

## GITA CLASS – CHAPTER 2, PART 4

*‘Na tvevāham jātu nā ‘sam na tvaṁ name janādhipāḥ  
Na chaiva na bhaviṣyāmaḥ sarve vayamataḥ param. 2.12.*

2.12. ‘But certainly it is not that I did not exist at any time; nor you, nor these rulers of men. And surely it is not that we all shall cease to exist after this.’

Now, to the Śaṅkara Bhāṣyā, ‘kutaḥ te aśochyāḥ.’ ‘Kutaḥ,’ for what reason, ‘te,’ they, Bhīṣma and Droṇa, etc., ‘aśochyāḥ’- ‘Why are they not worth grieving for?’ The answer is said, ‘yataḥ nityaḥ.’ It is because they are *nitya*, eternal. In their true nature they are never destroyed.

‘Katham,’ How is that they aren’t destroyed? That is what is explained in this śloka, ‘natviti.’ Here, Śaṅkara is commentating word-by-word.

*Kutaste ‘śochyā yato nityāḥ – katham – na tveva jātu kadāchidahaṁ nā  
‘sam kiṁtvāsamevātīteṣu dehotpattivināśeṣu nitya  
evāhamāsamityabhiprāyaḥ. Yathā cha tvaṁ nā/siḥ kiṁtvāsīreva. Tathā  
name janādhipā nā ‘sankiṁ tvāsanneva. Tathā na chaiva na  
bhaviṣyāmaḥ, kiṁ tu bhaviṣyāma eva sarve  
vayamato/smāddehavināśātparamuttarakālepi triṣvapi kāleṣu nityā  
ātmavarūpeṇetyarthaḥ. Dehabhedānuvṛtṭyā bahuvachanam  
nā ‘tmabhedābhiprāyeṇa. 2.13.*

‘Na tu eva jātu kadāchit ahaṁ na āsam.’ ‘Ahaṁ na āsam.’ This word, ‘āsam,’ comes from the verb root, ‘ās,’ ‘to be.’ The conjugations of this in the third person, for singular, dual, and plural, are ‘asti,’ ‘staḥ,’ and ‘santi.’ When this word is in the first person and in past tense, it becomes ‘āsam.’

‘Na tu eva jātu,’ not once, ‘kadāchit,’ at any time, ‘na āsam,’ ‘was I not.’ ‘Kim tu āsam eva.’ Indeed, I have always been. I have never ceased to exist. That is the meaning. From the root ‘ās,’ to be, come the past conjugations,

‘*āsām,*’ ‘*āsīḥ,*’ and ‘*āsīt.*’ This means, ‘I was,’ ‘you were,’ and ‘he was.’ So, ‘*aham na āsam.*’ I have never ceased to exist.’ ‘*Kim tu,*’ Instead, ‘*āsam eva,*’ I have always existed. I have never ceased to exist at any time.

This is explained further in the *bhāṣyā,* ‘*atīteṣu dehotpatti vinaśeṣu ghaṭādiṣu viyad iva nitya eva aham āsam ityabhiprāyah.*’ What does this mean, ‘I have never ceased to exist?’ This refers to previous births. ‘*Atīteṣu,*’ in long gone, ‘*dehotpatti vinaśeṣu,*’ accepting of bodies and their destruction..’ We have accepted several bodies in different births. Even though the *Ātman* accepts those bodies and they are destroyed, it says, ‘*ghaṭādiṣu viyadiva*’ - this is like space situated in a pot or any other object.

A pot and other objects that contain space within them are created and destroyed. The space may be contained within, or it may not be. Even if the object is destroyed, space isn’t affected. In this way, it says, ‘*nitya eva aham āsam.*’ I have existed eternally.’ ‘*Ityabhiprāyah.*’ ‘This is the meaning.’

‘*Tathā na tvam na asīḥ.*’ Here we can see the difference in the verb conjugation. In the *śloka,* it simply says, ‘*na tvam.*’ In the *śloka,* the verb isn’t given. This is because the verb is indicated from the previous statement, ‘*na kadāchit aham na āsam.*’ ‘I have never ceased to exist.’ This verb, ‘*āsam,*’ was in the first person, the speaker. The part doesn’t include a verb, so *Śaṅkara* includes the appropriate verb. Thus, the verb conjugation ‘*āsīḥ,*’ ‘you were’ is used.

This is said, ‘*Tathā na tvam na asīḥ.*’ ‘You have never ceased to exist.’ ‘*Kim tu asīḥ eva.*’ ‘Instead, you have always existed.’ In the *śloka,* it only says, ‘*na tvam,*’ ‘not you.’ So, the commentator explains by saying, ‘*na tvam na asīḥ.*’ ‘You have never not existed.’ Here, he joins this with the words, ‘*na*’ and ‘*asīḥ.*’ The phrase, ‘you have never ceased to exist,’ means, ‘you have always existed. This is a double negative, because there are two ‘*na*’s.

‘*Na asīḥ iti na.*’ This means, ‘the statement, ‘you have not existed,’ is not correct.’ In other words, you have always existed. ‘*Tathā na ime janādhipāḥ na āsān.*’ In the *śloka,* it says, ‘*Na ime janādhipāḥ.*’ There is no verb there. The commentator includes the verb, ‘*āsān.*’ First was ‘*āsam,*’ ‘I was,’ then ‘*asīḥ,*’ ‘you were.’ Now it says, ‘*āsān,*’ they were. ‘*Na āsān*’ means, ‘they were not.’ So, *Śaṅkara* completes the sentence as, ‘*na āsān iti na.*’ This means that the thought,

‘they did not exist’ is incorrect. Again, this means that they have always existed. ‘*Tathā na ime janādhipāḥ na āsāṇ.*’

So, couldn’t the Lord have simply said, ‘*āsān,*’ they existed? Why does he give the meaning, ‘It is not true that they have not existed.’ This is a double negative. This is in order to correct the misunderstanding of Arjuna, who thinks, ‘all of them will be destroyed. They have all taken birth.’

These are the thoughts of an *Ajñāni*; ‘this was non-existent, then came into existence, and then was destroyed.’ To refute this thought, the word ‘*na*’ is used. This is used to form a double negative, ‘they have never not existed.’ *Tathā na ime janādhipāḥ.* These kings and rulers, ‘*na āsān iti na.*’ They have never ceased to exist. This means that have always existed.

‘*Kim tu āsān eva.*’ Instead, what is it? For all times, they have existed. ‘*Tathā na chaiva na bhaviṣyāmaḥ.*’ ‘*Kim tu bhaviṣyāmaḥ eva sarve vyaṁ.*’ In this way, we will never cease to exist. Instead, we will always exist from hereafter. ‘*Bhaviṣyāmi,*’ means, ‘I will exist.’ ‘*Bhaviṣyāmaḥ,*’ means ‘we will exist.’ This is the form of the first person in plural, as ‘we.’ This word, ‘*bhaviṣyāmaḥ,*’ is a verb. With this, it says, ‘*sarve vyaṁ,*’ ‘all of us,’ ‘*Kim tu bhaviṣyāmaḥ,*’ ‘will always exist.’

To say, ‘*na bhaviṣyāmaḥ,*’ means, ‘we will not exist.’ When we combine this with, ‘*iti na,*’ the meaning becomes, ‘we will never cease to exist.’

Why does the Lord say this? It is because Arjuna thinks that these people will be destroyed. By using a double negative, the Lord is rejecting this idea of Arjuna’s. Everyone, ‘*sarve vyaṁ.*’ Me, you, and all of these rulers here, everyone, will exist. We will exist even from here after.

Then, ‘*ato asmād dehavināśād paraṁ uttarakāle api. Triṣvapi kāleṣu nityā ātmasvarūpeṇa ityarthāḥ.*’ Then what? Because of this, me, you, these rulers, and everyone, including *Bhīṣma* and *Droṇa*, ‘*asmāt dehavināśāt paraṁ uttarakāle api,*’ Even after the destruction of this body, we will exist.’ The actual *śloka* says, ‘*sarve vyaṁ ataḥ paraṁ.*’ The word, ‘*ataḥ,*’ ‘from here,’ in the *śloka* means, ‘even after the destruction of the body.’

Similarly, ‘*triṣvapi kāleṣu,*’ in all three periods of time; past, present, and future, ‘*nityāḥ,*’ we are eternal. How is that? ‘*Ātmasvarūpeṇa,*’ in the true nature of the Self, we are eternal. It is not that the body is eternal. Instead, this

means that everyone on the battlefield is eternal in the true nature of the Self, ‘*ātmavarūpeṇa.*’ ‘*Iti arthaḥ.*’ This is the meaning of the *śloka*, the words of the Lord.

‘*Dehabhedānuvṛtṭyā bahuvachanam na ātmabheda abhiprāyeṇa.*’ What is said here? Didn’t the Lord say, ‘you, I, and all of us?’ The Lord said, ‘*Sarve vyaṁ ataḥ paraṁ.*’ Thus, the Lord said, ‘all of us.’ This is a *bahuvachanam*, a plural noun. The Lord said, ‘you, I, and all of us.’ Is this difference in the subjects, such as ‘I,’ ‘you,’ and ‘we,’ used to show the plurality of the Self in these different subjects? No. Instead, it says, ‘*dehabhedānuvṛtṭyā.*’ This is used to show the distinction between each body, *deham*, not a distinction of the Self.’

Was the Lord suggesting that the Self in each body is separate and distinct, by saying, ‘me,’ ‘you,’ and ‘we’? No. This only shows the difference between bodies. It doesn’t mean that the Self is different from another Self. Because of this distinction between each body, a plural noun was used by the Lord, which was ‘we.’ So, in this section, some commentators such as *Ramanujāchārya* say that this shows that the Self is different in each body. God and the *jīva* are different from each other. This is how some followers of the dualist philosophy comment on this *śloka*.

Because of that, *Śaṅkara* says that it is not so. It says very clearly, ‘*Sarve vyaṁ,*’ ‘us.’ This is a plural noun. If you take the literal meaning of this, it means that ‘I am one thing, you are another, and so on.’ This creates the feeling of otherness. That is from seeing all of the different bodies externally. That is why it is plural.

‘*Na ātma bheda abhiprāyeṇa.*’ ‘That doesn’t show any difference in the Self.’ It is not the meaning of the Lord’s words that the Self is different in each body, according to *Śaṅkara*. However, that is how *Ramanujāchārya* commentates. His commentary says, ‘*evam bhagavataḥ sarveṣvarāt ātmānām parasparabhedārthaḥ paramārthikā.*’ He comments that the Lord says that the *Ātman* is different in each body. How is this? It is because it says directly in the *śloka*, ‘*sarve vyaṁ,*’ ‘all of us.’ This is a plural noun, so it must mean that the *Ātman* is plural, or different in each body.

This is not something that Śaṅkara accepts. He says that this was Arjuna's conception, that the Self is different in all bodies. Thus, considering the mental level of Arjuna, the Lord uses this language. Śaṅkara will further explain how this concept is not true in the coming sections. Śaṅkara's ideal is that though there may be differences between two physical bodies, the indwelling Ātman undergoes no form of change whatsoever.

Now, we can look at the śloka. 'Na tu eva ahaṁ jātu na āsām.' 'Ahaṁ,' I, 'jātu,' even once, 'na āsam iti na.' I have never ceased to exist. 'āsām eva.' 'I have always existed.' Like this, 'na tvam āsīḥ iti na.' You have never ceased to exist. 'āsīḥ eva.' 'You have always existed.' 'Ime janādhipāḥ,' these kings here, 'na āsān iti na.' They have never ceased to exist. Instead, 'āsān eva.' They have always existed.'

'Ataḥ paraṁ,' after the destruction of the body, 'sarve vyaṁ,' all of us, 'na bhaviṣyāmaḥ iti na.' We will not cease to exist. 'Bhaviṣyāmaḥ eva.' Indeed, we will continue to exist. By separating the words in this way, Śaṅkara helps us to understand the meaning of the śloka.

In this way, this śloka describes the eternal nature of the Ātman. Because Bhīṣma, Droṇa, and so on, are eternal in their true nature of the Self, there is no reason for you to grieve over them. That is the Lord's opinion. Next, the Gita gives an example of how the Self is indestructible.

