

INTRODUCTION TO VEDANTA, Part 2

REVIEW: Type 1: अप्राप्तस्य प्राप्ति Apraptasya Prapti – gain of something I do not have

This is the normal method of leading our lives. In Vedanta, it is called 'life of becoming', to gain total freedom. But the issue is this: does it ever happen? Don't all lives end unfulfilled, only to repeat itself in subsequent life. It is like catch 22. I can neither give up my desire to be unconditionally free, and nor ever achieve it. It is like trying to swim across the endless ocean. Life this way should be seen as भाव सागर - an ocean of becoming or changing, or a changeless change. It just does not work. Life is an unending circle: Self-assess (pt. A), then taking some actions to get to the next place (pt. B), Then assess again, take further action, and on and on... This is the background *shruti* that is only temporarily interrupted by "Happy Hour."

Type 2: प्राप्तस्य प्राप्ति Praptasya Prapti – the gain of something that I already have but do not recognize

Vedanta says our needs are valid, but perhaps the methods to fulfill not so. In fact, make a complete switch to look for the gain of the already gained.

New material:

This requires a complete transformation in the way we look at everything in life. Here knowledge becomes primary, and actions supportive.

Now, the nature of knowledge is ability to understand. Starting with simple equations, like $2+2=?$ Requires one to be 2 years old, sophisticated equations like $e = mc^2$, has to be understood with considerable preparation and eligibility. Like the study of any subtle subject (i.e., theoretical physics, science, engineering), the study of Vedanta requires preparation and readiness to engage in study. It needs to be studied structurally, building upon previous knowledge, reviewing etc.

NEXT PHASE/BUILDING BLOCK of following the (2nd) classification of unconditional freedom: looking at the preparation required when dealing with more subtle and more sophisticated knowledge (ज्ञानं jñanam).

In Vedanta, the equation/*sadhya* to be understood is:

The limited individual = the unlimited whole.

The Limited Becoming Unlimited

End knowledge is called **sadhya** – साध्य = what is to be established. This is a sophisticated, subtle, to-be-established knowledge. This knowledge is in the form of an equation, where the left side seems completely different from the right side.

Sadhya requires the appropriate eligibility and preparation.

Sadhana comes from same root 'सिद्ध sidh.' Here, it is the means to understand **sadhya**. (the one who is established in the goal is called सिद्ध - siddha

You, the seeker, are in fact the sought. You are already complete. This needs to be understood. Now, how do we set about understanding this??

The difference b/t a falsehood and truth is **inquiry**. If you do not inquire, falsehood can appear as truth. If you analyze, come closer and inquire, the truth comes out and the falsehood disappears.

EX: Swami Maheshananda was invited to someone's house for a meal. He wasn't offered a sweet, so reached for fruit on a plate after his meal. The host stopped him—he looked closer and saw they were fake/decorator fruits!

My self-assessment is false b/c I have not analyzed it enough. If I do, it transforms itself to a certain truth that was unavailable/not visible/not understood by me.

The Analysis/Classification of Truth.

Truth = Reality (truth means it should be real, even if it appears to be false)

There are 3 different classes/tools of Truth we should be aware of:

1. **Satyam** (Truth) = not untrue under any circumstances. Otherwise it will become conditionally true.
 - a. The *quality* of being true.
 - b. Diff b/t *satyam* and *sat*: *sat* = true.
2. **Asatyam** (Untruth) = not true under any circumstances.
 - a. EX: a square circle (it's either a square or circle, there's no such thing as a "square circle")
3. **Mithya** = neither *satyam* nor *asatyam*, but a little bit of both.
 - a. This is the important one to consider
 - b. Fun fact: "myth" may have been derived from "*mithya*"

| Satyam | vs. | Mithya |
|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------------------|
| Ocean water | | Wave or broken ice floating in ocean |
| No beginning/end | | Has a beginning/end |
| Secure: not afraid of dying | | Insecure: Cognizant of fact it'll die |
| Independent | | Dependent (on satyam) |

Formless

Has a name and form नाम रूप

Reason we are not completely blown over by our mortality is b/c deep in our hearts we know we are immortal. If we didn't know that, even subconsciously, we would never be able to stop thinking about dying and enjoy our lives.

Examples to Explore This Concept of *Mithya*

Consider this: Every object has its own name. Some have synonyms:

EX: water = H²O = pani (Hindi)

Here in the example of water and wave, why are there two names for the same object? Are there 2 different objects? If there are 2 different objects, they should have independent reality.

