

## GITA CLASS – CHAPTER 2, PART 5

We are discussing the 16<sup>th</sup> shloka. In the 15<sup>th</sup> shloka, the Lord said to Arjuna, ‘you must forbear the dualities such as cold and heat!’ How is that? The answer was said that in truth, these are not real. They are *asat*, imaginary. We said that the word ‘*asat*’ means, ‘imagined.’ Why are these imagined? Śāṅkara said that this is because they are changing. They are effects. When we examine all objects which are effects, we can know, ‘these are subject to destruction. They don’t exist before coming into being or after destruction. They are *asat*, imagined. They cannot exist apart from their cause.’

If everything that is an effect is *Asat*, imagined, then some will say that we have to accept the principle of ‘nothingness.’ This is in the *bhāṣyā*, as ‘*sarvābhāvaprasaṅgaḥ*.’ This ‘nothingness,’ or ‘*sarvābhāvam*,’ is not acceptable to an *Advaitī*. Therefore, Śāṅkara is explaining the principle of *Asat* in *Advaita*. It says, ‘*sarvatra buddhidvayopalabheḥ sadbuddhiḥ asadbuddhir iti*.’ Here, it is proving with logic, ‘The world is *Asat*.’ We can take a facet of the universe, and think, ‘How is this world *Asat*?’ Why does it prove that the universe is *Asat*, imagined? If one must prove the correctness of the *Advaita* Philosophy through logic, you must accept that the world is *Asat*, imagined.

If it is accepted that the World is ‘*Sat*,’ *Advaita* won’t succeed. Therefore, wherever *Advaita* is established through logic, or whenever the author strives to make one aware of *Advaita* through logic, he will first have to make the listener aware, ‘the Universe is not True.’ That is what happens here. Because this discussion relies on the strength of logic, when we hear for the first time, we will feel it a little difficult to understand. That isn’t just for those hearing the first time. It is also for those hearing a second time. That is the specialty of this subject.

This is because of the subtlety of Śāṅkara’s intellect. That becomes manifest in some sections of the *bhāṣyā*. We cannot reach that level suddenly, and grasp it. We have to go step by step. Therefore, one will need more explanation. When this is explained, the matter becomes more deep and serious. That is the other problem. We will have to depend on Tikas, explanations. In other words, to

explain things, some of *Śankara* disciples wrote Tikas. If we must understand that commentary, we will need another explanation. It goes like this.

Why is that? It is because it is presenting a deep subject. Therefore, after hearing this commentary or its explanation, no one should be startled. Be at ease. We said before, only if the mind is peaceful can we understand this. This is because I can see that some have quit the class and left. I don't have any expectation that I will see them again. This is because in a single day of class, it was enough. 'This program is not for me.' Some have felt this. Therefore, you need not be afraid. If you give just a little alertness, you will understand. This is because I am explaining with the request that you should understand. Explaining more is for that. This section is difficult to grasp. With awareness of that, I will explain.

I have had to explain this section on several occasions. However, I haven't had to explain in this much detail before. This is because I'm not becoming aware of whether the listeners understand or don't understand. I don't have any faith in that.

We should know that there is no knowledge that is gained from outside. All knowledge is contained within. When we hear something and understand it, what happens? What happens is that we bring to light the levels of awareness in the mind that were previously hidden from us. Everything that comes from outside is just an instrument for this process. What is most needed is the wakefulness of the mind. This is because all of this is contained within us in *samskara*. We again receive the opportunity to hear this. This isn't the first time we are hearing this. There is no way that can be. This is because there are many things which must be heard before this. If we hear along with that previous *samskāra*, then surely, we will understand properly. We should at least have this faith. This is subtle subject.

However, some commentators treat this subject with a light attitude. This subject must not be seen as insignificant. That is why I said that the wakefulness of the mind and intellect is needed. Yesterday, someone asked, 'how good are the Malayalam versions of *Śankara's* commentary?' Before stating an opinion, I should first go and read them. So, after the class, I went and got the translation read it seriously. Then I understood, 'everything in the commentary is changed.'

In other words, if someone hearing this class reads this Malayalam commentary while attending the class, they will become confused. A person can either understand that or understand this. It isn't possible to understand both at the same time, because what is said is different in both. Therefore, I ask you, till the end of this discussion, 'don't read the Malayalam commentaries!' If you know Sanskrit, it's fine to read the commentaries in Sanskrit. There, the matters are explained very clearly. However, by reading the Malayalam commentaries, it will change your head. Therefore, do not try to read these while attending the class.

We may think that this will help us to understand these matters simply, especially this section. This is because some commentators will explain this section in the same way as other sections; with an insignificant attitude and without thinking deeply about the subject. Reading this will create confusion for the reader. Therefore, if there is anyone here who has read the Malayalam translations like this, to correct this, I will explain this section once again.

In the *bhāṣyā*, it says, '*yad viśayā buddhiḥ na vyabhicarati, tat sat.*' In whatever objective knowledge that does not undergo change, that object is *sat*, True. This is what the commentary says. However, the Malayalam commentaries say, 'For whatever objective knowledge that does not undergo change, that knowledge is *sat*, true.' Through this commentary, the meaning is changed. In this way, many sections of the commentary are changed.

What is the meaning here? Whatever objective knowledge does not change, '*yad viśayā*,' that object is Sat. So there is the word '*yad*.' Then in the end of the sentence comes the word '*tat*.' So there is '*yad*' and '*tat*.' In the Malayalam way of pronouncing, it is '*yata*' '*tata*.' This is for showing a single object. This points to a single object. The word '*yad*,' means, 'whatever object.' This is a primary rule of commentary. This is a kindergarten lesson. When it says, 'for whatever objective knowledge, 'and then says, '*tat*,' that is what is being described. So, '*yad viśayā buddhiḥ*.' The knowledge about whichever object, which does not change.' Then when it says, '*tat*,' because it said, '*yad*' before, this is connected. 'That object.' That is the meaning. Not, 'that knowledge.' The meaning is, 'that object is Sat, Real.

This can be explained in a different way, through *anuvṛtti* and *vyavṛtti*. This is explained in another *bhāṣyā* in *Advaita*, as '*anvayam*' and '*vyatirekam*.' In

several classes, we have discussed these concepts, of ‘*anuvṛtti*, *vyāvṛtti*, *anvayam* and *vyatirekam*.’ *Anuvṛtti* means to continue. An example of this is, ‘there is this. This is True.’

Then the parts of the sentence can have *vyāvṛtti*. This is where there is a contrast. ‘There is this. This is Unreal.’ That which is continuous is called Real, and that which changes is Unreal. To show that continuity, it says this word ‘*anuvṛtti*,’ or ‘*anvayam*.’ To show that changing, the word ‘*vyāvṛtti*,’ or ‘*vyatirekam*’ is used. This isn’t the meaning of these words used in *Tārka Śāstra*, the science of Logic. These are the meanings for *Advaita*. These are different. Here, what is said, ‘*yat viśayā buddhiḥ*.’ When we know an object, our knowledge contains that object. Or, the object exists in our knowledge. That is what happens. Here, it says that the object is the indication of knowledge. It makes knowledge manifest. For that knowledge becoming manifest, the object exists as its indicator. We said an example of this in the *bhāṣyā*, ‘*san ghaṭaḥ san paṭaḥ san hastī*.’

Whenever we know any object in the Universe, Existence is joined together with the knowledge of that object. That is the meaning of what is said in the *Bhāṣyā*. That knowledge is merged with Existence. In the way it is described in the *bhāṣyā*, when we have knowledge of any object, there are two elements to that knowledge. One is Existence, and second is that object. There is existence and the object. This is something we must keep in mind.

When we obtain knowledge within, we see all of the objects as being external. We experienced them as being external. In the object that is seen externally, there are two parts. First is the portion of the object, and second is the portion of *Sat*, Existence. For whatever knowledge we experience, there is both *Sat* and *Asat*, or *Sat* and *Mithyā* (illusion), or *Sat* and the imagined object. We know that *Sat* as being joined together with the imagined object. This is true no matter what knowledge it is.

One part is imagined, created by the mind. That is called ‘*Asat*.’ In the external object, there is this quality of being external. I said this the previous day. The mind superimposes time and place, and imagines this ‘external.’ We say normally, ‘knowledge occurred within me.’ We say this. In truth, there is no inside of outside for knowledge. Inside and outside exist for the body. These exist

for the body. Within the body, there is the heart, bones, blood, flesh, etc. Thus there are several things within the body. Outside of the body, there are external objects, such as stones, mud, trees, everything. However, in truth, how is knowledge? Like that, does knowledge have a place inside, or a place outside? There is no internal or external for knowledge. Why is that? It is because it is pervasive.

Here we are sitting, and we know the sun. We know space. Knowledge contains space within. Then where is space? It is within and out. Can we say there is an internal and external for space? No, we can't. It is knowledge which knows the space. That knowledge is the same; it has no inside or outside. Instead, it has everything within it. Everything exists within knowledge.

This is said in elsewhere by *Shankara*. '*Viśvam darpana dṛśyamāna sadṛśī tūlyam, nijam antargatam paśyan ātmani māyayā bahiryodbhūtam.*' We see this universe as being external. When we see objects as being external, in the supreme truth, the objects are not situated outside. When we know the Universe, the world, what happens? The world is situated in knowledge. The world exists, being contained in knowledge. That is why *Shankara* says, 'it is like seeing in a mirror.'

Within a mirror, one can see the reflection of nearby objects. Where is that reflection? It is within the mirror. That is seen within the mirror. So like seeing a reflection within a mirror, in one's realm of awareness, this universe exists. As far as a mirror goes, an external object is needed. That object must be reflected into the mirror. A person to look in the mirror is needed. He thus sees the reflection in the mirror. Then he sees all surrounding object within the mirror.

Why does all of that happen? A mirror is a material object. It is not a *taijas* object, composed of pure Energy. However, that isn't what happens to knowledge. Knowledge is neither material, nor *taijas*. That is *Chaitanya*, Pure Consciousness. Because it is made of *Chaitanya*, it can reflect and support this universe within it without the help of anything else. When we see an object, that is what happens, in truth.

Here, we are examining this kind of object-experience. '*Yat viśayā buddhiḥ.*' We know any small object. Knowledge contains that object. When we know an object, knowledge is always joined together with the object. I know, 'this is a

book.' This knowledge exists joined together with the book. Otherwise, the book exists joined together with knowledge. This happens when I know the object. However, when I know another object in the next moment, what happens? This object leaves knowledge. The object leaves. Even though knowledge remains, it receives a new object. That is what it says here.

While I know the book, the book is an object of knowledge. However, when I know a different object in the next moment, what happens? That moves away from knowledge. How? A new object comes to knowledge. That is what is explained here. '*Yad viṣayā buddhiḥ,*' in whatever kind of objective knowledge, '*na vyabhicharati,*' that does not change, '*tad sat,*' that object is Real. However, here it isn't like that. The object changes. While knowing the book, in the next moment, I know the table. Then the object of knowledge changes. Because the object changes, what happens? '*yad viṣayā buddhiḥ vyabhicharati, tad asat.*' In whatever objective knowledge that changes – my knowledge about the book left, therefore, what is it? – '*Tat asat,*' that is imagined. That is something that exists within the mind. That isn't something that exists outside of the mind, or outside of knowledge.

And what about what is seen as external? Where is the external place that is created by knowledge? It is within knowledge itself. Knowledge itself imagines its knowledge as being internal and external. It is knowledge itself that does that imagining. After imagining, what does it do? Knowledge says, 'the knowledge within me,' and knowledge says, 'the external object.' Both are imagined by knowledge; inside and outside. In Sanskrit, this is said as '*ahamīta,*' and '*idamīta.*' One is the attitude of 'I,' along with everything connected to it. Second is the attitude of 'this,' and the external side that is joined with that.

Both of these are things that exist within knowledge. That is why it says here, '*yad viṣayā buddhiḥ,*' whatever objective knowledge, '*vyabhicharati,*' changes, '*tat,*' that object, '*asat,*' is imagined. This book before me, is imagined. Why is that? It is because the knowledge about that changes. How does it change? When I know the book, I have knowledge of the book. When I know a pen, I have knowledge of the pen. When I know the table, I have knowledge of the table. Because this knowledge constantly changes, the objects that are known through that knowledge change. If they are subject to change, how can they be

True? If they aren't True, then what are they? They are imagined. What is this like? '*Svapnavat*,' like a dream.

Nothing that is seen there is here now. That disappears. So what do we say? We say that it is imagined. This is the imagination of a dream. In truth, that is what happens in the waking state. When we know each and every object, really, knowledge is knowing the object that it imagines. Knowledge creates place and time, and knows objects. In every moment, that knowledge continuously changes, so the objects change. Therefore, all of the objects that we know are imagined. '*Iti sadasad vibhāge buddhitantre.*'

However, how is knowledge in truth? Can we say 'knowledge is inside,' or 'knowledge is outside'? No. There is no inside or outside to knowledge. Why is that? It is because knowledge is pervasive. Now we are here and can see the sun. We know that there is space, *akāśa*. This is because knowledge contains space. Where is space? Is it within or without? Can we know space in this way? No, we cannot.

So, space is contained by knowledge. Knowledge is similar. It has neither inside nor outside. Instead, everything is situated within knowledge. Everything is manifested within knowledge. In a different section of the *bhāṣyā*, it says, '*vishvam darpana dṛśyamāna nagari tulyam nijāntargatam*' *paśyan ātmani māyayā bahiryodbhūtam.*'

We see the world externally. We see objects that are outside of us. However, in the supreme Truth, these objects are not outside. When we say that we know the world, what happens? In this, knowledge contains the world. The world is situated in knowledge. That is why *Śankara* says, 'it is like seeing a city in a mirror.' One sees the reflection of objects in a mirror. Where is that reflection? It is within the mirror. The reflection is seen within the mirror. In the same way that the reflection is seen within the mirror, this universe is seen in one's collective awareness (*bodha maṇḍalam*). For a mirror, an external object is needed. Also, that object must be reflected in the mirror. Then there must be a person to see the reflection, and that person can also see all of the surrounding objects through the reflection. In other words, a mirror is merely a worldly object. It is not a Conscious object. However, knowledge is neither a worldly object, nor a conscious object. It is Consciousness Itself. Because it is composed of Pure

Consciousness, it is able to reflect and support the entire Universe within it. When we see an object, this is what happens, in truth.