***'Dehino 'sminyathā dehe kaumāraṁ yauvanaṁ jarā  
Tathā dehāntaraprāptirdhīrastatra na muhyati. 2.13.***

2.13. 'As are boyhood, youth, and decrepitude to an embodied being in this body, similar is the acquisition of another body. This being so, an intelligent person does not get deluded.'

Now, to the bhāṣyā. 'Tatra kathaṁ iva nitya ātma.' We spoke about the eternal nature of the Self. 'Kathaṁ iva?' What is this like? 'Iti dṛṣṭāntaṁ āha.' This śloka gives us an example to understand this principle. Then, Śaṅkara commentates on the śloka.

‘Tatra kathamiva nitya ātmeti dr̥ṣṭāntamāha – dehina iti. ‘deho/syāstīti  
 deho tasya dehino dehavadātmano/sminvartamāne dehe yathā yena  
 prakāreṇa kaumāraṁ kumārabhāvo bālyāvasthā yauvanam̐ yūno bhāvo  
 madhyamāvasthā jarā vayohānirjīrṇāvasthetyetāstisro/vasthā  
 anyonyavilakṣanāstāsām̐ prathamāvasthānāśe na nāśo  
 dvitīyāvasthōpajanane nopajananamātmanaḥ kim tarhyavikriyasyaiva  
 dvitīyatṛtīyāvasthāprāptirātmano dr̥ṣṭā yathā tathā tadvadeva  
 dehādanyo dehāntaram̐ tasya  
 prāptirdehāntaraprāptiravikriyasyaivā/tmana icyarthah̐. Dhīo  
 dhīmām̐statraivaṁ sati na muhyati na mohamāpadyate.’

‘Dehaḥ asya asti iti dehī.’ *Dehī* means one who has a body, a *deham*. Śaṅkara gives us the structure of this word. It says, ‘dehaḥ asya asti iti dehī.’ One who has a body is a *dehī*. The word, ‘dehinaḥ,’ is the 6<sup>th</sup> conjugation of the word *dehī*, which means, ‘of, or for the embodied soul..’

‘Tasya dehinaḥ dehavataḥ,’ ‘for him, the embodied soul, the possessor of the body..’ What does this indicate? ‘Ātmanaḥ,’ ‘who is the Ātman..’ Therefore the word ‘dehī’ means ‘ātmā,’ the Self. ‘dehinaḥ asmin vartamāne dehe,’ for the Ātman in this present body, ‘yathā yena prakāreṇa,’ in the way that, ‘kaumāraṁ yauvanam̐ jarā,’ childhood, youth, and old age are experienced..’

The word *kaumaram* is explained, ‘kumāra bhāvaḥ bālyāvasthā,’ the state of childhood. Next is *yauvanam*,’ the time of youth. This is explained as ‘yūno bhāvaḥ madhyamāvasthā.’ This is the stage of maturing, the middle stage of life. Last is ‘jarā,’ old age. This is described, ‘vayo hāniḥ,’ the decay of life, and ‘jīrṇāvasthā,’ the state of senility.

‘Iti etāḥ tisraḥ avasthāḥ.’ How are these three conditions; childhood, youth, and old age? ‘Anyonya vilakṣaṇāḥ.’ This means that they are different from each other; childhood, youth, and old age.

‘Tāsām̐,’ of these three stages in life, ‘prathama avasthā nāśe,’ when the stage of childhood ends, ‘na nāśaḥ ātmanaḥ,’ the Self is not destroyed. Similarly, ‘dvitīya avasthā upajanane,’ when the stage of youth begins, ‘na upajananam̐ ātmanaḥ,’ the Self is not born. It doesn’t experience birth because

of this. This part is made very clear. There is no need to further commentate on this.

‘*Kim Tarhi?*’ Then what happens? ‘*Avikriyasya eva ekasya ātmanaḥ dvitīya tṛtīya avasthā prāptiḥ ātmanaḥ dr̥ṣṭā.*’ Here Śaṅkara says, ‘*avikriyasya,*’ ‘for that which is changeless, *ekasya,*’ the non-dual, ‘*ātmanaḥ,*’ Self, ‘*dvitīya tṛtīya avasthā prāptiḥ,*’ these different stages occur.’ What does this indicate? In truth, these don’t exist in the *Ātman*. That is the meaning.

‘*Tathā tadvat eva dehāt anyaḥ dehaḥ dehāntaram, tasya prāptiḥ dehāntaraprāptiḥ avikriyasya eva ātmanaḥ iti arthaḥ.*’ In truth, the *Ātman* is changeless. It is free of all transformation. So what happens to this *Ātman*? The *Ātman* accepts a body.

Thus, ‘*tadvat eva,*’ in the same way that the *Ātman* attains these stages in life, ‘*dehāt anyaḥ dehaḥ dehāntaram,*’ the *Ātman* attains another body.

This attainment is called, ‘*dehāntara prāptiḥ.*’ In this way, the changless Self becomes connected to another body. This can be said in two ways. Either the *Ātman* accepts another body, or another body comes to the *Ātman*. That is ‘*dehāntara prāptiḥ.*’

Then the next word in the *śloka* is explained; ‘*dhīraḥ.*’ The *bhāṣyā* says, ‘*dhīraḥ dhīmān.*’ This means one who has discrimination, a *viveki*. The word ‘*dhī*’ means ‘intelligence.’ Thus, the word ‘*dhīraḥ,*’ means one who has intelligence.

‘*Tatra evaṁ sati,*’ this process being so, ‘*na muhyati na moham āpadyate,*’ a wise person is not deluded. This is the process of ‘*dehāntara prāptiḥ,*’ acceptance of a new body for the Self. This can be said in two ways. Here it says that a body becomes connected to the *Ātman*, for the *Jīva*. The other way of saying this is that the *Ātman* accepts a new body.

In either case, what happens? In truth, these changes do not occur to the Self. Because of this, a person with discrimination has no delusion. What is shown here? Here an example is given to show the unchanging nature of the *Ātman*. This is to show that the Self does not undergo such changes as birth and death. Śrī Kṛṣṇa is making Arjuna aware that these changes happen to the body, not the Self.

What did Arjuna say? ‘*Bhīṣma* and *Droṇa*, my gurus, will die.’ Because of this, Arjuna was grieving. Here, *Śrī Kṛṣṇa* says that only their bodies are destroyed. In their true nature of the *Ātman*, they are not to be grieved for. They are ‘*aśochyān*,’ as we said earlier. Therefore, there is no reason for you to grieve for them.’ Now we can take a look at the *śloka*.

‘*Yathā*,’ Just as, ‘*dehinaḥ*,’ for the *jīva*, ‘*kaumāraṁ yauvanaṁ jarā*,’ there are these three conditions (childhood, youth, and old age) ‘*asmin dehe*,’ in the present body, ‘*tathā*,’ likewise, ‘*dehāntara prāptiḥ*,’ the *jīva* accepts another body. ‘*Tatra*,’ in this matter, ‘*dhīraḥ*,’ a wise person, ‘*na muhyati*,’ is not deluded. This means that he doesn’t grieve, thinking that these changes happen to the Self.

Thus, the body undergoes several changes in a single birth. Similarly, the *Ātman* accepts new bodies, after the destruction of the previous bodies. This example is given to show how the *Ātman* accepts new bodies, and that this is the same as the changes in the body throughout life. The acceptance of different bodies by the *Ātman* is only like the different changes of the body in this life. Both of these are the same. The awareness, ‘my body,’ is sustained throughout one’s life, even though the condition of the body changes. Similarly, while the body changes, the *Ātman* remains *ONE*.

One’s body in childhood is not the same as in youth. The body in youth is not the same as in full maturity. The condition of the body constantly transforms. Like this, after death, the *jīva* accepts another body.

Therefore, *Śrī Kṛṣṇa* is saying, ‘you should not become sorrowful due to the destruction of the body.’ If a person becomes sorrowful due to the destruction of the body, then he should also become sorrowful due to the changes of childhood, youth, and old age. He will have to grieve about the destruction of youth when he attains the state of full maturity. He will thus have to constantly suffer. This is how ignorant people experience sorrow. However, in truth, this is not needed. This is the delusion of a person who lacks discrimination.

Now, to the next *śloka*. This is the 14<sup>th</sup> *śloka*. The Lord is speaking. The commentator gives a small introduction to this.

*‘Mātrāsparsāstu kaunteya śitoṣṇasukhaduḥkhadāḥ  
āgamāpāyino/nityāṁstāmstitikṣasva bhārata. 2.14.*

2.14. ‘But the contacts of the organs with the objects are the producers of cold and heat, happiness and sorrow. They have a beginning and an end, and are transient. Bear them, O descendant of Bharata.’

Now, we can go the *Śaṅkara* Bhāṣyā.

*‘Yadyapyātmavināśanimitto moho na sambhavati nitya ātmeti  
vijñānatastathā ‘pi śitoṣṇasukhaduḥkhaprāptirnimitto moho laukiko  
dṛśyate sukhaviyoganimitto duḥkhasaṁyoganimittaścha śoka  
ityetadarjunasya vachanamāśaṅkyā/ha – mātrāsparsā iti.’*

The *bhāṣyā* says, ‘*ātmavināśa nimittah mohaḥ*,’ the delusion arising from the mistaken belief that the Self is destroyed, ‘*nitya ātmā iti vijānataḥ*,’ for a person who knows that the *Ātman* is eternal, ‘*na sambhavati*,’ does not happen. The delusion and indiscriminative thinking that the *Ātman* is destroyed does not occur for a person who knows the *Ātman* to be eternal. *Tathā api*,’ even still, ‘*śitoṣṇa sukhaduḥkha prāpti nimittah mohaḥ laukikah dṛśyate*.’ I is true that a person who knows the Self to be eternal does not grieve over death. However, even if that is accepted, ‘*śitoṣṇa sukhaduḥkha prāpti nimittah*’ - ‘*śīta*,’ cold, and ‘*uṣṇa*,’ heat, give rise to ‘*sukha*,’ pleasure, and ‘*duḥkha*,’ pain. From this comes *moha*, delusion. ‘*sukhaduḥkha prāpti nimittah mohaḥ*.’

How is this? We feel, ‘I am happy,’ or ‘I am sad.’ We may feel, ‘the cold is bothering me,’ or ‘the heat is bothering me.’ From this comes *moham* (lack of discrimination). The person superimposes happiness or sorrow onto the *Ātman*, his own Self. In this way, the person considers himself as happy or sad. ‘*Laukikah dṛśyate*.’ In the world, ‘*dṛśyate*,’ isn’t this seen everywhere? Due to identification with the body, the *jīva* has to experience this happiness and sorrow in every moment. Once the true principle of the *Ātman* is grasped

from the practice of contemplation, we can avoid grieving about death. This is because that sorrow is not connected to the body. That is mental. When we think that a certain person belongs to us, if that person dies, we become sorrowful. We don't become sad if just anyone dies. When we read the obituaries, we don't feel particularly sad.

Instead, when we are mentally connected to the person who died through our ego and attachment, we experience suffering. Death is not the cause of the suffering. Instead, what is it? It is the ego and attachment of the individual. Realizing this, a person may contemplate and renounce such attachments to relatives and friends. In this way, through discarding attachments to relations in the mind, he can avoid this mental suffering. That is correct. But what about the suffering that happens to the body?

Even if you avoid this mental suffering, you cannot avoid the suffering of the body. Why? It is because that suffering is experienced through the instrument of the body. You will have to experience that suffering.

Then, the *bhāṣyā* says, '*sukha viyoganimittaḥ mohah duḥkhasamīyoganimittaḥ cha śokaḥ.*' *Sukha viyoganimittaḥ mohah.*' It is saying, '*sukha viyogaṁ,*' the separation from pleasure.. For example, say that we get a nice breeze in hot weather. What happens at that time? One experiences *sukham*, happiness. Then what happens if that nice breeze is destroyed? Our happiness will also be destroyed. Because of that separation from happiness (*sukha viyogam*), we experience *moham*, lack of discrimination.

Say that it is very hot outside. The electricity is cut off, and the fan stops working. Then, our happiness is destroyed. Then, delusion comes. Thus, '*duḥkhasamīyoganimittaḥ cha śokaḥ.*' This is speaking about when we experience sorrow. We experience the heat. Because of the heat, we experience suffering within. Because of sorrow, we experience *śoka*, grief.

