

## Aum Amriteshvaryai Namah

### Swami Kaivalyanandaji's Talks on Bhagavad Gita, Part 36

Remembering the Guru Parampara, we begin our discussion on the Bhagavad Gita, Chapter Verse 58

**Yadā samharate chāyam kūrmaṅgānīva sarvaśaḥ  
Indriyāṅindriyārthebhyas tasya prajñā pratiṣṭhitā. 2.58.**

'Kiñcha.' 'Yadā Samharate samyagupasamharate cha ayam jñānaniṣṭhāyām pravṛtto yatiḥ.' This is describing the Yati, who is functioning in Jñāna Niṣṭhā. So, a Sthita Prajñan is one who is continuously in Jñāna Niṣṭhā. It says that the Yati is a Sanyassi. When one fully controls the senses ..' it says this here. These sections discussing about controlling the senses must be understood clearly. Just like the Gita discusses about karma, when it discusses about controlling the senses, this is one thing that must be given primary attention. This is something that has been wrongly interpreted alot. Otherwise, control of the senses is something that has been explained wrongly.

The primary cause for that is the difference between the time when this is being said and today's time. The society of today wasn't the society of back then. In the past, for controlling the senses, people left society and entered life in the forest. If we read our Purāṇas we can understand this. Then, man went from society to the forest for controlling the senses. He practiced sense control in a place free from all interaction with other people.

The aim of this was to step aside from desirous objects. This is because the nature of the senses is to go to their objects. The objects will constantly attract the senses. Therefore, these people left society and went to the forest, etc. That is the method used for controlling the senses in the old days. In those days, there were

forests. Comparatively, there were more places without people, and less occupied places. Now it has reversed.

Now there is more places occupied by people, and less that are unihabited. Therefore, it isn't possible for a person today to leave society and control the senses in solitude like then. That is impossible. Then some will ask, 'what about going to the Himalayas?'

There is no protection in the Himalayas. I'm saying from my own experience. The Himalayas of today isn't like the Himalayas of our imagination. All of the places where people can go there, have become big cities. These no longer exist as pilgrimage centers. Instead, these have changed to a tourist attraction. Therefore, today's society is the same everywhere.

It is the same as society. Therefore, it is difficult to find a solitary place anywhere on this Earth. That has gone. 'Vaṇi bhutvā.' This was said in old times. 'Go to the forest.' Then, they would stay in the forest. A person would leave society and live in solitude in the forest. That is what was said in olden time.

Now, that's not possible. Now, when we say 'sense control,' this must be practiced in the midst of society and other people. When that happens, man will have to face several new problems. It says, 'samyag upasamharate.' When we say, 'to withdraw completely the senses,' man is unable to do that practically today.

Seeing that, some modern people have discovered new paths. Some people explain this control of the senses instructed by our Acharyas as being a false practice, mithyāchāra. 'Control of the senses is impossible. It's control of the senses that is needed. Let the senses roam freely.' That's what they say. That is the view of modern people. 'Let the senses follow their own path - then they will be pacified. This is proved by our experience.'

'The senses become peaceful when they experience their objects. So, for making the senses peaceful, give them the experience of objects. In that way, through the experience of objects, the senses will become pacified. Otherwise, making the senses peaceful through sense control, is never something that is

possible. If the mind feels any kind of desire, immediately satisfy it, for the mind or senses. Then the mind will become peaceful.’

‘Thus, saying that this is the greatest and most scientific method of sense control,’ is what many people teach and make others believe. Then, they say that if one practices the sense control instructed by Acharyas from the past, it will create conflict. They say, ‘the traditional beliefs about sanyassa and brahmacharya have shortcomings.’ They aren’t correct. All of those are things which will create mental conflict.’

In that way, sanyassis and brahmacharis are those who live in mental conflict. Therefore, the senses can never be controlled.’ There are some who teach like this. And there are more and more people to learn this. Our śāstras say that this letting the senses act instinctively is indriya lālana, sense indulgence. ‘Indulge the senses.’ ‘If you try to control the senses, it will create mental tension. Therefore, indulge the senses.’

This is something said by Chārvakas, the materialists. The word ‘Chārvakas’ means ‘chāru,’ beautiful, ‘vākyāni,’ words. They say words that attract people. This means that it is not necessary for anyone to teach man to act instinctively. That happens naturally. This isn’t just for humans; animals also act according to instinct. Then, they say, ‘acting according to instinct is true Spirituality. Otherwise, it is not control of the senses.’

Everyone, up till Sanyassis accepted this idea. ‘That’s the right idea.’ ‘I have gone the wrong path. Now I understand.’ There are some sanyassis who are like this. ‘How will sense control be possible without mental tension and conflict?’ ‘That is possible through sense indulgence.’ There are numerous people who quote ślokas from the Gita in a way suitable to this. There are many books like that.

That is also how we study and think about this. If we think about this, we will say, ‘this is an old idea.’ ‘The time for this has gone.’ When we discuss, many ask, ‘the time for this has gone, hasn’t it?’ The sense control of old times is nothing like the sense control of today.’ People teach, ‘sense control is to make

the mind peaceful. The peace of mind that comes from experiencing objects is true sense control.’ There is a meditation for that, a Yoga, and numerous practices.

That’s not what is said here. Here it says in the old manner. ‘Samharate samyag samharate.’ This means that ‘sense control is indeed needed.’ Then, this problem comes, ‘why do people teach that sense control is ‘sense indulgence?’

This is because after reading these śāstras, and trying to practice these things, they don’t experience the fruit. When that happens, they think of another path. Such people are those who teach that sense control is ‘sense indulgence.’ Then why does that happen? Now, when we say ‘sense control,’ a person sometimes enters spirituality with great zeal. It will be a momentary excitement that leads him, that makes him leap into it. When he tries to make these things practical, his lack of maturity doesn’t allow anything. Then he will fail.

Then the mind will go to new philosophies. That is what happens with some, who teach this kind of sense control.’ Here, what is being said about sense control is after an extensive discussion about Karma Yoga. This kind of sense control is possible in its true meaning only for one with the mental purity gained through the practice of karma yoga. In the spiritual path, sense control is a must. So, control of the senses isn’t possible for a person without the mental purity gained in Karma Yoga. That is why when someone who enters spirituality with zeal reaches the part about ‘sense control,’ he will be unsuccessful.

Then, there is another thing. This sense control being discussed isn’t in the same way for everyone. Just like there is a difference in the aspirants for everything, there is also a difference here. Not everyone will have the capacity, or power to control the senses. Our Acharyas have advised the Dharma of Action for those who don’t have this ability. Then, they instruct for that person to enter the path of Pravṛtti, along with awareness of Dharma, Nyāya, and Nīti. He doesn’t have the capacity for control of the senses.