In this way, *Śankara* is explaining this knowledge of limited objects. ‘*Yad Viṣayā Buddhiḥ.*’ Suppose that we know an object. The object is contained within our knowledge. When this happens, the knowledge and the object are combined. Suppose I say, ‘I know this book.’ In that case, the knowledge and the book are combined. This is known. However, in the next moment, when I know a different object, what happens? The knowledge of this object disappears. The object disappears.

Knowledge remains, but a new object is accepted. That is what is said here. When a book is known, knowledge and the object are merged. But in the next moment, a new object is known. Then, the knowledge of the previous object is changed. That is what is said in the bhashya, ‘*Yad Viṣayā Buddhiḥ Na Vyabhicharati, Tat Sat.*’ Whatever knowledge of an object does not change, that object is true. However, in this case, it changes.

In one moment, I know the book, and in the next moment, I know the table. In that case, the object of knowledge changes. This is said, ‘*yad viṣayā buddhiḥ vyabhicharati tat asat.*’ Whatever knowledge about an object that changes, that object is *asat*, imaginary. The knowledge about the book changed. Therefore, ‘*tat asat.*’ That object is imagined. This is something that exists in the mind. The object is not something that is external.

What are the things that we see outside? They are things that we see due to the imagined limitations of place and time. Where are these limitations existing? They exist within knowledge. Knowledge itself divides itself into external and internal knowledge. Knowledge itself creates the imaginary object. How is this? Knowledge says that knowledge is within, and knowledge says that the object is external. These two things are created by knowledge; inside and outside.

These two (internal and external) can also mean *ahamta* and *idamta*. The feeling of ‘I’ and ‘that.’ Both of these feelings exist within knowledge. Therefore, it says, ‘*yad vishayā buddhiḥ vyabhicharati,*’ whatever knowledge of an object changes, ‘*tat asat,*’ that object is imagined. This book here is imagined. Why is this? It is because the knowledge about the object changes. How does it change? When the book is known, the book exists in knowledge. When the pen is



known, the pen exists in knowledge. When the table is known, the table exists in knowledge. Because this knowledge is changing, the objects connected to that knowledge also change. If the objects are changing, how can they be *sat*, true? Therefore, they are imagined. How? Like a dream.

Because we know them in one moment, and then this knowledge disappears in the next moment, these objects are called *kalpitam*, imaginary. They exist like a dream. In the same way, in the waking state when objects are known, knowledge imagines these objects. This happens by imagining place and time. This is how an object is known. However, every moment, this knowledge constantly changes, as well as the objects. Therefore, all of these objects that are known are imagined.

Then, the *bhāṣyā* says, '*iti sadasadvibhāge buddhitantre sthite.*' In this way, the division between *sat* and *asat*, between Real and imagined, '*buddhitantre*,' depending upon knowledge, '*sthite*,' situated. This is dependant on knowledge. When this is said, this means that it isn't dependant on the object. That is what I said before, '*viśvaṁ darpana dṛśyamāna nāgari tulyaṁ nijāntargataṁ paśyan.*' Like a city seen within a mirror, the Universe exists, reflected in Knowledge. This is it. This is dependant on knowledge. It isn't that we know some object externally.

Immediately, people will ask, 'how this object, with gross qualities such as height, width, weight, etc, be within our knowledge? How can that happen?' Why is this asked? It is because we imagine knowledge as an object, like these gross external objects. Because of that, what do we think? 'Another object cannot fit in that kind of object.'

This is because all objects are limited by place. Wherever an object is situated, another object cannot exist there at the same time. In the place where the book is situated, only the book can exist there. Like that, we think that knowledge is an object and that another object cannot fit within it. That is why we doubt like that.

Knowledge isn't an external object. Knowledge isn't an object like external objects. How? The external objects have qualities like length, width, weight, etc. Instead, what is it? It is like *tejas*, Pure Energy. It is Light. It isn't like things that become the object of experience. Instead, it is the true nature of experience. We

cannot compare that to anything else. It isn't necessary to know that in particular. This is because it itself is Knowledge. Thus, this division of sat and asat is depending on this knowledge. Therefore, '*sarvatra dve buddhī sarvair upalabhyate.*' Therefore, '*sarvatra.*' In all experiences, no matter what you experience in the world, whether the body, mind, or intellect, or any object experienced externally, still, '*sarvaiḥ,*' by all *Jivas*, '*dve buddhī upalabhyate.*' Two kinds of knowledge occur. When an object is known, these two kinds of knowledge happen. How? '*Samānādhikāraṇe.*'

We explained this *samānādhikāraṇa* the previous day. 'In *samānādhikāraṇā,*' in having the same substratum, here what happens? There is an object that exists. Suppose it is a book. I know that it is '*sat,*' that it exists. When I know that, what happens? Knowledge contains this object. The object shines within knowledge. The object effulges within knowledge. When that happens, there are two objects of knowledge. This is when I know, 'the book that exists.' I only know the book if it exists. If it doesn't exist, I don't know it. So it is seated before me, and I know the book.

One thing is Existence, and the other is the book. We use two words to describe this; 'the book that exists.' Here, the meaning of 'that exists' is different from the meaning of 'the book.' These are two words with different meanings. However, what happens when these two words join together? It indicates an object. Which object? *Sat.*

Then we will ask, 'is there the book?' No, that is imagined. In truth, this only indicates one thing. Yesterday, we said the example, '*so yam devadattaḥ.*' '*Tat,*' that, '*ayam,*' 'this. The meaning of these two words are different from each other. However, even if these two words have different independent meanings, here they indicate a single individual, *Devadatta.* That is the same thing that happens here.

'*San,*' Existing, '*ghaṭaḥ,*' pot.' Both of these combined indicate a single object - *Sat.* Then you may ask, 'isn't it indicating something else?' If it indicates something else, than that is imagined. In truth, this indicates only one object - *Sat.* The other is superimposed in *Sat,* Existence. What is the logic used in this? 'The knowledge about that changes.' It isn't continuous. It leaves.' That which is changing in what is continuous is imagined. That is the rule. This is to imagine a

changing object within a continuous object. Within the continuous *Sat*, the Real, one imagines the changing ‘pot.’

Then, there will be some doubts in the mind. ‘How can it imagine that?’ What is said next is the answer to that. When we discuss the coming part, we will make that clear; with what logic the commentator proves this. However, we discussed the other day about *samānādhikāraṇa*. That is called the primary *samānādhikāraṇa*. There is also a secondary *samānādhikāraṇa*. What happens to the primary *samānādhikāraṇa*? The object is one. In other words, the object indicated through two words is only one. There won’t be two. In the example, ‘*san ghaṭaḥ*,’ in the supreme Truth, only one object is indicated.

Even if we know about another object there, that is imagined. That is why we reject that. However, wherever secondary *samānādhikāraṇa* occurs, two different words are also joined together. For example, there is the phrase, ‘*nīlotpalam*.’ Where this happens, there is no oneness of the object. The object becomes two. The meaning of ‘*nīlotpalam*,’ is *nīla*, ‘blue,’ and *utpalam*, ‘lotus.’ Thus, this means ‘a blue lotus.’ Here, what is it? We said the two words ‘*nīlam*,’ and ‘*utpalam*.’ These two words used are in the same conjugation. However, two separate meanings are indicated by the two words. What is the relationship between those two meanings? It isn’t oneness. Instead, it is divided as the *dharma* and *dharmī*. This is the relationship between *dharma* and *dharmī*.

In the object of ‘lotus,’ the *dharma* of ‘blue-ness’ exists. That is what is meant in the word. The quality, or *dharma* of ‘blue,’ exists in the object of the lotus. One thing exists in the other. In whatever it is where the quality exists, is called the *dharmī*, and whatever exists within the object is called the *dharma*. This isn’t the *Dharma* spoken of in the Gita. Here, this is a different meaning for the word ‘*dharma*.’ This isn’t discussing about ‘*svadharma*.’ What is the word ‘blue’ here? It is a *dharma* of the lotus.

Thus, the word ‘blue,’ indicates a *dharma*, and the word ‘lotus,’ indicates a *dharmī*. Thus, they indicate different objects. This is said using a worldly example. In that example, when we discuss according to worldly experience, these words indicate two different objects. There is the *dharma* of ‘blue,’ and the *dharmī* of ‘the lotus.’ Here, there are two words in the same conjugation; ‘*nīlam*,’

and ‘*utpalam.*’ These do not indicate the same meaning. Instead, these indicate two meanings that are interrelated.

Here, what is it? Oneness of the object doesn’t happen. However, the example, ‘*san ghaṭaḥ,*’ isn’t like that. There also, there is *samānādhikāraṇa*. There, these two words join together and indicate a single object. How is that? There, the word ‘*san*’ means Truth, and what about the object that is joined with it? That is imagined. Therefore, what happens in the primary *samānādhikāraṇa*? Two words indicate a single meaning. This means that there is Oneness in the meaning and object of the two words. And what about secondary *samānādhikāraṇa*? There, both words indicate two separate objects that are interrelated. There, there is not oneness of the object. Instead, there is difference between the objects.

Therefore, it says in the *bhāṣyā*, ‘*na nilotpalaṭavā.*’ Why does it say this? This is because language must be used to express an idea. There are some rules in a language. How is that? This is for indicating a meaning. If one leaves those rules and uses the language, people will ask, ‘why did you say that?’ Thus, for expressing an idea according to the rules of language, this matter is said. This is not something *Shankara* discovered in particular to teach *Advaita*. These are certain principles that other pandits accepted, so when *Śāṅkara* explains *Advaita* in a way to make them aware, this is said. This is not presenting a new subject.

So, where it says ‘*nilotpalaṭavā*’ and where it says, ‘*san ghaṭaḥ,*’ the awareness of the words is of two kinds. What does one do? One indicates oneness of the object. And what about the other? That creates awareness about two separate objects and shows their relationship. This creates the awareness, ‘*nilam,*’ the blue, ‘*utpalam,*’ lotus. Then, there will definitely be the awareness of two objects. It is true that when related together, they become one. That is correct. Despite this, having known two separate objects, a *dharma* and *dharmī*, one joins them together. Only after they are joined together do they become one. However, there will be awareness of the two, and then they become one. There, we will feel that both are true in the worldly sense.

Then what about the example, ‘*san ghaṭaḥ?*’ There, one is True, and the other is imagined. That is what is said here, ‘*na nilotpalaṭavā.*’ *Śāṅkara* says, ‘the *samānādhikāraṇa* that I am referring to is not the secondary *samānādhikāraṇa*,

such as ‘the blue lotus.’ Instead, this is the *samānādhikāraṇa* that indicates the oneness of the object. That is what is being explained. ‘*San ghaṭaḥ san paṭaḥ san hastī iti. Evaṁ sarvatra.*’ Wherever we have any kind of objective experience, we can use this logic. Everywhere, no matter object is known, what is it? We feel about that object, ‘it exists.’

Existence is situated, joined together to all objective experiences and all imagined objects. The knowledge of Existence does not undergo any kind of change at all. Therefore, that Existence is Real. The Existence which is the object of knowledge is Real, *Sat*. Instead, the object that is joined together with that Existence is imagined. That is what is explained next.

*‘Na nilotpavāṭ san ghaṭaḥ sanpaṭaḥ san hastīti. Evaṁ sarvatra. Tayorbuddhyorghaṭādibuddhi vyabhicharati. Tathā cha darśitam. Na tu sadbuddhiḥ. Tasmādghaṭādibuddhiviśayo/sanvyabhichārāt. Na tu saadbuddhiviśayo/vyabhichārāt. Ghaṭe vinaṣṭe ghaṭabuddhau vyabhicharantyaṁ sadbuddhirapi vyabhicharatīti chet. Na, paṭādāvapi sadbuddhidarśanāt. Viśeṣaṇaviśayaiva sā sadbuddhiḥ. Sadbuddhivadghaṭabuddhirapi ghaṭāntare dṛśyata iti chet? Na, paṭādāvadarśanāt.’*

*Tayor buddhayoḥ ghaṭādibuddhiḥ vyabhicharati.*’ So, in the phrase, ‘*san ghaṭaḥ san paṭaḥ,*’ there are two kinds of knowledge. Why is this? It is because there are two different words given. Two words with separate meanings are used. This isn’t used in the manner of ; this word has one meaning, and that word has another meaning. In these two knowledges, what is it? ‘*tayor buddhyoḥ,*’ in these two kinds of knowledge, ‘*ghaṭādibuddhiḥ vyabhicharati,*’ the knowledge which makes things like a pot, a cloth, or an elephant its objects, changes. Because that knowledge changes, what happens? That object is imagined. That is what this means. If this is said clearly, we can understand.

Because the knowledge changes, the object is imagined. If the knowledge doesn’t change, then the object is True. ‘*Tathā cha darśitam.*’ When the discussion on this matter began in the Gita, I myself have made this clear. I have

shown this.' Where? 'Na hi śītoṣṇādi sakāraṇaṁ pramāṇaiḥ hi nirūpyamāṇaṁ vastu sat bhavati. Vikāro hi saḥ. Vikāras cha vyabhicharati.' It is there. All modifications change and disappear. In that section, this matter was made clear. What is that? All of these are effects. Effects change and disappear. The knowledge of these changes, and the object changes. That is the meaning.

