

Figure 30. “The Circle, the Head, and the Circle Members,” p. 345

No figure appears in the source passage in LLBA: 24-11-26, p. 3, but one seems to be indicated and presupposed in the language of the original text: “. . . the Sadguru then existent (Ramdas) laid the seed of the new spiritual circle-to-be. The point in the centre indicates the Head (of the circle) and those (points) on the circumstances [*sic*] (circumference?) indicate members.” Probably Meher Baba drew such a diagram on his slate while giving this explanation. Figure 30 has been drawn on the basis of this description.

Figure 31. “The Constituents of Human Existence,” p. 349

TTL p. 148 presents most of this diagrammatic content in typographic form. TTL/FF p. 148 and TLD/FF: 26-1-27, p. 1 add handwritten elements. Figure 31 is based on these three sources.

Figure 32. “Sanskaras and the Wheel of the Mind,” p. 376

Figure 32 is based on the hand drawings in TTL/FF p. 159, TLD/FF: 13-2-27 draft A, p. 1, and TLD/FF: 13-2-27 draft B, p. 1.

Figure 33. “The Three Yogas and the Aspects of the Highest State,” p. 380

TTL p. 162 has a lacuna here; and TTL p. 161 gives what looks like a primitive version of this diagram in typographic form. TTL/FF p. 161 and TLD/FF: 22-2-27, unnumbered p. i reproduce the content of TTL p. 161 with lines added in by hand. But TTL/FF p. 162 and TLD/FF: 22-2-27, p. 1 provide fully developed diagrams filling the lacunae in TTL p. 162. TTL/FF p. 162 and TLD/FF: 22-2-27, p. 1 serve accordingly as the sources of Figure 33 as recreated in this book.

Tiffin Lectures Endnotes

In this book the endnotes describe prominent features in the source manuscripts and discuss problems and cruxes in those original texts. When the editors have introduced emendations affecting the content (as opposed to the prose style) or have otherwise made decisions that impact on the revised text of this edition in a significant way, they have explained their reasoning in this section. By contrast, the footnotes within lectures provide information useful for general readers and abstain from more technical and detailed textual concerns.

In these endnotes all direct quotations from the source manuscripts reproduce the original text exactly, without any correction or emendation. By contrast, direct quotations in the footnotes and introductions to the lectures earlier in this book present the source text in a corrected and normalized form.

These endnotes say little about the figures. For that, readers should consult the keys that accompany the figures in the primary text as well as “Notes on the Figures” (pp. 523–34). Abbreviations for manuscripts are explained on pp. 475–77. Many of the detailed discussions of multiple manuscript sources in these endnotes can be illuminated by the chart in Appendix 1 (pp. 467–74), which shows the interrelation between manuscript sources.

29TH APRIL 1926

- 1.** This phrase in the “Tiffin Lectures” manuscripts (TTL/FF p. 1, TTL p. 1, TLD/FF: 29-4-26 draft A, p. 1 and draft B, p. 1) translates the Gujarati expression of ChD 62: p. 321, *paḍī rahelā*, “lying around,” in the manner of an idler who lies around and won’t do any work. Earlier, the designation *Īshwar* in *Īshwar Anubhav* appears as a handwritten insert in TTL/FF p. 1 only and in none of the other manuscripts.
- 2.** These two phrases occur respectively in ChD 62: p. 321 and TTL/FF p. 1.
- 3.** These two English adjectives in TTL/FF p. 2 and TTL p. 2 translate the colorful Gujarati vocabulary from ChD 62: p. 321, *chakit*, “surprised, astonished,” and *stabdḥ*, “amazed, dumbstruck, motionless due to astonishment or shock.”
- 4.** This expression, presented in the “Tiffin Lectures” manuscripts (TTL/FF p. 2, TTL p. 2, TLD/FF: 29-4-26 draft A, p. 2 and draft B, p. 2) with the first letters of words capitalized, translates a Gujarati phrase in ChD 62: p. 321: “*aḥhad ajāyibī bharyā anubhavno*,” “experience full of limitless astonishment.” Possibly Baba is talking here about the state that in *God Speaks* he referred to as Nirvana (*Nirvāṇa*), that immediately precedes the “I am God” state of Nirvikalp Samādhi.
- 5.** The English of “Tiffin Lectures” (TTL/FF p. 2, TTL p. 2, TLD/FF: 29-4-26 draft A, p. 2 and draft B, p. 2) translates two excellent Gujarati words from ChD 62: p. 321, *fenkolojī*, “idiocy” or “foolishness” in the sense of “throwing in the air,” and *murkhāī*, “folly” or “stupidity.”
- 6.** These last two sentences do not appear in the main typed text but are based on handwritten marginalia in TTL/FF p. 3 associated with the figure (represented as Figure 1 in this text).
- 7.** These parallel lists are closely related to the lists in series 5 of *Infinite Intelligence* (see, for example, p. 71).
- 8.** The diary that is the source for this passage (ChD 62: p. 322) here uses *Khudā*, the Persian-derived word for “God”; but in TTL/FF p. 3 and TTL p. 3 this has been translated to “Knowledge.”
- 9.** This analogy is similar (though not identical) to the analogy of the stick in the stream in *Infinite Intelligence* (see pp. 318-20, which refers back to Figure 22 on p. 316).
- 10.** Throughout this passage the original Tiffin Lecture uses the word “refuse” to translate this Gujarati word *kachro* (Hindi *kachrā*), rubbish, sweepings (of straw, etc.); garbage; trash.

11. *Chūt chakit* is a Gujarati expression meaning “wonderstruck” in the manner of one who is flat on one’s back in astonishment. The first element, *chūt* means fallen “flat on one’s back, floored, defeated”; it serves as the technical term when a wrestler has been pinned and lost the competition. *Chakit* means “surprised, astonished.” This phrase has been interpolated from a few lines later in ChD 62: p. 322. *Hayrat* appears in TLD/FF: 29-4-26 draft A, p. 6 and draft B, p. 6; TTL/FF p. 6 reads *hayrat thāy chhe*, “made amazed.”

12. Spelled *sāndhan* in several of the sources (TTL/FF p. 7, TLD/FF: 29-4-26 draft A, p. 6, and TLD/FF: 29-4-26 draft B, p. 7), which appears to be an irregular form. Another variant spelling, *sāndhan*, “an act of joining,” seems like an unlikely reading here.

13. The word “throat” does not adorn the text of “Tiffin Lectures” (TTL/FF p. 8, TTL p. 8, TLD/FF: 29-4-26 draft A, p. 8 and draft B, p. 8); it has been editorially inserted as a translation of *gardan*, “neck” or “throat,” ChD 62: p. 323.

14. The content of the four-item list below was published in “Spiritual Speeches of His Divine Majesty Sadguru Meher Baba. (4) On Samadhis,” *Meher Message*, vol. 1, no. 4 (April 1929), p. 9.

15. In the diary source for this passage (ChD 62: p. 324), Baba uses the words “*aurat ane paiso*,” “woman and money.” Yet this has been rendered as “WINE & WOMAN” (emphasis added) in the “Tiffin Lectures” sources (TTL/FF p. 9, TTL p. 9,

TLD/FF: 29-4-26 draft A, p. 9 and draft B, p. 9). But the immediately preceding passage in ChD 62: p. 324, excised from the Tiffin Lecture itself, inveighs against liquor. Probably the compiler of the Tiffin Lecture text, having deleted these diary lines, incorporated the reference to “wine” nonetheless to capture some of this sense. A few lines below in the “Tiffin Lectures” manuscripts (TTL/FF p. 9, TTL p. 9, TLD/FF: 29-4-26 draft A, p. 9 and draft B, p. 9) we find all three hazards that Baba says are to be avoided, “WINE, WOMAN, & WEALTH.”

16. This Gujarati phrase appears as a handwritten insert in TTL/FF p. 10. TTL p. 10 has a lacuna, which TLD/FF: 29-4-26 draft A, p. 9 fills with “*sharīrīnī īndrīyo*,” “senses of the body,” and TLD/FF: 29-4-26 draft B, p. 10 with “*sharīrīnī īndayo* [sic] (*havas*),” “senses of the body (lust).” ChD 62: p. 324 fills the lacuna with the phrase “*shārīrīk shokh*,” a spelling variation of “*shārīrīk sukh*,” which means “bodily pleasure.”

17. Though all of this Tiffin Lecture until this point took as its diary source ChD 62: pp. 321–24, which records a lecture dated 29th April 1926, this final paragraph seems to draw from ChD 57: p. 124, recording a lecture Baba dictated three months later, on 26th July 1926 (dated 27th July in the diary). Evidently Chanji drew on this thought from the later lecture as an editorial decision, thinking that it suitably framed and closed Baba’s first talk in this collection. This same passage from ChD 57: p. 124 was used again in Baba’s lecture of 26th July 1926 (see p. 200).

19TH MAY 1926

1. In TTL/FF and TTL (the carbon copy and original of the same typescript) this lecture, dated 19th May 1926, and the next, dated 20th May, run together, so as to convey the appearance of a single Tiffin Lecture. The 19th May lecture begins on TTL/FF and TTL p. 11, and the 20th May lecture begins near the bottom of that same page, after a blank space of several lines. It is true that the succeeding pages, TTL/FF and TTL pp. 12–15, have as their header the new date: “20-5-1926”; but this date does not

appear at its appropriate juncture near the bottom of TTL/FF p. 19 where the break between lectures evidently occurred. On the basis of the evidence of TTL/FF and TTL pp. 11–15 alone (uncontroverted by other manuscripts), one might conclude that we are dealing with a single lecture and that some of the dating in the headers was erroneous. TLD/FF, however, makes it unambiguously clear that we are actually dealing with two lectures on two dates. Both TLD/FF: 19-5-26 draft A, p. 1 and TLD/FF: 20-5-26

draft A, p. 1 are headed by place-date indications (“Meherabad, 19th May 1926” and “Meherabad, 20th May 1926”) in the style regularly used in these TLD/FF source-draft pages for the first pages of new lectures; and the same is true of TLD/FF: 19-5-26 draft B, p. 1 and TLD/FF: 20-5-26 draft B, p. 1. The editors have, accordingly, divided this sequence of pages, TTL/FF and TTL pp. 11–15, into two separate lectures with separate dates.

Filis Frederick, in her rendering of this material in the *Awakener* magazine, ran these two Tiffin Lectures together as a single lecture under the title “Lucky are Those Who Come Across the Realized!” See her edited text of certain of the Tiffin Lectures published under the title “Meherabad Talks,” *Awakener*, vol. 16, no. 1 (1975), pp. 7–9.

2. ComD 1: f. 259. The original text has been

20TH MAY 1926

1. TTL/FF pp. 11–15 (and, of course, TTL pp. 11–15) run this lecture together with the lecture of 19th May that preceded it, as though they both belonged to a single talk by Baba; TLD/FF makes it clear, however, that these constitute two separate talks. For further discussion, see endnote 1 on p. 536.

2. ComD 1: f. 261. The text has been slightly edited for readability.

3. Versions of this Farsi line appear in the Gujarati script on TTL/FF p. 11, TLD/FF: 20-5-26 draft A, p. 1 and draft B, p. 1.

4. The name “Waman” does not appear in any of the “Tiffin Lectures” sources; the editors have interpolated it from ChD 62: p. 329.

5. Throughout this passage the text of the original lecture (TTL/FF pp. 13–14, TTL pp. 13–14, TLD/FF: 20-5-26 draft A, pp. 2–3 and draft B, pp. 2–3) uses the word “peels.” Clearly this is an unidiomatic word choice, and the editors have replaced it with words like “coil,” “loop,” and “winding.” The Gujarati source for this passage, ChD 62: p. 329, speaks of a *rasi* (spelled *rassi*, “rope” or “string”), its *āṭ*-s (“twists” or “windings” or “entanglements”), and

slightly edited for readability.

3. Here as earlier in this sentence, TTL/FF p. 11 and TTL p. 11, TLD/FF: 19-5-26 draft A, p. 1 and draft B, p. 1 use the English word “spiritual” to translate *āmīk*, the adjectival form of *ātmā*, which appears in the Gujarati script in ChD 62: p. 327 (the correct spelling is *āmīk*). The expression “material Maya” in TTL/FF p. 11 (as also TLD/FF: 19-5-26 draft A, p. 1 and draft B, p. 1) renders *dunyavī māyā* in the same diary source.

4. In the diary source for these two sentences (ChD 62: p. 327) Baba praises the mandalī more extravagantly: “*Ane jene sadgurū mālyo tenā nasībī bālīhārīj kahevāy! Tyāre tame kevā nasīb vāḷā?*” That is, “And as to the one who finds a Sadguru, your fate is to be praised indeed! Then how fortunate you are!”

gāḥh-s (“knots”); these latter two words appear in the TLD/FF text also.

6. These last two sentences are an edited reconstruction of a rather convoluted and obscure passage in the “Tiffin Lectures” sources. TTL/FF p. 13 reads: “At first, there are ‘Natural’ (*kudarātī*) peels and knots (*āḷā- gāḥh*) etc. (Sanskaras) of the string places the string itself (SELF) into a puzzle and forgetting its own SELF, it diverts and concentrates all its mind on those ‘peels and knots’ (that are created by Sanskaras).” (TLD/FF: 20-5-26 drafts A and B, p. 2 read similarly; TTL p. 13 likewise, except that its lacunae have not been filled.)

7. The text of TTL/FF p. 14 reads: “this (dream) to be right (*sulaṭ*). Sanskaras.” (*Sulaṭ* here fills the lacuna in TTL p. 14.) TLD/FF: 20-5-26 draft A, p. 3 fills the same lacuna with “*sulaṭ = savaḷā*”; “*savaḷā*” means having the right or proper side exposed, not inverted. TLD/FF: 20-5-26 draft B, p. 3 gives us “*kharā-sulaṭ*.” The diary source (ChD 62: p. 330) provides only the word “*sulaṭ*.” The editors have emended *kharā* to *khari*.

8. “Dragon” in the “Tiffin Lectures” sources (TTL/FF p. 14, TTL p. 14, TLD/FF: 20-5-26 draft A, p. 3 and

20TH MAY 1926 (CONTINUED)

draft B, p. 3) translates *ajgar* (“python”) in TTL/FF p. 14 and ChD 62: p. 330. TLD/FF: 20-5-26 draft B, p. 3 also provides the word “*rākṣas*,” a monster or demon.

9. The original text of the “Tiffin Lectures” sources (TTL/FF p. 15, TTL p. 15, and TLD/FF: 20-5-26 draft B, p. 4; TLD/FF: 20-5-26 draft A, p. 4 reads similarly) provides us with “The Company and stay [with such a . . . Guru],” which is a rather insipid English rendering of “*saṅg-sahavās*” (ChD 62: p. 330). The editors have emended by reinserting this potent Indic expression along with a new English

phrase. Meanwhile, the “Sacred Guru” in TLD/FF: 20-5-26 draft A, p. 4 and draft B, p. 4 conveys a significantly different thought than the “Secret Guru” of TTL/FF p. 15. Context does not offer us any unambiguous criterion for choosing between these two words, either of which could suit the context. “Secret” could simply represent a typographic error in the copying process; but on the other hand, it better expresses the main idea of this passage, which is that the Guru appears in the disguise of what the disciple most fears and dreads. On the balance the editors have thought this the better choice.

22ND MAY 1926

1. This text is a translated and somewhat edited version of the Gujarati of ChD 62: p. 341. ComD 1: f. 264 recounts the same story with slight variations: “The moojavars and mutwallis at Bapoosaheb Vali’s tomb in Ahmednagar came to Baba for offering invitations and the subscription list in connection with the anniversary day of His death. Baba instructed Rs. 50/- to be paid them towards the Urus funds and after their departure dwelt for some time upon this well-known saint of Ahmednagar when He also gave interesting explanations on various other devine [*sic*] personalities and points.” Much of the content of this Tiffin Lecture is recorded in this 22nd May 1926 entry of “The Combined Diary,” ComD 1: ff. 263–66.

2. The content of the next five paragraphs (up to the beginning of the paragraph on Tukaram) was published in “Spiritual Speeches of His Divine Majesty Sadguru Meher Baba. (3) On God-Realized Personages,” *Meher Message*, vol. 1, no. 4 (April 1929), p. 8.

3. The text of TTL p. 16 is riddled with lacunae; the words *bāl*, *bāl-unmat* (or *bālonmat*), *unmat-gāṇḍā*, and *pīshāch* have been supplied from TTL/FF p. 16, from the source diary, ChD 62: p. 341, and from TLD/FF: 22-5-26 draft A, p. 1 and TLD/FF: 22-5-26 draft B, p. 1. This passage in Chanji’s Diary also supplies, as other expressions for these human

types and their associated states, *bachchā* (“child”), *bāl avasthā* (“child state”), and *bhū* (“ghost”). Much of this same vocabulary can be found in *Infinite Intelligence*; see, for example, pp. 443–44 and 450.

4. “Woman & Wealth” in the “Tiffin Lectures” sources (TTL p. 16, TLD/FF: 22-5-26 draft A, p. 1 and TLD/FF: 22-5-26 draft B, p. 1) translates the words *strī* and *dhan* ChD 62: p. 341. On this kind of reference to women and wealth, see footnote * on p.16.

5. While the TTL p. 16 and TLD/FF: 22-5-26 draft B, p. 2 read “Ishwar (God),” the Gujarati text of ChD 62: p. 342 records the word “*Bhagvān*.” In *Infinite Intelligence* “Ishwar” is used exclusively to designate God in the state of Creator-Preserver-Destroyer, unconscious of Himself yet Lord of the universe; in *God Speaks* Baba referred to this as the Third State of God. Yet Baba never uses “*Bhagvān*” in this sense, nor can one easily imagine how *Bhagvān* could ever carry such a meaning. Clearly “Ishwar” is being used in this present Tiffin Lecture not as in *Infinite Intelligence* but simply as a general term for God in His unconscious state. For further discussion of “Ishwar” and its various uses, see Glossary.

6. “Frank” in TTL p. 17 and in TLD/FF: 22-5-26 draft A, p. 2 and draft B, p. 2 translates “*bhoḷā*” in ChD 62: p. 342, a word Baba sometimes employed to refer to the guilelessness, simplicity, and innocence of Perfect Ones.

7. This last phrase (“though his course of action . . .”) does not appear in the original diary source (ChD 62: p. 343) but has been inserted by the editors, since it seemed necessary to recognize that al-Hallaj and Zoroaster met different fates (that is, the one was crucified and the other was not).

8. This last paragraph does not appear in any of the “Tiffin Lectures” manuscripts (TTL p. 17, TLD/FF: 22-5-26 draft A, p. 2 and draft B, p. 2). But it does appear in Gujarati at this juncture in the diary source, ChD 62: p. 343, and certainly it comprised a part of Meher Baba’s original lecture. Because of its innate interest, the editors have translated it and incorporated it into this text.

9. Some of the content of this and the next two paragraphs was reproduced in “Spiritual Speeches of His Divine Majesty Sadguru Meher Baba. (5) On Maya and Guru,” *Meher Message*, vol. 1, no. 5 (May 1929), pp. 6–7.

10. The typewritten text of TTL p. 18 and TLD/FF: 22-5-26 draft B, p. 3 reads: “Mai tera beta jīye do Khuda-ki nam-par”; TLD/FF: 22-5-26 draft A, p. 3 reads similarly. ChD 62: p. 344 reads: “*māi tera beṭā jīye—do Khudā kī rāhpar*,” that is, “Mother, may your son live long: give on the path of God!”

11. “[W]ives” (TTL p. 18, TLD/FF: 22-5-26 draft A, p. 3 and draft B, p. 3) translates “*māshuk*,” “beloveds, loved ones” (ChD 62: p. 344).

12. ChD 62: p. 344 adds the phrase “*jīv vaḷ vaḷ thāy*,” that is, “your heart would start palpitating.”

13. The “Tiffin Lectures” manuscripts (TTL p. 18, TLD/FF: 22-5-26 draft A, p. 3 and draft B, p. 4) give us only the abbreviation “Meh.” The diary source, ChD 62: p. 344, refers to a child but provides no name. The boy in this Tiffin Lecture, however, is clearly the same as the child in the lecture of 11th July 1926 (see p. 179), whom once again Baba refers to as an example of sexual innocence. Several of the source manuscripts for that 11th July lecture (TTL p. 81, TTL/FF p. 81, TLD/DF: 11-7-26, p. 1) provide us, once again, with only the abbreviation “Meh”; but TLD/FF: 11-7-26, p. 1 and the source passage in Chanji’s diary (ChD 57: p. 87) give us the full name: “Mehelli.” Rustom and Freiny’s oldest son, Merwan,

became known as Mehu in later years; “Mehelli” (a spelling variant of “Mehli,” a common sobriquet among Parsis) could have been his pet name as a boy. This network of evidence does not establish with certitude that the “Meh” and “Mehelli” of these two Tiffin Lectures designate Rustom and Freiny’s son; but the probability is great.

14. The “Tiffin Lectures” sources (TTL p. 19, TLD/FF: 22-5-26 draft A, p. 4 and draft B, p. 4) say only that the Guru “would free one from these ceaseless rounds of Births and Deaths”; but ChD 62: p. 344 makes it explicit that he will “grant Mukti”—“*mukṭī apāve*.”

15. TTL p. 19 has a lacuna here. TTL/FF p. 19 supplies the handwritten interpolation in the Gujarati script: “*bandhese bandhā milā, chhuṭe kon upāy/ sangat karye nirbandhkī, palme diye chhuṭāy*.” TLD/FF: 22-5-26 draft A, p. 4 supplies this fragmentary couplet: “*bandhyā ko bandhyā milē, kabu na chhuṭā jāy!* [lacuna] *palak me chhuṭā jāy*.” This appears to be based on ChD 62: p. 341: “*bandhyā se bandhyā milē, kabu chhuṭā na jāy/ bandhyā ko* [lacuna] *milē, palakme chhuṭā jāy*.” TLD/FF: 22-5-26 draft B, p. 4 gives a variant that seems to be a revision: “*bandhyese bandhā milā, kabu na chhuṭā jāy chhuṭe kon upāy/ sangat karye nir-bandhkī, pal me diye chhuṭāy*.” This kind of variation in the text of verses attributed to Kabir is commonplace. Kabir’s poetry has descended to modernity through oral tradition and in three major written recensions; enormous diversity appears in the forms in which his verses are quoted, particularly in popular culture and everyday usage. The editors have not found this particular couplet in any of the sources available to them.

16. Some of the content of this section and the next was published in “Spiritual Speeches of His Divine Majesty Sadguru Meher Baba. (6) Maya and God-Realization,” *Meher Message*, vol. 1, no. 6 (June 1929), pp. 7–8.