If one doesn’t have the capacity for sense control, he enters gṛhasthāśrama. When he performs the dharma and rules of gṛhasthāśrama, he must gain the

strength for controlling the senses. Those who don't have the strength to follow brahmacharyam or sanyassa are ordained to enter gṛhasthāśrama. That is also a training for controlling the senses. Still, the 'samyag upasamharate,' the perfect control of senses isn't necessary there.

Here, dharmic control of the senses is enough. This is because he accepts Dharma. This phrase, 'samyak upasamharate,' is not said for everyone. That is only said for those with the suitability for that. Then, the sense control instructed for a gṛhastha is different from the sense control of a brahmachari. The sense control of the brahmachari is complete. In that, there is no break or fall. Then, for the gṛhasthan, this sense control is a part of his performance of svadharma.

When a person enters brahmacharya and goes to sanyassa, strict sense control is needed. If a person is unable to do that, then he should surely accept gṛhasthāśrama. That is why the āśrama of brahmachārya is placed before gṛhasthāśrama. If he is more attracted by the senses, if the enjoyment of objects is firm in the mind, then he should definitely accept gṛhasthāśrama. There, he must lead a Dharmic life. In that way, also, sense control is possible.

In either part, it is 'sense control,' not 'sense indulgence.' If a person's mind doesn't have the maturity for sense control, and he strives for this complete control of the senses, that will definitely control mental tension for him. On one hand, that mental tension will make him have a downfall. He will fall from the path. That is from mental tension.

It is difficult to withstand that conflict. If the mind's saṁskāra isn't favorable, then control of the senses is difficult. Control of the senses described here is possible only for a person with favorable saṁskāra. Otherwise, he accepts gṛhasthāśrama. If not, he will definitely fall from the path. What is primarily needed for the sense control described here is that one's saṁskāra must be favorable. The antaḥkaraṇa must have purity. Then, this viveka will be there. This viveka will be there, which is obtained through one's own efforts. The circumstances must be favorable.

Only if all of these are combined together, - and beyond all of these, God's Grace is needed. That is another matter. That need not be said. Only then can the sense control described be possible. When we say, 'sense control,' this doesn't mean to simply control the emotion of kāma, lust. This means to withdraw from every kind of mental and sensual attraction. That is 'sense control.' That is just given as an example.

Therefore, this is speaking here about the 'sense control' of a Yati in Jñāna Niṣṭhā. He has attained chitta śuddhi and Jñāna Prāpti, and is in Jñāna Niṣṭhā. This is a Yati who is in the Discipline of Jñāna. When this is said, even the Yati who is in Jñāna Niṣṭhā must practice control of the senses. Even such a Yati may become controlled by attractions. There is a chance for that.

Those become obtained there. That is why there is a need for control. Numerous kinds of desires will be obtained there. Then there is no need to speak about the condition before that. There's no need to speak about a Karma Yogi. So, the 'sense control' described here isn't 'sense indulgence.' What is primary are the Dharmas of the āśramas, the life-stages. For the gr̥hastha, the Dharma of gr̥hasthāśrama is primary. For the brahmachari, the Dharma of the āśrama of Brahmacharya is primary. The Dharmas of these life-stages were organized into disciplines. The primary aim of this by previous Acharyas was for sense control.

That is why it says, 'the practices of a brahmachari must be like this.' 'The practices of a gr̥hasthan must be like this.' In all of these, it is sense control. 'Strictly follow the āśrama Dharmas.' This is in a way suitable to time. That must lead to sense control. When we say, 'the āśrama dharmas,' this is the same as the 'āśram' we are familiar with. This means the āśram where brahmacharis, sanyassis, etc. live. These āśrams are the places for developing sense control, etc., in today's situation.

In old days, man would go to the forest to practice. Now that is no more. Therefore, people go to 'āśrams.' They may know this or not know this. They may go unknowingly, or knowingly. So, to practice 'sense control' is the midst of

society, as a part of society, is very difficult. The most a person can do to move away from society, is to live in the āśram. That is the place to move away to.

That's not possible in the home. That's not possible, staying in the home. There, this kind of complete sense control described isn't possible. Therefore, people leave the home and come to the āśram. After coming to the āśram, one accepts the āśrama Dharmas, either Brahmacharya or Sanyassa. One accepts those Dharmas. So, the Dharma one must follow while staying in the āśram is the āśrama dharma. 'Aśram' means, 'the place where we live.'

Only if a person strives for sense control in such circumstances, cannot it at all be possible. In the atmosphere of home, that's not possible. The atmosphere of 'home' is a suitable place for practicing the sense control of the gṛhasthan. The gṛhasthan can practice that there. That's not possible for a brahmachari or sanyassi. That's only possible by leaving home. One must move away, to practice control of the senses. In the atmosphere of the home, that is possible for a gṛhasthan.

That has to be practiced today in a different place. There itself, obtain chitta śuddhi, mental purity, and gain viveka, discrimination. Only if these two are there, is sense control possible for a person. Both of these. You must constantly gain viveka, and must constantly obtain chitta śuddhi. These are two primary things. Only if a person has these, is control of the senses possible.

When one strives for sense control, we said before, 'this creates tension,' so there is a view that 'sense control isn't practical.' The reason for that is due to the lack of these two. If a person without viveka and chitta śuddhi leaves society, and practices this kind of sense control, that will be a great conflict, mentally. So, he won't obtain any happiness or contentment through sense control. Instead, he will have to live as a 'mithyāchāra' - a hypocrite.

For what is primarily needed, 'chitta śuddhi,' whatever is needed for that, accept. Whatever one can do to obtain viveka, do that. Doing that, become suitable for control of the senses. Only then can sense control be possible.

Otherwise, one will have to write new explanations about sense control. He'll have to write new books, just like others have done.

He'll have to say, 'all of this is unpractical.' That is correct. That is only possible for a suitable person. That is a primary matter. Sense control is never practical for a person without suitability. 'Sense indulgence' is not correct. Then, accept the Dharmas of gr̥hasṭha. Then live, according to the rules and regulations there.

Otherwise, it's not enough to just be a 'gr̥hasṭha.' It's not from just getting married and living. One person has written a commentary about these sections. In other words, numerous people come to the path of sanyassa without the suitability for sanyassa. 'The greatest curse of this country are those who live without living and practicing the sanyassa dharma.' Someone has written this in a commentary. They come to that path full of zest. Then matters such as sense control become impractical to them. These people are the greatest curse to this country.' Someone wrote this in a commentary.