Then the *bhāṣyā* says, 'na tu sadbuddhiḥ.' There is no change seen for *sadbuddhi*. Wherever there is knowledge, wherever ever an object is known, there will be *sadbuddhi*. In all objects, we constantly know, 'that exists, that exists, that exists..' 'Tasmāt ghaṭādi buddhiviśayo asan vyabhichārāt.' Here, the previous matter is concluded. 'Ghaṭādi buddhiviśayo,' the knowledge of objects such as a pot, 'viśaya,' the object of this kind of knowledge, whether it is clothes, a pot, or elephant, is *asat*, imagined. Why is this? It says, 'vyabhichārāt.' We said before, 'vikāras cha vyabhicharati.' *Vikāras*, or modifications, change and disappear. Here, also, these objects change and disappear. What was is said? Wherever the knowledge changes, the object changes.

The object in my knowledge when I knew the book, is not there when I know the table. It disappears. That is the meaning. 'Vyabhichārāt. Then, the *bhāṣyā* says, 'na tu sadbuddhiviśayaḥ avyabhichārāt.' However, what about the object of *sadbuddhi*? When we know that an object is *sat*, that it exists, how do we know this? That is the object of *sadbuddhi*. How do we know that? It is through Existence. This Existence is situated, joined together with the object. What is that? 'Sadbuddhiviśayaḥ.' This is the object of the knowledge that says, 'this exists.' How is that? It doesn't change. Thus, it says, 'avyabhichārāt.' There is never any change for that. In that, there is no change in the knowledge, or in the object.

Instead, what about the other? The knowledge changes, and the object changes. Here, it is showing a logic, that because the knowledge changes, the object changes. Only if the knowledge doesn't change does the object not change. Whatever changes, is Unreal. Whatever doesn't change, is True. That is the basic logic that is accepted here. What is that? Wherever the knowledge changes, the object changes. Whatever changes, is *Asat*, Unreal. If the knowledge doesn't change, then the object doesn't change. Whatever does not change, is *Satyam*, Real.

Thus, here all kinds of knowledge consist of both Real and Unreal, combined together. In the classes of the *Brahma Sutras* on ‘*Adhyāsa*,’ we discussed this in detail. That is shown here in a different manner. There, it says, ‘*satyānṛte vinatikṛtya*.’

There, we discussed and compared the differences in the waking state, the dream state, and state of deep sleep. Here, it is different. Here, this is knowledge about external objects. It is just that this discussion is focusing on this kind of knowledge. That is the only difference. To understand this section, it would be good to hear that section in the *Brahma Sutra* classes again.

Here, there are questions and doubts that come in the commentary. What is that? Once the object of knowledge changes, that object is *asat*. If the knowledge of an object remains, then that is *Sat*, Real. Therefore, in all of our experiences, we know the object, through *Sat* and *Asat* combined together. In that, to use an example, we said, ‘the pot that exists.’ In this kind of experience, because that Existence does no change, it is *Sat*, Real. However, because the objective knowledge of the object, such as a pot, changes, it is *Asat*. When this is said, there is a question asked in the commentary.

‘*Ghaṭe vinaṣṭe ghaṭabudhhau vyabhicharantyām sadbuddhiḥ api vyabhicharati iti chet*.’ Here a question is asked. While knowing a book, we have the awareness, ‘the book that exists.’ Then this book is destroyed. It catches fire and is destroyed. Once it catches fire and is burned, then nothing is left. We said that *sadbuddhi* doesn’t undergo change anywhere. If that is so, after this book has been burned and destroyed, then where is that *sadbuddhi*?

This is because we are able to know this *Sadbuddhi*, or this *Sat*, through it being combined with the book. ‘*Sat pustakam*’; the book that exists. That is how we know. Once the book is destroyed and gone, then there is no knowledge about the book, nor any knowledge about *Sat*. Thus, our knowledge about *Sat* was destroyed.’ What did we say before? We said that there is no change for the knowledge of *Sat*. However, here, the questioner is proving that there is change for the knowledge of *Sat*. How is that?

‘The book was destroyed.’ Then we don’t know the book, as ‘*sat pustakam*.’ If we don’t know this, then we don’t have awareness of *Sat*. That

awareness is destroyed. Thus, *Sat* is destroyed. *Sat* is also imagined, because it changes.’ That is the intellect that is used here. That is the question.

‘*Ghaṭe vinaṣṭe,*’ after the pot has been destroyed, ‘*ghaṭabuddhau vyabhicharantyaṁ,*’ then there is no knowledge about the pot. Because of that the knowledge that is joined together with the object, ‘*sadbuddhi,*’ the knowledge of *Sat* – we experienced this in ‘*san ghaṭaḥ,*’ the pot that exists.’ - ‘*api vyabhicharati,*’ that knowledge also changes. Because that knowledge changes, this *Sat* also changes. Thus, *Sat* is also imagined. That is the question.

‘*Iti chet,*’ is this true? ‘*Na.*’ No, that discovery isn’t correct. Why? It says, ‘*paṭādau api sadbuddhidarśanāt.*’ *Śāṅkara* says, ‘that’s not right.’ Because the book was destroyed, or burned, and we don’t have the experience of ‘the book that exists,’ therefore, we don’t have the experience of Existence. That experience changes. Therefore, Existence is also imagined.’ Saying this isn’t correct.

Why is that? Even if the object is destroyed, the experience of ‘*Sat*’ will exist in other objects.’ The experience of ‘*Sat,*’ is thus joined together with other objects. What you said was correct. After an object is destroyed, we don’t have the experience, ‘the object that exists.’ This experience is joined together with the object. However, that experience of Existence will be constantly experienced through all objects in the Universe. ‘*Paṭādau api sadbuddhidarśanāt.*’ Even when the knowledge of *Sat* in the experience of the pot isn’t experienced, in the experience of a cloth, when we know a cloth or another object, this awareness of *Sat* exists, and this *Sat* shines within as an object of knowledge. Therefore, the *Sat* didn’t go anywhere. ‘*Sat* exists.’

Now, the questioner will again state his case to prove his view. What is that? ‘We can accept that there is the experience of ‘*Sat*’ in another object. However, that isn’t joined together with the destroyed object, is it? Then, wherever the object is destroyed, we don’t have the experience of the *Sat* that is joined with it, do we? Once the ‘existing’ book is destroyed, then we cannot say, ‘the book that exists.’ Thus, there is not the experience of *Sat* that is joined together with the object. Because of that, in one place, there is not the experience of *Sat*. Therefore, *Sat* undergoes change.

Why is that? It is because that experience of *Sat* was non-existent. What about if this is said? Leave aside any other place, but in the destroyed object, that



experience isn't seen. Therefore, for that object, there is not the experience of *Sat*. 'Therefore, *Sat* is not Real.' What if this is said?

The answer to this is said, '*viśeṣaṇa viśayā eva sā sadbuddhiḥ. Atopi na vinaśyati.*' This is explained. Here, how is it proved that '*Sat* is Real, and without change?' It takes an experience. It takes an experience of an object. Here this is the summary of what is going to be said. It says that if take the experience before us and analyze, we will find that one thing is *Sat*, and another is *Asat*. Where an object is destroyed, what happens? We don't have the experience. How can we examine an experience that doesn't exist? It's not possible to examine that. That is the essence of what is said.

In other words, if we must speak about something with logic and reasoning, we must accept some authority as a basis. What happens when we speak, without accepting these? Our discussion will go somewhere else. There won't be any relation seen in the beginning and end. So, here, the *Advaitī* is striving to prove, 'the Universe is *Asat*, imagined, and the Existence that the substratum of that is *Sat*, Real.' The *Advaitī* is striving to prove this through logic. Why must this matter be made aware through logic? This is because those people, who understand things through logic, must be made aware of things through logic. After the matter is made aware to them through logic, they will have faith. *Once* faith, or *śraddhā*, comes, all other things will come. Only once that happens, will a person act for the attainment of that. This is for a discriminative person. Otherwise, others will jump and flee. However, for a discriminative person, he will only act on a matter that is made aware to his discrimination.

So, if a person desires the Realization, or Experience of the principle of *Advaita*, if he is has discrimination, what does he do? First, he makes that *Advaita* aware to his discrimination. What does he do for that? He takes his experience before him, and thinks. What experience? All experiences; the experiences of the Universe. He takes his experiences of the Universe before him, and proves *Advaita*. That must first be made aware to the *buddhi*, the intellect. Otherwise, a mere faith is possible only to the dull-brained. That isn't possible for a *vivekī*, one with discrimination.

Therefore, when we took that experience before us and analyzed, this question and answer is comes. First, we need our experience before us. The thoughtful discussion is based on our experience. We don't refute our experience; then there would be no relevance to the thinking or discussion. So, this object is before me. I have an experience about the object. When we analyzed that experience, I said that in this experience, there is Existence and the imagined object. Then suppose that the object doesn't exist? Then there is no experience. Then there is no relevance to our discussion. That is the essence of what is said.

Only if you understand this will you understand the *bhāṣyā*. '*Viśeṣaṇa viśayā eva sā sadbuddhiḥ.*' That is all that is said. That is the essence. In other words, in all of these experiences, '*san ghaṭaḥ san paṭaḥ san hastī,*' we say like this. However, we can switch the words, to '*ghaṭaḥ san,*' '*paṭaḥ san,*' '*hastī san.*' Even if you say the words like this, we said before that these two words indicate two meanings. In the supreme truth, the object there is only *ONE*. In these two meanings, one is called the '*viśeṣyam,*' and the other, the '*viśeṣaṇam.*' This can happen in the words, or in the meanings.

We gave the example, 'white horse.' The word 'white' describes the horse. There, the horse, is the '*viśeṣyam,*' the qualified object, and the color 'white,' is the '*viśeṣaṇam,*' or quality. Like that, what is here? '*San ghaṭaḥ san paṭaḥ san hastī.*' It is '*sat*' that describes the pot. It is the 'existing pot.' This '*sat*' describes the cloth. 'The existing cloth.' Then, '*san hastī,*' the elephant that exists.' Thus, this '*Sat*' that qualifies the elephant, cloth, and everything, that is the '*viśeṣaṇam,*' the quality. The objects, such as elephant, cloth, and pot, are all '*viśeṣyam,*' the qualified. Therefore, we should also understand these two; the '*viśeṣyam*' and '*viśeṣaṇam.*'

In all of these places mentioned, there is a quality-qualified relationship in both the words and the meanings. The word '*san*' is the quality. The word '*paṭaḥ*' is the qualified object. The object of our knowledge which we know through the word '*sat,*' 'that,' what is that object, though it is not really an object? That is the '*viśeṣaṇam,*' the quality. There, the object, let it be an elephant or cloth, etc., is the '*viśeṣyam,*' the qualified object.

This is a rule of *śabda bodha*, the knowledge of words. Thus, in the form of quality and qualified, when we know an object, here how do we know *Sat*? We

know it as a *viśeṣaṇa*, a quality. That is what it says in the *bhāṣyā*, '*viśeṣaṇa viśayā*.' The object of the word '*Sat*,' which is a quality – or in the knowledge of the quality of *Sat*, the object of that knowledge is what we say is Real. That is what is said, '*viśeṣaṇa viśayā eva sā sadbuddhiḥ*.' This *sadbuddhi*, the awareness of *Sat*, is what indicates the quality of our experience. What is our experience? It is the experience, 'the book that exists.' In this experience, this *sadbuddhi*, the knowledge gained through the word '*sat*,' indicates the quality of Existence. '*Atopi na vinaśyati*.' Because of that, what happens? Here, the knowledge which indicates the quality of existence exists only within the knowledge of the qualified object. That knowledge is only known joined together with the qualified object. We only experience both the *viśeṣaṇam* and the *viśeṣyam* joined together. That kind of experience is what we are taking about and discussing.

If there is no *viśeṣyam*, the qualified object, then we cannot discuss about the the *viśeṣaṇam*, the quality. There is no experience like that. Therefore, in that place, if we consider that the qualified object doesn't exist, we cannot think that 'there is no *Sat* there.' This is because we don't have such an experience before us. First take an experience, then we can discuss.'

Thus it says, '*viśeṣaṇa viśayā eva sā sadbuddhiḥ*.' Whenever we have an experience, that awareness makes the quality of '*Sat*' shine within. In that way, there is both the quality and the qualified. There is *Sat* and the book. In that experience, both of these are joined together, and that experience is what we are discussing. In that way, to take an experience that doesn't exist, discuss, and say that '*Sat*' doesn't exist there, and thus say '*Sat* isn't Real,' isn't logical. That is the meaning.

Therefore, after that object has been destroyed, is there knowledge of *Sat*? There is no meaning in asking this. After the object is destroyed, then the *Sat* joined with the object,.. we don't have such an experience. We cannot discuss about something that doesn't exist. Thus, this matter can be discussed on a different level. How is that? The book that was before me was destroyed. After it is destroyed, then is there the experience of *Sat*? If this is asked, we can say that whatever experience it is, there will be the experience of '*Sat*.' Then what experience remains, after the book is destroyed? What experience is left? It is the

experience of the destruction of the book. What do we say, 'the book is no more. That is gone.'

Then, what happened? The destruction of the book happens. There, what is remaining? Where is the Existence? It isn't in the book. It is in the destruction of the book, or the absence of the book. Joined together with that absence, what happens? This *Sat* will shine forth. This is because our experience there is the experience of the destruction and absence of the book. There is Existence in that experience. That is what we accept.

We accept the destruction of the book. What do we say, there? '*San pustakābhāvaḥ.*' This is the *abhāva*, the absence of the book. It is 'the absence of the book, that exists.' It isn't the book, but the absence of the book. We are also only able to understand the absence of the book, when it is joined with *Sat*. That is the summary.