17. While the “Tiffin Lectures” texts supply us with *nark* (in various forms), the Gujarati text of ChD 62: p. 345 reads “*gu (nark)j*.” *Nark* means “hell” and “excrement”; *gū* is a semi-vulgar word referring specifically to excrement.

22ND MAY 1926 (CONTINUED)

18. The Kabīr Granthāvalī, which is the Western recension of Kabīr’s verse, quotes the couplet thus: “*Tū-tū kartā tū bhayā, mujhmē rahī na hū/Vārī pherī valī gaṭjīt dekhau tīt tū.*” See *Kabīr Granthāvalī*, edited by Shyam Sundar Das (1928; republished Lucknow: Prakashan Kendr, 1973), p. 99.

19. TTL p. 20 gives the English gloss of these poetic lines, but the original Hindi lines themselves are missing. Versions of this Hindi text appear on TTL/FF p. 20, ChD 62: p. 341, TLD/FF: 22-5-26 draft A, p. 5 and draft B, p. 5. The edited text here is a slightly emended version of these lines in the sources.

20. This rather bland English phraseology does not adequately express the colorful idiom in the Gujarati of ChD 62: p. 346, which reads: “*Tame ekvār gurūne sharaṇ thayā ke tenā pīdarne paṇ, tamārā tarafnī faraj bajāvī paḍe*”; that is, “Once you surrender to the Guru, even his father has to fulfill his duty towards you.” The idea here is that the obligation placed on the Guru binds him to such an extent that, even if he were somehow to fail to fulfill it, his father or paternal lineage (*pīdar*, normally spelled *pīthar*) becomes obliged to do so.

27TH MAY 1926

1. TTL/FF p. 23 and TTL p. 23 read “are automatic and ‘Material.’” But the diary source (ChD 62: p. 349) gives us “are automatic and Natural”; and TLD/FF: 27-5-26 draft A, p.1 and TLD/FF: 27-5-26 draft B, p. 1 follow suit. The editors cannot easily ascertain whether “natural” was changed to “material” in error (something which often happened in the course of copying and retyping these manuscripts) or intentionally. In fact, both words

suit the context: Meher Baba often characterized the sanskaras acquired during the evolution of consciousness as “natural” (by contrast with the “unnatural” or “nonnatural” sanskaras gathered in human form); then again, the gross consciousness of the *jīvātmā* in evolution would be linked to its accumulation of gross sanskaras linked in turn to the “material” sphere. The editors have thought it best, therefore, to retain both words.

30TH MAY 1926

1. This account of the celebration of Maharaj’s birthday is based on ComD 1: ff. 268–70; on Bhau Kalchuri, *Lord Meher: The Biography of Avatar Meher Baba* (North Myrtle Beach, South Carolina: Manifestation, 1986–2001), vol. 3, pp. 803; and on Bhau Kalchuri, *Lord Meher: The Biography of the Avatar of the Age, Meher Baba*, revised edition (Hyderabad, A.P., India: Meher Mownavani Publications, 2006), vol. 2, p. 592. Baba’s discourse

on anger and obedience (as summarized in “The Combined Diary” entry) appears in Gujarati in its full form in ChD 62: p. 355.

2. A one-line version of this analogy of the barber appeared as saying no. 28 in “Sayings of His Divine Majesty Sadguru Meher Baba,” *Meher Message*, vol. 1, no. 6 (June 1929), p. 1. For further information, see Appendix 5, Table 10, p. 514.

31ST MAY 1926

1. This information (about the context of this lecture) is taken from ChD 62: p. 357. It does not appear in the “Tiffin Lectures” sources (TTL/FF p. 27, TTL p. 27, TLD/FF: 30-5-26 draft A, p. 1 and draft B, p. 1).

2. The “Tiffin Lectures” sources (TTL/FF p. 30, TTL p. 30, TLD/FF: 31-5-26 draft A, p. 3 and draft B, p. 4) give “Sat-Samagam”; the diary source, ChD 62: p. 360 reads “SAT SAMAGUM” (further

glossed in the line below as “Guru Sharan,” which means “Guru refuge” or “Guru asylum”). “Sat,” of course, means Truth, and “samagam” (*saṅgam*) means meeting, union; the confluence of rivers or roads; association; sexual intercourse.

3. Some of the discussion of shariat that follows, based on TTL p. 30–31, is presented in another form in “Fragments from the Spiritual Speeches of Shri Sadguru Meher Baba. (24) On Shariat,” *Meher Message*, vol. 2, no. 8 (August 1930), pp. 4–5.

4. Much of the discussion of rituals and the shariat in this section and the next two was published in identically titled articles in two successive issues of the *Meher Message*, “Spiritual Speeches of His

Divine Majesty Meher Baba. (2) On Shariat,” *Meher Message*, vol. 1, no. 2 (February 1929), pp. 8–9, and vol. 1, no. 3 (March 1929), pp. 10–11.

5. The “Tiffin Lectures” sources (TTL/FF p. 31–32, TTL pp. 31–32, TLD/FF: 31-5-26 draft A, pp. 4–5 and draft B, p. 5) use the unidiomatic English expression “striking off”; but the diary source in ChD 62: p. 362 provides *jhaṭakvī*, which the editors have inserted here in its Gujarati infinitive form, *jhaṭakavū*, “to snap or pull,” related to *jhaṭak*, “a sudden pull or jerk or snapping action.” What these phrases intend to designate is the act of shaking and snapping the sacred thread in the air, in the same way that teenage boys snap towels in the shower rooms of athletic facilities.

3RD JUNE 1926

1. ChD 62: p. 369 provides the basis for this bit of dialogue preceding the main lecture. Since the diary version is written in the form of rough notes, the editors have substantially revised it for readability.

2. These last two sentences have been significantly edited; TLD/DF: 3-6-26, p. 2 reads: “. . . you knew that you are ‘False I’ – you knew that this Universe etc. is all ‘Imagination’ (Bhas ‘Impression’). Here, you knew that you do not know anything – that you have no Knowledge of your Real Self, who you really are, were, and can be.” (TTL/FF p. 36, TTL p. 36, and TLD/FF: 3-6-26, p. 2 read almost identically; ChD 62 failed as a source a few lines earlier, since ChD 62: p. 370 breaks off in mid-sentence, and the next page—which would have contained the source material for this present passage—appears to have been lost.)

The problem in this passage lies in its implication that the ordinary human—who appears to be the “you” under consideration—consciously understands and recognizes his ignorance. But this is not typically the case for most people. At best, one educated in Meher Baba’s teachings (or some comparable body of philosophy like Advaita Vedanta) might understand these points intellectually; but only a spiritually advanced soul

or God-realized person would “know” it in any real sense.

The key here lies in the usage of the verb “know,” which functions effectively as a synonym for “experience.” The editors have emended to bring out this sense. In fact, this same issue—and the same usage of the word “know”—arises in *Infinite Intelligence* with respect to the phrase “Knowledge knows that it does not know”; see esp. pp. 95–96, 130–33, 441, and the editors’ discussion on 463.

3. This last sentence is extensively edited; the original text of TTL/FF p. 36, TTL p. 36, and TLD/DF: 3-6-26, p. 2 all read: “That is the difference in the ‘Sound Sleep’ states in these three.” (TLD/FF: 3-6-26, p. 2 omits the sentence.) Now this is the first time that this lecture has referred to **three** sound sleep states; only two appear in the diagrams in the source manuscripts. Evidently the sound sleep of an ordinary human is being distinguished from the original sound sleep before the moment of creation—though it is unclear how, in any essential way, these two differ from each other, apart from the fact that they occur at different stages in the soul’s journey. (As already noted, the source page in ChD 62 for this portion of the lecture appears to have been lost; and so no illumination is available there.)

5TH JUNE 1926

1. This quotation translates from the Gujarati of ChD 62: p. 371 the opening lines of a long and wide-ranging discourse by Baba on 5th June 1926 that was recorded in the diary account (but, for the most part, omitted from the typed Tiffin Lecture). Though four pages of diary material (ChD 62: pp. 371–73 and 375, and other pages which are copies and versions of this same content) are all attributable to this same date of 5th June 1926, a date which appears at the head of p. 371, none of it constitutes the unambiguous source for this Tiffin Lecture. Indeed, all four pages have been annotated in the margins with question marks, a marking that in ChD 62 and ChD 57 consistently signifies that passages so annotated have been intentionally excluded from “Tiffin Lectures.” We have no way of knowing, therefore, whether Baba’s comments on “anxiety” in the “Tiffin Lectures” manuscripts (TTL/FF p. 37, TTL p. 37, TLD/FF: 5-6-26, p. 2 and TLD/DF:

5-6-26, p. 1) comprise a part of Baba’s lecture to Gadekar that Chanji chose not to incorporate in the text of the typed Tiffin Lecture or whether they were delivered at some other juncture during the day under unknown circumstances. We can at least ascertain, however, that the topic of anxiety and worry was “in the air” at this time.

2. A version of the content of this Tiffin Lecture was published as “Fragments from the Spiritual Speeches of His Divine Majesty Sadguru Meher Baba. (8) On the Mind’s Wandering in Maya,” *Meher Message*, vol. 1, no. 8 (August 1929), pp. 9–10.

3. TTL p. 37 lacks this word, but TLD/FF: 5-6-26, p. 2 and TLD/FF: 5-6-26, p. 2 supply it, in the Gujarati script. (The Gujarati interpolation of TTL/FF p. 37 reads uncertainly.) *Upabhog* occurs frequently in *Infinite Intelligence*.

24TH JUNE 1926

1. Some of the content of this Tiffin Lecture appeared in “Fragments from the Spiritual Speeches of His Divine Majesty Sadguru Meher Baba. (9) Mind and Egoism,” *Meher Message*, vol. 1, no. 9 (September 1929), pp. 8–9.

2. This sentence has been significantly edited. TLD/FF: 24-6-26, p. 1 reads: “For you, ordinary human beings, it is like ‘walk-and-walk’ (*chālo – chālo ne tyānā tyā*) till the end is reached, (not for years only, but for ages together) . . .” (The text of TTL/FF p. 38 is broadly similar; TTL p. 38 lacks the Gujarati text.) Now the Gujarati text (which translates “[you] keep on walking, but [you remain] there, only there”) implies that the labor of walking is futile, that one progresses not at all, while the English text indicates otherwise—that one eventually achieves the Goal. These can be reconciled in the understanding that, in the subjective awareness of the spiritual traveler, one seems to be laboring without achieving anything, whereas in truth, one is advancing along the path. The editors have emended to suggest this.

3. The word *sharīr* has been inserted by the editors on the model of *Infinite Intelligence* and does not appear in the “Tiffin Lectures” sources. Apart from this, the six Indic words are taken from TLD/DF: 24-6-26, p. 1, TLD/FF: 24-6-26, p. 1, TTL/FF p. 38, and the diary source, ChD 57: p. 5. No Gujarati appears in the text of TTL p. 38.

4. This phrase has been inserted by the editors, since otherwise the peculiar use of the word *hāl* (see note † on p. 78) might confuse readers. TLD/DF: 24-6-26, p. 1 reads: “Now, the ‘Hal’ (*hāl*) is that state of the Mind . . .”; the other sources read similarly.

5. The words “subconsciously” and “subconsciousness” are editorial emendations; the original text of TTL/FF p. 39, TTL p. 39, TLD/DF: 24-6-26, p. 2, and TLD/FF: 24-6-26, p. 2 give the word “unconsciousness.” Yet the kind of consciousness experienced in dream must surely be differentiated from the unconsciousness of sound sleep; and the word “sub-consciousness” came

into service in the lecture of 3rd June 1926 earlier (see Figure 5 on p. 66; the Key on p. 67 reproduces relevant material from one of the sources). Hence the emendation.

6. None of the “Tiffin Lectures” manuscript sources (TTL/FF p. 39, TTL p. 39, TLD/DF: 24-6-26, p. 2, and TLD/FF: 24-6-26, p. 2) gives any indication that the higher yoga samādhi subtle state referred to here appertains to rāj yoga specifically; yet this term is provided in the diary source in ChD 57: pp. 6 and 7.

7. The phrases “anant Shakti,” “*Pūrṇa Jñān*,” and “[*kharo*] Ānand” in this sentence do not appear here in the “Tiffin Lectures” sources (TTL/FF p. 40,

TTL p. 40, TLD/DF: 24-6-26, p. 3, and TLD/FF: 24-6-26, p. 3); they have been introduced rather from the direct Gujarati source for this passage in ChD 57: p. 9.

8. The “Tiffin Lectures” sources (TTL/FF p. 41, TTL p. 41, TLD/DF: 24-6-26, p. 4, and TLD/FF: 24-6-26, p. 4) read: “Many a great Yogis, [*sic*], with years of ‘Tapa-Japa’, have been lying helpless in the mid-way.” The Gujarati diary source in ChD 57: p. 8 describes the situation more colorfully: “pl.-*vālā yogī bachārā hajī to kyā dhakkā khātā rastā vache padēlo chhe*”; that is, “yogis, poor fellows, buffeted about on the planes, are lying midway along the path.”

26TH JUNE 1926

1. This quotation from Hafez transliterates from Qodsī, p. 331, ghazal 264, couplet 2.

In TTL/FF p. 42, Hafez has been rendered into the Gujarati script in penciled handwriting, running horizontally from bottom to top, in the left-hand margin. The English translation has been written in pencil beneath (that is to say, to the right of) the Gujarati Hafez. In TLD/DF: 26-6-26, p. 1, this same material, both the Persian-in-the-Gujarati-script and the English translation, has been handwritten in (in horizontal writing in purple ink and pencil) immediately below the lecture title in a space left blank (obviously for this very purpose) in the typed page.

TTL p. 42, of course, gives the English only in typewritten form. TLD/FF: 26-6-26, p. 1 omits the text of Hafez—English as well as Gujarati—altogether, although it leaves a blank space of several lines with the typed attribution “(Hafiz)” at the bottom right.

In all of these “Tiffin Lectures” sources the quotation from Hafez (or the space left for it)—including the English translation—is followed by a short paragraph in quotation marks. Presumably these quotation marks signify that this represents Baba’s gloss and explanation of the Hafez couplet.

The source for this English gloss is ChD 57:

p. 13; this English text is bracketed on the left, and in the left margin beside it, Chanji has written, “Hafez (Pers).” Chanji does not provide the Persian text, however, either in the Arabic or Gujarati scripts, nor does he give a literal English translation.

2. TTL/FF p. 45 and TTL p. 45 reads: “SUCH BARBAROUS, BRUTAL BLOODSHED FOR RELIGION ON ONE SIDE, AND THEN THE ‘FORCED AVATAR’ AND PREJUDICES ETC. FROM THE OTHER!!!” TLD/DF: 26-6-26, p. 3 and TLD/FF: 26-6-26, p. 3 read almost identically (although they substituted “AVATARS” for “AVATAR”). None of these versions clarifies precisely what is meant by a “forced” Avatar; but this point is explained in a small appended note on ChD 62: p. 468, that reads: “(Ref. to ‘Krishna Murti’ being forced by Doctor Besant, in her Theosophical Society—as a vehicle of the Avatar—the World Teacher.)” The text has been emended accordingly.

3. A one-sentence version of this hypothetical example (of the religious leader and the authentic spiritual Master) appeared as saying no. 44 in “Sayings of His Divine Majesty Sadguru Meher Baba,” *Meher Message*, vol. 1, no. 9 (September 1929), p. 1. For further information, see Appendix 5, Table 10, p. 514.

27TH JUNE 1926

1. In TTL/FF p. 46, TLD/DF: 27-6-26, p. 1, and TLD/FF: 26-6-26, p. 4 & 27-6-26, p. 1, this table (which in all three manuscripts takes the form of five typed columns) contains merely the Indic, Urdu, and English language primary terms (typed in Roman transliteration with the same words inserted underneath in handwriting in the Gujarati script) without any identification by religious or spiritual tradition (“Vedantic,” “Sufi,” or “Christian”). (TTL p. 46 contains exactly the same content without the handwritten additions.) Versions of this table appear three times in Chanji’s Diaries—ChD 57: p. 16 and ChD 62: pp. 470 and 485. All three of these diary versions contain signs (=) indicating an equivalence between terms, although again, the spiritual traditions have not been named. Following the practice and precedent in *God Speaks*, the editors have introduced the labels “Vedantic,” “Sufi,” and “Christian,” since it plainly was Baba’s intention in this Tiffin Lecture

to correlate these terms from different traditions; and the material has been reorganized into a formal table.

2. This and other portions of this Tiffin Lecture were incorporated into saying no. 50 in “Sayings of His Divine Majesty Sadguru Meher Baba,” *Meher Message*, vol. 1, no. 10 (October 1929), p. 1. For further information, see Appendix 5, Table 10, p. 514.

3. TLD/DF: 27-6-26, p. 1 contains “Sat” (both in the typed Roman and handwritten Gujarati scripts); TTL/FF p. 46 has “Sat” followed by a handwritten Gujarati *sat* in parentheses (filling the lacuna in TTL p. 46); TLD/FF: 26-6-26, p. 4 & 27-6-26, p. 1 gives the typed “Sat” without the lacuna; ChD 57: p. 16 and ChD 62: p. 471 both read “*Satya*” in the Gujarati script; in ChD 62: p. 471 “*Satya*” appears in Roman script as well. It does not seem that Chanji or Baba had settled on any significant philosophical difference between these terms (Sat and *Satya*).

28TH JUNE 1926

1. TLD/DF: 28-6-26, p. 1 provides a very abbreviated account of this story: “(A Hindu Bhakta, who had observed many “Tapa-Japa-Vratas etc. and who had come and talked to Shree on Spiritual matters etc. before, one day came with an intention to speak to Shree on some monitory [*sic*] matters. Shree absolutely avoided him, for hours, which impressed him intensely, and he expressed his extreme regret before others) Thereupon Shree gave a nice piece of advice—...” (TTL p. 47 reads almost identically except that it substitutes the phrase “sanitary matters”—an obvious error; in TTL/FF p. 47 the first two letters of “sanitary” have been overwritten with a penciled “mo,” to read “monitory.”) The diary source for this is ChD 62: p. 472, which reads almost identically but supplies the word *upadesh*. By far the longest account, however, appears in ChD 57: p. 17. Since its rich details and fuller narrative make the story more intelligible and interesting, this last diary account has served as the basis for the text here.

2. The text of TTL/FF p. 47, TTL p. 47, and TLD/FF:

28-6-26, p. 1 reads: “But the fact is that if one is lucky to get . . .” But the source text in ChD 57: p. 19 reads: “But the fact is that if one is **not** lucky to get . . .” (emphasis added); and in TLD/DF: 28-6-26, p. 1, “not” has been handwritten in pencil and marked for insert with a caret. Clearly the good sense of the passage calls for the insertion of the “not,” and the editors have emended accordingly.

3. In most of the sources—TLD/DF: 28-6-26, p. 2; TTL/FF p. 48 and TTL p. 48; ChD 57: p. 19; and ChD 62: p. 489—the name that appears is “Mah.,” presumably an abbreviation for “[Upasni] Maharaj.” This presumption is corroborated in TLD/FF: 28-6-26, p. 2, where “*Mahārāj*” in the Gujarati script has been handwritten over this abbreviation.

4. The text of TLD/DF: 28-6-26, p. 3, reads: “A Chargeman prepares his Circle, and then, after entrusting them their respective duties (with One Chargeman), he gets himself free. . .” This reading follows ChD 57: p. 23 fairly closely. But TTL/FF p. 49 and TTL p. 49 read: “A Chargeman prepares

his Circle, and then, after entrusting them their respective duties (with the Chargeman) . . .” (TLD/FF: 28-6-26, p. 3 reads almost identically). The text of TTL/FF (and TLD/FF) obscures or leaves ambiguous a critical distinction: that Baba is referring to **two different** Chargemen, the first, who, as a Sadguru, prepares his circle, and the second who, as a member of that circle, is destined to become a Sadguru himself. The editors have followed the text of TLD/DF and ChD 57 and emended slightly to mark this distinction. Baba amplifies on this point later in the Tiffin Lecture.

5. The text of TLD/DF: 28-6-26, p. 3, says that the twelve of the circle includes “1 Chargeman, 4 heads, 4 heads, 2 heads 1 goes off.” ChD 57: p. 23 reads “1 chargeman 4 heads – 4 heads – 2 heads – 1 goes. . .” ChD 62: p. 478 reads almost identically; ChD 62: p. 490 contains the same information, as does TLD/FF: 28-6-26, p. 3. Only TTL/FF p. 49 (and, of course, TTL p. 49) give the aberrant reading “1 Chargeman, 4 heads, 2 heads 1 goes off”—which totals only eight, not twelve. Plainly the text of TTL/FF is erroneous, probably the result of miscopying.

6. The text of these last two paragraphs mostly follows TLD/DF: 28-6-26, p. 3 and TLD/FF: 28-6-26, p. 3, which, in turn, is largely based upon ChD 57: p. 23 and ChD 62: p. 478; TTL/FF p. 49 (and TTL p. 49) seem to be garbled throughout this passage. This last line, however, does not appear in TLD/DF but translates the Marathi of ChD 57: p. 23, “*mag-te dādā ekālā banavāt*,” that is, “then they [the āchāryas] make [that] one the older brother.”

7. In all of the source texts, the number 56 is introduced abruptly, without any transition. TLD/DF: 28-6-26, p. 3 and TLD/FF: 28-6-26, p. 3 simply read “Of the 56, one is a ‘Mujzoob’”; ChD 57: p. 23 and ChD 62: p. 478 read similarly. Most of the men Baba was speaking to, however, would probably have heard his talk of 12th June 1926 (ChD 62: p. 389), on which occasion the number 56 was explained. To convey textually what would have been situationally apparent during Baba’s actual lecture, the editors have interpolated the phrase “[Out of the fifty-six] we spoke of the other day . . .”

The other source for this passage, TTL/FF

p. 49 (reproducing TTL p. 49), provides the aberrant reading “55” instead of “56.” This is another example illustrating the hazards of copying; the possibility of error, whether in the transcription of Baba’s original dictation or in the subsequent copying, has always to be allowed for. The most advanced and finished in a series of drafts is not always the most correct.

8. TLD/DF: 28-6-26, p. 3, and TTL/FF p. 49 (reproducing TTL p. 49) provide the reading “GOES OUT.” The diary sources, ChD 57: p. 23 and ChD 62: p. 478, both read “goes off,” as does TLD/FF: 28-6-26, p. 3. Again, none of these sources explains either of these phrases.

9. Nothing in TTL/FF p. 49, TTL p. 49, TLD/DF: 28-6-26, p. 3, or TLD/FF: 28-6-26, p. 3 indicates that Baba’s talk was interrupted at this juncture. The editors have inserted this section title and narrator’s interpolation on the basis of Chanji’s comment in ChD 57: p. 23: “Continuation—after an interval—of the Special Lecture on ‘The preparation of the Circle duty etc. etc. . . .’”