Isn't this what happens? This is all experienced through the body as a medium. When the body becomes connected to the environment and *Prakṛti*, grief and delusion are experienced within the mind through the body. In this way, '*ityetad Arjunasya vachanam.*' So, in Arjuna's mind, such a doubt might have come, as to how to deal with this. So, it says, '*Bhagavān āha.*' The Lord

addressed Arjuna's doubt without it having been spoken. This is the shloka, 'mātrāsparsāḥ iti.' Next in the *bhāṣyā*, this śloka is commented on.

*'Mātrā ābhirmīyante śabdādaya iti śrotrādīnīndriyāṇi, mātrāṇām sparsāḥ śabdādibhiḥ saṁyogāste śitoṣṇāsukhaduḥkhadāḥ śītamūṣṇām sukham duḥkham cha pryacchantīti. Athavā spṛśyanta iti sparsā viṣayāḥ śabdādayaḥ, mātrāścha sparsāścha śitoṣṇāsukhaduḥkhadāḥ śītam kadāchitsukham kadāchidduḥkham tathoṣṇamapyaniyatarūpaṁ sukhaduḥkhe punarniyatarūpe yato na vyabhicharato/tastābhyām pṛthakśitoṣṇayorgrahaṇam. Yasmātte mātrāsparsādaya āgamāpāyina āgamāpāyaśīlāstasmādaniyā atastāñśitoṣṇādīmstīkṣasva prasahasva teṣu harṣaṁ viṣādaṁ vā mā kāṛṣirityarthaḥ.'*

First it takes the first word, 'mātrā.' What is this word? It says, 'ābhiḥ mīyante śabdādayaḥ iti śrotrādīni indriyāṇi.' This is the meaning of the word, 'mātrā.' 'Abhiḥ,' by these, 'mīyante śabdādayaḥ,' objects such as sound are grasped. What is the cause for these sense-objects such as sound to be grasped? It says, 'śrotrādīni indriyāṇi.' It is the senses such as hearing. These are called 'mātrāḥ.'

Several commentators explain the meaning of this word in different ways. Here, Śaṅkara explains as meaning 'the senses.' Why is that? It is because through the senses, one grasps objects. This grasping is called 'manan.' Therefore, the word 'mātrāḥ' means the senses, which grasp objects. 'Mātrāsparsāḥ.' The *bhāṣyā* says, *mātrāṇām sparsāḥ.* This is the connection of the sense objects with the senses. 'śabdādibhiḥ saṁyogaḥ.' Thus, the word, 'sparsā,' is explained as meaning 'connection.'

In the *śloka*, this is shown as a compound word; 'mātrāsparsāḥ.' However, Śaṅkara separates the words to gain the correct meaning; 'Mātrāṇām,' of the senses, 'sparsāḥ,' the connection. That is the meaning. The relationship of the senses with their objects is called 'mātrāsparsāḥ.' The word 'mātrā' is also used to refer to the 5 elements of Nature. If it is interpreted in this way, then it can mean 'the connection with the 5 elements (earth, water,

fire, wind, air, and space). This can be interpreted in two ways. The meaning of this one is the same as the first, ‘the relationship to the senses.’

Here, *Śaṅkara* explains the meaning as ‘the connection between the senses and the sense-objects.’ However, the meaning of both interpretations is the same. ‘*Te*,’ they, those connections with sense-objects through the senses, ‘*śītoṣṇasukha duḥkhadāḥ*.’ What do these do? This phrase is explained as, ‘*śītaṁ uṣṇaṁ sukhaṁ dukhaṁ cha prayacchanti iti*.’ These connections give cold (*śītam*), heat (*uṣṇam*), happiness (*sukham*), and pain (*dukham*).

This is true. The connection of the senses and the sense objects creates the experience of cold, through water. The connection of the senses with fire creates heat. According to the situation, this experience creates either pleasure or pain.

For example, heat gives us suffering in hot weather, and in cold weather, the cold gives us suffering. However, heat gives us pleasure in cold weather, and in hot weather, cold gives us pleasure. In this way, the experiences that are produced from heat and cold are changing.

In the *śloka*, this is said as a compound word; ‘*śītoṣṇasukhaduḥkhadāḥ*.’ *Śaṅkara* separates the words to explain the meaning; ‘*śītaṁ uṣṇaṁ sukhaṁ dukhaṁ cha prayacchanti*.’ ‘The connection of the senses and the sense objects creates these four; cold and heat, pleasure and pain.’

The nature of cold and heat is then explained. ‘*Śītam kadāchit sukhaṁ kadāchit duḥkham*.’ We cannot say that the cold always gives us pleasure or always gives us pain. Instead, ‘*śītam kadāchit*,’ the cold, sometimes, ‘*sukham*,’ gives happiness. The cold gives us happiness in hot weather. ‘*Kadāchit duḥkham*.’ ‘Sometimes, it gives pain.’ When it is cold, the cold gives us suffering. ‘*Tathā uṣṇaṁ api aniyatasvarūpaṁ*.’ ‘*Tathā*,’ Similarly, ‘*uṣṇam*,’ is heat.’ This is also changing between giving pain and pleasure. Therefore these are called, ‘*aniyata*.’ The word ‘*Niyata*’ means ‘decided, firm.’ *Aniyata* means ‘undecided, not firm.’ The word ‘*svarūpaṁ*,’ means ‘nature.’ Thus, these two, heat and cold, have an indefinite nature. Sometimes they give us pleasure, and sometimes pain.

We cannot say that they always give us suffering, or that they always give us happiness. These two things are dependant upon the circumstance.

However, *Śaṅkara* says, ‘*Sukhadukhe punaḥ niyatarūpe yataḥ na vyabhicharataḥ.*’ Pain and pleasure are not like this. Whenever you experience pleasure, you will experience pleasure, and whenever you experience pain, you will experience pain. Thus, it says, ‘*niyatarūpe.*’ We said that heat and cold are ‘*aniyata.*’ This means that they can give happiness or sorrow, depending on the situation. *Sukham* and *dukham*, pain and pleasure, are not like this. They are ‘*niyatarūpe.*’ They don’t change.

The word, ‘*vyabhicharataḥ,*’ means to change. So, it says, ‘*na vyabhicharataḥ.*’ These two, *sukham* and *dukham*, do not undergo any change. Happiness is experienced as happiness, and sorrow is experienced as sorrow. ‘*Ataḥ tābhyām pṛthak sītoṣṇayoḥ grahaṇam.*’ So, why are these two, heat and cold, mentioned specifically? It is because these are constantly changing, whereas the nature of pain and pleasure does not change. How is that? It is because pain and pleasure are experienced within the mind. They are always of the same nature.

Next in the bhashya, it says, ‘*Yasmāt te mātrāsparsādayaḥ āgamāpāyinaḥ sītoṣṇādīn titikṣasva prasahasva.*’ In the *śloka*, it says, ‘*āgamāpāyīnonyā.*’ This means, ‘these experiences of pain and pleasure from the sense objects come and go, and are impermanent.’ This part is commented on. It says, ‘*te mātrāsparsādayaḥ,*’ this connection of the senses with the sense objects.. How is this? It says, ‘*āgama,*’ ‘coming,’ and ‘*apāyi,*’ ‘disappearing.’ They come into existence and are destroyed. Thus, the *bhāṣya* says, ‘*āgamāpāyaśīlāḥ.*’ The *śīla*, or nature of these sense-objects is to ‘*āgama,*’ come, and ‘*apāyi,*’ go. ‘*Tasmāt anityāḥ.*’ Therefore, they are impermanent.

Because the sense objects such as heat and cold come and go, they are impermanent. They are not eternal. ‘*Ataḥ,*’ therefore, ‘*tān sītoṣṇādīn,*’ the dualities such as cold and heat, ‘*titikṣasva prasahasva,*’ forbear these!’ Arjuna was going to ask, ‘what about the suffering related to the body?’ The Lord says here, ‘*sītoṣṇādīn titikṣasva,*’ forbear them!’ What does this mean? It means, ‘you must simply experience these. You cannot avoid experiencing them.’

What should a person do when he experiences the sense objects such as cold and heat, as well as the resulting pain and pleasure that one feels from them? This is answered, ‘*Teṣu harṣam viśadam vā mā kārṣiḥ iti arthaḥ.*’ A

person cannot avoid the pains and pleasures that are connected to the body. One can only experience them. So, what can we do? We can forbear them. What does this mean, '*titikṣasva*,' or forbearance? It says, '*teṣu*,' in these..' This means 'in heat, cold, pleasure and pain, etc'. When the sense objects such as cold and heat come into contact with the body, the modification of pleasure or pain will be experienced in the mind. This doesn't happen in the Self, but the mind (*antaḥkāraṇa*). A person cannot avoid such pleasures and pains within the mind.

This means that you cannot get rid of these mentally. How can these be avoided? If it is cold outside, you can avoid experiencing the cold by wearing some warm clothing. Similarly, we can avoid this experience through external methods. In that case, what happens? There, this connection of the senses with the sense objects is avoided. Some people may ask, 'can we avoid the experience of pleasure and pain in this way?' The answer is, 'yes, you can avoid them like that.'

However, what is being discussed here? It is '*mātrāsparsā*,' the connection of the senses with the sense objects. This is whenever the senses come into connection with the sense objects. In the cold season, one can wear a blanket. Then the cold doesn't become connected to the body. Or in the hot season, one can use a fan. In that circumstance, the heat doesn't come into contact with the senses. Because of that, what happens? Through these external methods, pleasure and pain aren't produced from those sense-objects in the mind. By opposing heat with cold, or vice versa, one avoids the pleasure and pain that would have been experienced. It does not say here that this is how one should forbear them. What is said here?

Here, it is speaking about unavoidable experiences. As long as one has a body, pleasure and pain will be experienced through the connection with cold and heat. Once that happens, how should one deal with these? '*Teṣu harṣaṇi viśādam vā*.' Once one experiences the pain or pleasure in the *antaḥkāraṇa* that results from the contact with the sense objects, what does the ordinary man do? If he experiences pleasure, that grows into delight. The original modification is sustained in the mind. This is called '*harṣam*,' delight.' If he experiences pain in the mind, he continues that modification. This is called '*viśādam*,' sorrow.'

That is why the Lord used the word ‘*anuśochah*’ in the 11<sup>th</sup> *śloka*. The prefix ‘*anu*’ indicates continuation. The original experience is thus continued in the mind. If the experience is pain, the *Jīva* falls into sorrow. In pleasure, the experience grows into delight.

‘*Mā Kārṣīh.*’ ‘Don’t do that!’ That is called ‘forbearance.’ This means, ‘do not continue the experience of the pain.’ Why is this said? This is because pain is unavoidable. Once that is experienced in the mind, accept it in that form. Don’t let it continue and create more suffering. It is the same with pleasure. That experience is unavoidable. Don’t continue that experience of pleasure into delight. This is the meaning of the word, ‘*titikṣasva!*’ ‘forbear!’

Otherwise, this doesn’t mean to eliminate pleasure or pain in the mind when cold and heat come to the body. Because of the constitution of the mind and body, this happens of its own accord. It cannot be avoided. Once the senses have attached to a particular sense object, the result of that connection will immediately have its result in the *antaḥkāraṇa*, the mind. When the connection to the external sense objects combines with the accumulated *samskāra* in the *antaḥkāraṇa*, this will produce a modification. This can be pleasure, pain, anger, lust, etc. This is how all modifications are formed. Once the connection with the sense objects has taken place, it is a must that this must happen. This is unavoidable.

If you must avoid the effects of this connection with the sense objects, you must stop experiencing the sense objects. For example, if it is cold, you take a blanket, to counter the effect of the cold. In this, there is no connection with the sense object, so neither pain nor pleasure are experienced in the mind. However, it is a rule of Nature that these experiences will be unavoidable. So, it says that once the connection with the sense objects has occurred and produced a result in the mind, one should not continue that effect. That is the meaning of ‘*titikṣasva,*’ ‘forbearance.’ Another name for this is ‘*sahanam.*’ In the *Viveka Chudamaṇi*, it says, ‘*sahanam sarvadukhānām,*’ the forbearance of all sorrows.’ This means to avoid the suffering caused by thinking and remembering the original experience. Forbearance is what prevents the experiences of pleasure and pain from continuing in the mind.