However, the person who wrote this forgot one thing. A person comes to this path. He has to live as a 'mithyāchāran,' a hypocrite. When this is said, that is the greatest curse for that individual. Only after that, doesn't it affect the country. However, that isn't the greatest curse on this country. The greatest curse,' when this is said, is the curse of the majority of people. This means, 'come to the gr̥hasṭha dharma. Live without knowing the Dharma of gr̥hasṭhāśrama.' These gr̥hasṭhas are the greatest curse on the country.

The number of those in the other group is few. Therefore, the power of that curse is less. That's not how this is. This is because it is their curse for creating these kind of sanyassis. Who created these people? That is the work of the home. Why is that? It is due to not correctly practicing the gr̥hasṭha dharma that so many curses were created. They thus have to accept that curse as well.

The greatest curse to this country,' when this is said, that is the gr̥hasṭhas who live, without knowing the dharma of gr̥hasṭha. It is they who created these kinds of sanyassis. Therefore, that responsibility is also with them. Because the

person who wrote this is a gr̥hastha, he didn't think like that. He didn't think of a matter like that.

What is important is not, 'are the sanyassis bad,' or 'are the gr̥hasthas bad?' Whether one is a sanyassi or a gr̥hastha, he must follow his dharma. If he practices his dharma, he is great. No matter who it is, if they don't follow dharma, they are off of the path. This is true for 90% of the people who enter the gr̥hastha dharma. We can say that the downfall of the stage of gr̥hastha is the downfall of society.

There, how is this sense control, etc. The society doesn't know about such matters. No has any awareness about Dharma. Still, people live in such a dharma. That is the greatest curse of this country. Otherwise, 100 people who pretend and put on an act are considered the greatest curse for the country. There is nothing particular good or bad from them.

For the other, it's not like that. That constantly destroys society. People live, ignorant of the dharma of gr̥hastha. No matter what dharma it is, if a person who is unsuitable practices this kind of sense control, they will have conflict. That is how a person enters into brahmacharya or sanyassa, with zest. He tries to practices this kind of sense control, and it becomes impossible. What is not needed is to immediately write a book.

Normally, when a person comes here, and finds that it isn't possible, he begins a new parampara of giving speeches. He creates a 'new' brahmacharya, a 'new sanyassa.' That's not what is needed. Understand this. 'What is it that makes us fail?' That is something that a brahmachari or sanyassi must think of for themselves. 'Why am I having a fall?' When that happens, the primary quality that is needed is forthrightness. Only a person with that can think.

You must think with forthrightness. 'Why are these failures happening?' It is lack of suitability. It is because one is not an adhikāri, suitable for that. A person who isn't an adhikāri will have a downfall. So, first strive to attain that suitability. That is purity of mind, viveka, everything. Because of the lack of those, control of the senses creates tension. Otherwise, this isn't something out of date

that was instructed. This wasn't instructed by Acharyas out of ignorance of psychology.

This happens because the person practicing doesn't have the suitability for that. Why does he act? For some, this 'sanyassa' is like an attraction. Seeing that as a desirous thing, they have enthusiasm, and leap. It doesn't become necessary to think about one's suitability where one doesn't practice sādhana. One has to think about one's suitability only when one practices. Otherwise, one doesn't have to think about that.

So, 'sense control.' Sense control won't ever come through changing one's external clothes. So, accepting the external clothes, whether brahmacharya or sanyasa, internal this downfall will continuously happen. Then, forthrightness will be destroyed. If one thinks without forthrightness, then it isn't possible to go down that path. There, forthrightness is destroyed. When that is destroyed, one tries to pretend in front of society. 'I am a sanyassi, a brahmachari.' He tries to pretend that.

He tries to make the society aware of something he isn't. He thus lives, striving like this. That is called 'mithyāchāra,' a hypocrite. If that must be avoided, it isn't sense control that must be done first; instead, one must first gain mental purity, discrimination, and so on. In that way, strive for sense control.

Primarily, stay only in favorable circumstances. Never make yourself subject to a test, for any reason. Here it says, even about one in Jñāna Niṣṭhā, 'indriyaṇi pramāthīnai.' It says that the senses make the mind perturbed. That what to say about an ordinary person. Never go to unfavorable circumstances and put yourself to test. Stay in favorable circumstances. In all times, be situated mentally in satsang. Externally, it isn't possible to be in satsang in all times. For a person in the realm of worldly experiences, be situated in satsang mentally, at all times. In all times, obtain viveka. At all times, develop the forthrightness of the mind.

Never justify mistakes. That is called 'forthrightness.' Mistakes are natural for a person travelling on the path. That can happen on any path. Therefore, on this path, also, mistakes will happen naturally. No one should have the idea that

because someone is a brahmachari or sanyassi, he is beyond the senses. It may happen that is unable to move forward according to his desire, and may have a fall. However, when falls happen, one must recognize with forthrightness. With forthrightness, understand, and try to change that.

Otherwise, to cover that, to pretend 'that didn't happen' – before devotees.. but no one can hide things from themselves. Therefore, don't pretend otherwise in front of others. Instead, examine, 'where did this fall happen to me? Where did this happen?' Recognize for yourself and try to change that. For that change, both of these are needed – viveka and mental purity. Therefore, give this subject the seriousness required. This isn't something insignificant.

'Sense control' is something imposible even for ṛṣis. When that comes to the level of ordinary man, don't accept that as an insignificant matter. Only if that happens, can there be this full withdraw, 'samyag upasamharate.' That will also be explained more. There is no difference for a Yati, Sanyassi and a Brahmachari. These are distinguished because of dress. When we say this is for a 'Yati,' a 'sanyassi,' don't think, 'this doesn't affect me because I haven't accepted sanyassa. 'Yati' also means brahmachari. There is no difference in that.

So, when a person acts for this, the primary thing needed is that the circumstances must be favorable. For making the circumstances favorable, he moves away from the society, and comes to the āśram, etc. However, even if he is in the āśram, he will again have to go into the society. This is the opposite nature of before, caused by time. He again goes to the midst of society. So, when we say, 'to go again into the midst of society,' this means when one goes in the midst of attractions.. in those circumstances, the mind and senses may go again to the wrong path. The negative vāsanās within one will again become strong.

This sense control is a means for conquering negative vāsanās. Those vāsanās will again become strong. So, a person going again to the midst of society, the midst of unfavorable circumstances, he needs the mental strength for overcoming those circumstances. He needs mental firmness.