If we are only able to understand an experience when it is joined with Existence, then we are only able to understand the destruction or absence of the book. There that *Sat* will shine forth. That *Sat* never went anywhere. So we have *sadbuddhi* in the book, and then it is destroyed. When it is destroyed, if we don't have knowledge of *Sat* in the book, then we have this knowledge in the absence of the book. We should understand this section in that way.

Either way, what is it? It is in the form of a *viśeṣaṇa*, a quality. That *Sat* will be in an experience, in the form of a quality, and there is no change for that *Sat*, no matter where. There is no point in discussing an experience that doesn't exist. That is what *Śankara* proves through logic.

Here, what is said? After an object is destroyed, there is no awareness of the object. Then there is no awareness of Existence.' Then what is *Śankara's* answer to this? He says, 'Ok, if there is no awareness of Existence in the object that is destroyed, aren't there objects that aren't destroyed? '*Paṭādaḥ api darśanāt.*' Then a question is asked again. '*Sadbuddhivat ghaṭabuddhirapi ghaṭāntare dṛśyate iti chet.*'

We can use this same logic in another way. What is that? The book exists.' This is an experience. Then the book is destroyed. Then here there is no *sadbuddhi*. *Shankara* said that there will be *sadbuddhi* in any other experience.

There is *sadbuddhi* in any other experience. Therefore, *sadbuddhi* is *Sat*, Real. There, the knowledge of the book doesn't exist. Therefore, the book is Unreal.

When this is said, the questioner says, 'even if there isn't the knowledge of the book in the book that is destroyed, aren't there other books around? There books around several people. In those, there is awareness of a book. Therefore, there is no change for the awareness of the book. Therefore, there is no change for the awareness of the qualified object. This is because if the knowledge stays without changing, the object of that knowledge is *Sat*, Real. That is the logic used here.

The book is destroyed. Then there is no knowledge about the book. That isn't correct. Why? It is because there are other books. There, you can know the book. Therefore, there is no change for the knowledge of the book. We said that even when an object is destroyed, the experience of *Sat* continues. Therefore, when we experience a book, and the book is destroyed, the knowledge of the book continues to another book. Then we will have to say that that knowledge is *Sat*. This is the logic used by the questioner.

This is, '*sadbuddhivat ghaṭabuddhirapi*,' in the way that *sadbuddhi* continuously exists in other objects, as a quality, like that, '*ghaṭabuddhirapi*,' the knowledge about the pot, '*ghaṭāntare*,' forget the pot that was destroyed; there are so many other pots in the world. We know all of them as 'pot.' We know these, '*drśyate*,' therefore, the object of knowledge, which is the pot is *Sat*, Real. What about this? '*Iti chet.*' '*Na.*'

That isn't correct? Why? '*Paṭādaḥ adarśanāt.*' You cannot argue like that. 'Even if the book is destroyed, the awareness of the book will be in the next book. There is no change for that awareness. That is what is said. Therefore, the book is True. The book, which is the object of knowledge which doesn't change, is True.' If this is said, it is not correct. Why is that?

The awareness of the book exists only when a book is known. When I know a table, it doesn't exist. When I know the table, there is no awareness of the book. There, it isn't awareness of the book. So, in the place where I know the table, there is no knowledge of the book. Therefore, this is no book there. Therefore, what happens? It is the same vice-versa. When I know the table, there

is no awareness of the book. There is only the table. Therefore, both of these are not True.

'*Sat*' isn't like that. '*Sat*' exists when I know the book and when I know the table. In both places, there is '*Sat*,' Existence shining forth in the form of the quality. That is the meaning. Here, there is a specialty we must understand when discussing about this 'destruction.' We can have an experience, only when it is joined together with Existence. When we know an object, we know Existence in the form of the object. In truth, when we know Existence in the form of the object, it is knowledge alone. There is no object separate from knowledge.

'*Sat-chit-ānanda*.' When we say this word, there are not 3 objects. There is only one. What is experienced as *Sat*, as *Chit*, and as *Ānanda*, can be called as any of these names, as '*Sat*,' '*Chit*,' or '*Ānanda*.' Here what happens? '*Viśvam darpana drśymāna nagari*.' Like this, for making the external objects, or the objects we feel to be external to shine forth, this *Sat*, or Existence is joined to the object. After that, it becomes an object of itself. That *Sat* Itself exists as both the Knower and Knowledge. At the same time, for making objects shine forth, that becomes joined to the object, and becomes an object of knowledge of itself. This is the specialty of knowledge.

Because of that, what happens? We are able to know objects, only when they are joined together with *Sat*. There, what does the object do? The object makes *Sat* manifest. It makes *Sat* shine forth. Objects make *Sat* shine forth. In another level, this reminds me of the story of the musk deer. Without knowing the pleasing smell that comes from it, the musk deer searches. It tries to find where the smell is, but cannot find it. Like that, what does man search for? He searches for Existence. If he must search for that, he needs some kind of awareness of that. A person searches for his or her Existence. From where does he know that Existence? Only if he knows, can he search. Without knowing, a person cannot search something. An incomplete knowledge is needed.

He continuously experiences Existence. Where is this? In the experience of objects. In truth, what is this Existence? That is him himself. He doesn't understand that. This Existence that is constantly revealed through the experience of objects is one's true nature. These experiences constantly make him aware of this Existence. They constantly make him aware of his Self. However, things have

become confused. It has become upside-down. He knows the Existence which is his true nature as being external. ‘*Bahiryodbhūtam.*’ That is said there.

He feels that it is situated outside. Then how does that happen? That is what is called ‘*Māyā.*’ He sees his true nature as being external. In that way, he constantly realizes his own true nature externally. Because of that, when we discuss about *Advaita*, what is said? All *Jivas* are in the realization of *Advaita* at all times. In every moment, in every experience. To say in another way, ‘*pratibodha viditam matam. Amṛtatvaṃ hi vindate.*’ This Immortality, or *Mokṣa* is ‘*pratibodha viditam,*’ known in every moment. In every moment, that effulges within you. This has become upside–down. The cart has been tied in front of the horse. It is upside-down. This veil which can be destroyed in a fraction of moment makes everything upside-down.

That is what happens; *saṃsāra*, bondage, etc. The Existence which is your true nature effulges within all experiences, at all times. We don’t feel, ‘that is me.’ We feel that it is external, as a pot, a cloth, etc. For revealing one’s Existence, the aid of external objects created by one’s own knowledge becomes necessary. That is why the object is called a ‘*vyañjaka.*’ When that Existence effulges without that aid, that is ‘*Jñāna.*’ Such a person is called a ‘*Tattvajñāni.*’ When constantly effulges joined together with this ‘*vyañjaka,*’ that is *Ajñāna*, Ignorance.

That is the difference between *Jñāna* and *Ajñāna*. That’s all. In other words, this *Tattva* being discussed is never hidden from us, at any time. There is no other place for it to hide. It cannot be concealed. Awareness of God can never be concealed from the *Jiva*. Where will it hide? There is nowhere to place it. That is effulgent, always. Still, there is a confusion there. This confusion which cannot be explained is what is called ‘*Māyā.*’ That is why it is called ‘*Māyā,*’ which is indescribable. This state of things being upside-down. That is it.

Therefore, a person who thinks and contemplates on this, feel it to be very small. What is this gruesome, frightening *saṃsāra*? For a person who thinks, it is insignificant. ‘Here, that has never existed, once.’ That is how person becomes aware of this. Like that, it says here, that the experience of one’s true nature, joined with the experience of objects, effulges at all times.

However, that has to constantly depend on the objects. The objects remain as a ‘*vyañjaka.*’ The objects exist for bringing to manifestation one’s own true

Nature, *Sat*, Existence. That is the problem. If that shines forth without depending on the objects, or if a person grasps that *Tattva*, he is called a *Tattvajñāni*. To understand that, *Śaṅkara* presents this subject, in a manner slightly difficult to grasp. We have discussed this in the *Brahma Sutra* classes.

Do you desire to know the unknown *Brahman*? Or do you desire to know the known *Brahman*? How does one gain *jijñāsa*, (spiritual enquiry) of *Brahman*? Where is it? If it enquiry into the known *Brahman*, then there is nothing to be known. If it is in the unknown *Brahman*, then how will one have *jijñāsa*? One cannot have *jijñāsa* in an unknown object. There, in all of this, it is this same matter that we discussed.

So, the effulgence of *Sat*, the experience of *Sat*, is experienced by all *Jivas* at all times. However, it is bound to the objects. One doesn't know that that is one's own true nature. One forgets, or doesn't know. That is what is explained here as well. Therefore, the *Sat* that is joined together with the object is what is called in *Advaita*, '*īśvara tattva*,' The *Tattva*, the reality or principle of God. That is the meaning.

Then where were we? '*Sadbuddhivat ghaṭabuddhirapi ghaṭāntare dṛśyate iti chet.*' '*Na. Paṭādaḥ adarśanāt.*' In the same way that *Sadbuddhi* is continuous everywhere, like that, even after a pot is destroyed, there is the knowledge of the pot in another pot. Therefore, that object is *Sat*, Real.' *Śaṅkara* says, 'that's not correct. This is because there is no knowledge of the pot in the experience of the cloth.' There, that doesn't exist. Therefore, that is *Asat*, Unreal. Again, the questioner puts forth a question.

*'Sadbuddhirapi naṣṭe ghaṭe na dṛśyate iti chet? Na, viśeṣyābhāvāt. Sadbuddhirviśeṣaṇaviśayā sati viśeṣyābhāve viśeṣaṇānupapatau kiṁviśayā syāt, natu punaḥ sadbuddhirviśayābhāvāt. Ekādhikaraṇatvaṁ ghaṭādiviśeṣyābhāve na yuktamiti chet? Na, sat idaṁ udakamiti marīchyādāvanyatarābhāve/pi sāmānādhikaraṇāyadarśanāt. Tasmāddehāderdvaṁdvasya cha sakāraṇasyāsato na vidyate bhāva iti.'*



*'Sadbuddhirapi naṣṭe ghaṭe na dṛśyate iti chet.'* This is a matter we previously discussed. What does *sadbuddhi* do? After the pot is destroyed, then it isn't seen, correct? *'Na.'* That's not correct. Why? *'Viśeṣyābhāvāt.'* This is because there is no such experience. Where the pot is destroyed, there is no experience about the pot. If there is no experience, then it isn't necessary to discuss about *Sat*, or the imagined object. Why is that? *'Viśeṣyābhāvāt.'* There, the *viśeṣyam*, the pot, doesn't exist. There isn't any experience about the pot. Where there is no experience, we don't have the experience of *'san ghaṭāḥ,'* etc. Therefore, there is no relevance related to experience there. There, the *viśeṣyam*, the pot that makes *Sat* manifest doesn't exist.

This is explained once more. *'Sadbuddhiḥ viśeṣaṇaviśayā sati viśeṣyābhāve viśeṣaṇānupapattau kim viśayā syāt?'* This is explained more. *'Sadbuddhiḥ,'* the knowledge of *Sat*, joined in the knowledge of the pot, *'viśeṣaṇaviśayā,'* of which the quality is its object, which makes the quality of *'Sat'* its object. Here you should pay attention. Here, anywhere, don't read any Malayalam commentaries! The trouble caused till now will thus continue. *'Sadbuddhiḥ,'* the awareness of *'Sat,'* of which the quality of Existence is its object, being so, *'satī,'* because its object is the quality of Existence, *'viśeṣyābhāve,'* in the absence of the pot, the qualified object, *'viśeṣaṇānupapattau,'* being the absence of the quality of *'Sat,'* – there is no such experience. Once the pot is destroyed, then the experience, 'the pot that exists' doesn't exist. What is the quality? That is *Sat*. That *'anupapattau.'* This means that this has no relevance. Such an experience has no kind of relevance. Therefore, such an object has no kind of relevance. *'Kim viśayā syāt?'* Then what object will be there for *Sadbuddhi*? If there is no quality, there is no *Sadbuddhi*. Then what will be the object of *Sadbuddhi*? There isn't such an experience.'

So, first take an experience, place it before, and then discuss. If there is no such experience, then there is no relevance in the discussion of *'sat'* and *'asat.'* That is the meaning. Otherwise, *'na tu punaḥ sadbuddheḥ viśayābhāvāt.'* Where the pot is destroyed, if we don't have the experience of *'Sat,'* then it's not that the object of *Sadbuddhi*, the *'Sat,'* wouldn't exist. That is the meaning. Where the pot is destroyed, not experiencing *'Sat,'* isn't because there is no such thing as *'Sat.'* Instead, there, there is no experience, such as *'san ghaṭāḥ,'* 'the pot that

exists.' We cannot discuss about something that isn't an experience. We can only discuss while placing our experience before us. How can we discuss about something we don't experience? Here, we discuss, while placing before our direct experience. The pot is destroyed, so the experience of 'the pot that exists,' doesn't exist, therefore, there is no kind of discussion there about '*Sat*.' Therefore, there is no meaning in saying that '*Sat*' is something can become non-existent. There is no meaning in saying, '*Sat* changes.' That is what is said. '*Sadbuddhiḥ*,' this knowledge of *Sat*, '*viśeṣaṇaviśayā sati*,' having the quality of Existence as its object, being so, '*viśeṣyābhāve*,' in the absence of the qualified object, the pot, '*viśeṣaṇānupapattau*,' if the quality of *Sat* has no relevance there, '*kim viśayā syāt*,' what becomes the object of that *Sadbuddhi*? There is nothing.

Therefore, there is no experience of *Sat* there. Where? Where the pot is destroyed. '*Na tu punaḥ sadbuddheḥ viśayābhāvāt*.' Instead, it isn't because the object of *Sadbuddhi*, *Sat* isn't there.' That is the meaning.