EX: A table sits steady in the room, but the chair can move away from the table. Each object has its own identity, independent of the other. But a wave can't separate itself from water in the same manner. Instead, it has a separate name and form, even as it's all water (same content, taste, texture). There is nothing independent, except for a name (wave) and function (to rise and fall).

EX: Indian bride getting married and gets gold from her parents. Lot of fighting going on—mother wants traditional ornamentation, but bride argues that she wants something more modern. Father and goldsmith are agnostic while women fight over something that doesn't make any sense to the men. If *mithya* was not there, they would not be fighting. One is concerned with value, the other with appearance. Ornaments have the same weight/luster as gold, but has some kind of name and functionality. An ornament has no independent reality.

Swami Dayananda-ji: This is how we get confused by *mithya*. *Mithya* means a **quality** so the noun = water and the quality = waviness. If we have a golden chain and say the chain = noun and golden = quality, this is absolutely inappropriate. You have elevated quality to a noun and have discarded the noun to be a quality. Instead, you should say "chainy gold." This is much closer to the truth b/c the gold can be a chain, or it can be melted back to non-chaininess.

Dependency of *mithya* means it is depending on *satyam* and is masquerading as something else.

Anything that name and form is *mithya*. Naama rupa.

Anything that has form is dependent on something else. It doesn't have its own existence. This is why we say *mithya* has a little bit of *satyam* (chain of gold).

We are formful individuals (body, mind, sense organs, life-giving properties, etc.). How do I look? How is my body? We're very concerned about it, aware of this

formful thing. We're unconcerned/unaware about what this form resides on. From there, one can make the judgment that **our involvement w/*mithya* is relatively immature and the involvement w/the content of *mithya* is relative maturity.**

EX: Carats of gold. Gold in purist form is brittle and cannot make ornaments so must mix with non-gold to make more malleable. The mature father can talk to goldsmith and see content of the gold b/c he's concerned w/value. But the daughter is unconcerned—she just wants pretty looking chain (form).

We are, from a standpoint of spirituality, immature b/c we are very concerned about our forms. We don't yet know the value of the *satyam* that the *mithya* is depending on. We're unaware of it. How can it be that I don't know myself?!

Vedanta says: it makes a statement we'll have to prove later on.

To understand formlessness is the sophistication and subtlety of this jñanam. This is where preparation is required.

You need to have right tuning/preparation to understand. To see an object, you just need a pair of eyes. To see something the object consists of, you need some help—an instrument that is consistent w/subtlety of what you're looking at. EX: Looking for virus, instruments are more subtle than instruments looking for bacteria.

Sadhana must be appropriate to *sadhya* in order to understand subtlety of my formlessness. It has to be my formlessness, as we will prove. *Satyam* is absolutely subtle—it is subtlest! You need proper mind's thinking.

Our minds right now are childlike. We are spiritually childlike.

The very existence of the word 'knowledge' requires readiness to understand. To lift something you need strength, but what do you need for knowledge? You need **eligibility**: for subtle objects requires an eligible mind.

NEXT BUILDING BLOCK: Eligibility

First, understand the *lack* of eligibility: Our involvement/fascination w/formful things alone. Non-inquiry into something more than that, about something being *mithya* will keep us ineligible. We take formful things as *satya*, reality, without further inquiry.

The world bothers me, therefore it must be real. Non-real things cannot bother me. If something bothers me, it must be real. NOT NECESSARILY!

EX: You go to a movie, knowing it's not real. But you are in tears when heroine experiencing injustice. How can you be troubled by non-real things?

→ Life is a movie. It appears to be real, but it isn't. And yet, you're bothered by it.

Eligibility to understand *satyam*/reality vs. *mithya*/kinda-real.

CATEGORIES OF ELIGIBILITY

Viveka: discriminative knowledge. Making a distinction b/t *satyam* and *mithya*.

Viveka forms the bedrock for understanding of Vedanta.

EX: A young actress had 2 daughters: 3 and 9 years old. One day she can't find babysitter, and takes them to work. She plays a battered woman and is crying on stage. The 3 year old is worried, the older one says it's OK, it's just a play! 3 year-old runs to mother on stage. At a certain age you cannot distinguish what is a play and what is real. 9 year old understands it's pretend and that mom is getting paid for it. 3 year old doesn't get it—you can't explain it to her. She doesn't want her mom to be hurt.

There is a play going on. And I don't have the *viveka*. From a spiritual standpoint, I am still a 3 year-old. I hate to get hurt and I get upset when people say things to me.

Next week: more categories of eligibility. What courses I have to take (what my shortcomings are). Forms a big content of the Bhagavad Gita.