If that firmness of mind is destroyed, then withdraw from that kind of scene. That is the only path. When one goes into society, there will immediately be attractions in the mind. Therefore, for that person, from those attractions, 'withdraw.' That is what is called the āśram. There, there will be favorable circumstances. Then it isn't possible for attractions to come. In olden days, this was called, 'Yati chāri.'

In other words, 'have strict rules and discipline in your life!' For that, sense control is absolutely necessary. Some disciplines of sanyassis have become impractical today. Those values of those disciplines should be imbibed and followed in a suitable manner to today's time. One may make one's own life full of strict observances and controls. Still, this kind of sense control.. This is said particularly in reference to a Yati. This is speaking about the sense control of a Yati, a Sanyassi. The sanyassi or brahmachari connected to society needs boundaries in life. If you step outside the boundary, you'll catch fire. He will burn.

Only a person who himself sets such a firm boundary with rules can avoid living like a mityāchāra - hypocrite. Otherwise, if we transgress that boundary, it will only be a dress. Then he will be a mithyāchāran, a hypocrite.

No kind of doubt is needed. That kind of control of mind is not possible for a person with a human body. Without external control, that will never happen. If someone claims they have that, then that is merely waste of speech. For a person who lives without following strict observances and discipline, internal mental control - that will never happen. 'I practiced japa for some time,' or meditation, or some kind of practice, or studied the Gita, for whatever reason, because of that control of the mind, or sense control is not possible.

If that must be possible, he must engage in strict rules and regulations in his individual life. This is especially for a sanyassi in today's society, etc. Otherwise, if someone declares for themselves, 'I am beyond any fall,' and goes into society, he will be completely destroyed. That is what happened in the Buddha religion, and elsewhere. In the Buddha religion, there were 1000's of monks.

However, the commentator said before, 'dīrghena kālena,' when this was practiced over a long time, 'kāmodbhavāt.' Negative vāsanās were born, and this affects society. If that affects an individual that will affect the society like an epidemic.

If that is one place, it will create destruction everywhere. If that is good in one place, everywhere will be good. That is how it happens in society. So, then these kinds of āśrams come to our society; they change into a joke. That is how the Buddha religion was destroyed. This is because the attitude of disinterestedness comes into the mind. If all of the observances and rules that must be followed in the life of sanyassa are destroyed, that will destroy the sanyassa life. That will destroy the position of sanyassa. That will become a complete joke to the society. That will become the greatest disaster.

This example is there in our country itself. Therefore, from a new explanation of sanyassa, or from organization new speeches, one cannot overcome this problem. One can only accept this is the way of old. Without sanyassis following a life a strict discipline, sense control is impossible. A sanyassi stepping into society and acting, is the most dangerous thing. That is like playing with fire.

How is that? In his individual life, that may destroy him in any moment. In any moment, he can have a downfall. That is very clear. When we say, 'society,' the society is without any of these rules or regulations. People are full of desire and anger. For a Yati to act in such a society, he will surely be affected by the harm of that. Through being affected like that, he will surely have a downfall.

However, today one cannot leave society. One will have to act in society. Then, what one must do, is to accept strict, external regulations in life. Follow the disciplines that remove oneself from enticing circumstances. Only if one follows these is there any meaning in discussions about these matters. Otherwise, all of this becomes a waste. Then, just from studying about sense control won't enable you to control the senses. Once the circumstance changes, in a second, all of this can become a waste.

So, circumstances are primary. There, what is needed is self-control. When we say, 'self-control,' this doesn't mean control of the mind. This means external control. That external control must be practiced strictly. And what about if a person can't follow that strict control?' Then he should go directly to gṛhasthāśrama. If that is going to make one have a downfall in brahmacharya or sanyassa, one should go to gṛhasthāśrama.

Therefore, there is benefit from just having a discussion on this. When this is discussed, what is primarily needed is this. A person must be ready to practice this. If one must be ready to practice this, he must try to only become connected to society while engaging himself in these regulations. In other words, a person must try to not become part of society. Having the attitude to make society good, and stepping to society, and being destroyed – he must avoid this.

When a person, a sanyassi steps down to make society good, he should know that the chance of society becoming good is 100 times less than the chance of him being destroyed. There is 100% chance to he will be destroyed. The chance of society becoming good is 1%. Only if one constantly keeps this in the mind.. this is because many people go to such things. This is because sense control is that severe a matter. That is never possible in unfavorable circumstances. That is only possible in favorable circumstances. Be very careful about that!

That is why this is said. Otherwise, this isn't a śloka to be merely memorized. 'Yadā samharate samyag upasamharate chāyam,' who? 'Jñānaniṣṭhāyām pravṛtto yatih,' the Yati who is in Jñāna Niṣṭhā.' That is the meaning. How is that? 'Kūrmah aṅgāni iva sarvaśaḥ yathā kūrmō bhayāt svāni aṅgāni upasamharati.' This is a good example. In the same way that a turtle, 'kūrma,' out of fear, 'bhayāt,' withdraws its own limbs.. 'sarvaśaḥ sarvataḥ,' from all sides.. Through the example, we can understand.

Once the turtle feels fear of an enemy, it has a strong armor, the shell. It draws its head and legs inside that, and is seated protected. However, the Yati doesn't have a turtle shell to draw his senses in to. Where does he draw them to?

Like the turtle draws in its head and legs, we can't draw in our nose and eyes. That's correct. Then what does the Yati do? That is called 'Yati chārya.'

This only means to engage in external regulations. This means that a Yati cannot be unrestrained. Become engaged in external regulations and observances. Thinking of what is good and bad, the turtle draws its limbs within. Like that, the Yati must be move away from external circumstances. Then some ask, 'even if we move away from external situations, they'll still be in the mind, no?' That is also discussed. Only if you move away from external situations, will the mind not go there. Then it's enough to purify the mind.

It's then enough to make the mind one-pointed, and through that, gain purity. Then, the others actions he performs will become pure. So, it's enough to make the mind pure. In the other way, it isn't so. Then, the actions through all organs become impure. When those organs are controlled, only the mind remains impure. Then it's enough to strive to make the mind pure.

What is situated in the mind goes out through the organs. When the organs are withdrawn from their objects, then the only task left to do is to purify the mind. That is why the example of a turtle was given. It's not possible to withdraw the organs in the midst of worldly objects and sit like a turtle. The organ's action towards the object is the dharma of the body; a part of the body.

Therefore, if there is the presence of worldly objects, the senses will become active. The body will show its nature. If that must be avoided, one can only leave those circumstances. Otherwise, it isn't possible for man to withdraw the senses like a turtle. Then, this means, 'to grasp that Principle.'