10. This wording has been adapted from ChD 57: p. 25. On the other hand, the text of TLD/DF: 28-6-26, pp. 3–4, following ChD 62: p. 479, reads: “He and the Circle (including the Chargeman) are one and the same, because, all are realized hence all are equal.” (TTL/FF p. 49, TTL p. 49, and TLD/FF: 28-6-26, p. 4 follow with only small variations.) The problem here lies in the ambiguity of the phraseology, which does not make it explicit that the equality of Chargeman and circle members consists in their all being **destined** for Realization. Obviously they are not realized at the beginning of their discipleship under their common Sadguru, which this language, read literally, might be taken to mean.

11. The original text of TLD/DF: 28-6-26, p. 4, reads: “Of the ten in a Circle, One is a Chargeman . . .”; TTL/FF pp. 49–50 (which reproduces TTL pp. 49–50), TLD/FF: 28-6-26, p. 4, ChD 57: p. 25, and ChD 62: p. 479 read similarly. This phraseology implies that the Chargeman is one of the ten; yet the preceding passage clearly indicates that the Chargeman stands in addition to the ten. The editors have emended this sentence accordingly.

28TH JUNE 1926 (CONTINUED)

(The same problem recurs later in this Tiffin Lecture; see endnote 15 on p. 109.)

12. The wording of the source texts does not fully clarify the sense here. TLD/DF: 28-6-26, p. 4 reads: “To one, he keeps aside (i.e. he either dies or has neither Knowledge nor Experience).” TTL/FF p. 50, TTL p. 50, TLD/FF: 28-6-26, p. 4, ChD 57: p. 25, and ChD 62: p. 481 read similarly, with no meaningful difference. Presumably the “one” being referred to here is the same “one” of the twelve who earlier was described as going out of the circle; and the editors have emended to clarify this sense.

13. The original texts of TLD/DF: 28-6-26, p. 4 and TTL/FF p. 50 (reproducing TTL p. 50) both read: “These ten mean He only”; TLD/FF: 28-6-26, p. 4 and ChD 62: p. 481 have the same, but underlined. In ChD 57: p. 27, however, much of this content of these last few lines appears in the left margin written vertically: “& then the ten of his circle who are realized prepare the 11th one, and make him Chargeman; this ten mean He only.” Plainly this marginal text is meant as a rewrite and replacement for two paragraphs in the main body of the page, written normally in the flow of diary prose but then crossed out. This crossed-out material reads thus:

Now, who is to take Charge of all this One? ~~Himself one of them?~~ Who are all these Ten? Mer. (one) only. No doubt about it. Then, to whom is the charge of Mer. to be given?

As he (Mer.) is only One, these ten gradually (in their preparation) actually prepare [illegible and crossed out] The chargeman as if [sic] for He cannot be in perfect circle without ten—hence his preparation of a Circle, may be taken as His own preparation – towards perfection of a circle—

We will not attempt to untangle this cryptic passage, whose obscurities open themselves to diverse interpretations. One puzzle is the word “Mer.,” which probably abbreviates “Merwan”; yet Chanji more characteristically refers to Baba as “Shree” or “B.” Concerning the passage as a whole, the

possibility must be borne in mind that Chanji himself might not have fully understood what Baba was dictating and may accordingly have recorded it in an incomplete or garbled fashion. It is also possible that Baba himself was hinting at esoteric truths that he chose not to clarify fully.

14. The original text of TTL/FF p. 50, TTL p. 50, TLD/DF: 28-6-26, p. 4, TLD/FF: 28-6-26, p. 4, ChD 57: p. 27, and ChD 62: p. 481 refer only to a “shop,” not a “toddy shop” specifically. Yet clearly the mixing, pouring, serving, and so forth are referenced here as toddy shop activities. This identification is confirmed by the fact that the analogy of the toddy shop—specifically identified as such—recurs later in this lecture.

15. As we saw earlier (see endnote 11 on p. 107), here again, the original text describes the Chargeman as one of ten. Thus TLD/DF: 28-6-26, p. 5, reads: “Then who is this Chargeman? Of course one of the ten of the Circle prepared, who are all Masters, but who (all 10) eventually become ONE.” TTL/FF p. 51, TTL p. 51, TLD/FF: 28-6-26, p. 5, and ChD 57: p. 27 read similarly. Again, this contradicts what has been said throughout this Tiffin Lecture, which has described the Chargeman as being in **addition** to the ten, not **one among** the ten. In the presumption that this discrepancy is due to infelicitous wording, again, the editors have emended to restore the total to eleven.

16. After this sentence ChD 57: p. 29 provides the additional parenthetical note: “(Mah. has also said so – and we shall see it here)”. Again, “Mah.” is doubtless the abbreviated form of “Upasni Maharaj.”

17. This is followed in ChD 57: p. 33 by an odd two paragraphs on the hazards of a man being reborn in bird form if the sanskaras of lust predominate excessively. This curious passage and this diary page conclude with notes indicating that Baba now resumed his discourse with explanations on the subject of matter and energy, as in the lecture presented here.

18. In TLD/DF: 28-6-26, p. 7, after a section break,

the title reads, “Continuation of the Lecture on THE PREPARATION OF THE CIRCLE D/28--6--26” (TTL/FF p. 53, TTL p. 53, and TLD/FF: 28-6-26, p. 7 read similarly). The discussion that immediately follows, however, has nothing to do with that topic, though Baba does come back to it at the end of his talk. In any event, this section title probably signifies that Baba was resuming his lecture with the mandali after a break of some kind. But since the section title in the “Tiffin Lectures” manuscripts plainly does not suit the content, the editors have substituted a new one, “Energy and Matter (*Prāṇ* and *Ākāśh*).”

19. ChD 57: p. 26 gives the reading *khandīl* (with dental consonants instead of the retroflex *ṇ* and *ḍ*); this Gujarati word does not appear in any other source, handwritten or typed. As a further problem, the *anusvār* (nasal diacritic) appears only uncertainly in the Chanji’s Diary manuscript; and without it, we would be left with *khandīl*, which is not an identifiable word. Nonetheless, the Gujarati word *kaṇḍīl*, “lantern,” “candle,” suits this context well; it could very reasonably translate into English as “lamp,” which is what we find in the “Tiffin Lectures” sources at this juncture. The editors have accordingly presumed that Chanji used a different form of this word familiar to him that substitutes *d* in place of *ḍ*; since nasal consonants assimilate in this context, the emendation to *kaṇḍīl* is warranted.

20. This paragraph is enigmatically written in the sources. TLD/DF: 28-6-26, p. 7 reads: “From ‘Atom’, it advances to the ‘Stone’ state. (Supposing ‘atom’ = the Lamp, if we go back to its root, it is ‘Akash’. (*Ākāśh*).” TTL/FF p. 53, TTL p. 53, and TLD/FF: 28-6-26, p. 7 read almost identically. The first problem that presents itself concerns the referent of “it” in the sentence “. . . it advances to stone state.” **What** advances? The diary gives no help here: ChD 57: p. 26 simply reads “atom *māthī* stone,” which translates, “from atom, stone.” Taking the line in context, and interpreting it in the light of similar passages in *Infinite Intelligence*, the editors have supposed that “it” in this case refers to chaitanya, and they have emended accordingly. This brings us to the sentence in parentheses: what does “it” refer to in the phrase, “it is ‘Akash’”? The diary source in ChD 57: p. 26 reads: “atom = *khandīl* [sic] – *pāchhu*

muḷmā back *jāy* to *ākāśh*”; that is, “atom = lamp – if once again we go back to the source, then *ākāśh*.” Again, the reference may be to chaitanya: when one traces back along the line of evolving chaitanya to its source, one finds *ākāśh*—which, along with *prāṇ*, is present in the original point. The obscurities of this passage, however, make it impossible to assert this interpretation, or any other, with confidence. The editors have thought it best, therefore, to avoid determining what “it” is, and accordingly they have had recourse to the fairly neutral locution, “we find *ākāśh*.”

21. “Swelling and expanding” is the somewhat speculative interpretation of a word written in an almost illegible (Gujarati script) handwriting in TLD/DF: 28-6-26, p. 8. The entire phrase reads: “*premā – janma – upasa[v] buddhī*.” The first, second, and fourth words of this phrase are clear enough; but the final letter of *upasa[v]* cannot be ascertained with surety; it could be the Gujarati letter for “t” or something else. Gujarati dictionaries supply us with the verbal form *upāsāvū*, “to swell, to expand, to spread out.” By this reading the phrase *upasav buddhī* could refer to the “swelling” or expansion of chaitanya from its earlier stage of instinct towards *buddhī* or intellect. It is not inconceivable, however, that the word is a Gujarati rendering of the Marathi *upasaṇ*, “approaching, advancing to.” Conjoined with *buddhī*, the phrase would mean “approaching intellect”—a sense admirably suited to the context. The editors have inserted an English translation suggesting movement and expansion towards, while sounding here the cautionary note that the manuscript reading may be unreliable.

22. This line has been constructed on the basis of TTL/FF p. 54 (reproducing TTL p. 54), TLD/DF: 28-6-26, p. 9, TLD/FF: 28-6-26, p. 8, and a sentence in ChD 57: p. 28.

23. TTL/FF p. 55 (like TTL p. 55) reads “conscious,” but TLD/DF: 28-6-26, p. 9, TLD/FF: 28-6-26, p. 9, and the diary source ChD 57: p. 30 all read “unconscious”—clearly the right meaning in this passage, which is trying to mark a contrast between Sat and Shiv where consciousness is concerned.

28TH JUNE 1926 (CONTINUED)

24. TLD/DF: 28-6-26, p. 10 and TLD/FF: 28-6-26, p. 10 make it clear that this section represents the continuation of this same Tiffin Lecture of 28th June—a point which cannot be ascertained with surety from TTL/FF pp. 55–56, TTL pp. 55–56, or ChD 57: pp. 30 and 32.

25. In TTL/FF p. 56, and TLD/DF: 28-6-26, p. 10 the “Question” and the “Answer” that follows it are designated through the abbreviations “Q.” and “A.” (TLD/FF: 28-6-26, p. 10 gives “Q.” and “An.”). None of these typed manuscripts nor the diary source (ChD 57: p. 30) gives any indication as to whether one of the mandali posed the question or whether Baba asked it of himself; but to judge by other such cases in “Tiffin Lectures,” it seems more likely that the question was asked by the mandali.

26. ComD 1: f. 283. The text here has been normalized in its spelling, capitalization, and punctuation.

27. The primary source for this line, TLD/DF: 28-6-26, p. 10, reads: “The same way, the number (of Spiritual workers) fixed is 56, just as there are 56 parts of the body. (Limbs *avyavo – indriyo*). Eyes are only two, the nose is only one . . .”

28. This text is based on Godsī, p. 76, ghazal 9, couplet 3. TTL/FF p. 57 does not mention the name of Hafez and has a lacuna at the juncture where this couplet occurs, but the couplet appears in the Gujarati script in three of the sources, TLD/DF: 28-6-26, p. 11, TLD/FF: 28-6-26, p. 11, and ChD 57: p. 32. In ChD 57: p. 32 it takes the following form (here transliterated into the Roman alphabet, with English words incorporated): “(name of a kind of hen – here a Sadguru) *Ūngā shīkāre kas na shavad dām bāz chīn/ Kījā hamishe bād ba dastast dām rā.*”

29TH JUNE 1926

1. The typescript of TTL/FF p. 57 (and TTL p. 57) does not in any way indicate that a new Tiffin Lecture begins here (ten lines up from the bottom of the page). It is true that the running head at the top right of this page gives a new date—“29-6-26.” Yet the general layout of the page conveys the impression that the previous lecture (of 28th June) is continuing; and in the absence of other evidence one would have concluded that the date in the header is erroneous. But the fact that a new lecture begins at this juncture (marked by the centered title phrase “What is LUCK?” and title-page-style header with the place and date) is established beyond doubt by the presentation and layout of TLD/DF: 29-6-26, p. 1 and TLD/FF: 29-6-26, p. 1.

2. ComD vol. 1: f. 285.

3. TLD/DF: 29-6-26, p. 1, reads “Sharma”; TTL p. 57 reads the same, but someone has indicated the need for correction and handwritten “Shram” above the line (*shram* means exertion, effort, toil). ChD 57: p. 34 provides the reading *sharam*, while

ChD 57: p. 35 gives *sharm*. On the other hand, *Meher Message*, vol. 1, no.11 (November 1929), p. 1 renders this word as “Snarma”—almost certainly an error, since the present editors have been able to identify no such word. Though *sharm* (derived from the Persian) may seem slightly forced in this context, neither diary version warrants an emendation to the final-long-voweled and Sanskrit-derived *sharmā*, “happy, prosperous,” whose meaning one could reconcile to this passage only with the greatest difficulty. “Karma” and “dharma” are the Sanskrit spellings for what the modern Indic languages render as *karm* and *dharm*. *Sharm* does not occur in Sanskrit and is therefore never rendered as *sharma*; the form “sharma” has probably been introduced into the sentence here to rhyme with “karma” and “dharma.”

4. A version of these two lines (including the word “Snarma”—see the previous endnote) was published as saying no. 53 in “Sayings of His Divine Majesty Sadguru Meher Baba,” *Meher Message*, vol. 1, no.11 (November 1929), p. 1. For further information, see Appendix 5, Table 10, p. 514.

5. The sources for these last three sentences vary from each other slightly, though the general meaning is plain enough. TLD/DF: 29-6-26, p. 1, reads: “Krishna said—‘None is DEAD’—meaning —‘the falling of the body’ is not ‘death’. ‘Killing or destroying Maya’ is ‘death’,- real death.” TLD/FF: 29-6-26, p. 1 reads virtually identically; so do TTL/FF p. 58 and TTL p. 58 except for the first phrase: “Krishna said—‘Mine’ is DEAD’ meaning —‘the falling of the body’ . . .” (The word “Mine”

is probably a typographic error.) The diary source in ChD 57: p. 34 expresses the thought more elliptically: “Krishna *kahyu ke mār - sagaḷā marīj gayalā chhe. Tyāre kahej koi nathī muvu*”; that is, “Krishna said, ‘Kill!’ All are already dead. Then he says, no one is dead.” The editors have tried to compile an integrated text from these diverse and slightly contradictory sources that expresses the main idea.

30TH JUNE 1926 (FIRST SESSION)

1. TTL pp. 59–66 (and TTL/FF pp. 59–66, their carbon copies) have running heads that date this material to 30th June 1926. In the middle of TTL/FF p. 62, however, the discourse is interrupted by a new rubric or section title:

Continuation of the lecture on
“THE CIRCLE & ITS PREPARATION”
given on 28-6-26.

The editors understand this to mean that, on 30th June, Baba was reverting to the topic he had discussed two days earlier. Does this imply that Baba was embarking on a new Tiffin Lecture? The typographic layout of TTL/FF p. 62 (and TTL p. 62) is ambiguous on this point; but TLD/DF: 30-6-26 (first session), p. 1 and TLD/FF: 30-6-26 (second session), p. 1 start a new page with the section title as above, use the typographic layout design characteristic of the first page of a new Tiffin Lecture, and begin their pagination over again (from pages 1 to 5). The compilers of these two manuscripts, in other words, viewed these two sequences as constituting different lectures by Baba. Following these hints, the editors have divided TTL/FF pp. 59–66 (and TTL pp. 59–66) into two lectures, the first from TTL/FF p. 59 through the rubric (as above) on p. 62, and the second from the rubric to the end of p. 66. Since both of these lectures were given on the same date, the editors have differentiated by calling the first the “first session” and the second the “second session.”

2. The original text of ChD 57: p. 42 seems

defective: “Shree B.—thereupon said—that he truly knew of all this, nor had he paid any serious thought to this request. . .” But the point of Baba’s comment seems to be precisely that he did **not** know about all of this; for as the Tiffin Lecture explains in detail, miracles like this come about automatically, without the Sadguru’s direct involvement. Probably Chanji left the words “did not” out of this sentence; this supposition is corroborated by the appearance of the word “nor” in the phrase “nor had he paid any serious thought. . .” The editors have emended accordingly.

3. ChD 57: p. 42 reads “Hindu gentlemen” at this juncture, even though in the opening lines of the account he had been characterized as a “Jain gentleman.” The editors take the earlier reference to be the correct one.

4. This episode does not appear in any of the “Tiffin Lectures” manuscripts—TTL/FF p. 59, TTL p. 59, TLD/DF: 30-6-26 (first session), p. 1, TLD/FF: 30-6-26 (first session), p. 1—but has been taken from Chanji’s account in ChD 57: pp. 42–43.

5. The analogy of the whip in this paragraph and the next cannot be found in the “Tiffin Lectures” manuscripts (TTL/FF p. 59; TTL p. 59; TLD/DF: 30-6-26 (first session), p. 1; TLD/FF: 30-6-26 (first session), p. 1). It does occur in this point of the lecture, however, in both ChD 57: p. 44 (mostly in English) and ChD 62: p. 495 (mostly in Gujarati); undoubtedly it belonged to Baba’s original exposition before the mandali. In both diary

30TH JUNE 1926 (FIRST SESSION) (CONTINUED)

versions the analogy is presented confusingly, and the versions contradict each other on certain details. The gist, however, is clear enough; and the overall metaphor expresses Baba's idea so marvelously that the editors have thought it desirable to restore this content into the edited Tiffin Lecture here.

6. A version of these last three sentences appears as saying no. 52 in "Sayings of His Divine Majesty Sadguru Meher Baba," *Meher Message*, vol. 1, no. 11 (November 1929), p. 1. For further information, see Appendix 5, Table 10, p. 514.

7. In the source manuscripts (TTL/FF p. 60, TTL p. 60, TLD/DF: 30-6-26 (first session), p. 2, TLD/FF: 30-6-26 (first session), p. 2, and ChD 57: p. 45, though not in ChD 62: p. 495, since that account is too abbreviated to exhibit this feature), this incident is narrated in an odd hypothetical voice: "One comes with the news to Shree . . . Then Shree would say . . ." (TLD/DF: 30-6-26 (first session), p. 2)—as if Chanji is not describing what actually happened on that day but a typical incident of the sort that occurred often. The editors have tried to preserve some of this sense and flavor while sustaining the coherency of the exposition.

8. The wording of TTL/FF p. 61 is obscure: "Not only that, but the very first idea (of a Serpent) in itself was a mere 'Illusion (*bhās*), which shows its power to suffice (the first-created) Maya." (This wording matches closely that of TTL p. 61, TLD/DF: 30-6-26 (first session), p. 3, TLD/FF: 30-6-26 (first session), p. 3, and ChD 57: p. 46.) The puzzle here centers on the word "suffice," which seems to have been used erroneously as a transitive verb with "Maya" as its direct object. But even if we construct Maya as an indirect object, by which reading the "powers" (of the illusion) suffice to Maya, the sentence remains enigmatic. Trying to render the sentence into an intelligible form, the editors have taken the underlying thought to be that the powers of Maya suffice for the creation of an illusion like this (that is, for the creation of an idea of a serpent which gets superimposed on a string). Moreover, the original creation of the idea of a serpent lies quite

within Maya's powers, since Maya herself was the first-created of all.

9. In the two typed "Tiffin Lectures" sources (TLD/DF: 30-6-26, p. 4 and TTL/FF p. 61), the word in parentheses takes the Gujarati oblique form *māyāne*. These typed versions appear to be based on the diary source text, ChD 57: p. 47, in which *māyāne* has been written in the left hand margin, off and apart from the poetic line, which is enclosed in quotation marks. Perhaps Chanji inserted the word in his diary as an explication, to clarify who the "you" is (*tujhe* is written in the diary as *tuje*); and subsequently this got inserted into the text of the poetic line in TLD/DF: 30-6-26, p. 4 and TTL/FF p. 61. The result is a line in which the Hindi oblique form *tujhe* (*tuje*) gets restated and explicated parenthetically through the Gujarati oblique form *māyāne*. This mix of languages does not make for good reading, however, and accordingly the editors have emended to *Māyā*. It is possible that Baba was quoting from a line of Hindi verse, providing his own glosses and explications, which the compiler or typist later worked into the primary text.

10. At this juncture in the "Tiffin Lectures" manuscripts (TTL/FF p. 62, TTL p. 62, TLD/DF: 30-6-26 (first session), p. 4, TLD/FF: 30-6-26 (first session), p. 4) the typed Tiffin Lecture ends. But the source diary (ChD 57: p. 47) shows clearly that Baba's talk to the mandali continued. The diary material up until this point is annotated with a large marginal check mark, while the material following has a marginal question mark: these are Chanji's standard signs that material should be included or excluded (respectively) from the typed version of the manuscript. Perhaps he felt that the "mad dog" analogy made for a good ending, while the material that follows suffers from a certain ambiguity, especially in the last paragraph. The editors have deemed it best to restore this content nonetheless, particularly because the analogy of the hair and the head illuminates Baba's discussion on the nature of Maya so superbly.

11. At this juncture (in ChD 57: p. 47) there appears

an inserted note that probably expresses a thought and observation from Chanji himself: "To my mind, the law of *Māyā* of the whole Universe applies here, too, i.e. the very idea, appearance of hairs growing, being cut off etc. is—all a *bhās* . . ."

12. ChD 57: p. 47 reads: "Who created it? (Don't say—God! but take it that) *Paramātmā* is being freed from the Clutches of this *māyā*, and it is always His duty & working to destroy *māyā* from all—as best as it can." While the idea here is presented clearly and intelligibly, one puzzles at the representation of *Paramātmā* as being bound and thus needing to be freed, in view of the fact that the lecture throughout has insisted on *Paramātmā*'s utter transcendence and immaculate dissociation from the world of Maya. Possibly the diary sentence **should** have read "*Paramātmā* is **free** from the clutches of this *māyā*"; but the editors do not find the arguments and evidence for this sufficiently decisive as to warrant an emendation.

30TH JUNE 1926 (SECOND SESSION)

1. ComD 1: f. 285. The text has been slightly edited here for readability.

2. The "Tiffin Lectures" source texts read obscurely here. TTL/FF p. 62, TTL p. 62, and TLD/DF: 30-6-26 (second session), p. 1 all give us: "And although, in this 'Yoga-Marga', one can gradually proceed further, however, the initial final method can be had and learnt from a Guru." (TLD/FF: 30-6-26 (second session), p. 1 reads almost identically). What could be the meaning of this oxymoronic phrase "initial final method"? The diary source in ChD 57: p. 49 reads: "*to paṇ pratham nī rīt gurū pāsthīj maḷī shake chhe*"; that is, "then the initial method [of yoga] can be obtained only from the Guru." These

13. "Sadguru's" is an emendation for "His"; the relevant sentence from the diary is quoted in full in the previous endnote. Ostensibly, in the grammar of the original diary sentence, "His" refers to *Paramātmā*; yet it is hard to believe that this could be so, in view of the way in which the lecture vehemently dissociates *Paramātmā* from worldly involvement. The fact that the previous sentence characterizes *Paramātmā* as a *jīvātmā* in bondage only makes the problem worse: how can this be assimilated to a *Paramātmā* who destroys Maya and sets *jīvātmās* free? This final paragraph seems to have been drafted in a confused and hurried manner; it is more than likely that Chanji had in mind some referent for the pronoun "He" that he did not actually write down. What the "He" does in this sentence sounds like the activity of the Sadguru as described earlier in the lecture, and the editors have emended accordingly.

two sources might be brought together through the thought that, within those very yogic traditions that Baba has been speaking about (wherein yogis progress gradually from stage to stage), the wisdom from the past has it that one can pass through the final stages of the path only with the help of a Guru. This idea is consistent with this passage, and the editors have emended accordingly.