This means to keep the pain that must be experienced from growing. To stabilize that ordinal experience requires mental strength. How is that? This will be explained in all of the following sections. This is the contemplation, ‘pleasure and pain are related to the body and mind, but do not affect the Self. In truth, I am that Self.’ Through this contemplation, a person gains firmness. He will then be able to avoid the continuing of happiness and sorrow in the mind. This occurs, according to the firmness of mind gained. However, it is not possible for a person to cease from experiencing pleasure and pain in the mind. That is unavoidable.

That is all the word ‘forbearance’ implies. Otherwise, it cannot be said, ‘forbearance is the capacity to prevent the experiences of pleasure and pain in the body and mind, which arise through the connection of the body with Nature.’ This is because the body and mind are under the control of Nature’s laws. Thus, that is unavoidable. However, the suffering caused by thinking about that must be avoided. A normal person thinks after the experience, ‘why did this have to happen to me? I don’t deserve this suffering.’ Through forbearance, a person can avoid the suffering created by thoughts in the mind. Otherwise, as long as one has a body, it isn’t possible to eliminate the pains related to the body.

Some people ask, ‘some people accept external practices. Then it’s enough to make the body numb externally. Then there won’t be pain, right?’ This is true. Why is this? It is because this ‘*mātrāsparsā*,’ the connection with the sense-objects does not occur there. In that, there is not the connection of the senses with the sense-objects. If the body is made numb, then one won’t know cold or heat. In making the body numb to sensation, what happens? In that, there is no gaining of pleasure and pain. In that case, this forbearance is not necessary. For this, *Ātma Vidyā* is not needed.

When one dies, this is not needed, and when one is in deep sleep also, this is not needed. Here it’s not like that. This *Ātma Vidyā* is necessary only when one is in the waking state. This teaches us how to accept such matters there.

Say that a person practices a particular form of practice, such as *Yoga* or something, and accepts some *Vidyā* to make his arms and legs numb to

sensation. There, what happens? In that, there is no pleasure or pain within. Because these aren't there, this kind of 'forbearance' isn't necessary for that person. This '*titikṣa*' that is spoken of here is not needed there. In truth, what happens in these circumstances? In truth, pleasure and pain are not experienced in the *antaḥkaraṇa*. It is possible to do that, through certain practices.

For example, say a person performs practices for withstanding the cold. Little by little, his skin adapts and develops the thickness to not experience the cold. There, what happens is that there is no connection with the external sense objects. This '*mātrāsparsā*,' that is described in the *śloka* does not occur there, in the same way as normal people experience this. When that happens, through these practices, one gain the ability to withstand these outer forces, such as the heat, or cold, etc. Because of that, what happens? Because of this, he doesn't experience pain or pleasure within.

Actually, many other creatures can withstand the cold and heat much more than humans. Even among humans, people have different capacities. For example, in Northern areas, people can withstand more of the cold. In places that in the South, the people will be able to withstand more of the heat. In truth, when this happens, this '*titikṣa*,' or forbearance isn't necessary. That isn't '*titikṣa*.' Why is that? In truth, there doesn't exist there this connection of the senses to the sense-objects. This is due to the change in the nature of the body and senses of the people. For them, this kind of '*mātrāsparsā*,' connection of the senses with the sense objects, along with the resulting pleasure and pain, does not occur.

When it refers to the forbearance of pleasure and pain, this means when pleasure and pain must be experienced. This can be anyone. No matter what person, whether one from a cold climate or warm climate, or from an even climate, whoever it is, when this unavoidable contact of the senses with the sense objects occurs, and creates pleasure and pain in any way, the Gita says, 'don't continue these!' 'Don't create more of that mentally.' That is what is called 'forbearance.' This is purely a mental practice. It is not a physical practice. It is not any other kind of practice of Yoga.

What does one do mentally? This is said clearly. ‘*Teṣu,*’ in these experiences, ‘*harṣam,*’ joy, ‘*viśādam,*’ sorrow, *vā,*’ either of these, ‘*mā kārṣiḥ,*’ don’t do this.’ *Iti arthaḥ.*’ This is the meaning of the *śloka*. This is what is called ‘*sahanam,*’ forbearance. This is explained further throughout the Gita. So, how does one forbear these experiences? Ordinary people continue these experiences in the mind. One means for preventing the continuation of pleasure and pain within is *Ātma Bodha*, knowledge of the Self. This is the knowledge, ‘I am not the body. I am the Self.’ This awareness helps one avoid the further experience of suffering in the mind.

This won’t necessarily reduce the intensity of the suffering gained through the connection with the sense objects. There are different intensities of suffering. The pain arising from a scratch is not the same as being stabbed by a knife. The intensities of the suffering in these are different. So, mentally, one cannot reduce the intensity of that pain. One must simply experience it, as long as one has a body. If you think, ‘I am the *Ātman,*’ when you have a bad toothache, the pain won’t be reduced at all. Instead, the pain will only increase. If one tries to say mentally ‘I am the Self,’ in that painful situation, the pain of the toothache will only double. There won’t be any reduction.

We can do this much. What is that? There is nothing we can do at that moment we experience the pain. This is not something that can be controlled. So, it says, ‘forbear!’ ‘There’s no point in being sorrowful about this. This is an unavoidable experience.’ Thinking like this, gain an even mind. That is all that is meant by the word, ‘*titikṣa,*’ forbearance. Even if a person stubbornly thinks, ‘I am the *Ātman,*’ they won’t feel any peace from the toothache. There may also be those who know certain practices from Yoga who can make the tooth numb to sensation. Those who study *āsanas*, etc., if they have any ability like that, that may be possible. If that part of the body is made numb, you won’t know the pain.

However, this is not what the Lord is instructing. The Lord says, ‘do not allow the experience to continue in the mind.’ This *śloka* has been misinterpreted in many ways. After studying the Gita, it is foolish to think that ‘even after being stabbed by a knife, a person won’t experience pain. That is the condition of the mind.’ This is how some may think. But that’s not what is

said here. When pain comes, one can only experience it. No kind of *Vidyā* will help to avoid that. You must simply suffer it.

So, because of the firmness of the mind, a person can prevent the pain from continuing in the mind. In that case, both pain and pleasure are seen to be equal. If a person gains the mental strength to prevent the experience of suffering from continuing, he must also prevent the experience of pleasure from continuing in the mind. Both are the same there. In *Ātma Vidyā*, spirituality, both happiness and suffering are seen as the same. It is not that one should forbear one and not the other. One should also forbear pleasure, *sukham*. That is what it says.

*'Kaunteya, 'Hey Son of Kunti! 'Mātrāspārsās tu.'* The connection of the senses with the senses objects, *'sītoṣṇasukhaduḥkhadāḥ,'* give experiences such as heat and cold, pleasure and pain.' *'āgamāpāyinaḥ,'* they are coming and going, *'anityāḥ,'* they are impermanent.' *Bhārata,'* O Arjuna, *'Tāṁs Titikṣasva,'* Forbear them!' Here, the meaning of *'titikṣa,'* forbearance, is an especially important subject. Next class, we will move on to the next *śloka*.

## VII. *Real and Unreal- in Shankara's Words*

We discussed yesterday how Sri Krishna told Arjuna that the destruction of *Bhīṣma*, *Droṇa*, and the other warriors on the side of the *Kauravas* should not be grieved for. This is because they are eternally free as embodiments of the Self. However the Lord doesn't tell Arjuna to not grieve about death only. The Lord also says that the pain and pleasure that the individual experiences constantly is nothing that should be grieved for. Sri Krishna says, '*Tāṁś Titikṣasva Bhārata.*' Arjuna, forbear these dualities!

By saying, 'forbear!', the Lord means that the experience of pleasure and pain in the *antaḥkaraṇa* of the Jiva is unavoidable. However, the Lord says, 'don't continue that suffering!' This continuance of suffering is called *anuśochanam*. 'Oh, I have gotten this suffering!' Don't suffer in that way. The *bhāṣyā* says, '*harṣaṁ viśādaṁ vā mā kārṣiḥ.*' Don't let the pleasure and pain become joy and sorrow.'

Like this, when pleasure comes, don't continue it in the mind. Don't indulge immoderately in that pleasure. This is because that will ultimately end up as a cause for sorrow. That is 'forbearance.' It is a mental practice. What helps this forbearance? How can one make it firm? Forbearance is strength of mind. The next part says how one can make this forbearance strong. Next, we are on the 15<sup>th</sup> *śloka*.

***‘Yam hi na vyathayantye puruṣam puruṣarṣabha  
Samaduḥkhasukham dhīram so/mṛtatvāya kalpate. 2.15.***

2.15. ‘O Arjuna, foremost among men, verily, the person whom these do not torment, the wise man to whom sorrow and happiness are the same – he is fit for Immortality.’

The *bhāṣyā* says, ‘*śītoṣṇādīn prasahataḥ tava kim syāt?*’ *śītoṣṇādīn,* heat, cold, etc., ‘*prasahataḥ,*’ forbearing these, *tava,* ‘for you, *kim syāt,*’ what will happen? What will happen when you reach the fullness of this forbearance? That is described here as ‘*prasahataḥ.*’ If you forbear these fully, what will happen? ‘*Iti śṛṇu.*’ Hear this. The Lord gives the reply to this in this *śloka,* ‘*Yam hi,*’ etc. *Śaṅkara* explains the words in the *śloka.*

*‘Yam hi puruṣam samaduḥkhasukham same duḥkhasukhe yasya tam  
samaduḥkhasukham sukhaduḥkhaprāptau harṣāviṣādarahitam dhīram  
dhīmantaṁ na vyathayanti na chālayanti nityātmadarśanādete  
yathoktāḥ śītoṣṇādayaḥ nityātmadarśananiṣṭho  
dvaṁdvasahiṣṇuramṛtatvāyāmṛtabhāvāya mokṣāya kalpate samartho  
bhavati.’ 2.15.*

‘*Yam hi puruṣam,*’ Whatever person, ‘*samaduḥkhasukham.*’ *Same duḥkhasukhe yasya tam samaduḥkhasukham.* *Śaṅkara* explains this phrase, ‘*samaduḥkhasukham.*’ ‘*Sukhadukhaprāptau harṣaviṣādarahitam dhīram dhīmantaṁ na vyathante na chalayati.*’

‘*Same dukhasukhe yasya tam samaduḥkhasukham.*’ A person who experiences pleasure and pain equally.’ What does this mean? We can understand one thing from this. This is that even a yogi has *sukham* and *dukham*, pleasure and pain. Because of this, it says that pleasure and pain are equal. If the Yogi didn’t have these, there would be no point in saying this.

This doesn’t refute the occurrence of pleasure or pain. This doesn’t refute that pleasure and pain exist in the *antaḥkāraṇa*. He is a Yogi. Because of that,

we cannot say that there is no pleasure or pain in his *antaḥkaraṇa*. The occurrence of that pleasure and pain are necessary. That is why it says next, ‘*sukhadukhaprāptau*,’ in the attainment of pleasure and pain. This is said clearly. ‘Pain and pleasure are attained.’ Where is this? In the *antaḥkaraṇa*. Thus, pain and pleasure can be attained in the *antaḥkaraṇa* of the Yogi. They will be attained. When this happens, what is the specialty of the yogi?

It says, ‘*harṣaviṣādarahitaṃ*.’ In pleasure, he doesn’t continue to experience happiness in the mind. In pain, he doesn’t continue to experience suffering in the mind. The mind doesn’t create more by continuing what is attained through the *prārabdha* of the body. That is the difference. Whatever must be come simply must come.

The primary cause behind the actions of the body and mind is *prārabdha*. The next cause is the circumstances of the *Jīva*. Therefore, pleasure and pain will be necessary, but ‘*harṣaviṣādarahitaṃ*.’ A *Jñāni*, or *Yogi* is devoid of excessive delight and sorrow. This shows the difference between the mind of a Yogi and a worldly person.

In both places, there is pleasure and pain. That is said clearly, ‘*sukhaduḥkha prāptau*.’ However, the *Jñāni* doesn’t allow that to continue. When pleasure comes to the *Jñāni*, there are no experiences of happiness that are created by the mind. In the same way, there are no experiences of suffering which are created by the mind, when pain comes. That is ‘*sama*,’ evenmindedness.

What unsettles and disturbs the mind is the continuance of pain and pleasure into delight and sorrow. A *Jñāni* understands that the attainment of these is necessary, but he halts it there itself. That experiences stays there. He doesn’t allow the experience to continue in the mind.