From here on, we will speak about several means for this sense control. Out of these means, there is a common matter of moving away from unfavorable circumstances. Don't go to situations that are enticing. Strictly follow external disciplines and regulations. All of these are external matters. Then let that be in the mind, no problem. Even if they come to the mind, there is no problem. Then it's enough to purify the mind; that's all.

First, what is needed is purity of the organs. That must be gained first. The vow of brahmacharya is for that. Then one must be disciplined in those vows. One must not go to what is opposed to those vows, externally. 'But that's still in the mind, isn't it?' Some say this. Some say, 'no matter where or in what my senses act, it doesn't affect me. My mind is beyond all of that.' That is the greatest hypocrisy.

This is said to deceive others. Wherever the senses go, the mind will follow. 'For the senses to act somewhere, and the mind to not go there' – saying this is mere fraudery. That is what is said before- lack of forthrightness; hypocrisy. That's not what is aimed at here. Here, the aim is to control the senses. The example is said for that purpose. Don't operate the senses in unfavorable actions.' That is the aim.

That it is said, 'if a strong internal prompting comes in the mind, and one doesn't act through the senses, won't the mind have conflict?' That will come. There will be strong conflict. When that conflict comes, there is the desire to control the senses. However, the conflict of the mind grows. Then he is defeated in sense control. In that way, if one feels that sense control is impossible, then he need not try. He need not go to sense control. He should not enter this Yatichārya.'

We said before, this sense control is possible only for a person with favorable samskāra. He should go to the gr̥hasthāśrama. That's better than writing new commentaries about sanyassa and other things. Then he should follow the Dharma of the gr̥hastha. That is good for himself and society.

If not, what happens? Then in the same way as the turtle pulls in its organs, he must withdraw from external objects, from all enticing objects. 'Sarvaśaḥ.' This is said in particular. This means, 'from all objects.' This isn't any particular object; wherever the mind is attracted, from all those objects, 'saravataḥ.' He must control all senses.

Then who can do this?' Only a few can do this. This is said for them. This doesn't say that all of society must have this sense control. This is said for

whomever is suitable for that. If not, a person who isn't suitable need not try. That is not the defect of the instruction. A person strives for sense control, and is unable to do so. That isn't the defect of the śāstra. That isn't the defect of the person instructing. This is because he isn't an adhikāri, a suitable practitioner. He doesn't have the samskāra for that.

If negative vāsanās are powerful within him.. negative vāsanās will be within all people. Even for a person without strong negative vāsanās, there will be negative vāsanās. For controlling those vāsanās, this discipline is instructed. 'Evaṁ.' This is a discipline, a chārya. 'Withdraw the senses from the objects. That is *Yatichārya*, the vow of brahmachārya.'

If a person feels that that is impossible, reject that!' That will be practical for him. It doesn't say that this is practical for everyone. It says that this is only practical for rare virtuous souls. This is said, aimed at them. This is said for whomever has favorable samskāra. Here it says, for a person who has entered sense control, 'how can he progress forward?' Otherwise, this doesn't say for a person without suitability to do this.

'Evaṁ,' in this way, '*Jñāna Niṣṭhaḥ*,' a person in *Jñāna Niṣṭhā*, one who has gained *chitta śuddhi* through karma yoga.. that is the meaning. '*Indriyāṇī indriyārthebhyaḥ sarvaviṣayebhyaḥ upasamharate.*' What does he do? He makes sense control perfect. '*Tasya prajñā pratiṣṭhitā ityuktārtham vākyam.*'

'*Iti ukta artham*,' what is the meaning we said before? One with this kind of sense control is the Sthita Prajñan. Only a person with sense control can be a Sthita Prajñan. Sense control is only possible for the Sthita Prajñan. When this is said, however much a person progresses in sense control, in that same way, his Wisdom progresses. However much a person's Wisdom progresses, in that same way will be progress for his sense control.

These two must progress together. They must progress, depending on each other. It isn't that one attains one after attaining the other. That's what is said here. '*Tasya prajñā pratiṣṭhitā.*' His Wisdom becomes established. Without sense control, it isn't possible to be a Sthita Prajñan. It isn't possible to become a

Sthita Prajñan through sense indulgence. 'When one experiences objects, the mind feels peace, when the desire is fulfilled..' This isn't the state of Sthita Prajñan. There are some who teach that.

'Won't the mental balance of a person practicing sense control be destroyed?' Some ask this. 'You said before that the Karma Yogi needs evenness, samatvam. The Karma Yogi needs *samatvam*, and non-attachment, all of these. Along with that training, this training of sense control necessary. When he practices this sense control, powerful enticements will come in the mind. He tries to control that externally. Therefore, won't that break his evenness of mind?' Some have this doubt.

That may happen. We said before, no matter what practice it is, in the level of training, falls will occur. If one succeeds, then that isn't training. Then there's no need for training. In the time when one is training, for mistakes to happen, cannot be considered as ultimate failure. Those are the lessons of experience. Through those lessons, we go forward. Those kinds of mistakes happen to everyone. If a person recognizes those, and imbibes the lesson from them, those mistakes help one to go forward.

Then if there is a break in one's evenness of mind, that will be for making it more firm. That break will happen. However, the enjoyment of objects isn't like that. Through the enjoyment of objects, man's mind becomes peaceful. However, after creating a firm saṁskāra, that will create more disturbance. It says later, 'havisā tṛṣṇavat eva.' Some people say, 'let the mind experience objects. Then it will become peaceful. The mind only becomes peaceful when it experiences objects. Otherwise, the mind cannot become peaceful by drawing away from objects. The mind should experience objects.' These are all new commentaries.

All of these things were said by the Charvakas, the Materialists. The mind gains a firm desire for the experience of objects. That desire makes the mind disturbed. For avoiding that disturbance is the experience of the object. That

experience of the object makes the mind peaceful. This is the correct path of Sādhana.’ There are some who teach this.

This is something that was tested and rejected in the olden times. There are so many examples in the Purāṇas. ‘This is Yoga. This is meditation.’ Numerous ṛṣis have looked examined this. What did they say in the end? ‘*Haviṣā tṛṣṇavat eva.*’ In the way that fuel makes fire grow, like that, the enjoyment of objects only makes longing grow.’ These can never pacify longing.

‘Bring the experience of objects, which is out of control and spontaneous, under control. What everyone says, ‘just be without any control,’ is wrong. Those are things that were tested and rejected in olden times. That can only increase desire. Then some may ask, ‘what about the gṛhasthan? What about his dharma?’ Some ask this. ‘Uncontrolled sense enjoyment is never allowed to a gṛhasthan.’ All of that is bound by regulations. Therefore, what happens? The gṛhasthan is a Karma Yogi.

