

2023 0719 Wednesday Communing on Plotinus 6.8.16 PART 1

Between the Wednesdays, a few ideas showed up....

* A class on *The Unveiling Of Reality* 0109 1980, where people are asking: What does PB mean by Mind? What does he mean by World Mind? What is Reality? When he says there's only the One, or there's only Mind, or Mind is continuous with its appearance. How does that fit with Plotinus? "how does the many come from the one?" [I send a link to this on the web.]

* A second lead that showed up was *aspara*. the literal meaning is non touching or possibly touching the untouchable-- PB translation from the Advaita: the touch of the No touch or the touch of the untouchable or the yoga of the untouchable., [see link to PB quotes... on the web]

[Aspara Yoga: The literal meaning is "non-touching" or, possibly, "touching the Untouchable." Everything is either related to, or in contact with, something else, that is, in touch with it. But in the state of Aspara there is no such possibility because the nondual Brahman is alone acknowledged, THAT which is uncontacted by anything. 28.2.138](#)

The One or Brahman is beyond being, and yet everything arises from it. Are we talking about how do we get back to it? If it's untouchable? And yet he says nowhere is it not? How do we understand this?

On Youtube, a great modern Vedanta Swami gives a good metaphor for No touch. If you have a pot made out of gold does the gold touch the pot? No, that would be silly, of course. The gold doesn't touch the pot that is made out of gold. And remember the Golden Lion.

We read last time: Lovable, very love the supreme Self love. But does that mean that the one loves itself, or knows itself? That's not right. There's nothing else but itself. Does The One give rise to the Nous... well, was it there to begin with in the one? How would it come out if it wasn't already there. But how could there be anything in the absolute One? How would the Golden Lion lion forms come out of the gold? The gold is formless-- but formless doesn't mean unformable. This is very formidable! There's only the gold. There's not a separate reality. But the gold is present imminently, immediately in all the lion forms. But it doesn't touch the form. It doesn't change into something else for the lion form to arise.

And: in the clay pot metaphor... Where did the pot come from? I mean, in a dualistic sense, no problem. The Potter made the shape of the pot from their mind? But here we read: there's only the One-- from the unveiling of reality. There's only the one and then everything else is. Continuous with that, but these are great mysteries. The ocean waving. Gold is itself Lioning... this is Shakti.

In this 0109 1980 class on *the unveiling of reality* chapter in The Wisdom there is a related discussion. Anthony brings in the Plotinus 6.8.16 and 5.1.6. people in the class ask: Are you saying there are two realities? Well, no. Is the World-Mind reality as well?

There is only this one Mind. All else is a seeming show on its surface. To forget the ego and think of this infinite and unending reality is the highest kind of meditation. 28.2.102

Ultimately the one reality. All else is a seeming show on its surface. Oh my God PB. Is the World-Mind also a seeming show, or is the World-Mind in essence the same as the one Mind? Where did the lion form come from? It didn't come from outside the gold, but the gold has no form to it. Or it's formable in all ways. What allows the formidable form to arise? That's the World-Mind. What's the relation of the World-Mind as the active aspect with gold as the ultimate. God knows. That is the top-down reason for "World-Mind" as the active aspect of Mind. And from the bottom up: universal manifestation is within World-Mind, and the still ultimate nature of World-Mind is Mind itself. Mind is Gold, and World-Mind is the formability of Gold: to appear as the infinite lion forms.

Do we include WM in Reality itself? Is the WM intrinsic to, but implicit in, Mind? As Taimni puts it: there are infinity of Logoi in Parabrahman: can't have manifestation without a center of manifesting... and not that the Logoi are potential and Brahman actual: the logoi are inseparable from Brahman.

For me this is a motivation to think about this infinite and unending reality. This is a great meditation. Even if you don't figure out The One, even if it's beyond being. It's great to meditate on. It'll help clear our minds. It'll take our minds off the local limited finite problems we have. Then put them on a real problem like how does the money come from the one? What's the relation of this self-love of the one with the love that we find in ourselves? What does Plotinus mean? And where he says "though it is nowhere, nowhere is it not." These are profound meditations. PB is telling us in the philosophic yoga way. take these profound statements about ultimate reality and meditate on them.

There's the touch of the untouchable.

There is at once act and repose, very profound.

And the third question that comes up: Is the news reality, isn't the Overself reality?

I don't think Anthony intended to answer them then and I don't think he would have been to answer them now, but they're intended to get us to, to shake us up.

Cleta: I think of reality a couple of different ways. Active part of mind, which is World Mind, but at the same time PB talks in the Hidden Teaching that it's the underlie of everything. It's the real, the Realness of that the underlie the stillness. So the word, reality sounds like it's mind. Would you say?