## GITA CLASS - CHAPTER 2, PART 6

Yesterday, we discussed about the nature of experience. By this we mean the experience of objects, or the experience of the Universe. Here, the *Siddhantī* says that the experience of *Sat*, of Existence, is continuous in all experiences. These are the experiences we have of external objects. When this happens, the objective experience is joined together with the experience of the *Paramātmān*. That is why. However, we don't distinguish these separately. This is said to make this clear. Because this experience of *Sat* is continuous in all experiences, it is True. When we say of an object, 'it exists,' the experience of Existence is joined together with the experience of the object. Because the experience of that Existence does not change, the object of that experience, or that which one knows through that experience, that *Sat* is True. When we know objects, the knowledge is joined together with Existence. The object of that knowledge, or that which is known through that knowledge, that object changes. It constantly changes. Therefore, the object is *asat*. That is what was said.

In this matter, we explained through the *Siddhāntī* and *Pūrva Pakṣa*. Here, there is a question by the *Pūrva Pakṣa*. '*Ekādhikāraṇam ghaṭādi viśeṣya abhāve na yuktaṁ.*' We explained this yesterday, but we can once again review this part of the *bhāṣyā*. It says, '*ekādhikāraṇatvaṁ ghaṭādi viśeṣyābhāve na yuktaṁ.*' This concept of *ekādhikāraṇatvam* is the same as *samānādhikāraṇatvam*. We discussed this before in detail. What does the *Siddhāntī* say? He speaks about *samānādhikāraṇam*. When two words with two meaning are joined together, and this produces a single meaning, that is *samānādhikāraṇa*, a shared substratum. We said, '*san ghaṭaḥ,*' the pot that exists.' There, the meaning of the word 'pot,' is an object. The word '*san,*' is different. The meaning of '*san*' is Existence. The *Siddhāntī* says that these two words joined together produce a single meaning. Even if the meaning of the words is different when separate, they only indicate a single object. What is that? It is *Sat*, Existence.

So, on the side of the *Siddhānti*, the side of *Advaita*, this *samānādhikāraṇa* indicates the oneness of the object. Why is that said? There, it says that in the two words, the meaning of the word '*ghaṭaḥ,*' is imagined. That isn't considered

as an object. That indicates what is imagined. Instead, the word ‘*san*,’ indicates Existence. These two words joined together do not indicate two meanings; it is only one meaning. If that is so, when this subject is discussed, a person asks, ‘when the pot is destroyed, what happens?’ After the answer to that, it is asked, ‘you are using two words in this example. One is the word ‘*sat*’ and the other is the word ‘*ghaṭaḥ*.’ You said that one of these is the *viśeṣyam*, the qualified object. The *ghaṭaḥ*, or pot is the qualified object, and ‘*sat*’ is the *viśeṣaṇam*, the quality. If we say that the qualified object is imagined, then there is no difference in the meaning of both words. This *samānādhikāraṇam* can only occur where two words indicate a single thing. So, if we say that the meaning of one word is imagined, then there is no difference between the meanings of the two words.

The Purva Pakṣa says, ‘you are getting wrong the basic rule of *samānādhikāraṇam*. We can only say that a single word indicates a single meaning. You can’t say that two words indicate a single meaning.’ This is because in subjects such as *samānādhikāraṇam*, one must accept certain rules put forth by those expert in the *śāstras*. So Śaṅkara accepts certain things, like ‘how must *samānādhikāraṇam* be?,’ etc.

So, when a subject is discussed, only if both groups accept some common basic matters, can a discussion take place. Otherwise, both groups will go their own way. ‘What I say is right!’ The other person will also say, ‘What I say is right!’ So, both people won’t be able to reach an agreement. So, when we say that it is a logical discussion, this means that are basic matters accepted by both people. Only after certain things are accepted can the discussion begin. Normally, wherever there is a debate, one person will say the *Pūrva Pakṣa* and another will say the *Siddhānta*.

Before the start of the debate, both sides will ask, ‘which scriptural authorities are accepted? On what grounds should our discussion proceed? First, both people reach an agreement. This kind of agreement is in all scriptural discussions. There is such an acceptance for the concept of *samānādhikāraṇam*. We said the example before, ‘so ‘*yam devadattaḥ*.’ ‘This is that *Devadatta*.’ The word ‘*saḥ*’ indicates a meaning, and the word ‘*ayam*’ indicates a different meaning. When both of these are joined together, it indicates a single meaning. Here, it says, ‘*ghaṭādi viśeṣyābhāve*.’ Here, the objects are not real; they are

imagined. This doesn't mean that they are non-existent; instead it says that they are imagined. This word '*abhāva*,' should be interpreted as 'imagined.' Thus, the qualified objects, such as a pot, are imagined. They are superimposed. They don't exist in the Supreme Truth. That is the meaning.

This isn't the ordinary meaning of '*abhāva*,' or non-existence. These are imagined. Thus, the use of this word '*abhāva*' shows a difference from normally. Take this book here. Normally, we cannot say that it is '*abhāva*' non-existent. That is only possible to say if there is no book. That is the meaning of '*abhāva*' accepted by everyone else, except for the *Advaitī*. What does *Advaita* say? While this book exists, it is '*abhāva*.' We see the object, know it, and use it. Still, the object is '*abhāva*.' Why is that? This is because the word '*abhāva*' here means, 'imagined.'

That is what we explained before. For explaining that, we discussed how knowledge grasps an object through the medium of Place and Time. When knowledge grasps an object, how does knowledge contain the object?' We discussed all of these matters before. This is in order to understand the meaning of 'imagined.' So, if we accept that these qualified objects, such as a pot, are imagined, then there is only object there. That is '*sat*.' It is the object we grasp through the word '*Sat*.'

There is no *viśeṣyam*, the object. There is only the *viśeṣaṇam*, the quality. If that is said, how can there exist this *samānādhikāraṇam*? '*Na yuktam*,' that isn't correct. '*Iti chet*,' what about this? These words '*iti chet*,' indicate that it is a question. A word used for indicating a question is '*chet*.' 'If it is so.' After that, it says, '*na*.' From this, we understand that what is going to come is the *Siddhānti*. This refutes the question. 'That question isn't correct.'

'*Sat idaṁ udakaṁ iti marīchyādau anyatarābhāvepi samānādhikarāṇyadarsanāt*.' Here, what does the *Siddhānti* do? We said before, that the person asking the question and the person giving the reply will agree on certain basic matter. The discussion proceeds on that foundation. Here what happens? The questioner accepts one thing. He accepts that the object is imagined. That is why it says, '*marīchyādau*,' in objects like a mirage. Here, for matters like a mirage, both people have no difference of opinion. What is that? It is that the water there is imagined. Seeing that imagined water, what does a

person say? Just like a person says before, '*san ghaṭaḥ*,' the pot that exists, here it says, '*sat idam udakam*.' 'The water that exists.'

This is because in the time when water is seen within the mirage, that water is known as being true, until one understands that it is merely an imagination. Because of knowing thus, the person goes near to drink the water. For a person who sees the mirage, the first experience he has is '*sat idam udakam*.' He experiences, 'there is water here.' Then what happens? There, like in the experience of any object, both *Sat* is known and the water is known. The experience of water here, the water that is the object of experience, is imagined. In truth, it doesn't exist. There is no difference of opinion in the questioner on this point.

However, here, how is it? Where it says, '*sat idam udakam*,' are the words are used as a *samānādhikaraṇa*? Yes. The meaning of *Sat* and the meaning of '*udakam*' are different. Here, this is said as a *sāmānādhikaraṇam*. Here, how did this *samānādhikaraṇa* come? The *Siddhānti* is asking this to the questioner. Why is that? It is because of this, '*viśeṣyābhāva*.' Here, the qualified object is water. That doesn't exist; it is imagined. There, the water is imagined, and the '*Sat*' is Real. This is the '*Sat*' that exists in all places. The water is imagined. Still, here, the questioner has to accept *samānādhikaraṇa* at least in this example. Because of this, he has to agree. The *Siddhānti* takes it to this place. He leaves the ordinary worldly experience, and takes the subject to the level of illusions for the questioner. That is why this example is given. 'Then isn't the water imagined?' After that, don't you accept *samānādhikaraṇa*? If that is so, go to the worldly level of experience, and look.' There also, it is like this.

This is an example. The object is imagined, while '*Sat*' is continuous. Thus, it says, '*idam udakam iti marīchyādau anyatara abhāvepi*.' Here there are two objects; one is *Sat*, and the other is water. In that, '*anyataram*,' not one, '*anyatara abhāve api*,' even if there is not one, '*samānādhikaraṇya darśanāt*.' There is *sāmānādhikaraṇa*. That is the meaning. Here, in this example, this is mostly not in any books. In some books, there is not the word '*sat*.' Even without that word, this can be explained. It can be explained with just, '*idam udakam*.' What is this like?

Wherever the subject of delusion is discussed, there are some famous examples. There is the example of the snake in the rope, or of silver in the mother-of-pearl. All of the experiences there are the same as this. ‘*Idam rajatam,*’ this is a rope. ‘*Ayam sarpah,*’ this is a snake. In all of these, in the snake, in the silver, all of that is *Asat*. It is imagined. But what is it that is continuous in all of those? It is the word ‘*idam,*’ ‘this.’ ‘*Ayam sarpah,*’ this is a snake. In masculine form, it is ‘*ayam.*’ In neuter form, it is ‘*idam.*’ This is the same word, the same meaning. ‘*Ayam sarpah.*’ ‘*Idam udakam.*’ ‘*Idam rajatam.*’ This is used in all of these. In all of these, there is the word ‘*idam,*’ ‘this.’ We know these objects through the word ‘this.’

There are three forms for the word ‘*idam.*’ In neuter case, it is ‘*idam.*’ In masculine, ‘*ayam,*’ and ‘*iyam*’ in feminine case. These are the three forms of ‘*idam.*’ This word is used to show objects that are very close. This means, ‘this.’ In all of these situations of confusion, the object seen in delusion disappears. When we see a snake in rope, or when we see silver in mother-of-pearl, or water in a mirage, these objects are all seen in the moment of delusion. Only a moment is needed. Through a moment itself, that delusion is created, and in same moment, it disappears. This can happen in a single moment. There, what is it that doesn’t change? It is ‘This.’ That doesn’t change. This word ‘this,’ is what is considered as True.

This is because the word ‘this’ points to the object which was seen differently in delusion. This is a matter we have discussed in detail before. The word ‘this’ points to the base. This points to the foundations, of the mirage, the rope, the mother-of-pearl. That is the support, therefore it is True.

Here, through just using these two words ‘*idam udakam,*’ we can say that one is true, and the other is imagined. ‘*Idam*’ is True, and ‘*udakam,*’ is imagined. That can happen. However, this is explained, being joined to the word ‘*sat.*’ Why is that? It is because we aren’t discussing about ‘*idam,*’ ‘this.’ We are discussing about *Sat*. This is the *Sat* that is continuous in all experiences. Here, the word ‘*idam*’ points to the truth, the foundation. This shows Existence, but the word ‘*idam*’ is used.

However, *Śaṅkara* is discussing about the word ‘*sat.*’ That is why it says in some books, ‘*sat idam udakam.*’ Now it will be easy to understand a little more.

We can explain this idea, also using the word '*idam*.' There, '*anyatarābhāvepi*,' even if there is more than one thing, '*samānādhikaraṇyadarśanāt*.' *Samānādhikaraṇa* is seen. When this is said, we feel the idea.

In our every worldly experience, when we know each and every object, we have the experience of Existence along with the experience of the object. Because that experience of the object is joined together with the experience of Existence, that object must not be Real. Instead, that object is imagined.

However, in all of these matters, in each and every object, we know as being true. This isn't like a snake in the rope, or like water in a mirage. We know that object as true. We don't just know. We act, using that object. Take clothes. '*San paṭaḥ*.' When we have the experience of clothes, we know that as being true. We know it as being true. We discussed this in the *Brahma Sutra* classes. This is '*artha kriyā kāryam*.' This means that we can utilize that object. That makes it difficult for us to accept that that is imagined. We thus have difficulty.

This is because, how can we say that the cloth we take now is imagined. We have a utility for that. The silver in the mother-of-pearl isn't like that. Nobody takes the silver in mother-of-pearl, and makes an ornament out of it. We haven't seen anyone make an ornament out of that. But here, it isn't like that. Here, what is it? There is '*artha kriyatvam*.'

To say in another way, that has worldly suitability. When we are awake and act, we think and act, depending on each one of these objects. Therefore, what happens to those objects? They have a continuance. I wear the clothes today that I wore the other day. It isn't like that with imaginings. That disappears in an instant. So, when it is said that objects that are suitable in worldly experience are the same as the imagined objects that disappear in a moment, this isn't agreed to by the intellect. How can both of these be true in the same way? The other has no worldly suitability. The snake in a rope has never bitten anyone. No one has ever died like that.

However, the snake in worldly experience isn't like that. That is born, and grows. It bites men, and they die because of that. Then how can we say that both are the same? When this is said, in one example, we directly experience the truth



behind the object. In the other, we clearly experience illusion. Here what is said in *Advaita*? Both of these are the same.

Like that are these two. When we link together two separate things in our experiences, we feel there is a 'contradiction.' Because of that, why does our mind feel this difficulty? The mind accepts that these worldly objects are Real. To refute this, this example was given.

We experience each and every object as being Real, in the worldly level of experience. Here, what is said? That Real-ness, the experience of Real-ness, doesn't belong to the object. Instead, it belongs to the Existence that is joined together with the object. That is different. Because the objects become an object of our awareness, being joined together with Existence, we think that the objects are Real. It says to be give more alertness. If we think grossly, we experience that these objects are real. That experience isn't refuted here. That is something of primary importance.

This doesn't refute the reality of objects in the worldly level. While accepting that, what does it say? The reality experienced in the object isn't the object's self-controlled Existence. Instead, we experience the object because it is joined together with another Existence. That is how we experience the object. Because we experience it like that, we feel that the object has existence. Here, it is distinguishing and showing this.