3. TTL/FF p. 65 and TTL p. 65 have "red heat" and TLD/FF: 30-6-26 (second session), p. 4 "red lead." Presumably these are typographic or copying errors; TLD/DF: 30-6-26 (second session), p. 4 provides the most plausible reading, "Red-head," which appears in a handwritten interlinear addendum.

1ST JULY 1926

1. This account is based on the information in the 30th June 1926 entry in ComD 1: ff. 285–86.

2. TTL/FF p. 67 and TTL p. 67 read: "When the Mind gets Samadhi (Higher concentration), it is

prepared to rise upwards—towards realization"; TLD/DF: 1-7-26, p. 1 and TLD/FF: 1-7-26, p. 1 read almost identically. The best diary source in ChD 57: p. 61 reads: "*Jyāre manane samādhi*

1ST JULY 1926 (CONTINUED)

(higher concentration) *lāge chhe, tyāre tenī upar javānī* (realizn *taraf*) *taiyārī thāy chhe*.” This translates: “When mind goes into samādhi (or higher concentration), then it is preparing to move upwards.”

3. The original text of TLD/DF: 1-7-26, p. 1 reads: “‘Internal Knowledge’ acquired haphazard [*sic*] is nothing”; TTL/FF p. 67, TTL p. 67, and TLD/FF: 1-7-26, p. 1 read almost identically. This translates ChD 57: p. 61: “*Tufāt antar jñān to kāij nahī*”; that is, “Incomplete inner knowledge is nothing.” Presumably such knowledge is acquired “haphazard[ly]” when it does not come in the course of the pilgrim’s struggle and endeavor.

4. These first two sentences do not appear in TTL/FF p. 67 or TTL p. 67, but they do in TLD/DF: 1-7-26, p. 1 and TLD/FF: 1-7-26, p. 1. The corresponding lines in ChD 57: p. 61 and ChD 57: p. 60 (two separate occurrences) read similarly, if one allows for an admixture of Gujarati.

5. “Permanent” and “true” appear in all the “Tiffin Lectures” manuscripts; “*kāyam-satat*” with or without the hyphen appears in TTL/FF p. 67, TLD/DF: 1-7-26, p. 1, TLD/FF: 1-7-26, p. 1, and ChD 57: pp. 60 and 61. Grammatically *satat* is an adverb that means “continually”; yet it is glossed in the “Tiffin Lectures” as “true,” a rendering which the editors have retained.

6. This phrase “like the perfect yogis” does not occur in the “Tiffin Lectures” manuscripts (TLD/DF: 1-7-26, p. 1 gives us: “And these ‘valis’ too, who have gone . . .”; TTL/FF p. 67, TTL p. 67, TLD/FF: 1-7-26, p. 1 read almost identically). But what could the adverb “too” refer to? The previous paragraph described perfect yogis in these same terms, viz., as having advanced to the extreme limits of the mind. The editors have construed “too” as an allusion to them and have emended accordingly.

7. The original text of TLD/DF: 1-7-26, p. 2 reads: “Even then i.e. in that realized state too, he (Mujzoob) is in ‘No Dualism’ state (*advait avasthā*)” (TTL/FF p. 67 and TLD/FF: 1-7-26, p. 1 read similarly, and

also TTL p. 67, except that here the Gujarati words are missing.) Now in its implications this sentence seems to be at odds with itself, since, through the adverbial conjunction “even though,” it opposes what are actually two names for the same state—the “realized state” and the “No Dualism state.” Drawing on content from the previous sentence, the editors have emended so as to bring out what seems to be the real relevant contrast, that is, between the Majzūb’s embodiment and his non-duality. This accords with ChD 57: p. 61, which reads: “*Ā realizn bād je tyājī rahe chhe tene sharīr chhe, man chhe, pañ ahaikār ane buddhī nathī tobi te a-dvaitamāj chhe*.” That is, “After this Realization, those who remain there have body, have mind, but egoism and intellect are not there. Yet they are in non-duality.”

8. Here and throughout this Tiffin Lecture, the English words of this trinity translate the Indic words *ānand*, *shakti*, and *jñān* (the source for this present occurrence is ChD 57: p. 61).

9. The original text reads ambiguously here: “. . . a Sadguru has the control and submission of both the Subtle and the Gross, and then he can make use of these ‘consciously’ with the aid of his Knowledge Bliss and Power, which he naturally can ‘give’ to others, if he so desires” (TTL/FF pp. 69–70 and TTL pp. 69–70; TLD/DF: 1-7-26, p. 4 and TLD/FF: 1-7-26, p. 3 read very similarly). Grammatical ambiguity afflicts the word “which”: does it refer to the Knowledge, Power, and Bliss (the proximate nouns), or to the “Subtle and the Gross” (which, as we have just been told, the Sadguru controls)? In the former case, the Sadguru would be giving Realization; in the latter case, he would be fulfilling gross and subtle desires. Since no clear resolution offers itself, the editors have opted for inclusiveness, and have emended to suggest that the Sadguru can give any part or all of these.

10. Though the texts of TTL/FF p. 70 and TTL p. 70 have a lacuna here (“reach the [lacuna] plane”), TLD/DF: 1-7-26, p. 4 shows no such reticence: “reach the 5th. plane” (and TLD/FF: 1-7-26, p. 4 reads similarly). This follows the diary source: ChD

57: p. 65 supplies the phrase “5-*mā bhuvan* (5th pl.)” (ChD 57: p. 64 gives the same information.)

11. The texts of TTL/FF p. 70 and TTL p. 70 appear to be garbled here: “The reason for this is that the Yogis can only use the SHADOW of the Real Knowledge, Bliss and Powers, and with these very knowledge, Bliss and Power do they lead other ans [*sic*] give them that ‘experience’ (realization).” This appears to miscopy the text we find in TLD/DF: 1-7-26, p. 4: “The reason for this is that the Yogis can only use the SHADOW of the Real Knowledge, Bliss & Power, and not the Original. Those that have reached that ‘Perfection’ state can only make use of the Real Knowledge, Bliss & Power, and with these very Knowledge, Bliss & Power do they lead others and give them that ‘experience’ (realization).” TLD/FF: 1-7-26, p. 4—a separate typing of the lecture—reads very similarly. The Gujarati diary source passage in ChD 57: p. 65 generally confirms this (though it mentions only the Shakti or Power of those who have attained, not their Knowledge and Bliss also).

12. TTL/FF p. 70 and TTL p. 70 read: “Only a Sadguru, who comes down for duty can use the Highest Knowledge, Power & Bliss, full consciously and that too, not only in ONE state.” TLD/DF: 1-7-26, p. 5 and TLD/FF: 1-7-26, p. 4 read very similarly. The diary source (ChD 57: p. 67) reads: “*parantu te bī ek sthītī mā nahī*” (“but that too, not in one condition”). In all these sources the precise sense remains elusive. The editors have interpreted it to mean that the Sadguru does not wield his Knowledge, Power, and Bliss only from his unitive state of oceanic consciousness but does so from many different stations in creation in the course of his work; and the text has been emended accordingly.

13. This phrase (“poor fellow”) does not appear in the “Tiffin Lectures” manuscripts; it translates the Gujarati of ChD 57: p. 67, “*bachāro te*.”

14. The diary source for this passage, ChD 57: p. 69, gives the word “*Prabhu*” rather than “*Īshwar*”: “*Prabhu eṭale shakti, ānand, jñān*,” that is, “Prabhu means power, bliss, knowledge.” Probably in the course of compiling “Tiffin Lectures,” Chanji

thought that the word “*Īshwar*” better expressed Baba’s meaning. This suggests that “*Īshwar*” does not in this usage carry the specialized meaning (of Creator-Preserver-Destroyer) that it does in *Infinite Intelligence*. Probably it is just a synonym for God, or perhaps for God in His personal, theistic aspect.

15. The “Tiffin Lectures” manuscripts read disjointedly here, e.g., TLD/DF: 1-7-26, p. 6: “God (Ishwara) means ‘Knowledge, Bliss & Power’ (Nothingness *sunya*), i.e. one must get the real experience that all these (the whole Universe etc.) is ‘Nothing.’” (TTL/FF p. 72, TTL p. 72, and TLD/FF: 1-7-26, p. 6 read similarly.) Note that the word “Nothingness” has been introduced abruptly; and the same is true stylistically in the Gujarati of ChD 57: pp. 69 and 66. The underlying continuity of idea is clear enough, however.

16. The last few lines appear in garbled form in TTL/FF p. 72 and TTL p. 72: “. . . a hard fact to you, human beings – but which, to us (real) is a mere ‘dream state’ (of Truth) is so vividly ‘Perfect’ and that he who . . .” Plainly this miscopies the text recorded in TLD/DF: 1-7-26, pp. 6–7, which reads: “. . . a hard fact to you, human beings – but which, to us (realized) is a mere ‘dream state’. Then, where remains the doubt? That state (of Truth) is so vividly ‘Perfect’ and ‘Real’ that he who . . .” (TLD/FF: 1-7-26, p. 6 reads almost identically).

17. The manuscript sources are at variance with each other in this passage; probably Baba’s dictation got garbled in the transcription. The best texts are those of TLD/DF: 1-7-26, pp. 7–8 and TLD/FF: 1-7-26, p. 7, which differ from each other only trivially; the former reads: “Suppose, a man, being intoxicated, (with some drink) forgets his own self (*bhān gumāvī chhe*). Now, although, he is quite unaware of his own existence during that time, he himself IS i.e. does exist there. Now, the real ‘experience’ (realization) is not only thousands but crores of times more real and assured than this assurance of one’s existence during his state of intoxication (or ‘Forgetfulness of one’s own-self). Here, i.e. in this life and reference of intoxicated state, there is body even, but there, i.e. in the ‘real experience state, there is no body too.” While

1ST JULY 1926 (CONTINUED)

this verbiage is confusing enough, TTL/FF p. 73 appears to have lost a phrase: “Suppose, a man, being intoxicated, (with some drink) forgets his own self (*bhān gumāvī de*). How, although, he is quite unaware of his own existence during that time, he himself IS i.e. does exist there. How, the real ‘experience’ (realization) is not only thousands but crores of times more real and assured than this assurance of one’s existence during his state of intoxication (or ‘Forgetfulness of one’s own self). Here, i.e. in this life and [with] reference of intoxicated state, there is nobody too.” (TTL p. 73 reads identically except that a lacuna has not been filled.) The text of the diary source, ChD 57: pp. 70 and 71, is written in Gujarati: “Example—*ādmīne koī chīhñī nīshā chaḍhe chhe, tyāre (potānu bhān gumāvī) ‘gung’ thāi jāy chhe, te vevā potānī hastīnu te ne jarā e bhān nathī rahetu, chhatā te pote to hastī dharāve chhej. Haiyāt chhe j. Ā bīnā jetlī sāchchī chhe (yāne nīshamā padelo insān bhān bramīṣṭa chhatā haiyā chhe te) te kartā karōdo ane abājō ghañī khātārī to te anubhav chhe. (Amastho jahi)*

Temā body *to chhej nahi.*” This translates: “For example: [take] a man [who] gets inebriated with something, so then (he loses his consciousness) he becomes intoxicated; at that time he is not conscious of himself, yet even then his existence is still there, he remains. This fact is true (meaning that a human intoxicated and retaining no awareness whatsoever still exists): but crores and trillion times more than that is the conviction, and that is experience (it is not meaningless), in it there is no body.” None of these versions resolve the central problem in this passage: what is the point of comparing the certitude of Self-awareness of the God-realized person with the (non-existent) self-awareness of a drunk who has lost all consciousness of himself? There can be no proportion between infinity and nothing: so what exactly is being compared with what here? No easy way of creating coherency and intelligibility among these various versions suggests itself. The edited text primarily follows those of TLD/DF and TTL/FF p. 73.

3RD JULY 1926

1. TTL/FF p. 75 and TTL p. 75 read: “The ‘Bhaktas’ (Devotees) select their own Guru and surrender [to] Him (one seeing the other).” (TLD/FF: 1-7-26, p. 8 & 3-7-26, p. 1 and TLD/DF: 3-7-26, p. 1 read similarly.) Though the meaning of this final parenthetic phrase is somewhat ambiguous, probably “[the] one” refers to the devotee and “the other” to the Guru. That is, the devotee’s act of seeing the Guru (“one seeing the other”) leads to the devotee’s choosing him as Guru and surrendering to him. ChD 57: p. 73 confirms this sense: “*yāne bhakt loko potāno gurū pasand karīne te ne sharaṇ jāy chhe*”; that is, “Meaning, the bhaktas choose their own Guru and surrender to him.”

2. Much of the content of the next several paragraphs was published in “Fragments from the Spiritual Speeches of His Divine Majesty Sadguru Meher Baba. (10) On Real Knowledge,” *Meher Message*, vol. 1, no. 10 (October 1929), pp. 7-8.

3. The “Tiffin Lectures” manuscript sources (TTL/FF p. 75, TTL p. 75, TLD/DF: 3-7-26, p. 1, and TLD/FF: 1-7-26, p. 8 & 3-7-26, p. 1) all read (with variant spellings): “physical phenomena.” But one of the sources for this passage, ChD 62: p. 531, reads “psychic phenomen[a].” Since miracles, though perhaps manifesting in the realm of physical phenomena, derive from the realm of the psychic (or subtle), the reading in the diary is clearly superior, and the editors have adopted it.

4. The texts of TTL/FF p. 75 and TTL p. 75 seem garbled in various ways in the middle column entries associated with “intellect” and “instinct.” The editors have preferred the texts of TLD/DF: 3-7-26, p. 1 and TLD/FF: 1-7-26, p. 8 & 3-7-26, p. 1, which read sensibly, and which better comport with the diary source in ChD 57: p. 73. The text of TTL/FF p. 75 and TTL p. 75 characterizes intellect as the “4th shadow” (the other two manuscripts give us no

number at all); but since intellect is the “shadow of a shadow” (according to TLD/DF: 3-7-26, p. 1, TLD/FF: 1-7-26, p. 8 & 3-7-26, p. 1, and ChD 57: p. 73), the editors have emended to “second shadow.”

5. All the “Tiffin Lectures” manuscripts (TTL/FF p. 75, TTL p. 75, TLD/DF: 3-7-26, p. 1, and TLD/FF: 1-7-26, p. 8 & 3-7-26, p. 1) give us “4th shadow”; but since instinct is a shadow of a shadow of a shadow, the editors have emended to “third shadow.” See also the preceding endnote.

6. TLD/DF: 3-7-26, p. 1 gives us a sentence fragment followed by another sentence with which the fragment is not connected in any obvious way: “And Mind. It is this ‘Dnyan’ acquired in the 7th. plane that he uses . . .” The other sources (TTL/FF p. 75, TTL p. 75, TLD/FF: 3-7-26, p. 2 and ChD 57: p. 74) read similarly. None of these versions clarifies, in grammar or in sense, precisely what relation “mind” has to the idea that follows. Perhaps the passage means to imply that, whereas

“inner knowledge” has a connection with the mind, Jñān does not. But because no reading commands sufficient certitude, the editors have emended in a loose and general way.

7. TLD/DF: 3-7-26, p. 3, TTL/FF p. 76, and TTL p. 76 all read: “The Mind and Body of the ordinary people (without realization) are inter-mingled into each other when they work (as shown in the side figure), and they turn together” (TLD/FF: 3-7-26, p. 3 reads similarly). The diary source conveys this same thought without any reference to the figure: “The Mind & body of you ordinary people (without realzn.) are inter-mingled into each other when they work, and they turn to gether [*sic*] . . .” (ChD 57: p. 75). As explained in “Notes on the Figures” (p. 529), in the commentary on Figure 15 the editors feel that the reference to the figure (rendered in this book as Figure 15) in the “Tiffin Lectures” versions is erroneous, and they have edited on basis of the diary source.

7TH JULY 1926

1. The source (ChD 57: p. 55) reads: “. . . when he found out that all this is Nothing—before ‘Perfection’ he frankly admitted . . .” The diary does not explain what “all this” is; but in view of the lecture that follows, the diarist must have been referring to yogic experiences and powers. The text has been emended accordingly.

2. These opening two paragraphs do not appear in the text of the “Tiffin Lectures” sources (TTL/FF p. 78, TTL p. 78, TLD/DF: 7-7-26, p. 1, or TLD/FF: 7-7-26, p. 1) but are derived from ChD 57: p. 55. In the diary version Baba’s actual discourse is prefaced by a paragraph describing this yogi and his meeting with Baba; Baba’s own explanations follow (on ChD 57: pp. 55, 56, and 77) and these serve as the basis for the Tiffin Lecture. Since this narrative background from the diary version gives context and motivation for Baba’s talk, the editors have reinserted it here.

3. TLD/DF: 7-7-26, p. 1 reads: “It is only upto the 3rd. plane that one can come and go at will—i.e. in

the 2nd, 1st. planes and return etc. with one’s own power of concentration (*samādhi*), but NOT in the 4th.” (TTL/FF p. 78, TTL p. 78, and TLD/FF: 7-7-26, p. 1 read almost identically.) ChD 57: p. 56 gives us: “Upto the 3rd one can go & come back in 3-2-1, as his will & power of concentration (*samādhi*) but Not in the 4th.” The wording of the diary version implies that the pilgrim of the third plane comes and goes as an act of will, and that the power of concentration serves as an instrument for this movement: that is, the word “with” in the text of the Tiffin Lecture should be read as an instrumental; it does not mean that the “power of Concentration” is simply an accoutrement with which one travels. The text has been emended accordingly.

4. To capture the full force and import of what is expressed in the various sources, this last sentence has been reconstructed on the basis of the various readings in TTL/FF p. 79, TTL p. 79, TLD/DF: 7-7-26, p. 2, TLD/FF: 7-7-26, p. 1, and ChD 57: p. 56.

9TH JULY 1926

1. In TTL/FF p. 80–81 and TTL pp. 80–81 this Tiffin Lecture and the next bear the same date, 9th July 1926, conveying the impression that they constitute one lecture only, not two. But TLD/DF: 9-7-26, p. 1 and TLD/DF: 11-7-26, p. 1, TLD/FF: 9-7-26 p. 1 and TLD/FF: 11-7-26, p. 1, and Chanji's Diary (ChD 57: pp. 81–82 and 87) establish convincingly that we are dealing with two separate lectures whose dates, according to these sources, are 9th and 11th July, respectively.

The same 9th July 1926 entry in Chanji's Diary that provides the source for this 9th July Tiffin Lecture (ChD 57: pp. 81–82) records certain remarks of Baba's concerning Hazrat Babajan, to the effect that her spiritual workings would come to an end on 10th July and that she would drop her body ten, twenty, or 200 days thereafter. Yet "The Combined Diary" (ComD 1: f. 292) gives another version of these same remarks in its 10th July 1926 entry; and the 10th July 1926 diary entry of Chanji's Diary 35 (ChD 35) provides certain supporting evidence (the pages of this diary of Chanji's have not yet definitively been numbered, but this entry appears as the diary's last two pages). In other words, these three diary accounts divide against each other on the matter of date.

The editors of this present volume concur with the editor of *Lord Meher* in the view that Baba's comments about Hazrat Babajan were probably misdated in ChD 57: p. 81 and that the true date for these is 10th July, as reported in "The Combined Diary." The dates in "The Combined Diary" are generally found to be more reliable than those in Chanji's Diaries; and the fluency of the handwriting in ChD 57: pp. 81 suggests that it may have been written out by Chanji some time after the event, creating scope for error. But in that case, the possibility cannot be discounted that this present Tiffin Lecture, too, has been misdated, since its diary source (ChD 57: p. 82) belongs to the same entry that provides the misdated remarks about Babajan (ChD 57: p. 81).

At present no unequivocal grounds present themselves settling the date of this Tiffin Lecture definitively. Yet since the evidence for emending

its date to 10th July does not appear substantial enough to have achieved a critical mass, the editors think it best to adhere to the primary Tiffin Lecture manuscript sources—TTL/FF p. 80, TTL p. 80, TLD/DF: 9-7-26, p. 1, and TLD/FF: 9-7-26, p. 1—which explicitly attribute the lecture to 9th July.

2. All the "Tiffin Lectures" sources (TTL/FF p. 80, TTL p. 80, TLD/DF: 9-7-26, p. 1, TLD/FF: 9-7-26, p. 1) have lacunae here: "Somewhere ([lacuna]) it is said that . . ." The Gujarati text of ChD 57: p. 82 sheds no further light on the matter. Plainly Chanji intended to locate the source of this aphorism but never did so.

3. The text of TTL p. 80 seems to have omitted a clause: "i.e. Perfect Sadgurus. (State). Because, this state is the Highest order." TTL/FF p. 80, the carbon copy of TTL p. 80, has the missing words written in by hand. But TLD/DF: 9-7-26, p. 1 reads more intelligibly: "Because, this state is the Highest, and the deserving (*lāykān*) for such a state must be of the Highest order." TLD/FF: 9-7-26, p. 1 reads similarly. The Gujarati of ChD 57: p. 82 concurs.

4. Both TLD/DF: 9-7-26, p. 1 and TTL/FF p. 80 fill the lacuna in TTL p. 80 with *ākāsh*, a peculiar word choice, since it means "space." However, TLD/FF: 9-7-26, p. 1 and the diary source for this passage, ChD 57: p. 82, supply *svarg*, "heaven." The editors have opted for *svarg*, since it translates "heaven" and so better suits the context.

5. This extended English gloss of the couplet of Kabir translates the original text of ChD 57: p. 82, which reads:

*Sadgurū samān ko nahi, sapta dvīp nav khaṇḍ,
fīn lok na pāiye, aur ekbīs brahmāṇḍ
sāt dvīp ane nav khaṇḍomā pharī vaḷo,
pātāl, pruthvī ane svargmā pharī vaḷo, 21
brahmāṇḍmā paṇ pharī vaḷo – ne juvo ke
khodānī mulākāt karāvṇār guru jeṭlu aṇṇu
bhalu kamār bījo koīe badhāmā kāy paṇ chhe
ke? Ke chhej nahi.*

11TH JULY 1926

1. On the assignation of the date 11th July to this Tiffin Lecture and the textual problems surrounding this, see endnote 1 in the previous lecture (p. 556).