AS

Yes, we can call it mind itself, Mind, Capital M, Brahman, primordial awareness from Plotinus, The One. OK, but as soon as you begin using those words, as you just said, PB uses words world-mind. In Vedanta, Brahman without attributes and Brahman with attributes. They use the same

word Brahman, but qualified and unqualified. And I believe PB's doing the same thing with Mind and world Mind. Mind itself is unqualified. World Mind is mind, with the qualification active.

Cleta

So when he says reality is continuous with its appearance, it's that the inactive part of mind that is continuous with the active part. Or Mind with the world Mind.

Avery: That's a very good interpretation. Another interpretation could be that Reality refers to Mind and world Mind. Mind passive and mind active are reality... or rather reality is both Active and Passive... and appearance is everything else-- form world.

If the one which is the ultimate reality is both active and passive perfection or act and repose, and everything else participates in that, or gets its reality from that. One way to solve this reality appearance question is to say that reality is both Passive and active, still and active. Or in the Shaivite tradition, it's both awareness and vibration. Shiva and Shakti.

Are we including in Reality both Active Shakti and Passive Siva, as Plotinus does in 6.8.16? If you say "reality continuous with its appearance": does this mean the Inactive is Mind itself, continuous with Active, then you are saying inactive is Reality and Active is Appearance. Or we can say: the inactive, repose, is Mind Itself, or One itself, as discontinuous with appearance, and Active, Shakti, is Reality or Mind Itself as continuous with appearance.

Cleta

wouldn't you say that both active mind and inactive is in world-mind? It's in Overself right down here to us. Those two things, stillness and active comes all the way down.

Avery

Yes. PB An ever active mind within an ever still mind that is the real truth, not only about God, but also about man. Category 25, Section 1, 9

Cleta

And that goes all the way up and all the way down.

Avery

Yes. All the way up and all the way down.

Avery

Reality is 1. It's absolutely I Rahman self identical period.

Reality is complementarity. It's two still inactive Shiva and Shakti. You name them.

3/3. Reality is also three. It is the good, the true and the beautiful. It is sad, cheat, Ananda.

Reality is fourfold, is it not? Look at the Mandela. The one the noose, the soul, and the entire blessed cosmos. The whole thing. And other ways to speak about or states of consciousness, et cetera, right.

Can't we also say 5? I'll leave that for now.

in one way. Sarvam, he tat Brahman, everything's Brahman. We're done. Everything is Brahman is, I believe, what they call asparsa. You need to get the touch of the untouchable. It doesn't require numbers. It doesn't require a whole lot of thought. It requires complete and total self surrender in some form. To recognize immediately that every single piece of that lion is gold. You need a better lion form? No. Is gold more somewhere else than other? Everything's Brahman. And then you go on to the next pointer:

mind is mysteriously as still. As it is self active. Or an ever active mind within an ever still mind. That's another truth about reality and very important. It doesn't just reduce everything is Brahman, OK. And then they ask. But what's Brahman if everything is Brahman and there's nothing else? That's a good that's. That's the view from the number one. Yes, it's all one next. Complementarity and ever active mind within and ever still mind. That's great Shiva and Shakti. Very nice. Right. And a threefold and. Thank you very much. I I think that will help us with our reading.

How to say it: One view is that Reality is both still and active. Another is that ultimate reality is still, and relative reality is active: two truths. Is it that reality is ineffable, and even Nous is appearance. Or that One-Nous-Soul is Reality and manifestation is appearance?

How does the relation of reality to the appearance change depending on whether we're looking at it from the point of view of the one, or of the intellectual principle, or of the soul, or of manifestation?

Cleta

Brahman. If it's both active and inactive, it's both the reality and the appearance. Ohh and look. From the mind looking down, that's what it is. But beyond Brahman, para Brahman is where the union is. Yoga is union with where there's only the one when it's projected out or or something. It becomes both the active and inactive. Her world mind arises. But that's then becomes a duality. So in order to get to the non dual or the oneness which is pure mind in itself, it would have to be parabrahma.

Avery

What I mean by Brahman. Nirguna without attributes, that is parabrahman. Brahman with attributes. That's called saguna Brahman. So I take it that. The word. Nirguna Brahman or what you said Parabrahman any word you want you that's OK. There is an attribute which equates

equates with Plotinus's. The one of course. **(Mind and WM) [get AD comment from ch90 of Ohio]**

Avery

The one this is the highest Plotinus goes parabrahman the ones self originating self tendance at once act and repose. Far as I can tell, he's talking about Brahman itself here. And he's very clear. We're going to read about. He's not talking about the one and the Nous. He's talking about the ones interior self regard itself. This is unusual. I don't know if if Veda would accept this, but here's the thing. We've made a big point that Reality is both Shiva and Shakti.