Then a question comes. This suitability of worldly experience isn't seen in the other examples. There is a sanke that bites, and a snake that doesn't bite. There is silver we can use to make ornaments, and the silver we cannot utilize. Thus, there is no worldly suitability in these, is there? Here, what does the *Siddhanti* say? It says that however worldly suitability this has, that is how much worldly suitability that has. However, we don't experience like that. In other words, the snake seen in a rope doesn't bite us. Why is that? It is because it doesn't get the time to bite. If it gets the time, it will bite. That is it.

What happens there? It is in half an instant, that that happens. Because that happens in the smallest fraction of a moment, what is it? Matters that are continuous don't happen. However, sometimes delusion can be like that. Some people, if their foot becomes entangled in a rope, they don't see a snake. Instead, what will be their experience? 'A snake bit me.' The rope becomes entangled and

causes a bruise. Immediately what happens to them, if it is a person traveling, who is afraid of a snake? He will be suspicious. It's not that he saw a snake. Instead, he becomes deluded, that 'a snake bit me.'

That will be made somewhat more clearer, if you look at a dream. In a dream, a snake may bite us. An elephant may attack us. We may have to lie down in the hospital. We may sometimes die. All of this happens in a dream. There also, what happens? There is worldly suitability of objects. All of these illusory objects have worldly suitability. How? It is in the level of their experience. Because of that, there is no difference in the level of worldly experience.

Then when do we understand that all of that is irrelevant. It is immediately upon waking up. It is after coming to this state that we understand, 'everything that happened - an elephant didn't run towards me. I didn't fall unconscious. The elephant didn't strike me.' The person understands all of this later. So, in the level of experience, there is worldly suitability. That is the same thing that happens here.

When we take clothes and utilize them, what happens? In this level of experience, that object has worldly suitability. Only then do we know it. For a person who contemplates and understands this, there is no kind of difference between the two. This is the same as that. What happens in a dream is the same as in the waking state. What happens in the waking state is the same as in the dream state. There isn't a single difference. Then what does a person with discrimination know? 'If that can be imagined, then this can also be imagined.'

In both places, it is in the level of experience. But later, without knowing after waking up, there is no difference in both in the level of experience. For a person who sees a dream, the dream is never an illusion. No matter how intelligent, in a situation where he sees, that is true only. Like that, when we experiences these things in the worldly level of experience, all of that is Real. That is also said.

Therefore, the experience isn't refuted. Instead, it says to reflect on the experience. Having reflected thus, understand the truth behind. To give this understanding, it says, 'anyatara abhāvepi.' Even if there is no one within these two, '*samānādhikaraṇyadarśanāt.*' There is *samānādhikaraṇam*. Because of that alone does the object become Real. Wherever there is *samānādhikaraṇam*, the

object will be imagined. And the 'Sat' exists in any form, as being without change. This is what *Śaṅkara* desires to make clear through the *bhāṣyā*.' 'Tasmāt,' therefore, 'dehādeḥ dvandvasya cha sakāraṇasya asataḥ na vidyate bhāvah iti.' So, 'dehādeḥ dvandvasya,' the pairs of opposites. We had been discussing about opposites such as cold and heat in the previous shloka. Of those, 'sakāraṇasya,' along with their causes. Along with its cause, which is also produced from a lineage of causes. If we think like this, in the attitude of cause and effect, all of the effects are destroyed. Clothes are destroyed. Then the thread is destroyed. Then the cotton is destroyed. Then the tree from which that came is destroyed. If we go like that, then the atoms that make up the cotton are destroyed. Thus, if we look and think in terms of cause and effect, we know that all of these are subject to destruction. Like that, that which is destroyed is Asat. It is imagined. For that, 'vidyate na bhāvah.' There is no *bhāva*, no Existence for that. We should understand this.

There is a difference between destruction and imagined. Where it accepts that the objects are destroyed, it doesn't necessarily accept that they are imagined. A object exists, and is then destroyed. That's not difficult for a person to accept. Everyone accepts this. However, it isn't destruction; it is imagination. What does 'imagined' mean? It means that even that destruction is imagined.

What do those who accept that these are imagined say? The birth, sustenance, and destruction of those are all imagined. The *Advaitī* accepts like this. What does the *Dvaitī* do? He accepts birth, sustenance, and destruction. There, what is said? 'These aren't eternal. They are perishable.' However, the *Advaitī* accepts that these are imagined. That is the difference between them.

Then there is a question: 'If *Sat* is itself the embodiment of awareness, is it correct to say that it again becomes aware of itself?'

This indicates *Asat*, or imagining. So, *Sat* is itself the embodiment of Awareness. The questioner asked if it is correct for that to again become aware of itself. In truth, that is what constantly happens. What happens? *Sat* makes itself an object of awareness again. This process of *Sat* again making itself an object of awareness is what is called 'bondage.' Or, this is called, '*saṁsāra*.' That is *saṁsāra*.

If *Sat* doesn't do that, because – that is the embodiment of Awareness. If such a process doesn't occur, what is it? That is *Mukti*. That is the difference between bondage and Liberation. How is that? Now, we think. What do we think? We think, 'I have knowledge.' Or else, we think, 'I know the truth.' These are our worldly experiences. What do we say about these experiences? It is *Sat* that makes one aware of these. That is what is said.

How does this happen? This is because in the Supreme Truth, *Sat* is self-effulgent. We are not able to know That. However, we aren't like that. 'I know myself. I have awareness about my knowledge. 'I know my own knowledge.' These are our experiences. How does this happen? This is what we discussed the previous day. This is called, '*Māyā*.' We experience that *Sat*, which is not an object, as if it were an object. This is *Māyā*. We experience that self-luminous *Paramātmā* as if it were an object. Where is it experienced? It is the experience of 'I.' What is the experience of 'I?' That experience reveals me. In other words, it reveals *Sat*. It reveals one's own Existence. This is experience.

In truth, is that possible? No, it's not possible. Why is that? It is because in the Supreme Truth, *Sat*, or Existence, is not something to be revealed by knowledge. Then what? In the worldly level of experience, that is what constantly happens. In the Supreme Truth, that doesn't happen. So, we should understand the difference between the two.

When we say that *Sat* is itself the embodiment of Awareness, what is it? That is its Supreme State. *Sat* and Awareness are only one. That is constantly self-luminous. Then what about saying that it again becomes aware of itself? That is condition of bondage, which we constantly experience. This is the condition of worldly experience. Here what happens? Knowledge strives to know that constantly.

What is this bondage, or *saṁsāra*? In truth, it is an effort to return. In whatever moment you set out for the journey, at that time, you begin the return back. That is its specialty. The moment the journey of *saṁsāra* begins, in that same moment the journey to return also begins. One goes forwards and backwards at the same time. That is what happens. This is not possible normally, but is possible here. This is called *Māyā*. One walks forwards while walking backwards at the same time. In other words, the *jīva* constantly becomes bound

while striving to become free. That is what happens. This matter is said through many examples.

So what is the proof of our experience of Existence, or of the effulgence of Awareness, or the experience of Bliss? The *jīva* has only a small awareness of his true nature. Because of this, what is said? We said the other day that the *jīva* has part knowledge, part ignorance, about the *Ātma Tattva*. Because of that, the *Jīva* can develop *jijñāsa*. Because of that, a person strives to attain That. When we strive consciously for That, what do we do? We depend on the scriptures and Guru. A person who strives unintentionally, what does he do? He searches for that in the external objects. These are *Jīvas*. Worldly people search for objects in search of their true existence and bliss. That is why they approach the objects. That is an effort that is not intentional.

What happens in this? We try to reveal the Self, which is Self-luminous. Sadhana is the intentional effort towards this. Why do perform spiritual practices? We say we do *sādhana* for the attainment of *mokṣa*, or for Realization. What happens there? A person tries to reveal what can never be revealed. We are trying to discover what can never be discovered. That is the truth of what happens. We take a journey to a place that can never be reached. Why is this? Why is it said that the Self can never be discovered or reached?

This is because the Self is not a place that must be reached. It is the place where we are standing right now. Only if there is a difference of place can we reach somewhere. When do we need to realize something? That something must be other than us. This Self is not separate, so it cannot be realized. Only a distant place can be reached. This is not a distant place. Instead, it is your True Nature. Because of this, it cannot be reached. However, we try to do this.

Because of this, what is said? It says that knowledge tries to again become aware of its true Existence. This is a conscious, intentional effort. If the effort is intentional it is called 'spiritual.' If it is an unintentional effort it is called 'worldly.' That is the difference between the two. So, if we ask whether the worldly experiences are true, we can only say that they are true on the worldly level of experience. In the supreme Truth, they are not true. What is in the

Supreme Truth? This *Tattva* is constantly self-effulgent. There is neither bondage nor Liberation in the Supreme Truth.

Then, we can only say that the worldly experiences of objects are imagined. We discussed before that these experiences consist of *Sat* joined together with the object. This was shown through the examples, 'the pot that exists, etc.' What are all of our experiences? It is true that they indicate what is imagined. But what is indicating the imagined objects? That is *Sat*, Pure Existence. Therefore, we are indicating both *Sat* (Existence) and *Asat* (the imagined). We should understand this. When *Sat* and *Asat* are indicated, what is this *Asat*?

*Asat* is that which is not. If we indicate that which doesn't exist, in truth, what is it? We cannot become aware of that. There is no such awareness. Then, in the supreme Truth, there is only the effulgence of *Sat*, Pure Existence. What is the meaning in saying we have awareness of something that doesn't exist? In the truth, there is no such awareness. How can one have awareness of something that does not exist?

What is the meaning of saying that we indicate what doesn't exist? It means that there is no such awareness, in the supreme Truth. How can one be aware of what doesn't exist? If we think this much, think a little bit further. Then it will be correct. Will it be possible to be aware of what doesn't exist? One doesn't have awareness of what is not. This is because it doesn't exist. Then what is it that one is aware of? That is *Sat*. Will it be possible to make one aware of that? No, because it isn't an object of Awareness. That is constantly self-effulgent. That is the ultimate statement that can be given regarding this matter,

Even if that is so, in our day-to-day worldly lives, this is upside-down. We become away from the Truth. Everything we experience is opposite to the Truth. Through those opposite experiences itself, there is a light. That is what prompts us to search for *Sat*. That light is called '*Sat*. Existence'

So, we should think about this, accepting both levels of this at the same time. One level is the level of worldly experience, and the other is the level of the Supreme Truth. The scriptures discuss both of these. They discuss the worldly experience, as well as the Supreme Truth. If we merely put these together without distinguishing, it will only create confusion. So, the question is correct. At the same time, the question is wrong. It is both. When we take into consideration

the worldly level of experience, this question is correct. However, when we consider the Supreme Truth, this kind of question has no relevance. We should distinguish and understand like this. That is why it says in the *bhashya*, ‘*tasmāt dehādeḥ dvandvasya cha sakāraṇasya asataḥ na vidyate bhāvah.*’ This is ending this part of the *bhāṣyā*. This means that the dualities such as cold and heat do not exist in the Supreme Truth. Lord Sri Krishna tells Arjuna, ‘*Tāms Titikṣasva Bhārata.*’ ‘Forbear these dualities!’

So, how should we forbear them? This doesn’t mean to suffer. Suppose someone close to us dies. We immediately become sad. A friend comes to us and says, ‘suffer through it.’ What does this mean, ‘to suffer?’ This means, ‘go ahead and be sad.’ Is there any other meaning to this? ‘Suffer,’ means to let it continue like it is now. Nothing more is needed. This means to suffer. There is no other meaning for the word ‘suffer.’ This is a permission given to suffer. ‘Go ahead and suffer.’ That’s all. Otherwise, there is no other meaning of ‘suffer through it.’ Our suffering will continue like that. Here, that isn’t the meaning said. It says, ‘*Tāms titikshasva.*’ ‘Forbear these.’ The commentator said before, ‘*harṣam viśādam vā mā kāṛṣiḥ.*’ Do not give way to delight or sorrow. Do not continue the pleasure into delight. That is called ‘*anusukham.*’ Like that, there is ‘*anuśochanam.*’ This means to not continue the pain and suffer. This is what we normally do. If anyone dies, we go there and make them aware of this ‘*anuśochanam.*’ This means that we make them suffer more. Here, that isn’t what the Lord says. He says, ‘don’t give way to this *anuśochanam*,’ the continuance of suffering. Never instruct a person to continue to suffer. That may be difficult, but it says one should do that. ‘*Anuśochanam*’ should not happen.

How does that happen in the experiences of happiness and sorrow in our life? When we something is favorable to us, we experience happiness, and when something is unfavorable to us, we experience suffering. Whatever it is, a death, or anything, this unfavorable event causes pain for us. Where is this pain? This pain occurs in the mind (*antaḥkaraṇa*). This pain is a modification in the mind. This *antaḥkaraṇa*, according to its *samskāra*, can transform in several different ways. It can change. When it changes in that way, what is the cause of that? The change is caused from *samskāra*. One specific transformation of the *antaḥkaraṇa*

is called ‘*sukham*’ pleasure. Then it transforms in another way. That is called ‘*dukham*,’ pain.

When the external situations are unfavorable, the *antaḥkaraṇa* will transform in the form of pain. There will be the modification of pain. Then the mind transforms according to that modification. This transformation (*pariṇāma*) is something that happens to external objects when they change their form. For example, take water. If water is put in a freezing environment, it becomes ice. As ice, water has some unique features. Normally, if our body comes into contact with water, it doesn’t cause us pain, but if the water is frozen into ice, the contact of the body with the ice will cause pain and make the body numb.

