical self-abuse, or may constitute instructive preparation for really good action (as in the Greek philosopher’s view that good poetry and tragic drama may be used to purge the mind and give it tone), according to circumstances and to the proportion between mental activity and physical action; even as getting joy out of one’s physical body, by exhilarating exercise or play may be unhealthy if overdone or wrongly done, or be very healthful if properly done and well-regulated.

And yet, so closely are good and evil interwoven, that even disproportioned excess has, at times, its own good use or even great value in the universal scheme of things. As sung by Sūr Dās,

Lord of Pity! we see not Thy ways!  
Out of sin Thou drawest virtue, out of virtue sin.  
From the deepest depths of hell King Nrga doth to heaven win!

Excessive introversion, selfward-directed activity, while, in one sense, it is “regressing mentally to the age in which the satisfactions are normally taken out of the self and not out of the external world, namely, the age of infancy” (of the individual as well as the Human Race, we may add), in another sense is closely allied to *Vairāgya*, in which mood, too, the self retires into or upon itself, goes into a sort of sleep-and-dream or seed or egg condition, before waking up anew into the full-blown *jñāna*, knowledge, of the Universal Self. In other words, the first introversion has for object the individual self; the second, the Universal Self.

In this connection, the following extracts from the *Chhāndogya-Upanishad* may be found suggestive (VII, xxv).

*Prāna* and *Vāch*, vitality and voice, this pair is in the AUM; when the two of a pair come together, they fulfil each other’s desires. . . . He who knoweth thus, findeth his love, his play, his pair, his blissful joy within himself, he becometh truly self-governed, self-ruling, *swa-rāt*, he moveth at will in all the worlds; but they that know otherwise, they have others [than themselves] for their rulers, and their possessions are perishable.

(The quotation made above, regarding mental regression to infancy, is from Dr. Wilfrid Lay’s *The Child’s Unconscious Mind*, pp. 313-16 of which, it may be mentioned incidentally, contain some balanced and useful advice regarding the trouble of self-abuse and the way to deal with it, in connection with the education of children and youth, sympathetically, without prudery and without too much frightening and exaggeration as regards ill-effects so as to avoid lack of trust on the one hand, and, on the other, the production of neuroses in the tender mind which may be worse even than the habit of self-abuse.)

But in falling apart, the new, the second, mass, retains the nature of “livingness” of that particular type, which it has acquired during the period of oneness; and so it becomes the centre of the new life of an individual similarly constituted; another jīva, of the same class, at once comes in and occupies the readymade, specially-prepared, home. Trace the process up from *udbhij-ja*, born by fission, separation, or sprouting; through *sveda-ja*, sweat-born, by exudation and gemmation; and *anda-ja*, egg-born; into *pinda-ja*, viviparous sexual humanity, step by step. The kind, the essential nature, of the process is exactly the same in essence, but the manner has changed completely. The “expansion” of one embodied jīva, which was in the first instance caused by direct actual and real nourishment, comparatively speaking, is now caused by an excitement of the multiple senses and organs of that jīva by an appropriation of another embodied jīva, which appropriation is only the *simulation* and the substitute of the process of the absorption of nourishment.

In the simulation and substitution is the apparent mystery. Each *jīva-upādhi* attracts the other in order to absorb it into itself and so enlarge its own life; and at the same time each repulses the other sufficiently to avoid being wholly absorbed into it. This is mutual. Attraction prevailing largely over Repulsion — the latter becoming reduced to a mere consciousness of separate individual existence in some of the highest forms of love or *mukti* — there is mutual approach and embrace, a *simulation* of absorption and nourishment, but not complete and real absorption and nourishment. And here appetite and desire pass into the form of emotion.

It may be noted that *simulation*, *māyā*, is the very nature of the world-process. Therefore the more the simulation, the deeper, the more complex, the more real-seeming the world-process. That the Infinite and ever-full and changeless and Universal I Am the infinite and individual I, and absorb matter and grow with nourishment, and become too large to contain myself, to hold myself together, and so burst into many I’s — this is the first simulation. That the individual I seem to absorb my fellow I, and so enhance and multiply myself, is the second and still more flimsy simulation. But the more absurd and impossible the hypocrisy, the deeper it deceives! So that Sex has become all-dominating at this stage of evolution. Because of the greater *māyā* of sex, there results in connection therewith, the greater play of mind — which mind is the very embodiment of *māyā*<sup>1</sup> — in all its aspects; for with the advent of sex-differentiation, desire takes on newer and more arbitrary shades, and intelligence, at the bidding thereof, helps more and more to complicate the simple by devising ever more tortuous means to attain the ends commanded by desire, and action corresponds in complexity with the plans of the intellect. “The mind is the cause of bondage as well as of freedom” and “the man is desire.”

It has been observed that, in most living organisms, all the psycho-physical functions increase and decrease simultaneously with sex-power.

---

<sup>1</sup> Śamkarāchārya, *Upadesha-Sāhasrī*

## Endnote by the Author

The work of co-ordinating physiological facts with psychological experiences, of understanding physical processes and bringing them home to ourselves by reducing them into terms of mental processes, is one of the main functions of metaphysic. This view, the exact opposite of that materialism which held sway in the west a few decades ago, is steadily gaining ground there. Thus a medical man, Dr. Morton Prince, writes at p. 131 of his work on *The Unconscious* (publ. 1921) that:

. . . the psychical [and consciousness] is reality, while matter [and physical process] is a *phenomenon*, the disguise, so to speak, under which the psychical appears when apprehended through the special senses . . . In their last analysis all physical facts are psychical in nature . . . so that physiological and psychical are one.