2. ComD 1: f. 290.

3. ComD 1: f. 290.

4. The title in TTL/FF p. 81 and TTL p. 81 contains a typographic error—"BE ASS SAME AS A SAGE . . ."; but "same" is corrected to "sane" in the other sources (TLD/DF: 11-7-26, p. 1, TLD/FF: 11-7-26, p. 1, and ChD 57: p. 87).

5. TTL/FF p. 81 and TTL p. 81 refer only to Meher's ignorance, not his innocence: "For, he is

quite 'ignorant' of all the affairs of pleasure . . ." But TLD/DF: 11-7-26, p. 1 gives us: "For he is quite INNOCENT, and consequently quite 'ignorant' of all the affairs of pleasure . . ." TLD/FF: 11-7-26, p. 1 reads similarly. ChD 57: p. 87 likewise contains both terms: "Why—bec[ause] he is quite ignorant & at the same time innocent of all the affairs connected with this organ."

6. TTL/FF p. 81 and TTL p. 81 read, "be ye all as short, as able and as same . . ." TLD/DF: 11-7-26, p. 1 and TLD/FF: 11-7-26, p. 1 offers what is plainly a superior text: "be ye all as alert, as able and as sane . . ." ChD 57: p. 88 reads similarly.

15TH JULY 1926

1. TTL/FF p. 82 and TTL p. 82 give the date as "13th July 1926"; but TLD/DF: 15-7-26, p. 1 and TLD/FF: 15-7-26, p. 1 list the date as "15th. July 1926." This latter date is corroborated in the diary sources for the first page of this lecture, ChD 57: p. 91 and ChD 62: p. 503. The 15th July 1926 entry in "The Combined Diary," cited immediately hereafter, gives further supporting evidence. ("The Combined Diary" provides no entry at all for 13th July; the 12th and 14th July entries discuss other matters.)

2. ComD 1: f. 296. The text has been slightly edited for spelling and punctuation.

3. The source manuscripts (TTL/FF p. 82, TTL p. 82, TLD/DF: 15-7-26, p. 1, TLD/FF: 15-7-26, p. 1, ChD 57: p. 91) all provide the reading "below Truth." Yet this cannot easily be reconciled to the source diagrams for Figure 17, in all of which "Truth" appears at the bottom of the diagram. The text has been emended accordingly.

4. TTL/FF p. 82, TTL p. 82, TLD/DF: 15-7-26, p. 1, TLD/FF: 15-7-26, p. 1, and the immediate diary sources for this line in ChD 57: p. 91 and ChD 62: p. 505 all use the same expression for

this item in the list after "revelation" and before "stillness": "overpowering of feelings." Yet this phrase suffers from a serious ambiguity: does it mean that feelings are overpowered or that feelings do the overpowering? Happily, some clarification is offered a few lines below in all these sources, when Baba explains that "In the Inspired or in the Overpowered state, the Mind . . ." (TLD/DF: 15-7-26, p. 1). Bringing this later line to bear on the earlier one suggests that it is the mind that has been overpowered by feelings. Such a reading indeed comports with the description of the sixth plane of consciousness in *God Speaks* (p. 49): "The mental-conscious human soul of sixth-plane consciousness experiences the mental world through complete consciousness of feelings and thus has no thought at all . . ." The editors have emended to resolve the ambiguity and to clarify this sense.

5. The "Tiffin Lectures" sources for this sentence read ambiguously; thus TLD/DF: 15-7-26, p. 1: "In the Inspired or in the Overpowered state, the Mind is in the 'Intellectual Advance' [*sic*] state, yet in its own sphere (i.e. *sthūr*)" (TLD/FF: 15-7-26, p. 1 and TTL/FF p. 82 match this almost exactly, as does TTL p. 82, except that the lacuna has not been filled in with the handwritten *sthūr*). The word

15TH JULY 1926 (CONTINUED)

sthīr (a variant spelling of *sthīr*), “unmoving, lasting, steady,” appears in this position in the corresponding passages in both diary source pages (ChD 57: p. 92 and ChD 62: p. 505). Yet it is not self-evident how *sthīr* glosses the phrase “in its own sphere.”

While the editors see no way of bringing certitude to the interpretation of this confusing sentence, their best guess is this. Presumably the intellect, in one transformation or another, persists throughout the journey through the planes; thus the mind can be characterized as “intellectually advanced” in the “inspired” and “overpowered” states—which is to say, throughout the series of states (intuition, inspiration, power, etc.) listed in the previous paragraph. Yet the mind itself abides in its own sphere, constant and steady (*sthīr*), beyond these changing states. The sentence is distinguishing, in other words, between the mind and its states. The text has been edited according to this understanding.

6. The diary source for this line (ChD 57: p. 92) introduces this early reference to masts: “*Keṭlā evā mast (guṅg) paḍelā chhe.*” That is, “There are many such masts (dumb) lying about.” TLD/DF: 15-7-26, p. 1 gives the reading: “There are so many who have been lying (*guṅg thai*) ‘Unconscious’ in this states! [*sic*]”

7. ChD 57: p. 91 gives the reading *husne ākebat*, and ChD 62: p. 503 possibly likewise, though the last letter is hard to read. TTL/FF p. 82, TLD/FF: 15-7-26, p. 1, and TLD/DF: 16-7-26, p. 1 all transliterate “*husne ākeban*,” though in the Gujarati script the letter transliterated as the Roman *n* is similar to that transliterated as *t*, and in view of how Chanji often writes this his Gujarati *t*, it is very likely that *t* is what he intended. In all three of the typed texts this Gujarati-script verbiage is presented in parentheses as a gloss for “Beautiful & Peaceful End” (and ChD 57: p. 91 has “Peaceful-Beautiful

end”). The Persian-Urdu word *āqibat* carries the meaning “end, conclusion; future life,” so the editors have adopted this reading.

8. TTL p. 82 has a lacuna here; handwritten Gujarati text is supplied by TTL/FF p. 82, TLD/DF: 15-7-26, p. 1, and TLD/FF: 15-7-26, p. 2 & 16-7-26, p. 1. ChD 57: p. 92 has a version of the same couplet with an introductory phrase and gloss after it. That diary source reads as follows:

Jñān when once gained is for ever Perfect

Gau-shā-

*karodo abjo me se koī ekadeko fakhr (realzn)
hāsel hotā hay*

*aur hāsel ho to phīr jhāhel nahi hotā hay
yāne ke karodo abjomā thī koī ekādāne realzn
thāy chhe – ne te thavā bād pachhī te kadī nāsh
pāmtu nathī yāne te forever perfect-aj chhe.*

This poetic couplet cited above is in the Urdu language, although it has been written in the Gujarati script (with spelling mistakes), and in its first line features a form of the Gujarati word *ekād*, “some, hardly any,” conjoined with the Urdu postpositive *ko*. The prose lines that follow are in Gujarati. The passage translates thus:

Knowledge when once gained is forever perfect.

Gau[s Ali] Sha[h Qalander has said:]

Only one in millions of millions of crores obtains the glory;

and once he has obtained it, he cannot forget it.

Meaning, out of a hundred crores, one gets Realization, and after getting Realization, it never gets destroyed – meaning it is forever perfect.

16TH JULY 1926

1. ComD 1: f. 296; the text has been slightly edited for readability.

2. The diary source (ChD 57: p. 93) identifies this mandali only as “R.”—which could be either Rustom Irani (Kaikhushru and Gulmai’s son) or Ramjoo Abdullah. The editors think Rustom to be more likely, since he is known to have been an active participant in these lectures during this time disposed to ask questions of this type. Indeed, the entry in “The Combined Diaries” for the very next day—17th July 1926 (ComD 1: f. 297)—relates that “[t]he details of this explanation [that Baba gave on this day] are with Rustomji.”

3. The original text of TTL/FF p. 83 and TTL

p. 83 reads: “Every Master (CHARGEMAN) has to prepare” (TLD/FF: 15-7-26, p. 2 & 16-7-26, p. 1, TLD/DF: 16-7-26, p. 1, and ChD 57: p. 93 read similarly). This phrase has been expanded here to clarify that the “Master” served as Chargeman in the circle of the Master before him, as was explained in Baba’s lecture on 28th June 1926 (see pp. 104–9).

4. ChD 57: p. 94 contains only the first of these last two sentences: “To be like – little rays is nothing”—though this is followed by what appears to be an underlined caption: “A Persian quotation—”. But the remainder of the page is blank; unfortunately no Persian quotation has been inserted below the caption.

21ST JULY 1926

1. ComD 1: f. 301. The text has been slightly edited for spelling.

2. None of the “Tiffin Lectures” manuscripts (TTL/FF p. 85, TTL p. 85, TLD/DF: 21-7-26, p. 1, or TLD/FF: 21-7-26, p. 1) mentions this contextual detail; it has been introduced into the text here from the Gujarati introductory notes on ChD 57: p. 115.

3. The “Tiffin Lectures” sources word this sentence obscurely; thus TLD/DF: 21-7-26, p. 1: “‘Dnyan’ = State (*Avastha avasthā*)” (TTL/FF p. 85 reads similarly; TLD/FF: 21-7-26, p. 1 gives us “Dnyan = State (*Avastha jñān = avasthā*)”; TTL p. 85, afflicted with lacunae, offers little help.) But ChD 57:

p. 115 provides clarification: “*jñān chār prakārnu chhe* [blank spaces] *jñān = avasthā.*” This translates: “There are four types of knowledge [blank spaces] knowledge = state.”

4. TTL p. 85, TTL/FF p. 85, and TLD/DF: 21-7-26, p. 1 render this sentence in an abbreviated form: “(Also a ‘Ray’)—”. TLD/FF: 21-7-26, p. 1 gives only a handwritten parenthetical “(Ray.)” ChD 57: p. 115 gives this word in Gujarati: “*kīran.*” The editors interpret “Also” as a reference and comparison to the vishva jñānis; “Ray” acquires its significance by comparison with the Sun, as explained in the previous Tiffin Lecture.

26TH JULY 1926

1. The dating of this lecture is vexed by conflicting evidence. All the “Tiffin Lectures” sources (TTL/FF pp. 87–89, TTL pp. 87–89, TLD/DF: 27-6-26, pp. 1–3, and TLD/FF: 27-7-26, pp. 1–3) clearly cite the date as 27th July 1926, and the same date appears in Chanji’s Diary (ChD 57: p. 121). However, the 26th July 1926 entry from “The Combined Diary” (ComD 1: ff. 306–7) records what cannot be doubted

to be a synopsis of the same lecture; the 27th July 1926 “The Combined Diary” entry (ComD 1: f. 307) gives completely different content.

Since a decision has to be made, the editors have opted to follow the dating in “The Combined Diary,” this generally having proven to be the better source where dates are concerned. This 26th July 1926 “The Combined Diary” entry offers a

26TH JULY 1926 (CONTINUED)

detailed description of events of the day and the circumstances specifically that led to the lecture that night; and the 27th July 1926 “The Combined Diary” entry makes no mention of anything of the kind. On the other hand, the “Tiffin Lectures” manuscripts are probably dependent on Chanji’s lone diary entry in ChD 57: p. 121; a single wrong date there could have rippled out in the form of wrong dates in the other “Tiffin Lectures” sources. ChD 57: p. 121 records that the lecture took place “at night” (“The Combined Diary” likewise describes the lecture as having taken place at night—on the 26th—between 7 and 10 p.m.). Perhaps Chanji ascribed to this night talk the date of the following morning, when, as it happens, another meeting was held (on the subject of mandali diet).

2. ComD 1: ff. 306-7. The original text has been slightly edited.

3. The Gujarati text of ChD 57: p. 121 says that those with *svayambhū* powers “also have in their hands the other two, Ishwarī and siddhi powers” (“*tenā hātmā bijī be ishvarī ane siddhī shaktio to hoyechhej*”).

4. This last phrase (about Baba’s sudden disappearance from the view of Kaka’s brother) has been inserted editorially; the thought is missing from the original text of TTL/FF p. 87 and TTL p. 87: “The one Kaka’s brother—assures you of having actually seen Shree with his own eyes, nay, having actually taken his ‘Darshna’ [*sic*] and talked to him personally. . . .” (TLD/DF: 27-6-26, p. 1 and TLD/FF: 27-7-26, p. 1 read similarly; the Gujarati source text of ChD 57: p. 121 expresses the same meaning). Since Chanji is here describing an episode perceived as extraordinary or even miraculous, clearly he has inadvertently left out the miraculous detail of Baba’s sudden disappearance from a setting (i.e., the Ahmednagar bazaar) where Baba had just been seen. The editors have restored this detail, using as their source and authority “The Combined Diary” account reproduced at the head of this Tiffin Lecture, where this element of the story is clearly narrated.

5. Three of the “Tiffin Lectures” manuscripts (TTL/FF p. 88, TTL p. 88, and TLD/DF: 27-6-26, p. 2) give us, as abbreviations for these two names, “Pad.” and “Byr.”; TLD/FF: 27-7-26, p. 1 diverges in spelling the second abbreviation “Beh.” Now while “Pad.” can unproblematically be identified as Padri, “Byr.” and “Beh.” send mixed signals. Yet the diary source for this passage, ChD 57: p. 122, resolves the matter. For while it mentions no name, it gives the abbreviated English word “suptd.,” short for “superintendent.” A year earlier Behramji and Rustom had been appointed superintendents of Meherabad, and this office and the performance of its occupants came in for occasional discussion. Clearly Behramji is the individual being referred to, as consistent with the text of TLD/FF: 27-7-26, p. 1; “Byr.” represents a somewhat peculiar form of the abbreviation for this.

6. The original text of TLD/DF: 27-6-26, p. 2 reads: “Now, this poor unfortunate patient is here at a great disadvantage (of losing the benefit of so much ‘Sat-Sang’ and many other subsequent advantages) . . .”; TTL/FF p. 88, TTL p. 88, and TLD/FF: 27-7-26, p. 2 read similarly. Clearly the wording of this sentence works counter to the theme of the anecdote, asserting as it does that the poor patient, by remaining “here,” has lost the benefit of Baba’s satsaṅg, when the problem resulted from the fact that the patient left. The editors have emended accordingly to restore good sense.

7. Again, the sources word this thought infelicitously: TTL/FF p. 88, TTL p. 88, TLD/DF: 27-6-26, p. 2, and TLD/FF: 27-7-26, p. 2 all read, “The advantage to the poor patient was either through a ‘mis-understanding’ . . .” But the very moral to the story is that the patient *lost* the advantage. ChD 57: p. 123 expresses this thought in the phrase, “*gerfāydo thayo*”; that is, “a loss occurred.” The editors have emended accordingly.

8. This sentence, expressing a thought implied by the context, has been inserted editorially to connect the preceding paragraph with what follows.

28TH JULY 1926

1. ChD 57: p. 129 cites these lines in Gujarati translation: “*Ādame ek juvārīnā dāṇā māte svarg chhoḍī dīdhū, paṇ hu to ā tamām dūnyānī kīmat ek ghaunā dāṇā jeṭṭī bī gaṇto nathī.*” That is, “Adam for a pellet of jawar forsook heaven, but I do not rate this entire world at the worth of even one single grain.” Jawar (or jowar) is the vernacular name in north India for sorghum, one of the principal fodder crops in the Deccan plateau regularly eaten in the form of bread known as bhakri. The couplet presented in the primary text of this edition, however, is taken from the original Farsi of Hafez, which does not appear as such in any of the sources.

2. This introductory material can be found (in Gujarati) in ChD 57: p. 129 as a preface to this lecture of Baba’s in the direct diary source. The editors have interpolated it here since it provides an interesting context for Baba’s explanations.

3. TTL/FF p. 90 reads: “But you (all) human beings . . .” ChD 57: p. 129 reads “*sādhāraṇ manuṣyamā,*” that is, “ordinary mankind.” The editors have inserted the word “ordinary” to convey that Baba means to speak here of the masses of humanity.

4. The original text of TTL/FF p. 90, TTL p. 90, and TLD/DF: 28-6-26, p. 1 reads: “How could you reach that which is beyond the limit of your Intellect which is Limited?” (TLD/FF: 28-7-26, p. 1 reads similarly.) This wording does not express the idea that it is impossible to reach **by means of the intellect** what is beyond the intellect. That idea does appear in the Gujarati source text of ChD 57: p. 129, which gives us: “*to je intellect nī pelī mer chhe tene*

tamo intellect thīj kevē rūte pahōchī shako?” (“so that which is beyond the intellect, how can you reach by means of the intellect?”). The present text has been revised to incorporate this idea of the instrumentality of intellect.

5. “Powers and mediums” has been inserted editorially as a translation from a phrase in the Gujarati source text, “*shaktio ane sādhanō*” (ChD 57: p. 129).

6. The sources cited in the previous endnote give only the English word “Intellect”—and in the next line in the diagram, “Mind.” The words *buddhi* and *man* do appear in the course of the commentary below, however; and the editors have inserted the two words into the diagram from that source.

7. Filling a lacuna in all of the “Tiffin Lectures” sources, ChD 57: p. 131 names Hafez and renders his couplet into Gujarati: “*Parantu-tārā man par kashij asar thatī nathī, hu tārā kaṭhaṇ dīlthī heyraṇ thatī rahyo chhū. Te (tārū dīl) khaḍak karīā bī jāstī kaṭhaṇ chhe.*” The English gloss that follows Hafez’s Farsi couplet in the main text is a fairly close translation of these Gujarati lines.

8. The text of TLD/DF: 28-6-26, p. 3 reads: “Your Mind & Heart are not at all effected [*sic*] with my such severe sufferings, O Guru! I am amazed at your ‘hard-heartedness’. Your heart (Dil) seems to me harder than stone even.” TLD/FF: 28-7-26, p. 3 reads similarly. TTL/FF p. 92 and TTL p. 92 suffer from several typos, most notably in the wording “I am amused” instead of “I am amazed.”

5TH AUGUST 1926

1. ComD 1: f. 311.

2. See LM (Mownavani), vol. 2, p. 612; LM (Manifestation), vol. 3, p. 830.

3. A version of this the first section of this Tiffin Lecture appears as “Fragments from the Spiritual Speeches of His Divine Majesty Sadguru Meher

Baba. (11) On Desires and Bindings (given at tea-time on 5th August 1926),” *Meher Message*, vol. 1, no. 11 (November 1929), pp. 6-7.

4. The diary source for this passage is ChD 57: p. 135: “When these formless impressions go away the *jivātmā* is given to *atma*.” TLD/FF 5-8-26, p. 1 reads similarly. TTL/FF p. 93 gives the reading:

5TH AUGUST 1926 (CONTINUED)

“Then these ‘formless impressions’ go away (*jīva-ātmāpañī*) is given to ‘Atma.’”

5. The text of TTL/FF p. 93 and TTL p. 93 read: “then it becomes the ‘Original Power’ i.e. ‘Atma.’” TLD/FF 5-8-26, p. 1 reads similarly. But the word “Power” here seems to result from a misreading of the diary. In both ChD 57: p. 134, which is the raw source, and ChD 57: p. 135, which is the fair copy (based on that raw source), we find the phrase “original pure atma.” Probably the text of the Tiffin Lecture results from a reading or typing error in which “pure” was misconstrued and rendered as “power.” The editors have emended, accordingly, in favor of the diary reading.

6. “Fragments from the Spiritual Speeches of His Divine Majesty Sadguru Meher Baba. (12) On Service,” *Meher Message*, vol. 1, no. 11 (November 1929), p. 7, draws selectively from this portion of this Tiffin Lecture—particularly TTL pp. 95–97, that provide the source for about two-thirds of this section in this edited text.

7. TTL p. 95 provides “boats,” and TTL/FF p. 95 has the same, except that an s has been inserted in handwriting with a caret. TLD/FF 5-8-26, p. 3 likewise provides the reading “boast.”

8. These Gujarati words in TTL/FF p. 95 fill a lacuna in TTL p. 95. ChD 57: p. 136 is the diary source, whose text is followed fairly closely in TLD/FF 5-8-26, p. 3.

9. A lacuna in TTL p. 95 is filled by the Gujarati text (here slightly edited) of TTL/FF p. 95. ChD 57: p. 136 constitutes the diary source. The same Gujarati passage appears in TLD/FF 5-8-26, p. 3.

10. These Gujarati words, filling a lacuna in TTL p. 96, are taken from TTL/FF p. 96, TLD/FF 5-8-26, p. 3, and ChD 57: p. 143.

11. TTL/FF p. 96 and TTL p. 96 read “particularly — everywhere.” But ChD 57: p. 143—the clear source for this passage—reads “practically everywhere.” The same appears in TLD/FF 5-8-26, p. 4. The diary and TLD/FF reading seems preferable; perhaps the word “particularly” in the Tiffin Lecture results from an error in typing.

12. TTL/FF p. 97 and TTL p. 97 read “‘Dnyan’ (Concentration).” In this manuscript “Dnyan” serves as the normal transliteration for the Indic word *jñān*. The word “concentration,” however, better serves to translate the Indic word *dhyān* rather than *jñān*; and in fact this is what we find in the diary source for this passage (ChD 57: p. 147): “*karma, bhaktī, dhyān*” (though this last word may be spelled *dhyān*). TLD/FF 5-8-26, p. 5 also provides this reading: “All ‘Karma’ (Actions), ‘Bhakti’ (prayers) and ‘Dhyān’ (Concentration) must be done . . .” “Dnyan” in the “Tiffin Lecture” typescript appears to be a mistyping of “dhyān”; and the editors have emended accordingly. It is true that the three yogas—the *trimārg*—are conventionally said to be karma, bhakti, and jñān (action, devotion, and knowledge); but Baba here appears to have substituted “concentration” (involved in the meditational process, a part of jñān yoga) in place of the “knowledge” term.

13. The original text of TTL p. 97 reads: “destroys all the ‘gratitude’ (Punya [lacuna]).” TLD/FF 5-8-26, p. 5 and TTL/FF p. 97 fill the lacuna with “*puṇya*” in handwritten Gujarati; the diary source for this passage, in ChD 57: p. 147, simply omits the word “gratitude”: “. . . destroys the *puṇya* . . .” The word “gratitude” does not adequately translate *puṇya*, nor does it in any other obvious way make sense in this context. Perhaps the underlying thought is that, when one claims for oneself the credit for action, one fails to show proper gratitude towards Him who is action’s true source. Yet since this meaning is not at all clearly expressed, the word “gratitude” must be taken as a typing error or mental lapse; we have accordingly emended by replacing it with “merit,” a correct translation.