How is this? It says, ‘*dhīraṃ*.’ One who is wise. It says, ‘*dhīmanṭaṃ*.’ *Dhī* is knowledge, discrimination, intelligence. This means an *Ātma Jñāni*. So what about him? It says, ‘*na vyathayanti*.’ *Na chalayanti*.’ He is not disturbed, not moved. What is it that disturbs the evenness of the mind? It is this pain and pleasure. Even if the *Jñāni* attains pain or pleasure, these do not perturb the mind. In other words, once pleasure comes to the *Jñāni*, that becomes known to him in that instant. Like this, pain becomes known in experience in a

moment. How is this? We said earlier, '*mātrāsparsāḥ.*' Pain and pleasure can be caused either by connection with the external sense objects, or by the mind's imagination. This can be in either way. It can be caused through the mind, or through the body.

The pain and pleasure caused through the mind is of two types. One of these is prompted by external causes. Suppose that our closest friend dies. That is an external catalyst. Immediately, pain is experienced in the mind. Like this, when something externally favorable happens to us, we experience pleasure in the mind. Here, what is the cause of pleasure and pain? It is external. That pain and pleasure is purely of the mind.

There can also be internal cause for mental pain and pleasure. A person can feel very sad for no particular reason. He may feel despressed. What is that? The cause of that is *vāsana*, or *saṁskāra*. That is an internal cause.

In the same way, we may feel very happy sometimes. That may happen due to internal causes. Then, any kind of external cause isn't necessary. However, in both cases, this pleasure and pain are mental. These come from the *sankalpas* of the mind. When someone dies, and we feel, 'he was a relative. He was very close to me,' attachment comes in the mind. We spoke earlier about '*sneha vichedam,*' the destruction of love. That happens within the mind, and he immediately experiences pain. This is purely mental.

We discussed the other day about the pain and pleasure of the body. This is called, '*maatraasparshaa,*' the connection of the body with the external objects. That is also in two kinds; external and internal. There is the pain caused by physical illness. That is physical pain. The other type is mental pain.

Either way, when either kind of suffering comes to us due to our *prārabdha*, we have no choice but to experience it. When our body is supposed to get ill, it will get ill. Because of that, there will be pain in the body. Also, due to the connection with external objects such as cold and heat, the mind experiences physical pain. These objects create both pleasure and pain within the mind.

From one's *sankalpas*, or from *saṁskāras*, pleasure and pain will occur in the mind. When these pleasures and pains happen in mind, what happens? The mind stays unperturbed. '*Na chalayati.*' The mind does not become scattered.

How is this? He doesn't create happiness or suffering through their continuance. How does he avoid creating these? Who is it that experiences this? the *Jīva*. So, the ordinary *jīva* becomes identified with the *antaḥkaraṇa* due to ego, and identified with the body and other objects due to attachment, and continues to create more pain and pleasure. This doesn't happen to the *Jñāni*. As much as one can avoid creating more pain and pleasure, by not identifying with the *antaḥkaraṇa* through the ego, then even if pain and pleasure occur in the *antaḥkaraṇa*, it will remain comparatively peaceful.

What helps this? This is said next, '*nitya ātmadarśanāt.*' The Yogi constantly abides in the experience of the Self, in *Ātma Jñāna*. Therefore, he is able to avoid identifying with the modifications of the mind and body through the *ahaṁta*, the ego. The *Jñāni* is able to avoid being identified through the *ahaṁta* with these changes. How is this? '*Nitya ātmadarśanāt.*' It is through the constant experience of the Self.

The *śloka* is then further explained in the *bhashya*. '*Ete yathoktaḥ śitoṣṇādayaḥ,*' these sense objects such as heat and cold, etc., '*saḥ nitya ātmasvarūpadarśananiṣṭho dvanda sahiṣnuḥ.*' So here, when it says, '*nitya ātmasvarūpadarśananiṣṭho dvanda sahiṣnuḥ,*' this doesn't simply just mean someone who has destroyed Self-Ignorance, and thus abides in *Ātma Niṣṭhā*. That is a spontaneous *bhāva* of one in *Ātma Niṣṭhā*.

Then what is this? This is instructed in the form of a *sādhana*. That is why it says, '*dvanda sahiṣnu,*' a person who forbears the pairs of opposites. This means one who is practicing forbearance of these *dvandvas*. This refers to a person who practices forbearance of the pairs of opposites. In that way, this is also speaking about a person who accepts forbearance of the pairs of opposites as a *sādhana*. What does he do? It says, '*nitya ātmasvarūpadarśananiṣṭho.*' We said before that the word '*niṣṭhā*' means 'decisive knowledge.' Here, it says that forbears these *dvandvas* through the practice of constantly contemplating the true nature of the Self. '*Nitya ātma svarūpa.*' We said before about *Bhīṣma*, *Droṇa*, and the others on the *Kaurava* side; the body perishes, but the *Ātman* doesn't change.

This is the same knowledge about oneself. 'I am Eternal, and the embodiment of the *Ātman*.' The *darśana*, or Knowledge of this, is a *niṣṭhā*, or

decisive discrimination. This is made firm in the *antaḥkaraṇa*. Such a *sādhak* is called, ‘*dvanda sahiṣṇuḥ*.’ He is practicing the forbearance of the pairs of opposites, the *dvandvas*. What happens? It says, ‘*Saḥ Amṛtatvāya Kalpate*.’ He becomes fit for immortality. ‘*amṛtatvāya, amṛtabhāvāya mokṣāya kalpate*.’ For immortality, for the experience of immortality, for *mokṣa*, he becomes fit, suitable.

So how does forbearance of the *dvandvas* help a *sādhak* to attain Liberation? What is the relationship between these two? This is said by the phrase, ‘*na vyathantye*.’ In other words, how is a *Siddha*’s mind? The mind of a *Siddha* will be still in the *dvandvas*. Like that, the practice of this stillness in the mind of a *sādhak* is necessary. ‘The mind of the *sādhak* while performing *sādhana* can be in any way. Then it’s enough if the mind is peaceful after attaining *Jñāna*.’ That’s not what it says here. In the section about the ‘*Sthita Prajñan*,’ the Man-of-Steady-Wisdom, this matter will be repeated. However the mind of the *Sthita Prajñan* is, that should become a *sādhana* for a *sādhak* to practice on his own mind. This means that there cannot be wavering there.

The difference is only this. For the *Stitha Prajñan*, there is no need of practice in this. And what about for the *sādhak*? He tries to sustain that through practice. When he practices, he may fail; he may fall. Still, that effort must continue. There, the *sādhak* gains a state of stillness in the mind. This is a state of stillness where the mind isn’t moved by either pleasure or pain. This state of stillness is what helps the mind to gain and develop one-pointedness. This is clear. If the mind becomes perturbed, whether through cold or heat, attachment or hatred, or through thinking of objects, through worldly experiences, or any other matters, the mind attains a state of *vikṣiptam*, scattered. Once the mind becomes *vikṣiptam*, then Self-contemplation cannot become possible. That is impossible.

There, the mind will be peaceful. ‘*Na vyathanti etc*.’ So, one thing that helps to make the mind peaceful is this forbearance. This means to forbear the *dvandvas*. Before it said to forbear pleasure and pain; now it says to forbear the *dvandvas*, the pairs of opposites. This doesn’t just refer to pleasure and pain. Whatever opposing experiences exist, those that make the mind run back and forth from two corners are *dvandvas*. The mind goes from one end of

happiness, to the other end of sorrow. These are opposite experiences. All of these are *dvandvas*; fame and dishonor, pleasure and pain, victory and defeat, profit and loss, etc. In this way, these experiences take the mind back and forth between two opposite ends in all times. This happens constantly within the *antaḥkaraṇa*. Even if there is no external cause, this will still occur through one's *vāsana* or *samskāras*.

When this constantly happens, what does one do? Ordinary *Jivas* think about those, making the experiences continue. If they think about sorrow, they become sorrowful. If they think about happiness, they feel happy. In both conditions, the mind is not peaceful.

If the experience of these *dvandvas* is made to grow in the mind, the flow of thoughts will happen according to that. The mind won't become peaceful. We can't say that there is peace in these. So, what is peace of mind? It is the ceasing of the flow of *vṛttis*, the modifications of mind. Otherwise, the concentration on a single *vṛtti* can give peace of mind.

What does a *sādhak* desire to do? A *sādhak* desires to keep the mind on a single *vṛtti*. Otherwise, he desires to keep the mind on the same kind of *vṛtti*. When the *sādhak* reflects on the Truth, or remembers God, what does the mind do? It stays on a single kind of *vṛtti*.

Here, we are reflecting on the Self. In this, many subjects enter the mind. However, all of these subjects are of the same kind. These are subjects related to the *Ātman*. These are mental *vṛttis* related to *Ātma Vidyā*. In this way, a *sādhak* strives to keep the mind on a single kind of mental *vṛtti*, or modification.

However, what happens? Even if there is no external cause, through *vāsana* or *samskāra*, the mind becomes modified in the *dvandvas*. That is the nature of the mind. The mind will constantly be modified in this pleasure and pain, fame and dishonor, any of these. Otherwise, the mind will become extroverted through thoughts of objects. All of these will create an obstacle for thinking of the *Ātman*.

So, when we discuss peace of mind, when our thoughts are based in the Self, the mind becomes peaceful. Why is this? Take now, for example. If our

minds are listening to this subject with one-pointedness, then the mind will be peaceful. This is if there is one-pointedness. There won't be any thought about the past or future. There will only be one subject in the mind. Like that, because the mind modifies in a single form, the mind becomes peaceful. In that, there are no modifications of the *dvandvas*.

In this time itself, if the mind leaves the subject due to some kind of *prārabdha*, and either broods over the past or worries about the future, the mind experiences the *dvandvas*. The mind loses its peace. We can understand at present itself. On one hand, there is the remembrance of the past, and the other, worry about the future. If the mind goes to this now, the mind becomes modified in the *dvandvas*. Then the mind loses its peace. In the end of the 2<sup>nd</sup> chapter, Krishna says, '*asāntasya kutaḥ sukham,*' where is happiness for one with no peace?' A person without peace doesn't experience happiness.

In this time, the flow of modifications should be in a single form in the mind. However, that doesn't happen. When that is attained, what happens? '*Amritatvāya kalpate,*' he becomes suitable for Immortality, for *Mokṣa*.

Therefore, to say 'the peace of the mind,' means to keep the mind in a single modification. Don't make the mind modified in the *dvandvas*. Then, because of a person's *prārabdha*, or due to circumstances, when one unavoidably attains the *dvandvas*, use this weapon of 'forbearance.' This means, 'don't allow that grow.' Then there is another means instructed. Another meaning for 'forbearance' is '*nitya ātma darśanam,*' to base one's thoughts in the Self. That is the purpose of satsang. We have discussed this before.

We can understand one thing. For the ordinary person, it is impossible to make the mind still. The mind will constantly undergo transformation. We make that mind peaceful and concentrated for at least some time. That is *satsang*. It can be one hour, or half an hour, of thinking about this subject. This can be alone, or as a group. In that time, the mind gains this peace and concentration. One also experiences the feeling of stillness.

What will happen the rest of the time? Normally, the mind will be in the thought of objects. Otherwise, it will be in the condition of the *dvandvas*. Because of that, it says, '*dvanda sahiṣṇuḥ,*' a person who forbears these

*dvandvas*. How? ‘*Nitya ātmadarśanāt,*’ from thinking of the Self, from *satsang*. He becomes suitable for *Mokṣa*, ‘*amṛtatvāya kalpate.*’ ‘*samartho bhavati.*’ This matter will be discussed again later in the *bhāṣyā*.

Sri Krishna calls Arjuna, ‘*puruṣarṣabha.*’ This means, ‘O great one among men!’ Sri Krishna calls Arjuna many names like this in the Gita, ‘*Bhārata,*’ ‘*puruṣa śreṣṭha,*’ ‘*parantapa.*’ By using these names, the Lord is giving a psychological ‘treatment’ to Arjuna. Arjuna is collapsed. In the 3<sup>rd</sup> chapter, he says, ‘*vyamīśreṇeva vākyena.*’ Out of the weakness of his mind, Arjuna was speaking sentences that had no relation to each other. So, the Lord tries to give self-confidence and self-strength to Arjuna, an individual who is mentally weak at this point. The Lord is also using these powerful names to make Arjuna aware of his own true nature.