Accordingly, the processes of cell-multiplication by simple or direct division, by mitotic or indirect division, and by conjugatory fertilisation, successively growing in complexity, require all to be translated into terms of metaphysical ideation (for many examples of which, see *The Pranava-vāda <Gargyayana>*, or *The Science of the Sacred Word*) <in 3 Vols., by Bhagavan Das. Adyar: The Theosophist Office, 1911>

“I that am One, may I become much and many”; for “The Solitary feels no joy; yet from *another* ariseth fear.” These, as indicated by the Upanishads, seem to be the main ideas or ideations that underlie multiplication of the various kinds, and indeed all manifestation of the Unmanifest, and also the ambivalence of all that manifestation.

With the progress of research, naturally, the accounts of these processes of cell-physiology have been amplified and also altered in details. Thus ch. xxi, by Guyer, in H.H. Newman’s *Evolution, Genetics, and Eugenics* (publ. 1921) contains many statements which not only supplement, but differ from, the descriptions given in the works on cytology of twenty years ago. But the main facts remain unchanged.

What the significance is, in terms of metaphysical ideation, of the elaborate and minute processes of these various kinds of cell-multiplication, is a subject of profound interest and importance, and, it is to be hoped, will be worked out some day.

The description in *Manu* (i, 9-13), of the beginning of our world-system (which too may be regarded as a cell, or an atom <i.e., the “indivisible” or the Pythagorean Monas>, from different standpoints), may almost be interpreted as if it were in terms of cell-physiology.

He, the Subtle, the Self-born, the Unmanifest, manifested Himself as a whirling mass of light. Desirous of evolving various kinds of living beings, he created the waters [plasm], and in them the *bija* [nucleus]. It became the golden *anda* [egg, cell]. In it was born Brahmā [centrosome]. The *āpah*, waters [plasm], are created by Nara, the Self; therefore they are known as *nāra*; and because Nara comes to dwell in them [as nucleus], therefore is Nara also called Nārāyana. The Primal Cause [as the nucleus?] causes the formation, out of Himself, of Brahmā [the centrosome]. Brahmā, dwelling in the *anda* [egg or cell] for a long

age, divides it into two [brings about the formation of a second centrosome, polarisation, cleavage of chromosomes, *etc.*]. With the *shakalas* [pieces of chromosome] all the things of the world are built.

Incidentally, it may be mentioned here that the different species were fixed by Brahmā in the very beginning, according to *Manu* (i, 29). The latest researches in cytology also show that each species has its fixed number of chromosomes. This requires to be reconciled with the ordinary evolutionary view of the origin of different species from the same root-stock. The metaphysical explanation and reconciliation are simple. All the effects are already present in the One Cause. If cell-physiology can ascertain that at some stage the chromosomes also are or were modified, it will have effected the reconciliation.

There are many suggestive stories in the *Purānas* connected with this subject generally. Modern works on the reproductive processes (*e.g.*, Thomson and Geddes' *Sex*) tell us that single-celled organisms seem to lose their vital force and cease multiplying asexually, after the two-hundredth generation or so; but that conjugation, then, restores their vitality and power of multiplication to them. The *Purānas* say that Brahmā first created Shtānu-Rudra, and bade him go and multiply, and he went and repeated exact copies of himself. Whereat Brahmā was dissatisfied and divided himself into two halves, of two different and opposite sexes, (Manu and Shata-rūpā, "mind" and "the hundred-formed") and then the progeny multiplied and varied endlessly. Guyer, above referred to, tells us (at *pp.* 305, 306) that "sex, through recombinations of the ancestral materials" (particularly of the chromosomes), "undoubtedly means among other things, the production of great diversity in offspring." He also tells us that "a single set of chromosomes derived from one parent only is sufficient for the production of a complete organism." This is matched in the *Purānas* by the stories of special births from the father alone or the mother alone. Alternate predominance of one sex, in hermaphrodite organisms, (though perhaps more psychically than physically), has already been referred to in the case of Shakuni. Other cases are those of Rksha-rajā (in the *Rāmāyana*), of Ila-Sudyumna (in the *Purānas*), *etc.*

It has to be borne in mind that, metaphysically, and apparently physiologically also (as is but right, for spirit and matter, mind and body, go with each other), even in the case of what seems asexual cell-multiplication and reproduction by simple division, duality is present, though hidden.

Guyer's remark (*p.* 302) that "There is considerable evidence which indicates that throughout life, the chromosomes contributed by the male parent remain distinct from those of the female parent," and the notion put forward in Sanskrit works on medicine (*e.g.*, *Sushruta*), that, of the various systems which make up the human organism, the skeletal, the nervous, the vascular, the hairy, *etc.*, some are derived from the mother and some from the father, may someday throw light upon each other. The dualistic symmetry pervading the body, of the right and the left sides, may also be due to some "sex" causes, the primal sex-difference being that of Purusha and Prakriti, Spirit and Matter.