Whenever an object transforms into a different form, the new object will have unique qualities to it. This is what happens with the *antaḥkaraṇa*. Normally, the *antaḥkaraṇa* is free and pure. It is like light. Like the light of the sun, it is full of Pure Energy, at all times. However, when that undergoes a transformation, in the same way that water became ice, the mind freezes and transform. Then pain happens. Or that can become liquid, in the experience of pleasure. All of these are some specialties of the *antaḥkaraṇa*. This is what is called ‘*sukham*’ and ‘*dukham*.’ What is the cause of this at all times? These are external and internal causes.

The external cause is the experience of objects. We said before about the experience of pleasure and pain. The internal cause is primarily our *saṁskāra*. We discussed this before. Through these causes, the *antaḥkaraṇa* will have transformations of pain and pleasure. The *antaḥkaraṇa* does not have a firm nature. It is constantly undergoing transformation. When the mind transforms in that way, it can vary in relation to time. The transformation may take place over a long time, or over a few moments. For whatever cause prompted that transformation, in the presence of that cause, the *antaḥkaraṇa* will continuously transform. That is the meaning.

For example, suppose you have a toothache. Then the *antaḥkaraṇa* will have a transformation of pain. As long as that cause of the transformation of pain exists within, till then that transformation of pain will constantly take place in the *antaḥkaraṇa*. This is depending on an external cause. Here, what is it? The body is the cause. This is a trouble that came to the body. That will make the



*antaḥkaraṇa* transform in that manner. Here, where it says, 'don't give way to sorrow,' what is meant? It means to not become a cause for that kind of transformation, knowingly or unknowingly.

After the spontaneous transformation, how does one become a cause of suffering? This happens by thinking about that transformation. We think about that suffering. When we think about the sorrow, our minds become weak. This is what happened to Arjuna, this weakness of heart. When that happens, we create another cause. How is this? It is our thoughts. Having created that cause, through that cause, this will transform again. Then, the suffering will extend more.

However, one must not sustain the suffering. To avoid this, the Lord says, '*Taams Titikshasva.*' 'Forbear these!' The saying to 'not have delight or sorrow' is the same thing. The same thing applies for pleasure. The continuing remembrance is what creates '*anuśochanam.*' That again becomes a cause for suffering. It says here to avoid that. Either way, that has happened. Through the trouble of the body, the *antaḥkaraṇa* had a transformation of pain. If one thinks about that and becomes a cause for its continuation, then we give a prompting for the mind to continue to transform in that way. This prompting for the repeat of experience, avoid this. According to either the specialty of the mind, or the weakness of the mind, the experience may be even stronger than the beginning. That what is called 'inability to suffer.' If a person has pain, and doesn't have the strength to bear it, what happens? His suffering will be more intense. This means that he thinks very seriously about the pain, and suffers more. The continuing transformation of the mind will be stronger and more intense.

This second coming of the transformation – avoid that. That is '*titikṣa,*' forbearance. However it is experienced in the beginning, through internal or external causes, keep that suffering there itself. Don't continue and develop that. That is '*titikṣa.*' That which comes to us, which is unavoidable, is not possible for anyone to avoid, even for *Jñānis*. That is what is called '*prārabdha.*' That simply must be experienced. However, do not suffer through continuing that. This means that we can avoid the suffering caused from thinking about that. That is primarily what is meant by '*titikṣa.*'

However, how can we obstruct this coming transformation of the *antaḥkaraṇa*? If we continue to think about that suffering, the suffering will

continue. If we view the suffering seriously, it will grow. But if we view the pain very lightly, it will stop coming. This is how one ends the transformation in the *antaḥkaraṇa*. One thing that helps in this is the knowledge that these objects are unreal. This helps to gain forbearance. When this is said, *Śaṅkara* says that *Ātma Bodha*, awareness of the Self, is an aid in forbearance. How is that an aid? ‘These objects are imagined. These objects are insignificant. These objects, the pleasure and pain, are in the *antaḥkaraṇa*. In truth, I am the pure, Self-luminous *Ātman*, which is not identified with this *antaḥkaraṇa*.’ In this way, for a person who thinks correctly about the suffering, the object, and the Self, makes this firm, and gains mental firmness, when these experiences of pleasure and pain are unavoidable, he feels the insignificance of these experiences in the mind. He becomes aware in the mind of the insignificance of these. What is this like?

For example, a person becomes sad after his best friend dies. This is an ordinary, worldly mind. However, another person thinks correctly about this relationship and other things, because of a special *saṁskāra*. This is a person who thinks in the view of spirituality. Because of that, this person has a special view of this. ‘These relationships aren’t like we think. These are an illusion.’ If a person thinks in the correct manner like this, that kind of death doesn’t make him suffer in the way that the worldly person suffer.

Like that, for matters related to the body, for the suffering caused by the body, these affect an ordinary person. He suffers. However, for a person who thinks correctly about these matters, and gains courage and firmness of mind, he doesn’t allow the suffering to overpower him. The pain doesn’t control him. This is while he experiences the pain. To say in another way, he will have more strength to face the pain than the other person. For that, one primary means is *Ātma Bodha*, awareness of the Self. This *Ātma Bodha* transfers stability to the mind. Through that, he becomes able to overcome pain. For that, here, it is making the listener aware of the Reality of the *Ātman*, and the illusory nature of the worldly objects. That is what is said next.

*‘Tathā sataśchā/tmano/bhāvo/vidyamānatā na vidyate  
sarvatrāvyabhichārādityavochāma. Evamātmānātmanoh  
sadasatorubhayorapi dṛṣṭa upalabdho/nto nirṇayah*

*satsadevāsadasadeveti tvanayoryathoktayostattvadarsībhiḥ. Taditi sarvanāma sarvaṁ cha brahma tasya nāma taditi tadbhāvastattvaṁ brahmaṇo yāthātmyaṁ taddraṣṭum śīlaṁ yeṣāṁ te tattvadarśinastaistattvadarsībhiḥ. Tvamapi tattvadarśināṁ dṛṣṭimāśritya śokaṁ moham cha hitvā śitoṣṇādīni niyatānityarūpāṇi dvaṁdvāni vikāro/yamasanneva marīchijalavanmithyā/vabhāsat iti manasi niścitya titikṣasvetyabhiprāyaḥ.’*

‘*Tathā sataḥ cha ātmanaḥ abhāvaḥ avidyamānatā na vidyate.*’ Here it is speaking firmly about *Ātma Bodha*. It says, ‘*sataḥ ātmanaḥ.*’ This means that the Self is *Sat*. That has no destruction. The ‘*abhāva,*’ the non-existence of that, does not exist. ‘*Abhāvaḥ na vidyate.*’ Why is that? ‘*sarvatra avyabhichārāt.*’ That *Sat* is the *Ātman*. That *Sat* that is experienced as joined together with the experience of objects is the *Paramātmā*. It says, ‘*sarvatra avyabhichārāt.*’ Without any change, that is situated everywhere, without any break. ‘*Iti avochāma.*’ This was said before, and is being repeated.

Then, the *bhāṣyā* says, ‘*evam,*’ in this way, ‘*ātmānātmanoḥ sadasatoḥ ubhayoḥ api dṛṣṭaḥ upalabdhaḥ antaḥ nirṇayaḥ.*’ So it said, ‘*evam ātmānātmanoḥ,*’ the Self and the non-Self, this *Sat* and the objects, ‘*sadasatoḥ,*’ the *Sat* which is the object of our experience, and ‘*asat,*’ these objects, ‘*ubhayoḥ api dṛṣṭaḥ.*’ The *śloka* says, ‘*dṛṣṭontaḥ.*’ This part is being explained. The decisive knowledge of both *sat* and *asat*, ‘*dṛṣṭaḥ,*’ was seen, or ‘*upalabdhaḥ,*’ was obtained. This firm knowledge becomes firm in the mind of the *Jñāni*, and he realizes both of these, *sat* and *asat*. He gains the firm knowledge that the *Ātman* is *Sat* and the objects are imaginary. He has this decision. This is made firm. How is that?

It then says next, ‘*sat sadeva.*’ This *Sat* does not change. It is continuous, and unbroken in all experience. Then, it says, ‘*asat asadeva.*’ What is *Asat*? It is imagined. That is never *Sat*. That never has any stability. ‘*Iti tu anayoḥ yathoktayoh tattvadarśibhiḥ.*’ This is explained. ‘*tat iti sarvanāmaḥ sarva cha brahma. Tasya nāma tat iti tadbhāvaḥ tattvaṁ brahmaṇaḥ yāthātmyaṁ. Tat draṣṭum śīlaṁ yeṣāṁ te tattvadarśinaḥ. Taiḥ Tattvadarshibhiḥ.*’ The *śloka* says,

‘*ubhayor api dṛṣṭontas tvanayos tattvadarshibhiḥ.*’ The breakdown of the words in this part is, ‘*ubhayoḥ api dṛṣṭaḥ antaḥ tu anayoḥ tattvadarshibhiḥ.*’

Here it is explaining these four words in the *śloka*, ‘*sat sadeva asat asadeva tu anayoḥ yathoktayoḥ tattvadarshibhiḥ.*’ ‘The words ‘*ubhayoḥ anayoḥ,*’ mean ‘both of these.’ Then, ‘*yathoktayoḥ*’ means that *sat* and *asat* that were spoken of earlier. What are these? ‘*Antaḥ dṛṣṭaḥ.*’ This means that the *tattvadarśis* grasped the *tattva* of these. By who? ‘*Tattvadarshibhiḥ.*’ That was understood by *Ātma Jñānis*. So, it says, ‘*tattvadarśi.*’

Therefore, the *bhāṣyā* explains the meaning of the word ‘*tattva.*’ What is *tattva*? The *bhāṣyā* says, ‘*tat iti sarva nāmaḥ,*’ The word ‘*tat*’ is all names. This is a ‘pronoun.’ In *Sanskrit*, this word is all names. To continue the indication of a name, this word is used. That is how it is ‘*sarva nāma.*’ In *Sanskrit*, all names can be indicated by the word ‘*tat.*’ This can also be indicated by the word ‘*idaṁ,*’ ‘this,’ or by ‘*etat,*’ ‘this.’ This word ‘that’ can be said in different ways also, ‘*saḥ,*’ he, ‘*ayam,*’ that,’ and ‘*īmam,*’ her. Therefore, all names are this word ‘*tat.*’ Why is it called this, ‘*sarva nāma?*’ This is because it indicates everything. That is why it says that the word ‘*tat*’ is all names. This is how the word ‘*tat*’ is described in *Sanskrit* grammar. So, the word ‘*tat*’ can be used to indicate anything, anyone. Take the name ‘*Rama.*’ To indicate the name *Rāma*, it is said, ‘*saḥ Rāmaḥ.*’ ‘He is *Rāma.*’

So because the word ‘*tat*’ can indicate any object in the Universe, it says that this word is all names, ‘*sarva nāma.*’ There is nothing that the word ‘*tat*’ cannot indicate. It can even indicate God. There is the scriptural phrase, ‘*tat tvam asi.*’ ‘*Tat*’ God, ‘*Tvam,*’ the *Jīva*, you, ‘*asi,*’ are. Therefore, because ‘*tat*’ can indicate any object, it is said that it is the name for everything. What is this everything? It is said, ‘*sarvam cha Brahma.*’ All of this is *Brahman*, the Absolute Consciousness. Because everything is contained within *Brahman*, the Supreme Consciousness, it is said that *Brahman* is everything. Or you can say that it is *Brahman* that exists as the Self manifest in all of Creation, moving and non-moving. So, what is *Brahman*? *Brahman* is everything. Therefore, the meaning of the word ‘*sarvam*’ is *Brahman*. Therefore it says, that ‘*tat*’ is the name for everything, which means that it is the name for *Brahman*. That is why the word

‘*tat*’ is used in the phrase, ‘*tat tvam asi*,’ you are That.’ This word ‘*tat*’ is used to indicate, or is aimed at the Supreme Self, the *Paramatman*. Therefore, the *bhāṣyā* says, ‘*tat iti sarvanāmaḥ. Sarvaṁ cha brahma. Tasya nāma brahmaṇaḥ,*’ the name of *Brahman*, ‘*tat*,’ is ‘*tat*.’ So what is the meaning of the word ‘*tat*’ in the word ‘*tattvam*.’ It is *Brahman*. ‘*Tadbhāvaḥ tattvaṁ.*’ So, it says, ‘*tadbhāvaḥ.*’ This means that the *bhāva*, or condition of ‘*tat*,’ is ‘*tattvam*.’

Usually, the word *bhāva* refers to the *dharma*, or special quality of an object. We said the word ‘*brāhmaṇatvaṁ*’ before. This means the *dharma*, or unique qualities of the *Brāhmaṇas*. The qualities such as evenmindedness and self-control consist of *brāhmaṇatvam*. We discussed this earlier. Then, there is the word, ‘*manuṣyatvam*.’ This means the *dharma* of *manuṣya*, man. What does that mean? It means the unique qualities of man that distinguish him from other beings. This is the form, abilities, etc. of man. So the special qualities of an object are usually described as ‘*bhāvam*.’

Here, the word ‘*tat*’ means *Brahman*. This is the *bhāva* of *Brahman*. However, there is no particular quality or *dharma* for *Brahman*. Then what is the meaning of *bhāvam*? The word ‘*tadbhāvaḥ*,’ means the true nature of *Brahman*. There is only the true nature of *Brahman*. And what about any qualities, *dharmas*, or ways of describing *Brahman* aside from Its true Nature? There is none. There are no particular qualities such as these. Thus, it says, ‘*tadbhāvaḥ tattvam*.’ Then, the *bhāṣyā* says, ‘*brahmaṇaḥ yāthātmyaṁ.*’ This means the condition of the true nature of *Brahman*. That is ‘*brahmaṇaḥ yāthātmyaṁ.*’ The word ‘*yāthātmyam*’ means, ‘the truth.’ What is the true nature of *Brahman*? It is ‘*nitya śuddha buddha mukta svabhāvaḥ.*’ Its true nature is eternal, pure, intelligence, and free. Those are the special qualities which belong only to *Brahman*.