‘You are great among men. You have power and manliness. Your condition now is not suitable to that. Like this, the Lord uses such names for awakening Self-courage in Arjuna. ‘He *Puruṣarṣabha,*’ ‘O great among men, you are not one to falter like this.’ These are words for giving more strength. That is how the Lord uses these names.

‘*Yam Puruṣam,*’ whatever person. The word ‘*puruṣam,*’ means ‘a person with manliness, a person with strength, courage, and vigor, everything. Whatever person, ‘*Ete na vyathayanti,*’ these do not perturb, do not shake. Even if these experiences come in the mind, they don’t make the mind waver. For such a wise person, how is he? ‘*Samaduḥkhasukham.*’ He is even in pleasure and pain. We explained the evenness of the mind. This means to avoid creating more suffering or pleasure through continuing the experiences in the mind. ‘*Dhīram,*’ this is said repeatedly. A person with discrimination, with awareness of the *Ātman*. This is because *Ātma Bodha*, awareness of the Self aids one in this process. For whatever person whom these experiences do not make waver, ‘*sah,*’ he, ‘*amṛtatvāya kalpate,*’ attains *Mokṣa*. In other words, a person with a peaceful mind obtains *Ātma Vidyā*, Self-knowledge, and becomes liberated. That is the meaning. So, this *śloka* indicates the most important means by which a *sādhak* can mental peace. Then onto the preface of *Śaṅkara* for the next shloka. It says,

*‘Etaścha śokamohāvakṛtvā śitoṣṇādisahanam̐ yuktam̐ yasmāt –  
nāsata iti.’*

*Etaścha,* ‘what is going to be said, about the matters which I will say, ‘*śokamohau akṛtvā,*’ without creating grief and delusion, *śitoṣṇādisahanam̐ yuktam̐,* ‘the ability to forbear dualities such as cold and heat, in the manner described, ‘*yasmāt,*’ comes from what?’ It says this in the next *śloka.*

***Nāsato vidyate bhāvo nābhāvo vidyate sataḥ  
Ubhayorapi dr̥ṣṭo/ntastvanayostattvadarśibhiḥ. 2.16.***

2.16. ‘Of the unreal there is no being; the real has no nonexistence. But the nature of both these, indeed, has been realized by the Seers of Truth.’

*‘nāsato ‘vidyamānasya śitoṣṇādeḥ sakāraṇasya na vidyate nāsti  
bhāvo bhavanamastitā. Na hi śitoṣṇādi sakāraṇam̐  
pramāṇairnirūpyamāṇam̐ vastu sambhavati. Vikāro hi saḥ. Vikāraścha  
vyabhicharati, yathā ghaṭādisam̐sthānam̐ chakṣuṣā nirūpyamāṇam̐  
mṛdvyatirekeṇānupalabdher asattathā sarvo vikāraḥ  
kāraṇavyatirekeṇānupalabdherasan. Janmapradhvam̐ sābhyām̐  
prāgūrdhvam̐ chānupalabdheḥ. Mṛdādikāraṇasya cha  
tatkāraṇavyatirekeṇānupalabdherasattvam.*

*Na asataḥ avidyamānasya śitoṣṇādeḥ sakāraṇasya na vidyate nāsti bhāvo  
bhāvana astitā.*’ It says, ‘*avidyamānasya,* ‘what doesn’t exist, what is  
imagined.’ In *Advaita,* when it says ‘what doesn’t exist,’ it means ‘imaginary.’  
Then, ‘*asataḥ,*’ that which is imagined. Who imagines this? This is what the  
*Jīva* imagines. So, how can we explain this? It says, ‘*śitoṣṇādeḥ,*’ of opposites  
such as cold and heat, *sakaaranasya,*’ along with their causes, ‘*na vidyate na asti  
bhāvo.*’ There is no *bhāva,* or existence in them.

Because opposites like cold and heat are imagined, how is a person who forbears these? He has firmness of mind. For developing that, it says here that cold and heat, etc., are imagined. One should think like this. Thinking helps in this. Thinking always aids in developing the firmness of the mind. This is *manana*, reflection. How should *manana* be practiced? These opposites like cold and heat are imagined. In truth, they have no existence.

This is further explained in the bhashya next. '*Na hi śītoṣṇādi sakāraṇam pramāṇair nirūpyamāṇām vastu sadbhavati.*' So it says, '*śītoṣṇādi,*' dualities such as cold and heat, '*sakāraṇam,*' along with their cause.' One should also think about their causes. How does cold come? We know that water is cold. How does heat come? Heat is produced by fire. Thus, 'opposites such as cold and heat, along with their causes.' In other words, water is cold, but only when the body comes into contact with the water do we experience pain. So, the quality of cold is contained in water, but that alone doesn't cause us pain. Instead, that water must be connected with the body, mind, and senses.

So, the qualities of cold and heat, etc., are not the only cause of the experience of cold and heat, etc. Our mind and senses are also causes. So, opposites such as cold and heat, along with their causes, '*pramāṇair nirūpyamāṇām.*' When one thinks according to a *pramāṇa*, that is the meaning. How does one think with a *pramāṇa*? That is what we are going to think. '*Vastu sat na bhavati.*' The object is not real. That is the meaning. Why is that?

Why is this? It says, '*vikāraḥ hi saḥ.*' These are all modifications. These are effects. These came from somewhere are changing modifications. 'This isn't real.' What is the specialty of this changing? It says, '*vikāraḥ cha vyabhicharati.*' '*Vikārah,*' these modifications, '*vyabhicharati,*' change. The word '*charati,*' in Sanskrit means to move. This word combines to two prefixes, which are *vi* and *abhi*, so it becomes *vyabhicharati.*' This means to undergo change by nature.

Whatever state it is in one moment, this changes in the next moment. All of these modifications, the *vikāras*, undergo change. This means that they don't stay in a single condition. This is explained more.

*Yathā ghaṭādisamsthānam chakṣuṣā nirūpaymānam, mṛdvyatirekeṇa anupalabdheḥ asat.*' This is saying a famous example. '*Ghaṭādisamsthānam.*'

This means objects like a pot, or clothes, etc. '*Samsthāna*,' means the external form that we see. So how are the forms of these objects that we see, like a pot, clothes, and so on? A pot is round. It has thickness, height, and a lid, etc. That is what we see. And what about clothes? They are soft, etc. That is what is called '*saṁsthānam*,' the form that we see.

'*Chakṣuṣā nirūpyamāṇam*.' So what do we do with the eye? We know the object; we elucidate the object. How is this? We know, 'these clothes are flat, and long, has a width. With this object, we can cover our bodies.' In this way, we can know this through the eye. We understand. To know the length, structure, and width of an object is what is called '*nirūpanam*.' That is grasped through the eye.

What happens when we see a pot? We see its form with the eye and grasp its special qualities. These are just examples, the clothes, etc. This can be anything, such as a book, etc. Then, the *bhashya* says, '*mṛdvyatirekeṇa anupalabdheḥ asat*.' This pot, *mṛdvyatirekeṇa*, 'is not possible to know as separate from clay. It isn't possible to know the pot apart from knowing the clay. Because one cannot know that object apart from the mud, what does it say? '*asat*.'

This object is '*asat*.' It is imaginary. We imagine it. In the mud, we imagine an object. However, this doesn't mean that it really exists. We imagine that there exists such an object that is separate from the clay. Here, it is says to look with the eyes. Look closely. Do you see anything separate from the clay, or anything that is not clay? No.

So, we say that there is an object separate from the clay. We say that this was produced from the clay. Why do we make this distinction? We say that a new effect was produced from the clay. This is our experience. We say that a new object was produced from the clay. Because that 'new object' is not separate from clay, our calling it as a 'new object,' is merely imagined. No one can refute this.

We say this, that 'we made a new object out of clay'. This means that this object didn't exist before. We accept mentally that this is a new creation, a new effect, but the commentator says to look closely. Can you see any new object

that is separate from the clay? No. Then what about the thought that this is a new object? That is just imagination. The thought, ‘this is a new object,’ is imagined by the mind. It is nothing but clay. Therefore, this idea is ‘*asat*.’

So, it says, next, ‘*tathā sarvo vikāraḥ kāraṇavyatirekeṇa anupalabdheḥ asat.*’

If this is so, then all objects that are seen in the Universe, all modifications, all effects, ‘*kāraṇa vyatirekeṇa,*’ being separate from their causes, ‘*anupalabdheḥ,*’ because this isn’t experienced, ‘*asat,*’ that is imagined.

Why is this? It further explains this. ‘*Janmapradhvam̐ sābhyām̐ prāgūrdhvam̐ cha anupalabdheḥ.*’ We can any object, for example, clothes. That cloth, ‘*janma prāk,*’ before its birth, ‘*pradhvam̐,*’ and destruction, ‘*urdhvam,*’ afterwards’ *cha anupalabdheḥ,*’ isn’t experienced. ‘*Janmapradhvam̐ sābhyām̐ prāgūrdhvam̐ cha anupalabdheḥ.*’ So, because we don’t experience an object before its birth and after its destruction, that object isn’t eternal. It is *asat*, imaginary. That is the meaning.

We don’t experience any kind of modification like that. Before it was stitched together, we don’t experience that cloth. And after the stitching is undone, we don’t experience that object. Therefore, ‘*janmapradhvam̐ sābhyām,*’ in birth and destruction, ‘*prāgūrdhvam cha,*’ before and after, ‘*anupalabdheḥ,*’ these effects aren’t experienced. Therefore, that is imagined.

Then it says, ‘*kāryasya ghaṭādeḥ mṛdādikāraṇasya cha tat kāraṇa vyatirekeṇa anupalabdheḥ asattvam̐.*’ We say that we make a pot from clay. ‘The pot is produced from clay. That is a new object.’ After thinking this, when we look and examine, we find that nothing separate was produced. Therefore, we say that this is ‘*asat,*’ imagined. However, what about the cause of the pot, the clay? Isn’t that *sat*, Real? It says here to combine that with its cause and examine. There, this same thing occurs. So think further about this cause and effect relationship. It says, ‘*kāryasya ghaṭādeḥ,*’ the effects of a pot, etc, ‘*mṛdādikāraṇasya cha,*’ and the cause of that, clay, ‘*tat kāraṇa vyatirekeṇa,*’ one thinks, ‘what is the cause of the mud? That mud is not different from its causes.’ That is the meaning. This mud is a gross object. If we dissect the structure of that, we will come to the atom. The combination of these atoms creates the form of clay.

Thus, if we continuously think about the divisions and parts of this, we see that ‘each gross effect is not separate from its cause. It isn’t experienced as being separate. *‘Tat kāraṇavyatirekeṇa anupalabdheḥ asat.’* Therefore, in the same way that the pot is imagined, the clay is also imagined. Wherever this lineage of causes and effects leads, what is everything that comes before? This entire lineage of cause and effect becomes *asat*, imagined. Once that happens, it says,

*‘Tadasattve cha sarvābhāvaprasaṅga iti chet?’*

If we consider that this entire lineage of causes and effects is imagined, *asat*, won’t we have to accept the Reality as being ‘void?’ ‘*sarvābhāva?* Isn’t that what this is indicating? No. *Śāṅkara* refutes this. Once this principle is realized, the intellect doesn’t reach ‘voidness.’ This never causes a void of knowledge. Why is that?

*‘Na, sarvatra buddhidvayopalabdheḥ sadbuddhirasadbuddhiriti. Yad viṣayā buddhirna vyabhicharati tatsat, yadviṣayā buddhirvyabhicharati tadasaditi sadasadvibhāge buddhitantre sthite sarvatra dve buddhī sarvairupalabhyete samānādhikaraṇe.’*

It says, ‘*sarvatra,*’ in all conditions, whether it is a pot, or a cloth, or anything, there are two kinds of knowledge in relation to that object. ‘*buddhidvayopalabdheḥ.*’ These are constantly experienced by *Jivas*. These are *sadbuddhi* and *asadbuddhi*.