Therefore, that saṃskāra doesn’t become firm. All of the gṛhasthan’s practices are for chitta śuddhi, mental purity. Truly, the old sankalpa of a ‘karma yogi’ is a gṛhasthan. This didn’t refer to a brahmachari or sanyassi. Because of the change in time, this comes now to brahmacharya and sanyassa; the karmas there change. Truly, in the sankalpa of the commentator and others, only a gṛhasthan is a ‘karma yogi.’ That isn’t a brahmachari or sanyassi.

Why is the gṛhasthan a karma yogi? It isn’t to make his saṃskāras firm. Following dharma, this is to make saṃskara pure, to make the antaḥkaraṇa pure. Therefore, there also, the experience of object will never make saṃskara firm. For the sanyassi and brahmachari, they completely avoid the experience of objects. They make the saṃskāra pure.

And what about the gṛhasthan? Through the experience of objects itself he makes the saṃskāra pure, through control. That is the difference that comes between the two. This is the difference of old times, said clearly. Therefore, through viṣaya tyāga, the renunciation of objects, remove the vāsanās in the

antaḥkaraṇa. That is the path of sanyassa. That isn't through the experience of objects.

That is what is said here, in the śloka. Therefore, 'through experience of objects, the samskāra is removed; vāsanās are controlled.' Saying this is never suitable in the spiritual path. That is only possible through the renunciation of object. That is never possible through experiencing objects. A Yati is someone who must become aware of that. Our Acharyas composed the disciplining of a Yati (*Yatichārya*) for living accordingly.

That is what we must understand in particular here. Now look at the śloka. 'Yadā,' whenever, 'ayam,' the Yati who is in Jñāna Niṣṭhā, 'kūrmāḥ aṅgāni iva,' like the turtle and its limbs, 'indriyāṇi indriyārthebhyaḥ,' his senses from the sense-objects, 'sarvaśaḥ samharate,' in all ways, withdraws, 'tadā,' then, 'tasya prajñā pratiṣṭhitā,' his Wisdom becomes established, firm. We should pay attention to the word used here; 'samharate.' In that, there is no fall or mistake. That is complete withdrawal from the sense objects. 'That must be done by the Yati.' That is what is said.

**Yadā samharate chāyam kūrmāṅgānīva sarvaśaḥ  
Indriyāṇīndriyārthebhyas tasya prajñā pratiṣṭhitā. 2.58.**

**Viṣayā vinivartante nirāhārasya dehinaḥ  
Rasavarjam raso 'pyasya param dṛṣṭvā nivartate. 2.59.**

2.59. 'The objects recede from an abstinent man, with the exception of the taste for them. Even the taste of this person falls away after realizing the Absolute.'

We can look at Shankar's Preface to this śloka. 'Tatra viṣayānanāharataḥ āturyāpi indriyāṇi nivartante kūrmāṅgānīva samhriyante, na tu tad viṣayo rāgaḥ sa katham samhriyate iti uchyate.' This is a question that is normally raised when we discuss about these subjects. 'Viṣayā anāharataḥ.' Because of withdrawing from

sense-objects, how is that? One may gain sense control, but won't that be in the mind? What is the means that is said? This is what a brahmachari or sanyassi thinks. 'Even if we move away from the objects, they are still in the mind.'

Then what must be done next? Because these things are in the mind, one goes to such objects. Then when we move away from the objects, we can see that they are in the mind. They haven't left. Then what is the solution. 'Is it to go back to the objects?' No. You must not go back to objects because they are in the mind. That is the meaning.

In other words, is a person capable of withdrawing from objects? That is an important matter here. What is the difference between a gr̥hasthan and a Yati? A Yati who follows *Yatichārya* is able to withdraw from the objects. 'Can't they be in the mind?' He strives to remove them from the mind.

And what the gr̥hasthan? He is not able to withdraw from objects. So, these objects are in his mind. That is the difference between the two. The Yati is able to pull back from objects. After withdrawing from objects, then what does he do? He destroys them in the mind. That is the difference between the two.

The gr̥hasthan isn't like that. He is controlled by the senses. He has become subservient to the organs. Therefore, he is unable to withdraw from the senses. Therefore, in the midst of objects itself, he strives to withdraw from them, through following Dharma. That is the difference in the Dharma of these two. Both of these aren't the same.

The gr̥hasthan doesn't become a Yati, and the Yati doesn't become a gr̥hasthan. Both are two separate things. You need not think, 'once one becomes a Yati, he can perform the gr̥hastha dharma.' You need not think, 'a gr̥hastha can accept the Yati dharma in gr̥hasthāśrama.' That can never be joined in any place. If one is a Yati, he must pull back from the sense-objects. The Yati Dharma is said only for someone who is capable of withdrawing from the objects. For those who are unable to do that, there is the gr̥hastha dharma.

Whatever is refuted for the Yati, he must withdraw from that externally. The Yati doesn't have the right to declare, 'no matter what it is, externally, that

doesn't have the power to affect my mind.' He must move away from them. If he is incapable of doing that, he accepts the dharma of gr̥hastha. Then he remains in the external objects. He is unable to withdraw from them. Remaining there, he purifies the mind in order to withdraw from these externally. Both groups strive. That is the gr̥hastha's dharma.

Here it says, '*tatra viṣayān ahārataḥ.*' He doesn't accept objects. Just from that, doesn't mean that one has obtained sense control, '*indriya nigrahaṁ.*' Why is that? '*āturasya āpi,*' a person who is ill.. doesn't he have sense control, a sick person? Doesn't sense control happen for a person whose sense are weak? Or, those who do severe tapas? This is called '*kaṣṭha tapas.*' Don't those who perform tamasic tapas gain sense control? '*Karṣayan te śarīras taṁ bhūtgrāmam achetasaṁ.*' The Lord says this, 'some perform severe tapas without any discrimination. There are some like that. They expect some kind of *siddhi*. They also have sense control.

Here, the 'sense control,' being discussed is none of that. '*āturasyāpi indriyāṇi kūrmāṅgānīva saṁhriyante.*' 'Don't such people also experience control of the sense, like the turtle and its limbs?' However, there is a difference there. What is that? '*Na tu tadviṣayo rāgaḥ.*' However, they don't destroy the rāga, the attachment to those objects. That rāga in the antaḥkaraṇa is never destroyed there.