14. The Gujarati text of this indented line and the Gujarati line that follows it (“*Te karī āg! Shuī te āg?*”) is taken from TLD/FF 5-8-26, p. 5. A less complete version appears in ChD 57: p. 149. Though there is nothing in the source texts explicitly to indicate that this is a familiar saying, the fact that TTL p. 98 and TTL/FF p. 98 leave a gap for it in the typography suggests that this is intended as a quotation.

18TH AUGUST 1926

1. This Tiffin Lecture and the next (which will be referred to in this note by the titles “Types of Spiritually Advanced Persons” and “Four Short Talks,” respectively) are vexed with problems involving the dates as well as textual relations with the diary sources. On the matter of dating the problem can be described thus. The “Tiffin Lectures” manuscripts (TTL/FF pp. 99–105, TTL pp. 99–105, TLD/FF: 17-8-26, pp. 1–2 and TLD/FF: 19-8-26, pp. 1–5) specify the dates for the two lectures as 17th and 19th August, respectively. The full text for these two lectures as given in these manuscripts (TTL/FF pp. 99–100 and 101–5 and TTL pp. 99–100 and 101–5, TLD/FF: 17-8-26, pp. 1–2 and TLD/FF: 19-8-26, pp. 1–5) is based on two sections of ChD 57. This diary source material for “Types of Spiritually Advanced Persons” (ChD 57: pp. 162, 163, 165, 164, and 166) begins with a page (p. 162) dated “17-8-26.” Most of the diary source material for “Four Short Talks” (ChD 57: pp. 171, 170, 172, 174, 176, 178, 180, and 168) can with confidence be dated to 19th August 1926—since two of these pages bear that date; but ChD 57: p. 168 bears the date 18th August. Thus we find a total of three dates—17th, 18th, and 19th August—associated variously with these two lectures.

This already muddled picture is further complicated by the evidence from “The Combined Diary.” Here the entry for 17th August gives no indication of anything like a talk to the mandali; but the entry for 18th August (ComD 1: f. 319) closes with the following sentence: “In the evening Baba gave out some explanations on Atma-Gnyan, Paramatma-Gnyan, Jivan-Mukta, Videh-Mukta, Acharya etc.” This description corresponds well with content common to both lectures (in TTL/FF pp. 99–100 and 105 and TTL pp. 99–100 and 105, TLD/FF: 17-8-26, pp. 1–2 and TLD/FF: 19-8-26, p. 5, pp. 226–27 and 237–38 in this edition). Meanwhile, “The Combined Diary” entry for 19th August (ComD 1: f. 320) contains this sentence: “Today Baba gave out many interesting explanations for as many as four times in the day.” This description too seems to match the style and

substance of “Four Short Talks,” which is indeed discontinuous and broken into discrete and largely unrelated sections.

In short, the evidence of “The Combined Diary” points to 18th and 19th August as the probable dates for the two lectures, whereas “Tiffin Lectures” and ChD 57 indicate 17th and 19th August (with the exception of ChD 57: p. 168, dated 18th August). No easy method of reconciling this stark contradiction between manuscript sources offers itself. In general the editors have found the dates in “The Combined Diary”—which situates talks that Baba gave within a broader continuous narrative of his life during this period—to be more reliable than those in “Tiffin Lectures”; on this principle the date of this present Tiffin Lecture has been emended from 17th August to 18th August. It is quite possible that a single erroneous date in Chanji’s Diary (on ChD 57: p. 162) might be responsible for the replication of that erroneous date throughout the various “Tiffin Lectures” manuscripts; and thus the number of manuscripts bearing the 17th August dating do not count as independent testimony. It must be acknowledged, however, that this decision in favor of the 18th August dating overrides a body of contrary textual evidence (viz., the explicit dates on TTL/FF p. 99, TTL p. 99, TLD/FF: 17-8-26, pp. 1–2 and TLD/FF: 19-8-26, pp. 1–5, and ChD 57: p. 162). Until further evidence emerges, the problem of the dating of these two lectures must be regarded as unresolved.

A further difficulty presents itself specifically with respect to ChD 57: p. 168 (dated 18th August), which describes and distinguishes Videh-Muktas, Jīvanmuktas, and Āchāryas. As already noted, both Tiffin Lectures present this information, which might lead one to suppose that the same discourse material given by Baba on a single occasion found its way into the “Tiffin Lectures” at two different points. But again this picture is complicated by the fact that ChD 57: p. 162 and 164 (p. 162 bears the date 17th August) render their own version of this same content. In fact, the text of the explanation in TTL/FF pp. 99–100, TTL p. 99–100, and TLD/

18TH AUGUST 1926 (CONTINUED)

FF: 17-8-26, pp. 1–2 (pp. 226–27 in this lecture) follows the wording of ChD 57: pp. 162 and 164, while that of TTL/FF p. 105, TTL p. 105, and TLD/FF: 19-8-26, p. 5 (pp. 237–38 in the next lecture) shows a closer verbal relationship with ChD 57: p. 168. Once again, it is not inconceivable that a single explanation by Baba found its way into Chanji's Diary at two different points—since Chanji often reproduced the same material on different pages of his diaries; and these two diary versions could then have found their way into the “Tiffin Lectures” manuscript in two different lectures. So the question still stands: did Baba give this explanation about the types of God-realized persons once or twice?

Here again, no easy way of resolving this dilemma stands forth. To add to the difficulties, the text of TTL/FF p. 105 and TTL p. 105 is seriously garbled, though happily, a far superior version can be found in TLD/FF: 19-8-26, p. 26, reproducing the substantive content of the diary sources. (For a detailed discussion of this editorial crux, see endnote 13 in the next lecture.) In view of these complexities, the editors have thought it best to follow the “Tiffin Lectures” manuscript sources in presenting this same material twice (once in each lecture). In fact, it is not in the least unlikely that on the second day Baba did indeed revert to and explain again what he had explained the day before, as is suggested by the two different dates in Chanji's Diary.

2. While in *God Speaks* Meher Baba characterized a mahāyogī as an advanced soul of the fourth plane, in *Infinite Intelligence* the term usually refers to a person on the fourth, fifth, or sixth plane (on rare occasions the seventh). Though the present lecture does not pin down the meaning of the term unambiguously, from the fact that a mahāyogī is more advanced than a yogi and less than a pīr, we might infer that he belongs to the fourth or fifth plane. ChD 57: p. 162 and TLD/FF: 17-8-26, p. 1 associate the mahāyogī with the Gujarati expression *jīvan bhūmikā* (that is, “life plane” or “sphere”). While Meher Baba does not go on to gloss either of these terms in detail and perhaps had not settled on

their use, they seem to indicate the upper reaches of the subtle sphere.

3. This last phrase has been inserted by the editors to make explicit what is presumed in the diagram, that is, that the “Sun” and its “rays” are equivalent to the “Ocean” and its “drops”; the two metaphors are being mixed.

4. The meaning of the original text of TTL/FF p. 99, TTL p. 99, and TLD/FF: 17-8-26, p. 1 is not altogether clear; TTL/FF p. 99 reads: “The ‘Ananta’ Sat-Chit-Ananda (*Sat-Chit-Ānand*) state is comp[ar]ed with that of the SUN, so, the Jivatma, that is ONE WITH the ‘Sat-Chit-Ananda’ is similarized with the state of the SUN.” Now this sentence could be read to mean that “the Jivatma,” which is to say **any** jīvātmā, the **typical** jīvātmā, is one with the Sun and its Sat-Chit-Ānand state. Yet the word “similarized” suggests that Baba is explaining the terms of his “Sun-and-rays” analogy, in which, by the most obvious and sensible reading, the Sun represents Paramātmā and the rays represent the multitudinous jīvātmās. It seems more likely, therefore, that the phrase “the Jivatma, that is ONE WITH the ‘Sat-Chit-Ananda’” refers not to the typical jīvātmā but to that exceptional, God-realized Ātmā; in other words, the clause “that is one with Sat-Chit-Ananda” is used restrictively, not non-restrictively. We have edited the prose of this passage accordingly. (The text of the diary source—ChD 57: p. 163—offers no special illumination at this juncture.)

5. These English words (in TTL/FF p. 99, TTL p. 99, and TLD/FF: 17-8-26, p. 1) translate the Gujarati phrase “*Anant Shakti, Jñān, ane Ānand*,” that is, “Infinite Power, Knowledge, and Bliss” (ChD 57: p. 162; TTL/FF p. 99 and TLD/FF: 17-8-26, p. 1 read similarly). Elsewhere in the lecture, however, “Satchitānand” carries this same meaning.

6. These same three types of God-realized persons are discussed again in the next lecture, pp. 237–38 below. These two versions of the same material in these two Tiffin Lectures are probably based

on two different versions in Chanji's diary: the account here has as its evident source ChD 57: pp. 162 and 164, while the version in the next lecture (of 19th August) is probably based on ChD 57: p. 168. On problems of dating, source, and textual relations, see endnote 1 above.

7. The text of TTL/FF p. 100 and TTL p. 100 reads: “There are very very few, who remain IN the Sun, and from there, see their own ‘rays’” (TLD/FF: 17-8-26, p. 2 reads similarly). This wording does not unambiguously identify the “very few” with the “Āchāryas or Jñān Muktas” (i.e., Perfect Masters)

of the preceding line. Yet the way that this “very few” is described in the following paragraph makes it clear that they can be no one other than Perfect Masters. For the sake of clarity the passage has been emended accordingly.

8. The text of ChD 57: p. 166, which is the source for this passage, implies that this preparation that the Chargeman carries out is directed specifically towards his own successor (*bijāne*, from *bijū*, “another, a second one”): that is, the Chargeman who is to follow him.

19TH AUGUST 1926 (FIRST SESSION)

1. ComD 1: f. 320; the text is slightly edited.

2. The Tiffin Lecture source material for the following list, most of the content of this first section, and certain elements in the remainder of this lecture have been rendered in another (differently edited) version in “Fragments from the Spiritual Speeches of His Divine Majesty Sadguru Meher Baba. (13) On Spiritual Achievements,” *Meher Message*, vol. 1, no. 12 (December 1929), pp. 6–7.

3. The text of TTL/FF p. 101 and TTL p. 101 reads: “With the Gross Eye, the ‘Subtle’ things are seen: . . .” (TLD/FF: 19-8-26, p. 1 reads similarly). The diary source corroborates this: “With the Gross eye, the Subtle *vastu-s* are Seen” (ChD 57: p. 171). Yet it is hard to explain why **subtle** objects (*vastu-s*) would be seen with the **gross** eye (except on the first plane, where, according to *God Speaks*, this does happen; but there is no indication that Baba is talking about the first plane in our present text). A few lines below this, TLD/FF: 19-8-26, p. 1 provides the following: “But, as actually the gross material things (*jaḍ-vastu*) are seen, so also are the Subtle things seen with the Internal Eye, i.e. (Subtle eye *antar-draṣṭī*), and with the ‘Mental Eye’ (*divya draṣṭī*), God is Seen” (TTL/FF p. 101 and TTL p. 101 read similarly, except that all the lacunae have not been filled). This passage implies (though it does not explicitly state) that “gross things” are seen with the gross eyes. Since in many other places Baba has affirmed that gross (and not subtle) objects are perceived through

the gross senses, the editors have emended “subtle” to “gross” here.

4. This indented list and the two paragraphs before it were published as saying no. 112 in “Sayings of His Divine Majesty Sadguru Meher Baba,” *Meher Message*, vol. 2, no. 12 (December 1930), p. 1. For further information, see Appendix 5, Table 10, p. 514.

5. The “Tiffin Lectures” source texts (TTL/FF p. 102 and TTL p. 102) for these last three sentences are somewhat garbled: “Now just as this ‘eye’ sees this slate with the same (eye) open or closed, the same way, if it sees ‘Self’ with the same (ete) [*sic*] open, it is the same in all these.” (TLD/FF: 19-8-26, p. 2 reads similarly.) The underlying meaning seems clear, however, and the editors have emended accordingly.

6. In ChD 57: p. 176 the phrase “*he kāmī*” has been written in the Gujarati script on the bottom row of the left-hand column, across from and slightly below the English in the right-hand column, “sound sleep.” This phrase “*he kāmī*” has been carried over into TLD/FF: 19-8-26, p. 3, where it takes the form of a parenthetical penciled note filling blank spaces in the table (all the other slots in the table having been filled in). If this phrase is indeed in the Gujarati language, it means something like “O lustful one”; possibly the expression has a sarcastic connotation. It is not immediately clear why this phrase has been added at this juncture. Perhaps the notion is that the ordinary

19TH AUGUST 1926 (FIRST SESSION) (CONTINUED)

human, cycling between sound sleep, dream, and wakefulness (in the lower half of the diagram), is caught in the net of desire and lust (*kāma*). Does this handwritten annotation register some comment that Baba himself made? We cannot be sure, but it seems unlikely that the diarist would have inserted this thought on his own initiative.

7. Literally “freed” or “released,” in idiomatic usage *khalās* often functions as a kind of exclamation, meaning “finished!—done!—over with!” Though the word does not appear in the text of the TTL/FF p. 103, TTL p. 103, or TLD/FF: 19-8-26, p. 3, it does occur in the diary source (ChD 57: p. 174) and has been interpolated from there.

8. ChD 57: p. 178 gives the Marathi phrase “*numchī bokanḍīvar bāsto*,” “sit on your neck”; the sense of this idiomatic expression is to restrain or hinder from action. In TTL/FF p. 104 Chanji translates this into Gujarati: “*gardanpar savār chhej*”; TLD/FF: 19-8-26, p. 3 gives a similar reading. Probably in the original lecture Baba dictated this phrase in its Marathi form.

9. These last two sentences are based on TLD/FF: 19-8-26, p. 4, which reads “It is nothing—only the experience (realization *anubhav*) is required.” TTL/FF p. 104 and TTL p. 104 read: “It is nothing. Only the ‘experience’ is required.”

10. TTL/FF p. 104 and TTL p. 104 read: “For example, take your own question . . .” (TLD/FF: 19-8-26, p. 4 reads similarly). Presumably Baba was referring to a question which one of the mandali attending the lecture had recently asked; in other words, Baba was alluding to the give-and-take in this very lecture as an example of the process of acquiring intellectual understanding that does not succeed in transforming one’s root experience and breaking the identification with the false self—as he illustrates below with the example of the scorpion.

11. The source text of TTL/FF p. 104 and TTL p. 104 reads thus: “[you who] regularly hear all such talks (of ‘experience’ and ‘nothingness’ etc.) are NOT void of or any exception to these

‘inexperienced’ drops . . .” (TLD/FF: 19-8-26, p. 4 reads similarly). A word seems to be missing here: “void of” what? The editors have supplied the word “sankaras,” since it makes sense in this context, and since this phrase recurs throughout the literature of this period.

12. The texts of TTL/FF p. 105, TTL p. 105, and TLD/FF: 19-8-26, p. 5 do not indicate by what means one is travelling here; but the diary source (ChD 57: p. 180) clarifies that point: “samadhi is the rest one takes when travelling **on foot** from nager [*sic*] to Bombay . . .” (emphasis added).

13. These same three types of Muktas were described in the previous lecture (pp. 226–27 earlier). Similarities of wording suggest that TLD/FF: 19-8-26, p. 5 (used here as the primary source in preference to TTL/FF p. 105 and TTL p. 105: see endnote 15 below) was based on ChD 57: p. 168; though ChD 57: pp. 162 and 164 present much of the same content, the wording of those diary pages better matches TTL/FF pp. 99–100 and TTL pp. 99–100, which is the source for the relevant content in pp. 226–27 earlier. For detailed discussion of the textual and dating problems that vex these two passages and, indeed, these two lectures as a whole, see endnote 1 on pp. 563–64.

14. This narrative interlude referring to the context of Baba’s dictation does not appear in the “Tiffin Lectures” sources (TTL/FF p. 105, TTL p. 105, and TLD/FF: 19-8-26, p. 5) but in the diary source (ChD 57: p. 168). That diary page gives 18th August (not 19th August) as its date; for a full discussion of the problems and complications involved here, see endnote 1 on pp. 563–64.

15. The text of TTL/FF p. 105 and TTL p. 105 on which this passage is based seems badly garbled at this juncture. Its numbered list omits the first item entirely but starts with number two:

2. The “Videh-Mukta” keeps the body, which is moved by the Higher Powers (he has acquired) of “Jivatma” but “Unconscious only.”]

3. The “Acharya” keeps the body, moves and works it “Self-consciously” with His own “Knowledge, Power & Bliss”.

The typed draft version in TLD/FF: 19-8-26, p. 5, however, presents this list—with the complete three numbered items—in a much more reasonable form. Its first item is the “Videh-Mukta,” who “leaves the body immediately”; second comes the “Jivan-Mukta,” who “keeps the body which is moved by the Higher powers”; and third is the “Acharya” who “keeps the body, moves and works it, ‘Self-consciously’ with His ‘Knowledge, Power and Bliss[.]’” This text reproduces the content of the diary source, ChD 57: p. 168, and it accords with what has been explained about these three types of God-realized persons elsewhere in this and the preceding lecture. Plainly the

text of TTL/FF p. 105 and TTL p. 105 (both the products of the same act of typing) is defective; TLD/FF: 19-8-26, p. 5 has been preferred as the source here.

16. This phrase (*jīvātmā chalāve chhe*) appears uniquely as a handwritten interpolation in TLD/FF: 19-8-26, p. 5. Remarkably, it asserts that the *jīvātmā* persists after Realization. The editors cannot think of another instance in Baba’s writings where the *jīvātmā* is credited with this.

17. In *God Speaks*, by contrast, the Jivanmukta is characterized as enjoying creation-consciousness; the description of the Jivanmukta in this lecture corresponds to what *God Speaks* calls a Majzūb. (See also the previous lecture of 18th August 1926, p. 226 and footnote 5.)

19TH AUGUST 1926 (SECOND SESSION)

1. This Tiffin Lecture does not appear in any of the “Tiffin Lectures” source manuscripts (TTL/FF, TTL, or TLD/FF); the current text is based, rather, on ChD 57: pp. 182–86. The editors have chosen to incorporate it into this collection because of the extraordinary description that Meher Baba provides here of the character and significance of his philosophical explanations.

2. This Marathi phrase (literally translated in the first part of this sentence) appears (without English translation) in ChD 57: p. 183.

3. The original Marathi text of ChD 57: p. 183 reads “*jāgā jhālā khudā*.” The editors have emended this into an expression that fits the sentence grammatically.

4. The original text of ChD 57: p. 183 reads “*ek paygānthī*.”

5. The text of ChD 57: p. 184 reads: “(*sārū chhe ke sukhaḍ nā jhāḍabī hame pedā kīdhā chha*)—*nahī to—bāvaḷanā lākaḍā nā bī vāndhā rahete*.” Literally, this translates: “(it is good that we have grown the trees of the sandal wood) — or else—the wood of the bāvaḷa would come into doubt).”

6. The original text of ChD 57: p. 185 reads: “they

take the *sharīyat* as the *Goal sevaḍ* of realization [*sic*], instead of the way *mārg*. (rather foundation).”

7. At the bottom of ChD 57: p. 186, separated from the preceding by a few lines and in a slightly smaller handwriting, we find the following: “Ex—of Mr Angarh Vakil (*purāṇī*), who claims himself to have read the Scriptures (*hīdu-shāstrā*) & even other religions books. And in spite of these, he is stupefied, every time.” The word “*hīdu*,” written in a way as could be read “*hīk*,” is clearly intended to be “*hīndu*” (*hindu* in good Gujarati), that is, Hindu, with the *anusvār* mark inadvertently omitted; one finds “*hīndu*” spelled in full, with the *-du* formed in the same problematic way, in ChD 62: p. 483. The “Mr Angarh Vakil” here is undoubtedly Angal Pleader, who regularly gave talks to the Meherabad school children on the Puranas and other Hindu scriptures during this period. Is the idea here that even a man so well versed in Hindu scripture as Angal Pleader finds himself astonished by Baba’s talks? The manner in which this note has been taken down suggests that it might represent not a comment of Baba’s but an observation and reflection by Chanji. In any event, since the editors do not find themselves able to interpret this obscure line with confidence, they have not attempted to incorporate it into the main text of Baba’s lecture.

21ST SEPTEMBER 1926

1. ComD 1: f. 339; the 21st September 1926 entry that narrates this episode is one of the more expansive in the entire diary, occupying more than five pages (pp. 339-44).
2. Selections and extracts from TTL/FF pp. 106-7 (comprising a little less than the first third of this Tiffin Lecture) were published as “Fragments from the Spiritual Speeches of His Divine Majesty Sadguru Meher Baba. (10) On Renunciation,” *Meher Message*, vol. 2, no. 1 (January 1930), pp. 8-9.
3. This last participial phrase does not appear in the original text of TTL/FF p. 106, which reads: “But such a ‘Renunciation’ too is difficult (Tyag *tyāg*)” (TTL p. 106 and TLD/FF: 21-9-26, p. 1 read similarly; the Gujarati of ChD 57: p. 191 and ChD 62: p. 517 expresses the same meaning.) The word “too,” however, seems to imply that renunciation constitutes one path among several. To express this idea, as a transition the editors have reverted to the thought of the first paragraph of this lecture, which says that renunciation is the best expedient for most of humanity.
4. This text appears in ChD 57: p. 191. TTL/FF p. 106 gives a different version: “*Peṭ samānā anna māge—tan samānā chīr/ kahe Kabīr, sun bhāi sādhu—tākā nām fakīr.*” That is, “He who fills the stomach with food and covers the body with clothing—Kabir says, O listen, brother Sadhu!—such a one can be named a faqīr.” TLD/FF: 21-9-26, p. 1 reads virtually like ChD 57: p. 191, except that the line “*kahe Kabīr, sun bhāi sādhu*” has been written, crossed out, and replaced with “*adhik hī sangrah na kare.*” The editors have selected the diary version since it expresses the thought more adequately.
5. TTL/FF p. 107 and TTL p. 107 read “even if the world (people) may call you ‘cowards’ . . .” (TLD/FF: 21-9-26, p. 2 reads similarly). The word *hijrā*, “an effeminate person, a eunuch,” has been interpolated from the Gujarati diary source for this passage (ChD 57: p. 192).
6. The English word “suffer” in TTL/FF p. 108

and TTL p. 108 (“suffers” in TLD/FF: 21-9-26, p. 3) renders the Gujarati of ChD 57: p. 192, “*Bas kāi bī kīdhu ke mār,*” which means, literally, “whatever they say, they get beaten up.”

7. The text of TTL/FF p. 109 and TTL p. 109 reads: “External Renunciation, even with desires (being created) is alright, too.” (TLD/FF: 21-9-26, p. 3a reads similarly.) The diary source (ChD 57: p. 193) reads: “External (rennc.) *thīk*—desires *āve tobt*”; that is, “External renunciation is good—even if desires come.”