[but then have we qualified the "parabrahman"? Is the One beyond siva-sakti, or is it inclusive of them? Or is it beyond as Nirguna and inclusive as Saguna? Is both Nir and Sa in first quadrant? Or is Nir only first quadrant, and all the rest is Saguna... i.e. WM?]

So when PB says reality is continuous with its appearance,

Is he talking about Shiva and Shakti being continuous.

That's reality. Shiva Shakti is continuous with appearance.

But if you want to equate Reality as stillness with mind itself and reality as active as the world mind. Then we've got a kind of a hierarchy with stillness and activity..

But if we go to the Plotinus quote, we're going to read the one itself is both act and repose. That's not a hierarchy. if we have a hierarchy within reality that's interesting: but if we put both of them Shiva and Shakti together is reality and say the appearance is the manifest then we also have a whole other view that's very interesting and paradoxical.

There are two ways to think about this complementarity active and passive perfection.. There are two ways to think about the reality continuous with its appearance.

Brahman, as still as formless as Nirguna ultimate absolute. That's the top of the top and then Brahman with attributes as active. That's a lower stadia. Sometimes PB's mind and world mind seem like that. What about Siva/Sakti?

So can we leave those questions open and just hold them as very, very great questions. It's probably all of the above in some way because the third thing is what Linda mentioned to begin with and others have pointed out. Elephants all the way down. There is this complementarity all the way since it's there in the one in reality itself expresses itself through complementarities all the way down.

Anthony says if the world mind were not already present in the mind itself. If the news were not already there, present in the one itself, couldn't. Come out. It couldn't actualize. We would just. It would just stay in the formless, nothingness beyond being void. And we won't be here to be nothing. Just the one. But that's not the deepest teaching. we'll read platinus where he says the intellectual causes that are to arise as the actual world. Going I've gotta be already are there. In

that infinite depths of power. That is the ultimate reality. And Avery's language is. Gold can lion. That's its active aspect. Lioning is not imposed on the gold from outside. It's not arbitrary. It's not an illusion. It's an. The metaphor breaks down because normally gold doesn't have that kind of power. But imagine whatever you call the reality, the gold. It is infinite in fathomless depths of power, the gold itself and lionizing is an expression of whatever is deeply intrinsic, not explicit, but implicit. The gold, just like the dreams, are implicit to the mind having them and so.

Judy

we have this fundamental complementarity of simultaneity and hierarchy, but wouldn't you say as soon as we open our mouths we take a stance and there's not only the unfolding, but there's also the resolving. and in this text it's challenging us in some impossible way to resolve into the unresolvable unfoldable.

Avery

Right.

Again, we brought in asparsa. That it's a direct, immediate experiential knowing by going beyond everything. You don't have to go anywhere. It's absolutely immediately accessible, always and already.

“ We maintain and it is evident truth that the supreme is everywhere. And yet nowhere.” Another paradox, right? But it's saying you can go through all the yogas you want. You can do all the practices. You can do all that. Reality won't be any closer or any further or anything. It's direct, immediate, accessible. And that will resolve the apparent duality of appearance and reality, at least for you, for the ray of the sun. In reality, there was no distinction. But an appearance there is. In reality, there is no separation of reality and appearance, cause there's nothing else real. From the point of view of appearance, there is a distinction, the separation. Even appearance appears to be a separation of the appearance and the reality. I gotta do something to get there. And I gotta do my practices even very personally. I've gotta do the diving board. I've gotta jump off. That's very appropriate. and if we do that and grow up, we will heal that sense of separateness. I like your word resolve and absorb. That was another word we used last week was very good. You will be absorbed by the reality.

Judy

You're also talking about the magic of that word, continuity continuum, but I really loved your statement. Formless doesn't mean unformable. That was really helpful.

Avery

Yes, Formless does not mean unformat able and they always use. They use many examples. Golden Lion is a good one, but yes. Formless but formable.

Citsukha who after 1000 years debate with the Buddhists finally defined consciousness,. He says never an object which is absolutely unobjective. You can't take it out and look at it, but it's immediately usable in every moment of experience. Never an object, never objective. You can't

make it a content, but it's immediately usable in every moment of experience you say and science says, *but we can't measure it*. It is the measure, not the measured. But then it doesn't exist? no, it allows everything else to exist. It is the Is-ness of what is, but it is not a what. But then what are you talking about? Then he says you have to have the direct, immediate experience. There weren't many invaders who got this, but there were one or two Christians. Go read Saint Francis. *What you're looking for is what's looking*.