Then what does a Yati do? He withdraws from external objects, following Yaticārya. Then what does he do? '*Sa katham saṁhriyate.*' What does he practice? How does he destroy this rāga? He also does practices for that. That is also what a gr̥hasthan must do; it must be a means for destroying rāga. However, the gr̥hasthan doesn't separate from objects to destroy rāga; he has to be in the midst of objects itself.

The Yati isn't like that. He separates from all objects. That is difference in the dharmas of the two; the dharma of the Yati, and the dharma of the gr̥hasthan. While being situated in the midst of objects, the gr̥hasthan strives to destroy rāga. The Yati withdraws from objects, and strives to destroy rāga. Therefore, both of these are distinctly separated. One is Jñāna, and the other is

Karma. This is where *Shan̄karāchārya* becomes very strict. The dharma of the Yati is the sanyassa dharma. That becomes strict.

This is said next in the *bhāṣyā*. ‘Iti uchyate.’ This is said, in the śloka. ‘*Yadā iti. Yadyapi viṣayāḥ viṣayoṣalakṣitāni viṣayaśabdavāchyāni indriyāṇi.*’ The śloka says, ‘*viṣayā vinivartante.*’ Here, the commentator is giving two meanings of this. We can take the word ‘*viṣaya*’ to mean ‘*indriya*,’ or sense.’ This can mean, ‘whenever the senses are withdrawn..’ Otherwise, the word ‘*viṣaya*’ can mean ‘sense-objects.’ ‘Whenever the sense withdraw from the objects..’ That meaning can also be said.

This is just a small problem that comes in the commentary. This is to find the solution, that the commentator explains the word ‘*viṣaya*’ in two ways. In either way, the meaning is only one. ‘*Viṣayāḥ viṣayoṣalakṣitāni viṣayaśabdavāchyāni indriyāṇi.*’ This means, ‘we should understand the meaning of ‘senses’ from the word ‘*viṣaya*.’ It says, ‘*viṣayoṣalakṣitam.*’ This means the ‘senses, which are not separate from the word ‘*viṣaya*.’ This is because whenever something becomes an object of the senses, these are connected together. Therefore, if needed, you can say that the word ‘*viṣaya*’ can mean ‘senses.’

This is saying one side. Because of the commentary, that can be. So, ‘*viṣaya upalakṣitāni.*’ When it says, ‘*upalakṣitam,*’ this doesn’t directly say that the meaning is the ‘senses.’ However, because the senses are constantly situated in the experience of objects, the meaning of the word ‘*viṣaya*’ can mean the ‘senses, which are upalakṣitam, indicated by the sense-objects. ‘*Viṣayaśabdavāchyāni indriyāṇi.*’ Thus, the meaning of the word ‘*viṣaya*’ can be ‘the senses.’

Thus, those senses, ‘*vinivartante,*’ when they withdraw. Then, ‘*nirāhārasya anāhriyamāṇaviṣayasya kaṣṭe tapasi sthitasya mukhasyāpi vinivartante.*’ A person who is ‘*nirāhāra,*’ abstinent of sense-objects. This means, ‘*anāhriyamāṇaviṣayasya*’ – one who doesn’t grasp objects. Here, the word ‘*āharati*’ means – to grasp, to accept. This doesn’t mean, ‘to eat food.’ This means to grasp sense-objects.

‘*Anāhriyamāṇaviṣayasya*’ – the senses that don’t grasp the external objects, whose are they? ‘*kaṣṭe tapasi sthitasya,*’ one who is in severe tapas, through

accepting severe vows. They injure the body through tapas, through these vows. 'Such vows aren't to be done!' This is also said. Those kinds of vows aren't possible for an ordinary sādhak. These vows which torture the body aren't possible.

'*Mām chaitvāntaśarīrastham, Tān vidhyāsura niśchaya.*' Without knowing that I am situated within the body, asuric fools torture the body.' The Lord Himself says this. 'It is I who am within the body. But there are some who give suffering to me.' There are some who don't eat food, or drink water.. That is '*kaṣṭe tapasi sthitasya murkhasyāpi.*' For such a fool, a *murkhan*, '*vinivartante,*' doesn't he withdraw from the sense-objects?'

When we speak about this tapas, This tapas of fools, of torturing the body,' when this is said, we have a doubt. 'There have been many Mahātmas who performed severe tapas. Are they fools?' That's not what is aimed at here. Here, the tapas that is indicated is tapas for insignificant siddhis. Chant mantras. Perform practices. The aim of these is attaining some kind of siddhi. Here, that is the aim of this kind of tapas.

Great Jñānis and Siddhas also perform tapas. That is for destroying their prārabdha. That kind of tapas is not indicated here. Here, it is tapas, devoid of any discrimination. This person is called, '*murkhan,*' a fool.' Don't think that wherever you see tapas, that person has no viveka. In the life of some Siddhas, they performed tapas for destroying prārabdha. This isn't what is indicated. This a different kind of tapas, for gaining siddhis. Without any discrimination, these are practices performed for some kind of attainment. 'Don't drink water, don't drink food..' All of that is rajasic and tamasic tapas. We will discuss that later.

For such people, there eyes remain closed, they don't move their arms and legs.. so isn't there sense withdrawal there?' '*Dehinaḥ dehavataḥ,*' these individuals, how is this? '*Rasavarjam rāgo viṣayeṣu yaḥ taṁ varjayitvā.*' This word should be included with the first phrase. Thus, it is '*viṣayā vinivartante nirāhārasya dehinaḥ rasavarjam.*' The meaning is '*rasavarjam vinivartante.*' The means that the rasa, the taste for these objects remains.

Rāga, attachment to the objects remains in the mind. The mind of the Yati is like that. The Yati moves away from sense-objects. However, there is rāga, attachment in the Yati's mind. That is subtle. However, that isn't like the tapas of a fool described before. The Yati will be aware about that rāga. The Yati knows, 'that is to be discarded, to be renounced.' The Yati is someone who constantly strives for that.

The meaning of the word 'Yati' is '*yamana śīlam*.' The root of the word 'yati' itself is '*prayatnam*,' effort. When we hear the word 'yati,' we think of someone who is too lazy to do any work. However, what is the root of the word 'yati.' It is '*prayatne*' – to strive.' So, the Yati, the sanyassi, is one who strives at all times. Laziness has no relationship at all with that.

The word 'yati' was created itself from the meaning, 'one who constantly strives.' So, what does the Yati do? He avoids external sense-objects. This means that he constantly strives. What for? It is for destroying that rasa. It is for destroying rāga, that he acts.