Then the *bhāṣyā* says, ‘*tat draṣṭuṁ śīlaṁ yeṣāṁ te tattvadarśinaḥ.*’ We said that the word ‘*tat*’ is the true nature of *Brahman*. Therefore what is a *tattva darśi*? It says, ‘*tat draṣṭuṁ*,’ to realize *Brahman*, ‘*śīlaṁ yeṣāṁ*,’ of whose nature is so, ‘*te*,’ they, ‘*tattvadarśinaḥ*,’ are *Tattvadarśis*.’ This means those for whom Self-Realization becomes spontaneous. This means that it is not enough to have heard about the Self, or meditate on the Self, or to know the *Ātman* in some state of *samādhi* and then return. Instead, this must be one’s nature. Those who

constantly abide in the *Ātman* are *tattvadarśīs*. ‘*Taiḥ*,’ by them, ‘*tattvadarśibhiḥ*,’ by the *tattvadarśīs*, what do they do? They know the true condition of the *Ātman*. That is a *tattvadarśī*. What have they said about this? It says that they have explained the difference between what is Real and Unreal. ‘*Dṛṣṭaḥ Antaḥ Tattvadarśibhiḥ*.’ This was explained.

Then the *bhāṣyā* says, ‘*tvam api tattvadarśinām dṛṣṭim āśritya śokam moham cha hitvā śitoṣṇādīni niyatāniyatarūpāṇi dvandvāni ‘vikāro ‘yam asaneva marīchijalavat mithyā avabhāsate- iti manasi niśchitya titikṣasva iti abhiprāyaḥ.*’

Here the forbearance (*titikṣa*) that we discussed earlier is presented. It says here, ‘*manasi niśhitya titikṣasva.*’ Make firm in your mind this matter.’ Once this is made firm in the mind, you will gain the mental strength to withstand the dualities of life. This withstanding is called ‘*titikṣa*,’ forbearance. How is this? It says, ‘*Tvam api*,’ even you, Arjuna, ‘*tattvadarśinām dṛṣṭim āśritya.*’ Depending on the realization of the *tattvadarśīs*.’ This is an important matter. What is the realization of the *tattvadarśī*? It is a spontaneous experience. The Realization of the *tattvadarśī* is a spontaneous experience. The word ‘*dṛṣṭi*,’ can also mean viewing with the eyes, but that meaning is not indicated here. So, ‘*āśritya*,’ depending on this spontaneous experience.’ How can a *sādhak* rely on the spontaneous *bhāva* of a *tattvadarśī*? This means that wherever the *bhāva* of the *tattvadarśī* is explained and described, all of that is for the *sādhak* to depend on. This means that it is for him to follow. This can be said in a different way. It is said in the Gita, ‘*yat yat ācharati śreṣṭhaḥ tat tat evetaro janāḥ.*’ ‘Whatever a *śreṣṭha*, a great person does, other must follow that.’ This is the meaning.

When we say that the people follow the ways of a *śreṣṭha*, a great person, this doesn’t refer to the external practices of a *śreṣṭha*. If we consider the meaning in that way, we will have to do everything in the same way as the person we consider great. We will have to sit like him, walk like him, wear the same dress, spit like him, sneeze like him. We will have to do all of this in the same way. So, this doesn’t mean to imitate externally. The *bhāṣyā* says, ‘*tvam api tattvadarśinām dṛṣṭim āśritya.*’ We can grasp the spontaneous *bhāva* of the *tattvadarśī* through the intellect, or we can understand this through *bhāvana*. That is different. A person cannot contain the inner *bhāva* of another person within them. No one can contain within themselves the inner *bhāva* of someone else. If the person

contains something, that becomes his own; not the other person's. That is what happens.

For example, when we see a person who is very happy, we may also become happy. We normally say, that this happiness 'spread to us.' However, that is not true. His happiness is his. Our happiness is ours. Happiness is natural for us. The other person's happiness is just an instrument. This is the same way with sadness. In truth, these emotions are not spread from one person to another. However, one person can cause another person to experience happiness. How is this? This happens as an instrument. That is possible, but each person's happiness is their own.

We say that the Knowledge of a *Jñāni* is transferred to another *Jñāni*. That is not possible. We say this. We say that one *Jñāni* recognizes another *Jñāni*. As far as the *Jñāni* is concerned, there are not 2 *Jñānis*. There is only one *Jñāni*. Only if there are 2 *Jñānis* can they recognize each other. However, in that case, there are not 2 *Jñānis*. However, we have the freedom to say this. We say this on our level of experience. So what happens here? The Lord tells Arjuna to understand the condition of the *tattvajñāni*, and 'āśritya,' take refuge in that. The inner *bhāva* of a *śreṣṭha*, a great person, having grasped that, it says to take refuge in that. What is that? This means, 'practice that.' Make that a practice.' Krishna says this to Arjuna again. This is said in several sections. Having grasped the condition of the *Tattvajñāni* with the intellect, perform *bhāvana* on that by oneself. Otherwise, having grasped that, make it a practice. How? Mentally. What happens when he practices in that way? He tries to accept for himself the condition of the *Tattvajñāni*.

The *Jñāni* is beyond the pairs of opposites. So what does the *sādhak* do? He tries to go beyond the pairs of opposites (*dvandvas*). The *Jñāni* is non-attached. What does the *sādhak* do? He tries to practice that non-attachment. The *Jñāni* knows, 'I am different from the body, mind, and intellect.' *Śaṅkara* says, '*ghaṭa dṛṣṭo ghaṭābhinaḥ*.' This means, 'one who sees a pot is different from the pot.' Like that what does the *Tattvajñāni* do? He realizes that he is separate from the body, mind, and senses. Otherwise, what is it? He considers everything as his Self. This can be in either way. This is '*sarvātmabhāva*,' the realization of one's Self as the Self in all Creation. What does the *sādhak* do? He

performs *bhāvana* on that *sarvātmā bhāva* mentally. Otherwise, he thinks about that non-attachment. Thinking of that, he strives to gain firm conviction that that is his true nature. In this way, these are all mental practices.

By following these practices and making firm this *tattvam*, it says, ‘*śokaṁ cha moham hitvā.*’ ‘Having destroyed grief and delusion. Here this means ‘avoiding the despondency displayed earlier by Arjuna, ‘*śītoṣṇādi niyatāniyatārūpāṇi.*’ This was said before. These don’t have a decisive form; they constantly change. Sometimes the cold gives pleasure, and sometimes pain. In this way, when it says, ‘*śītoṣṇādi,*’ it refers to all pairs of opposites, all *dvandvas*. These are victory and defeat, gain and loss, etc. Whatever opposing experiences exist, that make the mind run from one pole to another, all of these, ‘*vikāro ‘yam asan eva.*’ All of these, these pairs of opposites like pleasure and pain, and the internal and external causes of these, all of these are *vikāras*. They are effects. They are effects of *Māyā*. Because of that, it says, ‘*asan eva.*’ These are imagined. They are the imagination of the mind. Having thought like this, or having practiced *bhāvana* like this – this can be in either way.

In one way, one can practice *mananam*, contemplation. Or, one can practice *bhāvana*, imagination. This is in two ways. There is a difference in these two. In *bhāvana* the *sādhak* continuously repeats something mentally. That is *bhāvana*. And what about *manana*? In *manana*, one thinks about a subject in different ways. This can be in either way; through *manana*, or through *bhāvana*. ‘*Asan eva.*’ All of these are imagined.’ How is that? It says, ‘*marīchijalavat,*’ like the water in a mirage, ‘*mithyā avabhāsate,*’ they appear as an imagined illusion. They are *mithyā*, imagined, ‘*avabhāsate,*’ they appear to exist. Being imagined, they are experienced. We discussed this in the previous class. The mind imagines these objects. They don’t exist externally. They effulge within the mind, within knowledge. ‘*Iva,*’ these are the creations of knowledge.

We said the example before, ‘*san ghaṭaḥ.*’ There, this pot exists only when it is joined together with *Sat*. Therefore, it is imaginary. Who imagined it? Where was it imagined? How did it come into being? It is imagined by *Sat* within *Sat* itself. That is how it is imagined. It is unreal, but experienced. Who made the unreal to appear to be real? It is the Real itself. It is *Sat* Itself that brings in the object. So, that is an expression of *Sat* Itself. That is something that *Sat* brings



out. Having this determination about all objects in the mind, '*manasi niścitya*,' making this firm in the mind. How can this be done? It is through *bhāvana* or *manana*.

For *manana*, more mental capacity is necessary. For *bhāvana*, that much isn't necessary. There, a single thing is repeated in the mind. There, one doesn't need for logic and reasoning.

Once a disciple approached a Guru. The Guru told him, 'the Supreme *Brahman* is a buffalo.' What did he do there? He didn't go to think more about it. He performed *bhāvana* on *Parabrahman* as a buffalo. That is what is called *bhāvana*. That is the determination he had. With an innocent mind, he had that same determination. With *śraddha*, he performed *bhāvana*. He didn't go to think about it. If one thinks, he won't be able to accept that. A buffalo has horns, a tail, legs, everything. That can never be *Parabrahman*.' He will think, 'I know at least that much.' What will he do?

He will go to the Guru and prove his case. 'The Guru is mistaken. *Brahman* is of the nature of eternal, pure, and free intelligence. There is no way that it can be a buffalo.' He will advise the Guru in this way. This is from *manana*. A person who does *bhāvana* isn't like that. If the Guru says, 'that is a buffalo,' then for him, *Brahman* is a buffalo. There won't be a doubt. He will perform *bhāvana* on that. He practices *bhāvana* with firm faith. What happens to such a person? Isn't this said in the legend? He attains Realization in that way.

A person who performs *manana* isn't like that. He thinks more. These are in different levels. The subject is not as two who is in front, and who is behind. These are just different levels. Either way, '*manasi niścitya*.' With both groups, what is it? That firmness is needed. That must be made firm. Having made that firm, it says, '*titikṣasva*,' forbear!' That is the meaning.

So, having performed *bhāvana* on the *Ātma Bodha* of the *Tattvajñāni* and made this firm, from that firmness gained, forbear these! We said before, that this is a primary means to forbearance. This is to be determined about the insignificance of these. This is said normally. Once we become aware of the insignificance of a matter, which we had considered very seriously, we are then able to deal with that matter with great lightness. This is the same with *śāstra chinta*, contemplating the scriptures. We are some people unable to swallow the

*śāstras*? It is because they have an attitude of seriousness towards the *śāstras*; they think that is impossible. They think that is something they cannot even enter into. That *śāstra* won't come inside. That is the meaning.

Without seeing the *śāstras* with that kind of fear, if one sees the *śāstras* as they are, in that way.. that doesn't mean ignore their value. Without seeing with this kind of fear, it will be possible for anyone to grasp them. It is the same with all subjects. If we see an object with fear, we become distanced from that object. Instead, if we see, 'that isn't impossible. It's possible for me,' than it is possible. Like this, it says ' seeing all pairs of opposites as being insignificant, as imagined, forbear the opposite experiences cause by the dvandvas, and the internal *dvandvas* experienced. That is '*titikṣasva*.' That is the meaning of the Lord. Now we can look at the *śloka*. We have finished the commentary.

'*Na asato vidyate bhāvo.*' *Asataḥ bhāvah na vidyate.*' '*Asataḥ*,' for that which is imagined, '*bhāvah*,' existence, '*na vidyate*,' does not exist. '*Bhāvah*' means Pure Existence. Like this, '*sataḥ*,' for the Supreme Truth, '*abhāvah*,' the imaginary existence, '*na vidyate*,' doesn't exist. This meaning is according to the *bhāṣyā*. The ordinary meaning of *bhāva* and *abhāva* is existence and non-existence. However, this is according to the ideas of the *bhāṣyā*. '*Asat*,' means imagined, and '*sat*' means 'Existence.' The Imagined object, *asat*, '*bhāva na vidyate*, does not have true Existence.

*Anayoḥ ubhayoḥ api antaḥ tu tattvadarsībhiḥ dṛṣṭaḥ.*' It says, '*tattvadarsībhiḥ*,' by the *Tattvajñānis*, Knowers of the Self. By moving the position of the words around, there is nothing wrong. We can join the words together in a way that we can grasp the idea. Whether the word '*tattvadarsībhiḥ*' goes in the beginning or middle is nothing to argue about. '*Tattvadarsībhiḥ*,' by Knowers of the Truth, those who have realized the Self, '*anayoḥ ubhayoḥ api antaḥ.*' The firm conclusion of both of these, *sat* and *asat*, '*dṛṣṭaḥ*,' was seen, Realized. The words '*anayoḥ ubhayoḥ*,' mean '*sat* and *asat*.' The firm conclusion of both of these is realized by the *tattvadarsīs*. '*Tattvadarsībhiḥ*,' by the knowers of the Self, this truth is known. In this way, Sri Krishna is telling Arjuna to forbear the dualities such as cold and heat through the Self-knowledge of the *Tattvajñāni* explained here. It says to understand the condition of the *Jnani*.

In truth, Sri Krishna has been encouraging Arjuna to perform *Karma Yoga*. We may remember this. In this way, is it possible to have this kind of true Self-knowledge and perform *karma yoga*? Yes, that may be, but there is no problem because of that. Then, the question comes, 'isn't this a combination of *Jñāna* and *Karma*?' That is a difference matter. What is that? The argument of the separation of *Jñāna* and *Karma* means that the feeling of doership cannot be combined with true Self-knowledge. That was what was said. Anyone can have a general knowledge of the Self while performing actions. That's not all. In fact, he must have this knowledge, of the true nature of the Self, as well as the nature of the mind and intellect. According to *Karma Yoga*, we will later discuss the difference between the practice of *Jñāna* and practice of *Karma Yoga*.