This is something that we should carefully understand. The individual constantly experiences two kinds of *buddhi*, or knowledge. These are *sadbuddhi* and *asadbuddhi*. It says, ‘*yad viṣayā buddhiḥ na vyabhicharati tatsat.*’ In whatever knowledge about an object that doesn’t undergo change, constantly continues, that object is *sat*. To say in a different way, when we know an object, that knowledge continues and remains. This knowledge doesn’t experience any change at all. No matter where or what it is, if that

knowledge doesn't undergo any change, then the known object is *sat*. This is the definition given for 'sat.' That is the meaning. Then the knowledge will be *sat*, and the object will be *sat*.' We should look at our ordinary experiences.

Here, I know this book. When I say, 'I know the book,' in truth, what happens? The knowledge situated within us contains the external object, the book. In other words, the object is existing within knowledge. That is what happens. How is that? Through the two means of place and time. We have discussed this several times before, in my memory.

We have discussed about place and time. Does anyone remember? Place and time. Now, I know this book. I knew it yesterday, and will know it tomorrow. So, my knowledge about the book can only exist in relation to time. Only then can I think about the book, or remember it. One is the knowledge of the present moment. The other is the memory about the book, and last is the thought about the book.

When these three things happen, the knowledge becomes related to Time. How? I say, 'I know now.' However, this Time may be concealed within our knowledge. In other words, we don't have to always remember about Time. When I see this book, I don't have say along with Time, 'I am seeing this book at this time.' Instead, that will be concealed within. Without awareness of Time, it isn't possible for me to be aware of this object.

Then suppose I remember about this book. How do I remember? 'Before, I saw this book.' The word 'before,' indicates Time. Otherwise, 'I saw the book yesterday.' This indicates Time. Thus, if there must be awareness about any object, this awareness of the object isn't possible without awareness of *kāla*, Time, when we are awake. Like that, one thing that cannot be avoided is *deśa*, place.

How do I know about this book? 'It is here.' That is what I know. That is the awareness of 'place.' 'Here.' 'Here' can mean, 'on top of the desk,' or 'in the house,' or 'in this area,' or I can say, 'it was in Delhi where I saw this.' 'I saw the book in this place, in Vallikavu.' Thus, 'here,' means for now, this table. The 'place' is the base of the book, the table. If we expand this some more, the place is this building. If the base is thought of more expansive, then

it is this state. If we go beyond India, then what is the base of the book? It is India, this country. I can say, 'I saw this book in India.'

So, these two, place and Time, can be limited, or they can be unlimited. We can know about an object, only through these two. When we know an object in that way, what happens to this knowledge? These two, Place and Time, form a sort of 'ring.' Through the 'ring' of 'place and time,' our knowledge, or antaḥkaraṇa contains an object. That is what is meant when we say, 'I know an object.'

Through a 'ring,' we grab and take an object, like a fish. How does the mind contain an object? It is through place and time. Through the 'ring' of these two, the mind contains each object. Here, what is the object? It is limited. The mind contains a limited object through limitation. According to how vast the object becomes, what happens? The ability of the mind to contain the object becomes continuously lesser. That is the meaning.

I can think about this place, here. This means that my mind can contain it. I said before, that to know an object means, 'to contain' the object. The mind covers the object. This means that the object exists within the mind. The mind accepts that object within. That is how we 'know an object.' However, suppose the object becomes unlimited.

I am able to know about this place. I can know about this area. I can see with the eye, and imagine mentally. However, what about when this area becomes more vast? When it becomes a county, when it becomes a state, a country, the globe, this Earth? Then the mind cannot contain that. This means that the mind cannot connect to that object through place and time. The place becomes vast.

Here, the book is seated on the table. The book is limited, and the base on which it rests, the table is also limited. That is why I am able to contain both of these within the mind. According to how pervasive place and time become, they become subtle. Then the mind is unable to contain them within. If I think about this place, this table, my mind can contain everything about it within; its name, form, and shape. If this has a width of 4 feet, my mind can contain it within. When becomes 10 feet, to 100 feet, then the mind is unable

to contain that within. When the object becomes pervasive, the mind is unable to contain it.

The mind cannot even imagine the distance from the Sun to Earth. Why is that? It is because that is pervasive. That is a specialty of the mind in the grasping of objects. The mind can only contain an object through place and time, if the object is limited. Otherwise, we will be unable to contain within the mind the object or its base.

When we think like this, what is the base of this globe? Wherever it is situated is its base. However, we are unable to think about its base. Look at the sky. The sun, moon, and stars are situated within that. These are objects of the mind. We grasp these. We grasp them through limitation, but we are unable to grasp their base. What is that base? That is the ether.

When we grasp an object and its base through place and time, when that becomes pervasive, the ability of our knowledge to contain that becomes destroyed. That is why after we look at the sky, even if this vast Universe is an object of our knowledge, we cannot grasp the base in which it is situated. Why is that? That is the ether. What is its form? How much width does it have? How much length does it have? What is its thickness? We are unable to know about the ether in this way.

Why is that? There, the object is unlimited. Its base is unlimited. However, what is space? That is the place of all objects. That is the place of this book. Like that, the sun, moon, stars, clouds, wind, everything seen in space, the place of all of these is *akāśa*, space. However, we cannot grasp that place. How do we know that place? We know it as 'void.' We know it as devoid of all measurements. Because it is devoid of length, width, density, etc., we say that space is 'empty.' We know it as 'indescribable.' We are unable to describe, 'what is space?' No one can do that. No one can grasp that. What is the most one can say about that? We can say, 'space is emptiness.'

However, how can something that is merely 'empty' support all of these beings? Therefore, that is an object. That is a place. That is the meaning.

This is called the '*bhautikākāśam*,' the material space. This is considered as an object, because it is the first element produced in Creation. What do modern thinkers say? 'It is emptiness.' But what do we say? That is an object.

That is the first object produced in Creation. That is ‘*akāśa*,’ or ‘space.’ Thus, in this space, which is all-pervasive and contains all, what do we do? In this moment, we see all reflections. Thus, this space, which contains everything from the sun, moon, and stars, is known as a place and an object. This means that that object is being contained within.

When we say that we know all objects in space, it means that space contains all objects within itself. Because that is an object, it is called ‘*bhūtākāśa*,’ the element of space. When we say that an object exists in space, it means that space contains that object within itself. What happens to the object, existing in space? The *Jiva* knows that. When the *Jiva* knows that, what happens? The knowledge of the *Jiva* becomes more pervasive than space. We said the reason for this before. If an object must be grasped in a place, that place must be more pervasive than the object. So, we know all of these objects, in space; the sun, moon, and stars. When we know all of these, space is more pervasive than any of these objects. The *Jiva* knows this space.

When this is said, it means that the knowledge of the *Jiva* is more pervasive than space. When we say that something becomes an object of the mind, it means that knowledge contains that object within itself. So what does the knowledge of the *Jiva* do? It contains all objects, from space onwards, within. That space itself is subtle. That is why it is called ‘emptiness.’ It exists without any kinds of measurements. If that is so, then the knowledge which contains space, is more subtle than space. That is the meaning.

Here, what is said? ‘*Asat*.’ This means ‘imagined.’ I said all of this for us to understand the meaning of ‘*asat*.’ Thus, that which contains space, which is the place of ‘space,’ is called ‘*chittākāśa*,’ the inner space. Then there are the names, ‘*bodhākāśa*,’ the space of awareness, and ‘*chidākāśa*,’ the space of Consciousness.’ These names come because of this principle. What happens? This contains knowledge. Space exists within knowledge. It becomes an object of knowledge. Thus, knowledge is subtler than space.

So, when knowledge knows space, what happens? Knowledge knows space itself through space and time. But there is no place there. The most we can imagine about a place is space. All objects exist in space. And what about space? That is why it is called ‘the first object.’ It is said that space is the first

object created. Then, what existed before that creation? What is the place of space? Where is that known? Space is known in the *chittākāśa*, the inner space. It is known in the *bodhākāśa*, the space of awareness. The place of space is in the *bodhākāśa*. It is within the *bodhākāśa* that space exists. This means that space exists, depending on the *bodhākāśa*. Other objects exist, depending on space.

Like that, what happens when we think about the place and time of an object? We understand that the object exists in the *bodhākāśa*. Instead, the Awareness doesn't exist, depending on the object. Why is that? If the object exists, depending on time and place, then we can understand that the object exists, depending on Awareness, when we think. There, what does this *bodhākāśa* do, to contain this material space, which contains everything? It exists in the form of time and place. It knows space in this moment.

What is this moment? That is an effulgence of Awareness itself. This moment. Where does space exist? It exists in knowledge. It is known because of knowledge. It is contained by knowledge. Thus, if this all-pervasive space exists in our Awareness, then all the objects in the Universe exist in our Awareness. Therefore, everything is an object of bodha, awareness. That is what is said here. That how a thing becomes an object of awareness.

So, all facets of the Universe from space onwards exist in this Awareness. These exist, being contained within awareness. That is why the *chittākāśa*, the inner space, is called, '*mahākāśa*,' the great space. What does that *mahākāśa* do? It exists, containing the material space. That is what constantly happens in all experiences of the Universe. Or else, this is what is called the experience of the Universe.

How do these objects exist within knowledge? Because these objects exist within knowledge, and because they are contained within knowledge, they are imaginary; *kalpitam*. They are imagined by knowledge. When this is said, this means that without depending on knowledge, the object cannot exist. Without depending on space, this globe cannot exist. For the Earth to exist, a place is needed. What is that? It is *akāśa*, space. If that is so, this *akāśa* also needs the support of awareness. Without depending on that awareness, *chit*, the *akāśa* cannot exist.

Thus, space is ultimate form of place we can imagine. The moment, this moment, is the ultimate form of Time we can imagine. What are both of these? They are effulgences of this Awareness. Because of that, what do they do? They exist within Awareness. Or, they exist as objects of Awareness, within awareness. This principle must be understood in the coming sections.

In these sections, it says that the '*buddhi*,' or knowledge, contains objects within. This principle must be understood. Here, what is said? Whatever object exists constantly in knowledge, that object will be *sat*, True. That is what it says. '*Yad viṣayā buddhiḥ na vyabhicharati.*' In whatever knowledge of an object doesn't change, that object, '*tat sat.*' '*yad viṣayā buddhiḥ vyabhicharati.*' In knowledge of whatever object that doesn't change, that object will be *sat*, True. If that knowledge does change, then the object is *asat*, imagined. '*Vyabhicharati,*' whatever knowledge changes, '*tad asat,*' the object of that knowledge is imagined.

When we know an object, and the object changes, how does it change? The knowledge changes. When the knowledge changes, the object changes. If the object changes, that object isn't *sat*, True. This will be made clear through an example. Next, it says, '*san ghaṭaḥ san paṭaḥ.*' Through example, that matter will be made clear.

Next, the *bhāṣyā* says, '*iti sadasad vibhāge buddhitantra sthite,*' In this way, the distinction of *sat* and *asat*, of existence and what is imaginary, '*buddhitantra,*' depends on knowledge. This is what we said before. The object exists within knowledge. The knowledge doesn't depend on the object. Thus, it says that *sat* and *asat*, Real and what is imagined, depend on knowledge, '*buddhi.*' Then it says, '*sarvatra dve buddhiḥ.*' Because of that, what happens? No matter what object we know, these two kinds of knowledge exist. One is knowledge of the Supreme Truth, and second in the knowledge of the imagined object.

'*Sarvair upalabhyate.*' This isn't just experienced by the *Advaitī*. All *Jivas* experienced this; it's just that they don't think about it. '*Samānādhikaraṇe.*' In this one word, so many matters are contained. This is experienced in a single substratum, in *samānādhikaraṇa*. '*Na nīlotpalavat,*' that is not like the phrase,

‘blue lotus.’ Instead, ‘*san ghataḥ san paṭaḥ san hastī iti evaṁ sarvatra.*’ That is the meaning.

In this one sentence, so many subjects are contained. One thing it says is ‘*samānādhikāraṇam.*’ This is also one thing that must be understood clearly; *samānādhikāraṇa*. We have discussed this matter before. I remember that this appeared in some other section in another class. Otherwise, I will say this again. ‘*Samānādhikāraṇam.*’ This principle of ‘*samānādhikāraṇa*’ appears in the object, in the word, and in knowledge. In these three places, ‘*samānādhikāraṇam* can come.