8. TTL/FF p. 110 reads: “If the Sanskaras of ‘karma’ attached to the ‘Pure Permatma’ (*shudhd Paramātmā*) be wiped off, it’s all right” (TTL p. 110 likewise, except that the lacuna has not been filled; TLD/FF: 21-9-26, p. 4 reads similarly). The diary source (ChD 57: p. 194) expresses the thought in Gujarati: “Pure *paramātmā par je karmanā sanskārlāge te saghlā nikalyā ke bas.*” This translates: “When all the sanskaras of karma affecting that Pure Paramātmā are wiped off—enough.” What exactly does it mean to suggest that sanskaras are “on” or “attached to” pure Paramātmā? The editors presume that this language means nothing more than to indicate that Paramātmā is the real Self with which sanskaras get associated; and the text has been edited accordingly.

9. The original text of TTL/FF p. 110 and TTL p. 110 reads: “(as to the connection of a ‘Circle’ it’s quite a [*sic*] different).” TLD/FF: 21-9-26, p. 4 gives us: “(As to the connection of a ‘Circle’, it’s quite a different matter).” The diary source (ChD 57: p. 194) provides the following: “(circle *nī to vātaj judī*);” this translates, “(The case of the circle is quite different).” Read literally, these source materials would seem to suggest that Tukārām was not the member of a Sadguru’s circle, since apparently the experience of circle members differs from his. Yet since Tukārām himself became a Sadguru later in his life, he must have been the member of a Sadguru’s circle prior to Realization. Probably Baba threw in this comment (about the case of circle members being different) simply to dissociate the

episodes from spiritual history that he was relating in this lecture from the experience that his own circle members were passing through at this very time. Spoken to his mandali, what this comment means, in other words, is, “all this has nothing to do with you.” The line has been emended to suggest this.

10. The source for this line in TTL/FF p. 110 and TTL p. 110 reads: “This ‘Doing’ & ‘Being’ (it is that) drowns all” (TLD/FF: 21-9-26, p. 5 reads similarly). The diary source in ChD 57: p. 197 helps to clarify: “*karvu – hovu’ ej dūbāde chhe*”; this translates, “‘To do—to be’: this is what drowns.” In light of the lines that follow, Baba’s meaning seems to be that the ordinary human Mayavic kind of “doing” and “being” are what cause one to drown in the sea of illusion and falsehood; “drowning” does not refer, in other words, to the drop-soul’s drowning and merging into the Ocean of Reality, but rather to its immersion in what is unreal and its loss of the life of higher possibilities. Since the original sentence is ambiguous, in their emendation the editors have inserted the phrase “in the sea of illusion” to help clarify this sense.

11. Much of the content of TTL/FF p. 111, TTL p. 111, and TLD/FF: 21-9-26, pp. 5-6—which provide the sources for the remainder of this Tiffin Lecture as far as the quotation from Hafiz and the analogy of the machine below—appears as “Fragments from the Spiritual Speeches of His Divine Majesty Sadguru Meher Baba. (16) On ‘To Be Nothing,’” *Meher Message*, vol. 2, no. 2 (February 1930), pp. 19-20.

12. TTL p. 111 has a lacuna here; the couplet (without any attribution to Ghalib) is quoted in the Gujarati script in ChD 57: p. 197, ChD 62: p. 515, TTL/FF p. 111, and TLD/FF 21-9-26, p. 5. There the form it takes is this: “*Na thā may to khudā*

thā, / kuchh na hotā to khudā hota. Dūboyā mujko honene—/ na hotā may to kyā hotā.”

13. This Gujarati rendering of Hafez is based on the diary versions in ChD 57: p. 197 and ChD 62: p. 515. The editors have not been able to locate a source for these lines in the *Dīvan* of Hafez.

14. In TTL p. 112 the terms interpreting the analogy, that is to say, the “tenor” terms of each metaphor, are all missing; in each line this spot (following the verb in each sentence) has an unfilled lacuna. Happily, the key missing terms appear in handwriting in two sources. TTL/FF p. 112 provides English words, and TLD/FF: 21-9-26, p. 6 gives words in Gujarati. As it happens, the two sets of “tenor” terms do not altogether match in their meaning, though the typed English terms for the “vehicle” (or literal surface image of the comparison) are almost identical, as is shown in the table below:

“Vehicle” of the metaphor in both manuscripts	“Tenor” of the metaphor in TTL/FF p. 112	“Tenor” of the metaphor in TLD/FF: 21-9-26, p. 6
the “machine”	Life	<i>manuṣya</i>
the “wheel”	Birth & rebirth	? (<i>manuṣya</i>) <i>sharīr</i>
the “points”	Sanskar	<i>sanskār</i>
the “instruments”	Good action	<i>anant shakti-jñān</i>
the “expert stopper”	Sadguru	<i>sadguru</i>

The edited text tries to integrate the two sets of “tenor” terms, according a certain priority to the text of TTL/FF p. 112, which seems superior at this juncture. (The question mark in the right hand column of the table occurs in the source manuscript.)

22ND SEPTEMBER 1926

1. ComD 1: f. 345; the text has been slightly edited.
2. TTL/FF p. 114 and TTL p. 114 read: “. . . these Great Avatars were ‘GOD INCARNATES’ Nay. Fully ‘Awake and Conscious’ Gods” (TLD/FF:

22-9-26, p.1 reads similarly). The diary source in ChD 57: p. 195 reads: “They, were God incarnate—nay more—*jāgā jhālelā Īshwar.*” This last phrase, a Marathi expression written in the Gujarati script, means “awakened Īshwar.”

1ST OCTOBER 1926

1. ComD 1: f. 354. The text has been slightly edited.
2. TTL/FF p. 117 and TTL p. 117 read: “always do the right things—if your conscience accepts it and tells you to do it . . .” (TLD/FF: 1-10-26, p. 1 reads similarly). ChD 57: p. 208 gives the Gujarati source text: “*manne dilne je kharu lage tej karo*,” that is, “Whatever your mind and heart feel right, do only that.” The edited text incorporates the English renderings of both sets of expressions—“conscience” and “mind and heart,” “tells you” and “feel right.”
3. A version of this paragraph (on fear of Self) was published as saying no. 86 in “Sayings of His Divine Majesty Sadguru Meher Baba,” *Meher Message*, vol. 2, no. 6 (June 1930), p. 1. For further information see Appendix 5, Table 10, p. 514.
4. Some of the contents of what follows appears in a summarized version in “Fragments from the Spiritual Speeches of His Divine Majesty Sadguru Meher Baba. (14) On Fear,” *Meher Message*, vol. 1, no. 12 (December 1929), p. 7.
5. TTL/FF p. 117 and TTL p. 117, the source for this paragraph, appeared in another version as saying no. 114 in “Sayings of His Divine Majesty Sadguru Meher Baba,” *Meher Message*, vol. 2, no. 12 (December 1930), p. 1. For further information see Appendix 5, Table 10, p. 514.
6. The name “Arjun” does not appear in the “Tiffin Lectures” sources but has been interpolated from the diary (ChD 57: p. 208).

7TH OCTOBER 1926

1. These opening paragraphs, which do not appear in the “Tiffin Lectures” sources (TTL/FF p. 118, TTL p. 118, and TLD/FF: 7-10-26, p. 1), are based on two pages in Chanji’s diary (ChD 57: pp. 209 and 211) as well as the 7th October 1926 entry in “The Combined Diary” (ComD 1: p. 357).
2. ChD 57: p. 209 leaves the name of the place blank: the group “dropped in today while passing here from _____ [sic]” where they had been canvassing for “Mr. [?] _____ for the forthcoming Council election.”
3. This paragraph appears separately in ChD 57: p. 211, apart from the rest of the material in these paragraphs. This diary page does not make it clear at what point in the discussion Baba made these particular remarks; the editors have inserted it here, since this seems like the most probable juncture.
4. ChD 57: pp. 209 and 211 and ComD 1: f. 357. ChD 57: p. 210 constitutes the original diary source for Baba’s lecture that follows. (The “Tiffin Lectures” sources are TTL/FF p. 118 and TTL p. 118.)

16TH OCTOBER 1926

1. The account that follows summarizes the full and rich narrative in ComD 1: ff. 367–69. On the meaning of the “coach” and other details, see LM (Mownavani), vol. 2, p. 633; the episode is related in less detail in LM (Manifestation), vol. 3, p. 860.
2. ComD 1: f. 369 alludes to the recording of the lecture thus: “The details of Baba’s discourse on the three aspects of existence viz Body Life & the mind are narrated in Chanji’s lecture-notes.” This corroborates the supposition that this lecture (and no doubt the Tiffin Lectures that follow) are based on notes that Chanji recorded in his diary. For more on this point, see the next endnote.
3. Unfortunately Chanji’s Diaries, which have reliably provided the source material for the *Tiffin Lectures* until this juncture, break off at the end of the lecture of 7th October 1926; though doubtless diary sources for the remaining Tiffin Lectures at one time

existed, they cannot now be found. The lack of diary sources poses special problems for this particular lecture, which is riddled with thorny problems of interpretation. For a fuller discussion of the topic of “subtle physiology” with which this present passage is concerned, see Appendix 4, pp. 501–7.

4. This sentence has been interpolated by the editors to introduce the esoteric content of this lecture that follows. The bottom half of TTL/FF p. 119 and TTL p. 119, which constitute the immediate source of the four-item indented list below and Figure 23 that follows it, appears as “Fragments from the Spiritual Speeches of His Divine Majesty Sadguru Meher Baba. (17) On Sadguru’s Powers,” *Meher Message*, vol. 2, no. 2 (February 1930), p. 20.

5. Other references or occurrences of “plumb” as a slang term for “navel” in the general usage of the time, in India or elsewhere, have eluded the best research efforts of the editors. There can be no doubt, however, that the text intends this part of the anatomy as its meaning. For in TTL/FF p. 119 and TLD/FF: 16-10-26, p. 1 (respectively) the word “plumb” (in quotation marks) is glossed by a handwritten *duṭī* and *bimb duṭī*, that is, “navel” and “disk-shaped navel.” Further, in the portion of the lecture of 28th November 1926 when Baba recapitulates some of

his comments on “the spiritual significance of the parts of the human body,” he associates the “world” with the “Central circle in the abdomen (nave[ll]) . . .” (TTL/FF p. 140 and TTL p. 140).

6. TTL/FF p. 119 reads: “Yogis, and such others are in ‘Prana Loka’ (*prāṇ lok*), and more advance [*sic*] in ‘Prana Loka’ (astral plane), i.e. they are in the ‘Upper half of the body . . .’ (TTL p. 119 reads identically except that the lacuna has not been filled.) This repetition of “Prana Loka” seems to be an obvious error. Happily, TLD/FF: 16-10-26, p. 1 corrects it: “Yogis and such others are in ‘Prana Loka’ and more advanced in ‘Mana Loka’ (astral plane) . . .” Why “astral plane” serves as a gloss in this sentence for “Mana Loka” rather than “Prana Loka” defies easy explanation. In *Infinite Intelligence* Baba used “astral” as another term for “subtle,” which in that book meant the entire six planes of the inner world. Apparently the word carries another, more restricted meaning here.

7. The final pages of “Sadguru and the Light of Intelligence” in *Infinite Intelligence* (pp. 450–51) describe this same cyclic movement as the Sadguru journeys down into creation-consciousness and back again to the state of Realization.

23RD OCTOBER 1926

1. The “Tiffin Lectures” sources (TTL/FF: p. 120, TTL p. 120, and TLD/FF: 22-10-26, p. 1) give the date as 22nd October 1926, but the 23rd October 1927 entry in “The Combined Diary” opens with the following: “At eleven o’clock in the morning Baba gave a fine silent lecture to the whole of the mandali on ‘mind’ vide Chanji’s note book” (ComD 1: f. 380). The date in “The Combined Diary” has been preferred, since in dating it has been the more reliable source.

2. ComD 1: f. 376. The text has been slightly edited for readability.

3. This handwritten Gujarati interpolation poses something of an editorial crux. TLD/FF: 22-10-26, p. 1 gives the reading: “*pag pakaḍvā tamārū*

antākaraṇ nā pāḍe”. Literally this means: “‘To catch the feet’—[if] your conscience does not make you fall”; that is to say, if your conscience does not impel you to fall and catch the feet of someone [then don’t do it]. TTL/FF p. 120 reads similarly in a somewhat reduced form: “*pag pakaḍnā [sic] antākaraṇ nā pāḍe*” (“*pakaḍnā*” is obviously a misspelling for “*pakaḍvā*”). The phrase as a whole is not grammatical; it has been written elliptically, as often happens in oral discourse such as this. As the editors understand it, the opening phrase “*pag pakaḍvā*” (“to catch the feet”) seems to designate the topic that Baba wants to speak about, and the subsequent phrase “*tamārū antākaraṇ nā pāḍe*” (“—[if] your conscience does not make you fall”) expresses what he wants to say about it. Conceivably Baba may

23RD OCTOBER 1926 (CONTINUED)

have been referring to something happening in his immediate environment at that moment—such as a person touching his feet.

4. Much of the content of this last paragraph was previously published as saying no. 87 in “Sayings of His Divine Majesty Sadguru Meher Baba,” *Meher Message*, vol. 2, no. 6 (June 1930), p. 1. For further information, see Appendix 5, Table 10, p. 514.

5. The “Tiffin Lectures” manuscripts (TTL/FF: p. 121, TTL p. 121, and TLD/FF: 22-10-26, p. 2) have a parenthetical note here: “(Vide Mr. R’s narration d-21-10-26).” Probably this refers to an account by Rustom on the events of the day before. No such document has come to light to date.

1ST NOVEMBER 1926

1. The manuscript sources give conflicting evidence on the date of this lecture. TTL/FF p. 123 and TTL p. 123 cite on their title lines the date “10th November 1926.” But TLD/FF: 1-11-26, p. 1 contradicts this with the headline dating “1st. November 1926.” This latter date is corroborated by the 1st November 1926 entry in “The Combined Diary,” as quoted in the introduction to this lecture, and it has been accepted by the editors accordingly.

2. From the 27th October 1926 entry in ComD 1: ff. 384–85. The prose of this passage has been somewhat revised for greater readability, and translations have been incorporated.

3. ComD 1: f. 387. The text has been slightly edited.

4. The content of TTL/FF p. 123 and TTL p. 123—the source for the main text of this lecture—was published as “Fragments of the Spiritual Speeches of Shree Sadguru Meher Baba. (17) A Spiritual Riddle,” *Meher Message*, vol. 2, no. 5 (May 1930), p. 8.

5. The “Tiffin Lectures” manuscripts (TTL/FF p. 123, TTL p. 123, and TLD/FF: 1-11-26, p. 1) read: “If 5 be taken out of 7. . . .” Literally this would designate the operation of subtracting five from seven, which would yield a remainder of two. Clearly this wording is inexact; the editors have emended accordingly.

11TH NOVEMBER 1926

1. ComD 2: f. 13.

2. Much of the content of TTL/FF pp. 124–25 and TTL pp. 124–25, which provide the immediate source of about the first two thirds of this Tiffin Lecture, was previously published as “Fragments from the Spiritual Speeches of His Divine Majesty Sadguru Meher Baba. (18) On Keeping the Mind Quiet, Steady and Firm,” *Meher Message*, vol. 2, no. 6 (June 1930), pp. 5–6.

3. Two of the “Tiffin Lectures” source manuscripts (TTL/FF p. 127 and TTL p. 127) give only the elliptical phrase: “Power of these!” TLD/FF: 11-11-26, p. 3 lacks even this phrase and ends with “. . . will lead you no further than in ‘darkness.’” The editors have emended in the understanding that “these” refers to Realized Ones and that the phrase intends to accentuate the singularity of their power.

23RD NOVEMBER 1926

1. The wording of TTL/FF p. 128 and TTL p. 128 is obscure: “Asked the experiences of some, which almost went equally to mean that they had seen darkness at first, then through this darkness small circles of light appeared, and then only one circle in the end etc. etc.” (TLD/FF: 23-11-26, p. 1 reads similarly). Possibly the text in the earlier part of this sentence is corrupt, since it makes little sense in its present form. Presumably the gist is this: that after instructing them to close their eyes, Baba asked his mandali what they had experienced, and a few (“some”) said that they had seen circles of light, etc. The text has been emended accordingly.

2. The original text of TTL/FF p. 128 and TTL p. 128 seems garbled: “Now, this seeing of circles etc. is a step towards the Path of Seeing ‘Almighty’ . The ‘Eternal Light’ [empty space] At first, you

would see ‘circles’ . . .” (TLD/FF: 23-11-26, p. 1 reads similarly). The text has been emended on the basis of the reading that “Eternal Light” stands in apposition to “Almighty” and that it ought to be followed by a period.

3. The previous two sentences as they appear in “Tiffin Lectures” were in another version published as saying no. 88 in “Sayings of His Divine Majesty Sadguru Meher Baba,” *Meher Message*, vol. 2, no. 6 (June 1930), p. 1. For further information, see Appendix 5, Table 10, p. 514.

4. This analogy of the three curtains has been rendered in another form as saying no. 96 in “Sayings of His Divine Majesty Sadguru Meher Baba,” *Meher Message*, vol. 2, no. 8 (August 1930), p. 1. For further information, see Appendix 5, Table 10, p. 514.

24TH NOVEMBER 1926

1. TTL/FF p. 130 and TTL p. 130 both read: “This seeing of a Guru in his ‘ASSURED’ form . . .” But TLD/FF: 23-11-26, p. 1 gives us: “This seeing of a

Guru in his assumed form. . . .” Plainly this latter reading is the correct one.

28TH NOVEMBER 1926 (FIRST SESSION)

1. Many problems of dating afflict the two lectures that follow this one; for discussion, see endnote 1 on p. 577. Though this present lecture has been represented here as occurring in the “first session,” in fact, we have no evidence as to whether this lecture or the next (also assigned to 28th November) was given first. Indeed, these two “lectures” might represent two compilations from the same body of material given by Baba during the course of this day. The dating of this lecture as 28th November 1926 is based on the “Tiffin Lectures” manuscripts (TTL/FF pp. 131–47, TTL pp. 131–47, and TLD/FF: 28-11-26, pp. 1–16), where the date appears on every page but one. (The 28th November entry in “The Combined Diary” does not mention any lecture by Baba.)

2. The “Tiffin Lectures” sources (TTL/FF p. 132, TTL p. 132, and TLD/FF: 28-11-26, p. 2) read “ultimate.” The editors construe this as an error of diction and have emended accordingly.

3. Again the original text (TTL/FF p. 136, TTL p. 136 and TLD/FF: 28-11-26, p. 5) uses the infelicitous word “peels” (see earlier on p. 27 and associated endnotes 5 and 6).

4. In the text of TTL/FF p. 137 and TTL p. 137 several words are missing, but these are supplied in TLD/FF: 28-11-26, p. 6: “. . . without observing all the circumstances and surrounding, even after some very hard and severe tests and trials.” The editors construe this last phrase as referring back to the earlier reference to the sowing of the seeds and their bearing fruit.

28TH NOVEMBER 1926 (FIRST SESSION) (CONTINUED)

5. The original text here (TTL/FF p. 138, TTL p. 138) reads: “. . . those of the Circle who are selected to be realized, are realized, even if . . .” (TLD/FF: 28-11-26, p. 7 reads similarly). This could be construed to mean that the circle members are realized already but don’t know it. The greater sense of the paragraph, however, suggests that the phrase “are realized” means “do get realized”; that is to say, they are realized at some later time.

6. In the “Tiffin Lectures” sources (TTL/FF p. 138 and TLD/FF: 28-11-26, p. 7) the English lines are numbered, 1 through 6 (TTL p. 138 gives 1 through 5 only). Happily, TTL/FF p. 138 supplies the Persian poetic lines as well, handwritten in the Gujarati script. These handwritten lines too are numbered, 1 through 6. The editors have nonetheless reconstituted these six lines into three couplets, since the lines clearly pair off in this way; and they have quoted directly from Qodsī’s edition, since the couplets are defective as they appear in the manuscripts. The “Tiffin Lectures” manuscripts do not indicate the name of the poet; but all of these couplets are from the *Divan* of Hafez.

7. The discussion of the color of impressions in TTL/FF p. 139 and TTL p. 139, which provide the basis for the remainder of this section, was published in another version in “Fragments from the Spiritual Speeches of His Divine Majesty Sadguru Meher Baba. (20) On Colours of Impressions,” *Meher Message*, vol. 2, no. 7 (July 1930), p. 8.

8. TTL/FF p. 140 and TTL p. 140 read: “The Central portion of the forehead, exactly between the two eyes is the indication of the ‘Junction’ for the Saliks to go up and come down (Also called ‘the THIRD EYE’).” (TLD/FF: 28-11-26, p. 9 reads similarly.) This wording does not indicate explicitly what states the “Saliks” go up and down between; the editors have interpolated the phrase “between the Paramātmā state and the universe” on the basis of other explanations of this point given by Baba in these lectures as well as *Infinite Intelligence*.

9. TTL/FF p. 141 and TTL p. 141 read thus (and

TLD/FF: 28-11-26, p. 11 reads similarly): “Then a most beautiful and practical illustration was given by Shree of the clear explanation of--

THE YOGIS — THE MUJZOBS & THE SALIKS

THE HUMAN BEINGS — THE YOGIS & THE REALIZED.”

Below this there runs a line of hyphens. Here as in other places (especially in this particular lecture) the editors have construed this capitalized rubric with hyphens beneath it as the title for a new section, and they have adjusted accordingly.

10. The “Tiffin Lectures” sources do not include this word “attributes” but merely refer to “the 3 highest i.e. Eternal Knowledge Bliss & Power” (TTL/FF p. 141 and TTL p. 141; TLD/FF: 28-11-26, p. 11 reads similarly). *God Speaks* refers to Knowledge-Power-Bliss at various times as “attributes” of God and elsewhere as the “trio-nature” of God.

11. TTL/FF p. 142 and TTL p. 142 read: “(Truth and the Highest Knowledge, Power & Bliss imbibed in it) . . .” (TLD/FF: 28-11-26, p. 11 reads similarly).

12. With reference to this and the preceding sentence, TTL/FF p. 142 and TTL p. 142 read: “. . . even though these (Truth and the Highest Knowledge, Power & Bliss imbibed in it) is ‘Real’ and does exist, rather ‘Nothing also exists really except the TRUTH.’” Possibly the word “also” in the phrase “Nothing also exists” (“also” is missing from the version in TLD/FF: 28-11-26, p. 11) means to imply that Nothing has a kind of existence, a false and relative existence: that is, Knowledge-Power-Bliss are real and exist, but Nothing too has a seeming existence. The wording of the original text is too ambiguous, however, to assert this interpretation with confidence, and the edited text does not express this implication.