The bhāṣyā says, '*rasaśabdo rāge prasiddhaḥ*.' The word 'rasa' is well-known to mean 'rāga,' attachment. This means that this meaning is accepted in the śāstras. '*Svarasena pravṛttaḥ rasikaḥ rasajñah*.' So it says, '*svarasena pravṛttaḥ*,' one who acts with his own rasa, is called, '*rasikaḥ*,' or '*rasajñah*,' one who knows rasa. This is used in this way in the śāstras. This is explaining how the meaning of rasa is given as 'rāga,' attachment. This answer is based in rules of language.

The meaning is that the senses withdrawal, but the rasa, the taste remains. What is the meaning of 'rasa?' It is 'rāga,' attachment. That rāga is 'ekendriya,' based in only one sense-organ. That is in the mind. So there is rāga in the mind of the Yati. The Lord says later that having withdrawn the mind from sense-objects, yet still having attachment is called a '*mithyāchāra*,' a hypocrite. Does that make the Yati a *mithyāchāran*?' No. If one is a Yati, he is not a mityāchāran.

What is a Yati? He is '*yamana śīlam*' – he constantly practices self-control. A Yati is one who has rāga within and strives to destroy it. If one strives to destroy that, then he is not a mityāchāran. He has withdrawn from the sense-objects. To

withdraw from the sense-objects is the first step. The second step one must take is to destroy internal attachment, *rāga*.

If one is a *mityāchāran*, what does he do? He withdraws from objects. He keeps attachment intact in the mind. Through the prompting of that attachment, he will again jump into the experience of the sense-objects, out of control. That is called a ‘*mityāchāran*.’ This is also called ‘*puccha sanyassi*,’ a pussycat sanyassi. For some time, he will be still and calm. He will observe vows. Again, he will go and get something. That is how the name ‘*puccha sanyassa*’ came about.

They stay for some time in the Yati Dharma, and then again leave. That is *mityāchāran*. If there is attachment in the mind of the Yati, that doesn’t make him a *mityāchāran*. Why is that? While *rāga* is within.. otherwise, this yati *chārya* would not be necessary. This *Yatichārya*, the discipline of a Yati, is an *āśrama*. That is a dharma. He practices dharma. What does it mean, that ‘he has a dharma?’ That means that there are several things within him that must be discarded and rejected.

A person who strives in that way is a Yati. Otherwise, shaving your head, putting on ochre, wearing *rudrākṣa mālā*, smearing sacred ash and sandalwood paste, then saying, ‘I’m beyond all dharmas. I have no rules and regulations.’ A Yati is not someone who goes around saying this. Instead, this is someone who constantly acts. That is a Yati. What does he strive for? ‘So ‘*pi raso rañjanārūpaḥ sukṣmaḥ asya yateḥ*.’

That is within the Yati. What is that? That is ‘*rasa*.’ That is ‘*rañjanārūpaḥ*,’ of the nature of delight.. That has the capacity for making the mind delight in sense-objects, and is subtle. Therefore, the Yati must be careful. That is subtle. It is seated within him in a subtle form. ‘so ‘*pi raso*.’ That is in the form of *vāsana*. Therefore, no one should go mad just from some external dress. You must be careful!’ That is what is said.

‘*Raso rañjanārūpaḥ*.’ That taste which makes one delight in sense-objects is seated within. ‘*Asya yateḥ*,’ for that Yati, ‘*param paramārthatattvam brahma dṛṣtvā*

*upalabhya 'ahameva tat' iti vartamānasya nivartate nirbījam viṣayavijñānam saṃpadyate ityarthah.'*

However, that is also destroyed. How is that? '*Param dṛṣṭvā nivartate.*' That 'rasa' is destroyed. '*Param dṛṣṭvā.*' Because of that, we will think, 'isn't that a Swami?' Is that true for Swami? That can be true for Swami. If that isn't true for Swami, that is a wonder. Why is that? '*Rañjanarūpaḥ sukṣmaḥ.*' There is subtle rasa within him, which prompts one to delight in objects. That, param paramārthatattvaṃ dṛṣṭvā.' Only through Realization of the Supreme Truth will that go. Only through discrimination of the Supreme Truth, through the '*paramārthatattvam,*' *brahma, param dṛṣṭvā, upalabhya.*' Only then will it be destroyed.

'*Ahameva tat' iti vartamānasya.*' Therefore, what is said in the Gita? '*Jñānāgni sarvakarmāṇi bhāsmāsat kuruterjuna.*' The Lord says this in the end to Arjuna. All of that must be burnt to ash by the fire of Knowledge. In the perfection of that viveka, in the conclusion of that, only then.. '*ahameva tat' iti vartamānasya.*.. only for the Yati in perfect Realization, 'nivartate,' that also withdraws.

'*Nirbījam saṃpadyate.*' The knowledge of objects because '*nirbījam,*' seedless, devoid of a seed. Until then, '*Na asati samyagdarśanarasasya ucchedaḥ.*' Without *samyak darśana*, complete Realization, the rasa cannot be destroyed. That is the meaning. That will only be destroyed through the fire of Knowledge.

That will be destroyed. The Yati will destroy. However, having strictly followed the discipline of a Yati, through the practices of hearing and contemplation, for one in Jñāna Niṣṭhā, who has gained firmness in discrimination, or one who has attained direct Self-Realization – only then will this rasam be destroyed. That is the meaning.

Therefore, what must the yati do? '*Tasmāt,*' therefore, '*samyagdarśanātmikāyāḥ prajñāyāḥ sthairyam kartavyam ityabhiprāyaḥ.*' This Prajñā, or Wisdom, which is Perfect Realization, (*samyak darśana*), in that discrimination, '*sthairyam kartavyam*' – he must gain firmness in that. A person

must gains firmness in that. In that way, this rasam must be discarded. That is what is said. Now look at the śloka.

‘*Dehinaḥ,*’ for one with a body – this is very important. Even though he is a Yati, because he has a body.. this means he hasn’t reached Perfection.

‘*Nirāharasya,*’ the individual who abstains from sense-objects, ‘*Rasavarjam viṣayāḥ vinivartante.*’ Though he doesn’t grasp external objects, these external objects withdrawn, except for rāga, attachment towards them.

‘*Asya raso api,*’ Even that *rasa*, the attachment within him, ‘*param dṛṣṭvā nivartate,*’ only through Realization of the *Paramātman* does that withdraw.

**Viṣayā vinivartante nirāhārasya dehinaḥ  
Rasavarjam raso ‘pyasya param dṛṣṭvā nivartate. 2.59.**

**AUM AMRITESHVARYAI NAMAH**