How does ‘*samānādhikāraṇa* come in an object? Here, there are about 100 people sitting. Where is everyone sitting? Inside one building; in one area. Because everyone is situated in the same area, what can we say about everyone? We can call a person, ‘*samāna adhikāraṇaḥ.*’ This means each and every individual sitting here. ‘*Samānaṁ adhikāraṇaṁ yeṣāṁ,*’ whoever shares the same substratum, all of them are called ‘*samānādhikāraṇas.*’

So, what are all of us? We are ‘*samānādhikāraṇas.*’ Why is that? It is because the place we are sitting is one. It is a hall. So when we speak about ‘*samānādhikāraṇam,*’ we aren’t referring to the place where we sit. Instead, this refers to individual who is sitting. When we hear the word ‘*samānādhikāraṇa,*’ we become aware of the area of sitting. However, it isn’t the area of sitting. Then what is it? It is the individuals who are seated in that area. That is *samānādhikāraṇa*.

This is the *samānādhikāraṇa* that happens to an object. Then, *samānādhikāraṇa* can also happen to words. A famous example of this is, ‘*so/yaṁ devadattaḥ.*’ This example is necessary to understand. ‘*Devadattaḥ,*’ is a name in *Sanskrit*. We saw *Devadatta* before in one place. We saw him in a certain time and place. Now again, I see him, that individual. Now, I say, ‘*so/yaṁ devadattaḥ.*’ That *Devadatta* which I saw before is now before me. That is what is said. There, *Devadattaḥ* is an individual a person. However, for describing that individual, I use two different words. What is the first? ‘*Saḥ.*’ The word ‘*saḥ*’ is a form of the word ‘*tat,*’ or ‘that.’ In *Sanskrit*, there is a word, ‘*tat.*’ From that word, different forms are created, such as ‘*saḥ, tau, te,*

*tān,* etc. So '*saḥ*' is a form of the word '*tat.*' How is this? This is in the singular case, indicating a single person. That is '*saḥ.*'

After that, there is the word '*ayam.*' This is a form of the word '*idam*' or 'this' in Sanskrit. The forms of this are, '*ayam, imau, ime.*' The words conjugated from this word. This word '*ayam*' is also the singular form, in third person. Here, what happens? The word '*saḥ,*' which is singular, third person word, and '*ayam,*' which is also a singular, third person word are combined. These two words are different. However, these two different words indicate the same individual. So when two words in the same conjugation indicate the same meaning, that is *samānādhikāraṇam* of words. Those words have 'a shared substratum.'

I said before about *samānādhikāraṇa* of objects. Then we said about *samānādhikāraṇa* of words. This will come in several sections, in scriptural discussions. If two words in the same conjugation indicate the same meaning, in the words, not the meaning, there is *samānādhikāraṇa*. This means that they share the same substratum. That is *samānādhikāraṇa* of words. Now pay attention. We said, '*so yam devadattaḥ.*' What happens in the mind of a person who hears this, or in the person's knowledge? In these two words, a single object effulges in the *antaḥkaraṇā*. What is the object? This *Devadatta*, the object, effulges within the mind.

In other words, when someone says, '*so yam devadattaḥ,*' what does the person think? He thinks of an individual. This is a matter that must be thought about and understood. When he thinks like that, what happens in the mind? Two different words create awareness of a single meaning. Everyone is looking in the book, thinking, 'is this written here?' You need not look in the book. It hasn't been written in any book. Even if you read again and again, you won't find it. 'Is it here? I don't see it. How is he saying something that's not here.'

So, when two different words make a single meaning effulge in the mind, what happens? That is the *samānādhikāraṇa* of knowledge. This is because knowledge makes a single meaning effulge through two different words. This is *samānādhikāraṇa* of knowledge. This is because knowledge is the substratum of the object. How is that? It is through the two words. Otherwise, knowledge grasps an object through two separate words. There, it is *samānādhikāraṇa* of

knowledge. There is also *samānādhikāraṇa* of words. Then there is *samānādhikāraṇa* of an object.

In this way, the *sāstras* discuss *samānādhikāraṇam* in these three ways. Here, as well, there are three kinds of *samānādhikāraṇam*, in the *bhāṣyā*. As an example, it says, ‘*san ghaṭaḥ san paṭaḥ san hastī.*’ That must be understood. In truth, all of these matters aren’t learnt here. It is after learning all of this that one studies the *bhāṣyā*, normally. Before thinking about the *bhāṣyā*, all of these matters should be understood. It’s not enough to just say these things. They won’t be grasped. Here, we will also study that.

It says, ‘*san ghaṭaḥ.*’ Otherwise, we can say, ‘*san bālaḥ.*’ What does this mean? Here the word ‘*bāla,*’ or child is the *viśeṣyam*. The word ‘*san*’ is the *viśeṣaṇam*. We normally say, ‘the white horse.’ There, the horse is the *viśeṣyam*. ‘White’ is the *viśeṣaṇam*. Normally, we study this when we are first learning Malayalam. ‘The white horse.’ The *viśeṣaṇam* is ‘white.’ The horse is the ‘*viśeṣyam.*’ Like this, we can take the example, ‘*san bālaḥ.*’ The word ‘*bālaḥ,*’ or ‘child,’ is what is qualified. The word ‘*san*’ is the quality. This specifies the child. The word ‘*san*’ means ‘existing.’

There is a root ‘*as.*’ This means ‘to be.’ From that, according to grammar rules, ‘*sat*’ is the neuter form of this, in singular case. In masculine form, it becomes ‘*san.*’ From this, it can be conjugated, ‘*san, santau, santaḥ, santam, santau, sataḥ, satā, sābhyām.*’ In the neuter form, this is ‘*sat.*’ From this, come the forms, ‘*sat, satī, santi, satā, sataḥ,* etc. When the same word comes to the feminine case, it becomes ‘*satī, satyau, satyaḥ.*’ That is how its form changes.

So, all of this comes from the same word ‘*sat.*’ In masculine form, this is ‘*san.*’ So, we said, ‘*san bālaḥ,*’ the boy that exists. ‘*Satī bālikā,*’ the girl that exists. ‘*Sat puṣpam,*’ the flower that exists. Like this, this word ‘*sat*’ is generally used as an ‘objective.’ That is also used here.

What is this? This word ‘*sat*’ is used as an ‘objective’ of the child. Because it is in masculine form, we said ‘*san bālaḥ.*’ Here, all the words in the *bhāṣyā* are in masculine form. Therefore, it says, ‘*san ghaṭaḥ.*’ *Ghaṭaḥ,* or pot is a masculine word. ‘*San paṭaḥ.*’ *Paṭaḥ,* or cloth, is also masculine. If the word described is feminine, it will be ‘*satī bālikā,*’ the girl that exists. If the word is in the neuter case, it can be ‘*sat puṣpam,*’ the flower that exists.’

Therefore, there is no need to be afraid on seeing this ‘*san*.’ It is an objective. It is used to mean, ‘existing.’ When we say ‘*san bālah*,’ it means the boy that exists. That is the meaning. So, no matter what object we know about, what happens? *Shankara* says here that we know it through *samānādhikāraṇa*, through a common substratum. What is this *samānādhikāraṇa*? We can use the example, ‘*san aśvaḥ*.’ The horse that exists.’ Thus, when we hear the word ‘*san*,’ we gain awareness about its meaning. This means that we know the meaning of the word ‘*san*.’ Then, what is the meaning that the word ‘*san*’ makes us aware of? It is *Sat*, Existence. We know Existence.

We know Existence, through the word ‘*san*.’ This ‘*san*’ is joined together with all words. We said, ‘*san aśvaḥ*,’ the horse that exists.’ We can only know a horse that exists. We cannot know a horse that doesn’t exist. So when we say, ‘the horse that exists,’ along with the object, the horse, we have the experience of *Sat*, Existence. When we know about a clothe, or a boy, or a girl, know matter what object we know about, the experience of ‘*Sat*’ Existence, will be joined together. Only then can we know the object. That is what *Śankara* says here.

In that, one thing is True, while the other is imagined. When we say, ‘*san aśvaḥ*,’ where we know an object through the word ‘*sat*,’ that Existence is True. Combined together with that is ‘*aśvaḥ*,’ the knowledge of the horse. That is imagined. Here what happens? Pay attention, where it says, ‘*san ghaṭaḥ san paṭaḥ san hastī*.’ What is all of this? These are two words in the same conjugation. ‘*San*’ is a singular word in third person, and ‘*ghaṭaḥ, paṭaḥ, hastī, bālah*, etc.’ are all singular words in third person. Thus, two words in the same conjugation, combined together, indicate a single object. These don’t indicate two objects.

Where we say, ‘*san aśvaḥ*,’ when these are joined together, in truth, only one thing is made aware of. What is that? It is Existence. This creates awareness of Existence. Then what about the horse, or pot, or cloth, that are said, joined together? Those are not Real. Then what? Those are imagined. That is *Advaita*.

In all of our experiences, through the *samānādhikāraṇa* of the words, we become aware of this Existence. This creates awareness of *Advaita*, of Pure

Existence. Even if we use the words that are joined together to that, whatever those words create awareness of, that is imagined. That is what is said.

We said before, that when we think about any object in the form of its cause, that object disappears. That object becomes Unreal. Then, when we say, 'the horse that exists,' the Existence indicated by the word 'that exists' remains as *Sat*, True. At the same time, the horse that was indicated is imagined. That is what is said here. This is proved through logic and reasoning. This hasn't been proved yet. It will be proved.

When we think more subtly, we will understand. When this '*Sat*' or Existence becomes an object of knowledge, then knowledge and existence are not two. They are only *ONE*. Whenever Existence, *Sat*, becomes an object of knowledge, then knowledge and Existence are not two. Why aren't they two? In the way that knowledge contains all object from space onwards, at that time, the object moves away from knowledge. The knowledge remains, but the object moves away. At that time, whenever knowledge contains this Existence, which is the base of everything, then we are unable to take apart knowledge and its object, Existence. Why is that? It is because both become *ONE*.

That is what is called '*brahman*.' What are we saying through this word '*brahman*?' It is this *Sat*, Pure Existence. Otherwise, this word '*brahman*' indicates the Awareness which causes the *Sat* to effulge. In each and every experience of objects, that is joined with the object, and experienced without any change. That is what is said here. That is what is called, '*samānādhikāraṇa*.' There are two words here.

These two words are also in every experience. When we know an object, how do we know it? We don't know because it doesn't exist. Instead, we know because it exists. This knowledge that 'it exists,' is in aid in all of our experiences. 'Experience,' means to think about, know about, and act with any object. What helps in all of this? It is the existence of the object. It is because we know 'the object exists.' In the experience of all object, from the most subtle space onwards, this existence remains unchanged, as the substratum. Therefore, that 'existence' is the substratum, and the object is imagined.

Where we say, '*san bālah*,' the *Sat*, or Existence is Real, while the '*bāla*,' or boy, is imagined. This is what *Śankara* is going to say. In this way, through

two words, a single object is indicated, through the process of *samānādhikaraṇa*. That is the meaning. That is also what happens to knowledge. ‘*San ghaṭaḥ san paṭaḥ san hastī san bālaḥ.*’ What happens here? In the two words joined together, this *Sat*, Existence is made effulgent in knowledge. And what about the object joined with that? That is imagined. It remains as being imagined. However, in truth, it has no existence. This matter, that in truth, it doesn’t exist, will be discussed later.

However, when we understand this *samānādhikaraṇa*, we shouldn’t become confused. Because of this, *Śāṅkara* says, ‘*na nīlotpalavat.*’ There isn’t enough time to discuss that now. In the next class, we discuss that. Here, there is one matter, to keep in mind. When we say that something becomes an object of knowledge, it means that the object is contained within knowledge. Therefore, the object exists within knowledge. Knowledge does not depend on the object. This is because the object is grasped in knowledge through the instruments of time and place. This time and place are the effulgence of knowledge. No matter how vast time and place become, even if they are as pervasive as space, knowledge is able to contain that within. That is how knowledge exists as the *mahākāśa*, the great Space. In this way, when each and every object of the Universe becomes an object of knowledge, that is in two ways. It is through the Existence, which is joined together with the imagined object, that a thing becomes an object of knowledge. No matter object is known, the True Existence, along with the imagined object are experienced together. This is what we said in the *Brahma Sutra* classes. ‘*Satyante mithinī kṛtya.*’ This is said in another way as ‘*adhyāsa.*’ This is the combination of Consciousness and matter; *chit-jaṭa saṁyoga*. We have discussed this several times. This is said in a different way. This is shown in a different way of thinking by *Śāṅkara*.