Rick

This goes back to when you said elephants all the way down. Or turtles all the way down.

it's this all the way down part that you have at the very big top level. I hate to say this because now I'm hierarchical. But you have.

Avery

Both, we need hierarchy and simultaneous.

Rick

Ohh yeah, but here's the thing you can look at the Idea of the one in repose, in internal self-reflection or whatever versus the active state. And spilling out that becomes the next. It's the Nous, right?

Then it goes well. It does more. What I'm saying is it's the same. I mean, if you had an equation to just slide the system.

Avery

The same equation.

Rick

It's the same at every level. If I could understand the paradox.

Avery

And the paradigm.

Rick

The paradigms, yeah.

Rick

The paradox fits into the paradigm of this is resolving paradox.

Avery

The paradigm of this is appreciating and resolving it in some way.

Rick

If I could resolve it at the level of my big toe. I can resolve it all the way up. That's all. I mean it's the same problem everywhere. I mean, that's why we're here is the result.

Avery

Yes: the experience of the cup or the tree gives you the opportunity to appreciate the paradox of what we're saying. Right here and now and I believe that's what Citsuka was trying to point out. It's immediate experiential usage, but not an object. He's pointing you to that right here and now. In your experience, which would both resolve and Awaken you, yes.

And there's a similar model, a similar paradox at all the levels. If you could get it. And that's why some of the teachers and teachings, were an inquiry into my experience ... and if you want to question them, you have to question those assumptions and to compliment that you have to look into your experience. And the religion says there's God, or there's the one. the one Brahman mind itself. You could use any words you want. What is he really talking about? He's talking about a sparsa. How does the lion contact the gold. So here I am. I think I'm a lion. I know I'm a lion. I'm a lion form. And now somebody says God or somebody says, mind itself or somebody says reality. I said, where do I look? Where is? This reality you're talking about? I'm a lion. Right. You get it.

At some point one has to like turn around 180 degrees. This is why Vedanta calls it asparsa. The lion isn't gonna touch the gold. The lion is gonna. Thank you very much, Joyce. The lion is gonna recognize the gold. **[NO--gold is going to recognize itself as Lion]** Isn't that amazing? And then the other. Lion form say well, wait a minute. Show me this gold and the. C Lion form says. You you too are that gold. And they said, but where do I look for it? How do? If the scientist lie in form, says Ring it out, show it to me I want. To measure it and. And and the you know the say you. Just say, what are you talking? About you it's it's immediate. It's immediate, intimate. Infinite, inexpressible, and yet. Makes possible every single form of every one of you beings and one more thing, Rick. All you lie in forms, you're all identical as gold.

Avery

what I see is the connection between the modern nondual direct teachings and even the hidden teaching right here. Inquire into your experience and what Plotinus is talking about, all the way up, as you said. A similar thing will apply, and right here.

Rick

you don't have to go up the hierarchical tree to answer the question, because what you're doing when it's question is asked, if you think of it, if I'm thinking of it as the the repose the reflection, the inward focus versus the expression, and overflowing and outward focus. If I do that where I am at now, I don't have to be out somewhere else to do that. It's the same process: the inward, as opposed to the overflow.

Avery

it's a close one.

Rick

You're not exactly saying I'm God.

Avery

You shift out of the local limited finite person to recognize direct immediate, experiential glimpse that you are the *I am* itself without any form and then you recognize even that those two are inseparable in some way. In Plotinus language soul itself, now you're not finite anymore. You're not in quite the same relation to your source. You're a ray of the sun, but sunlight is not the same thing as being the sun. And so there's something deeper. So Anthony's language is a deepening of the consciousness

In some way that first step was rather a discontinuous one: from ego self to Overself. Whereas the shift from being Soul to being a particle of the Nous and then to the One, may be be more continuous. But in another way, following PB, the relation of the appearance to the Overself to the world does seem to be continuous, whereas the discontinuity the real break is between the end of the diving board, the World-Mind, and then beyond everything Mind in itself Ineffable One.

Rick

OK.

Avery

It is nested, nested contexts. The paradox looks a little different from the point of view of the One from the point of view of the Nous from the point of view of the soul and from the point of view of the manifest universe. it's parallel but still it feels different from each of the four.

Shaivism would point out a spectrum of levels of Shiva and Shakti: Anthony would point out that in every quadrant there are the substance of the houses and the functioning of the rings. Perhaps Shakti is responsible for a spectrum of vibrations and Shiva which is responsible for the ever presence of the formless primordial awareness no matter what form.