13. The text of TTL/FF p. 143 and TTL p. 143 is somewhat garbled in this section: “. . . their longing and labours in the acquirement of some ‘Knowledge and experience of the planes’ to which, they rise

step by step (as we do here), turning himself and rising step by step () [*sic*] as we and eventually after tremendous trials and untold difficulties, they rise . . .” (TLD/FF: 28-11-26, p. 12 reads similarly, with minor variations.) This text has been edited in the understanding that the phrase “turning himself and rising step by step” refers to Baba himself and describes his act of climbing back up the stairs that had been alluded to earlier.

14. The “Tiffin Lectures” sources (TTL/FF p. 143, TTL p. 143, and TLD/FF: 28-11-26, p. 13) give this number—“millions”—even though, as best we can gather from the various places that Meher Baba has discussed this subject, the ratio is not actually as drastic as this. That is to say, while most of those who achieve Liberation or God-realization remain absorbed in the Eighth State of God, the number that returns to creation-consciousness as Jivanmuktas and Paramhansas (the Ninth State) and Sadgurus (the Tenth State) is greater (or so one would infer) than one in millions.

15. After the Realization of God in the state of Fanā Fillah, the Sadguru “assumes” (TTL/FF p. 144, TTL p. 144, and TLD/FF: 28-11-26, p. 13) human form in the sense that he regains consciousness of it. It should not be inferred that the Sadguru has to take birth again, since during this process he has never dropped his body.

16. The original text of TTL/FF p. 145 and TTL p. 145 reads: “And it is on thi [*sic*] Junction that the Salik makes his seat, takes in those prepared for that state and experience of Param Anand, i.e. between the 6th and 7th planes, and keeps those who are not to return THERE—in that same state in the 7th plane like the Mujzoob . . .” (TLD/FF: 28-11-26, p. 14 reads similarly with small variations.) Strictly speaking, the earlier part of this sentence asserts that Paramānand is experienced **between** the sixth and seventh planes. Yet it is hard to conceive how this could be so; indeed, the last part of this passage indicates that Majzūbs, who belong to this very category of those experiencing Paramānand, abide on the seventh plane. Presumably the sense is that those who experience Paramānand have been brought to that exalted state by the Sālik

Sadguru and abide with him, whose station is at the junction between these two planes; but Paramānand itself belongs to the Fanā Fillah of the seventh plane. Again, we must recall that the original prose of the “Tiffin Lectures” has not always been written with philosophical precision.

17. The “Tiffin Lectures” sources (TTL/FF p. 145, TTL p. 145, and TLD/FF: 28-11-26, p. 14) read: “. . . thereafter to those (of his Circle) he prepared for the same, and so and so on.” Though the wording is ambiguous, the last phrase probably means that the process repeats down the chain of succession between Sadgurus and circle members.

18. At this juncture the “Tiffin Lectures” sources give a parenthetical note: “(vide pp. 134 – 288–9)” (TTL/FF p. 146 and TTL p. 146; TLD/FF: 28-11-26, p. 15 reads “wide” instead of “vide”). Cross-references of this sort, introduced by the Latin word “vide,” occur several times in the “Tiffin Lectures” and with considerable frequency in “The Combined Diary.” What is remarkable about this particular cross-reference, however, is the latter set of page numbers (“288–9”). In fact, TTL/FF p. 134 and TTL p. 134, which provide a main source for the discussion of bhakti yoga earlier in this current Tiffin Lecture (see pp. 310–11), do indeed pertain to the subject now being alluded to and make sense as a cross-reference. The manuscript of “Thursday Tiffin Lectures” concludes with p. 174, however. And so the reference to “pp. 288–9” cannot easily be construed except as referring to a second volume of that same manuscript, continuously paginated from the end of its first volume. As of the present date no such volume has surfaced in any of the known archival collections. Until it does, or until fresh evidence comes to light, the reference to “pp. 288–9” will have to remain a mystery.

19. The original text of the “Tiffin Lectures” sources seems to be corrupt: “. . . and it will not only be proved but actually shewn [*sic*] that the ‘Root’ (Base & Head) of the tree is at the ‘top’ and the ‘Head’ at the root (bottom) . . .” (TTL/FF p. 146 and TTL p. 146; TLD/FF: 28-11-26, p. 15 reads similarly). Now it can hardly be the case that the “head” is both at the top and bottom, as this sentence indicates; and

28TH NOVEMBER 1926 (FIRST SESSION) (CONTINUED)

it is hard to make sense of the first occurrence of the word “root,” which the text glosses as including both the base and the head. Something has been garbled, possibly through a simple error in copying.

20. This paragraph in the “Tiffin Lectures” sources (TTL/FF pp. 146–47, TTL pp. 146–47, and TLD/FF: 28-11-26, pp. 15–16) has been written in an obscure and sometimes cryptic manner; the present text has been significantly edited, as will be commented upon in subsequent endnotes. But at this juncture it should be observed that the writing does not make it clear whether Baba’s own words are actually being recorded or whether they are being reported synoptically and in paraphrase. In actuality, of course, all of the “Tiffin Lectures” come to us through the filter of Chanji’s Diary and his recording process; but usually the “Tiffin Lectures” present content as Baba’s own words more unambiguously than the present passage does.

21. The original text of TTL/FF p. 146 and TTL p. 146 is obscurely worded: “and finally it assumes the Human form, and so on and so on” (TLD/FF: 28-11-26, p. 16 reads similarly). While the last phrase (“and so on and so on”) might literally be taken to imply that the evolution of form continues on after the human stage, we know that this was not Meher Baba’s view. Presumably what is meant is that the journey of chaitanya, though having completed its evolutionary phase, nonetheless continues (“and so on”) through reincarnation and involution.

22. The original wording of TTL/FF p. 146 and TTL p. 146 here is infelicitous but not altogether unclear: “Now – when in vegetable state when the growth commences from the diverse (reverse) opposite direction (upwards) i.e. head being downwards . . .” (TLD/FF: 28-11-26, p. 16 reads similarly.)

23. This parenthetic expression expands a rather obscure phrase in TTL/FF pp. 146–47 and TTL pp. 146–47: “. . . i.e. being head downwards, and the concrete concrete [*sic*] example of ‘slates’ taken up and put down) – then the Chaitanya gets a shock . . .” (TLD/FF: 28-11-26, p. 16 reads similarly, with minor variations.) Now the reference to “slates” in

this passage is unintelligible unless we suppose that it refers to the slates that Baba was writing his lecture notes on, and that this phrase essentially represents “stage directions” accompanying the lecture. It has been edited accordingly.

24. The “Tiffin Lectures” sources for the final paragraph that follows are once again exceedingly garbled and obscure; at certain junctures the editorial reconstruction has been little better than guesswork. To circumvent the necessity of riddling the edited text of this paragraph with endnotes, we reproduce the complete original text of TTL/FF p. 147, the only source in which a major lacuna has been filled (in other respects TTL p. 147 and TLD/FF: 28-11-26, p. 16 read similarly). In view of the extreme difficulties that it poses, readers with textual and critical interests should be warned that the edited text is at many points hypothetical. With that caveat, the source text reads:

With such and many other theories, and proofs, and marvellous [*sic*] wonders there will be some great miracle and the whole world will be “in a stir”, for this is now the end of the “Pralaya” (*pralayno ant najhdik āvato jāy chhe*)—a certain period for certain movements etc. There have been innumerable such “Pralayas” of crores of years each, in the past, and the different Avatars, that had been at different times in the past, are like “drops” in this “Ocean of Param Anand” (Truth) and though each “Avatars” [*sic*] (a drop) aloof from the other, coming after ages, each knew/that “I am Ananta” and so on – the Involutions and Evolutions—arising out of “chaitanya” and having attained to the Highest after ages, of course, and such other innumerable “atoms” (Avatars) being One with the Ocean, finishing one “Maha Pralaya” and then another “Maha Pralaya” and then another and so on, and so on, i.e. the different Avatars, coming after ages, and even in the Maha Pralayas are all “One and the Same” (drops of the One Ocean of Truth—the Rays of the same “Fountain of Light” etc. etc.).

25. The source for this Gujarati line, TTL/FF p. 147, reads: “*pralayno ant najhdik āvato jāy chhe*.” In this form the line does not make sense; literally it translates, “The end of Pralaya is coming near.”

But plainly the meaning of the passage is that Pralaya, which brings about the end of the eon, is coming near. The editors have revised to express this meaning, chiefly by adding the word *vakhat*, “time.”

28TH NOVEMBER 1926 (SECOND SESSION)

1. The text of this lecture is based on the last two-thirds of a six-page typed manuscript (abbreviated LLBA: 28-11-26) housed in Beloved Archives in Hamilton, New Jersey. For further discussion of this archival material, see pp. 441–44. All six pages have in their running head the words “Lonavla, Sunday, 28th November, 1926,” and every page after the first has a page number. Pages 1 through the middle of p. 3 present the content of TTL/FF p. 131–35 in a crude and abbreviated form; this coincidence of content corroborates the date. After the lacuna and the words “(part missing)” in the middle of p. 3, the text resumes with content unrelated to that in TTL/FF p. 135–47 (the remainder of the lecture of 28th November 1926, first session). The case can be made that the material after the gap in p. 3 was given out by Baba on the next day (Monday). For the third paragraph into this section begins with the words: “Then, talking about the Yogis, Shree repeated last night’s explanations, . . .” None of the diaries allude to any discoursing by Baba on 27th November, while we know that he lectured on the 28th. Nonetheless, since all six pages of this lecture are presented continuously with sequential pagination and a single date (28th November), the editors feel that, on balance, this date has to be accepted and the unity of the lecture upheld.

On the very eve of this edition’s entering into print production, the original source was unexpectedly discovered in a manuscript in Chanji’s handwriting in the Avatar Meher Baba Trust Archives. This lecture and the next are both based upon this source. For further details see pp. 441–45.

2. LLBA: 28-11-26, p. 3 reads “Gotapuri.” Since no one going by this name can be identified in connection with the life of Ramakrishna, the editors have taken this as a misspelling or mis-hearing of “Totapuri,” a well-known figure in Ramakrishna’s life accounts.

3. The following passage exhibits a close relationship to the opening section of the lecture of 6th February 1927 (TTL/FF p. 151, TTL p. 151, and TLD/FF: 6-2-27, p. 1), with many exact correspondences in verbiage, though the two passages diverge at a number of points also. It is possible that these two passages represent two write-ups of the same lecture moment by Baba. If so, this lecture content must have been given by Baba in Lonavla in November 1926 and not in Meherabad on 6th February 1927, since it is hard to conceive how it could have found its way into LLBA: 28-11-26, p. 4 otherwise. At the same time, a note in Chanji’s Diary for the date 6th February 1927 (ChD 20: pp. 6–7) makes it clear that Baba did give a lecture then on the powers of yogis. Possibly Meher Baba gave this same explanation twice, once on 29th November 1926 and again on 6th February 1927; then again, when the 6th February 1927 Tiffin Lecture was being compiled, it is also possible that this material from the previous November was added in, since it pertained to the discussion and since that particular November talk had been left out of the “Tiffin Lectures” compilation. For further discussion, see endnote 2 on p. 580.

4. Certain ambiguities afflict the prose in the sources for this passage as well as the sources for the lecture of 6th February 1926; for fuller discussion, see note 3 on p. 580.

5. LLBA: 28-11-26, p. 4 has a lacuna here: “after combining these two sources (? [lacuna] limited) by Yoga process” The “Tiffin Lectures” sources for the 6th February 1926 lecture (TTL/FF p. 151 and TTL p. 151; TLD/FF: 6-2-27, p. 1 reads similarly) fill the lacuna thus: “after combining these two sources (of the limited and unlimited) and there is the result. . . .”

28TH NOVEMBER 1926 (SECOND SESSION) (CONTINUED)

6. LLBA: 28-11-26, p. 4 reads: “While a sadguru has not to exert his energies in breathing and checking etc. (like the yogis). . . .” The sense of the word “checking” remains unclear; does the text mean that the yogi (unlike the Sadguru) alternately breathes and checks his breath in the yogic process? Lacking certitude on this point, the editors have left the text in an ambiguous form.

7. LLBA: 28-11-26, p. 5 reads: “Hence no difference or difficulty. He has merely to think and throw light of his eyes or mind.”

8. LLBA: 28-11-26, p. 5 reads: “To make you human beings understand and give some idea, . . .”

29TH NOVEMBER 1926

1. This is the second of two lectures based on manuscripts in the Beloved Archives collection in Hamilton, New Jersey. Consisting of four typed pages in the same general layout style and typed on the same typewriter as the previous lecture of 28th November 1926 (second session), this typescript has on its head page the following:

From Chanji’s Diary, November 24th, 1926 at Lonavla:
(A discourse by Meher Baba)

Each of the three succeeding pages has a running header with the words “Lonavla Discourse, Nov. 24, 1926” (page 3 has “No.” instead of “Nov.”) and then the page number (“Page 2,” etc.).

Now, many sources confirm that Baba and his party left Meherabad for Lonavala on 25th November, so the date on this manuscript, 24th November, cannot be right. “The Combined Diary” assigns Baba’s discussion on Shivaji and the seeds of the circle to 29th November. On this basis this lecture was dated accordingly—and was assigned its place in the lecture sequence of this edition. Yet very recent archival discoveries make it clear that Baba actually gave this talk on 27th November. For further details, see pp. 441–45.

Despite all of this, in references to the LLBA manuscript, we retain the date that the manuscript itself bears. Thus manuscript source pages for this lecture of 29th November (as we have re-dated it in the main text) have been abbreviated LLBA: 24-11-26, pp. 1–4.

2. ComD 2: ff. 32–33. The text has been slightly edited for improved readability.

3. The source text in LLBA: 24-11-26, p. 2, reads oddly: “But to be an atheist after the intellectual knowledge that one realized (?) [sic] gives, would be no fraud and would enable you, too, to make an advance towards the goal of truth (realization).” But the text has just informed us that atheism blocks progress on the path. Does it or doesn’t it? How is it that one could remain an atheist after receiving knowledge from one who is “realized”? And even assuming its possibility, why would the question of fraudulence arise in such a case? From all appearances, at this juncture Baba’s discourse has been garbled in the recording. Effective emendation has no foundation and has not here been attempted.

4. LLBA: 24-11-26, p. 2 has lacunae with question marks in the final word position in this and the next two sentences:

Jivatma in sound sleep and unconscious [sic] of its existence is ?

Jivatma in sound sleep but conscious of its existence is ?

Jivatma awake (in meditation) but conscious of its existence is ?

Two pages later, however, in LLBA: 24-11-26, p. 4, these three sentences are repeated almost exactly, and in this case the missing words are supplied: “God,” “Sadguru,” and “yogi.” The editors have interpolated these words from this source.

5. In LLBA: 24-11-26, p. 2, this passage has been obscurely written: “The sanskaras at first form like this (????). They are in the beginning very faint impressions. Than dradually [sic], when

they develop into the mental form (from atom to vegetable - animal - and human) they are like (???) - a snake bite. And this is the form of the mind with sanskaras.” (The illustrations in this note reproduce in facsimile the hand-drawn illustrations in the source manuscript.)

6. LLBA: 24-11-26, pp. 2–3 has a lacuna with a question mark: “there is no (?), no sense, no feelings, no experience . . .” The editors see no way of supplying the missing word.

7. The manuscript source text for this passage on Mahāpralaya in LLBA: 29-11-26, p. 3, comes in a prose form that is obscurely written with many grammatical ambiguities. The paragraph on Mahāpralaya in the lecture of 28th November 1926, first session (see p. 329 and associated endnotes) suffers from some of the same problems, though not as badly as this present passage does. Perhaps the source of these problems lies in Meher Baba’s original explanations having been given in a cryptic manner. Meher Baba virtually never spoke about an upcoming Mahāpralaya as he does here; in these

rare lecture moments recorded in these two Lonavala talks Baba may have veiled his meaning to a certain extent with ambiguities.

8. LLBA: 24-11-26, p. 3 refers to things “contemplated now by the Realized (Shree’s circle) . . .” The implication here that Baba’s circle members had already attained God-realization (as suggested by the capital R of “Realized”) is contradicted by many other statements of Meher Baba’s during this period. The editors take this to be another of the small mistakes in a lecture typescript that is riddled with them.

9. On the previous occurrence of these sentences, see p. 342 and endnote 4. In each of these three sentences in LLBA: 24-11-26, p. 4 “jīvātmā” is spelled “Gwatma.” That is, the note taker represented “jiv” as the letter “G” followed by a “w,” even though the very same word is spelled (reasonably) as “jivatma” two pages earlier. This gives us another clue that some of the notes for this lecture may have been taken by someone other than Chanji.

27TH JANUARY 1927

1. No diary account records whether Baba gave the following lecture to the general public or to the mandali privately. Chanji’s Diary (ChD 19: pp. 45–46), which relates the events of the day, provides only the cryptic note “Shree’s today’s lecture” in the top margin of p. 46, with no indication of when this occurred or what Baba said. Generally the content of the Tiffin Lecture as we have it seems better suited to a mandali audience.

2. The editors have been unable to identify this quotation which the manuscript sources attribute to Hafez.

3. The “Tiffin Lectures” sources (TTL/FF p. 149, TTL p. 149, TLD/FF: 27-1-27 draft B, p. 1) read: “Meals must be had twice or thrice, other talks afterwards” (TLD/FF: 27-1-27 draft A, p. 1 reads similarly). This last phrase eludes easy interpretation; possibly it means “talk about other matters.” It has been emended accordingly.

4. The “Tiffin Lectures” sources (TTL/FF p. 149, TTL p. 149, and TLD/FF: 27-1-27 drafts A and B, p. 1) read: “The answer to the question is again involved in the question itself i.e. ‘why should all the people eat at all?’” Since the path that Baba is going to recommend in the following lines is one that could be trodden only by a tiny number among the spiritual elite, the editors take the phrase “Why should all the people” to mean “Why should everyone . . .” Plainly Baba’s point is not that humanity should be denied food, but rather, that those really serious about God ought to forget about it completely.

5. The “Tiffin Lectures” sources (TTL/FF p. 150, TTL p. 150, and TLD/FF: 27-1-27 drafts A and B, p. 2) leave two or three lines blank before the English translation, which appears below the blank. Clearly the typist intended that this blank should be filled in by the handwritten line of Hafez in Farsi (or perhaps Gujarati, since often lines of Hafez were rendered that way in these early texts). The editors have not been able to identify these lines of Hafez.

6TH FEBRUARY 1927

1. These quotations, slightly edited, are from the 6th February 1927 entry in Chanji's Diary, ChD 20: pp. 6–7.

2. As was discussed earlier (see endnote 3 on p. 577), much of this same content (in the two paragraphs below) appeared in the Tiffin Lecture of 28th November 1926, second session, which Meher Baba gave at Lonavala. The correspondences between the source texts for the two lectures (LLBA: 24-11-26, p. 4 and TTL/FF p. 151) are pervasive and extend to many commonalities of verbiage. Now it is possible that Meher Baba gave out the same lecture content twice on these two separate days. But if we are dealing with the content of a single lecture moment that found its way into two separate lecture typescripts, probably Baba gave this material in Lonavala on 28th November 1926, since it is hard to conceive how it could have found its way into LLBA: 28-11-26 otherwise. In this case, Chanji must have decided to insert this bit of content into the 6th February 1927 lecture, since this lecture already contained a discussion of the power of yogis (with the "colored glasses" analogy below), which the discussion of yogic powers and "electricity" could fit in with. In any event, since the two bodies of source material are so closely interrelated, we have used the 28th November 1926 sources to help clarify ambiguous points in the present Tiffin Lecture. For our sources here (TTL/FF p. 151, TTL p. 151, and TLD/FF: 6-2-27 drafts A and B, p. 1) are written imprecisely; and the 28th November source material helps to clear up some of this.

3. The prose of the first few sentences of the "Tiffin Lectures" sources does not make it altogether clear whether the unlimited source of electricity in the air and the unlimited source of electricity in the body are the same or different: "The powers that the Yogis use are from the unlimited source of electricity in air—which is the third layer inside. With these powers of the unlimited source of Electricity in the third layer in their own body, (by means of breath etc.) and the combination of these two powers enable the yogis to bring about the results just as they desire"

(TTL/FF p. 151 and TTL p. 151; TLD/FF: 6-2-27 drafts A and B, p. 1 read similarly). The same ambiguity afflicts LLBA: 28-11-26, p. 4. These two sources of electricity must be different from each other, however, since the next sentence there goes on to say: "He has only to think after combining these two sources (of the limited and unlimited) and there is the result—such as, raising the dead . . ."

4. TTL/FF p. 151, TTL p. 151 and TLD/FF: 6-2-27 draft B, p. 1 refer here to the "unlimited" source of electricity in the third layer of the body; yet TLD/FF: 6-2-27 draft A, p. 1 reads "limited," and LLBA: 28-11-26, p. 4 says likewise. Clearly "limited" is the correct word here. For the source of electricity in the "air" without is "unlimited." The yogi, we are further told, combines the "limited" with the "unlimited." What could the "limited" be, then, except the electricity within his own body? The editors have emended accordingly.

5. The "Tiffin Lectures" sources (TTL/FF p. 153, TTL p. 153, and TLD/FF: 6-2-27 drafts A and B, p. 3) read: "I am in R, I am in B etc." The editors have supplied the names "Rustom" and "Behramji" as mandali on the scene at the time and likely candidates.

6. TTL/FF p. 153, TTL p. 153, and TLD/FF: 6-2-27 drafts A and B, p. 3 read: "And when it comes down again after realization, it sees its own image in every bubble, as also in the Ocean, that is everywhere he and he, in a drop, in a bubble, in a wave, in different size, shape and form, but he everywhere."

7. TTL/FF p. 153 and TTL p. 153 read: "'Because then you would be quite unconscious of the realized self i.e. Mujzooob, . . .'" (TLD/FF: 6-2-27 drafts A and B, p. 3 read similarly). Clearly this has been infelicitously worded, since a Majzūb is fully conscious of the Self; what he is unconscious of is the universe. The editors have emended the sentence accordingly.

8. The original "Tiffin Lectures" text (TTL/FF p. 154, TTL p. 154, and TLD/FF: 6-2-27 draft A,

p. 4 & 11-2-27 draft A, p. 1) appears to be garbled, perhaps through the omission of a phrase or phrases: "And to make you i.e. parts of that great body of Truth, as alright and as perfect as others, these ringing of the bell, and calling you to listen to these words of advice . . ." (TLD/FF: 6-2-27 draft B, p. 4 & 11-2-27 draft B, p. 1 reads similarly). It is difficult to determine with certitude what is meant by the phrase "these ringing of the bell," which appears

in the sentence abruptly and ungrammatically. The thought seems to be that Baba, as the divine Doctor, is treating his mandali (the diseased body parts) by giving these lectures, and that he convenes the lectures by ringing a bell. (In reality the "bell" may have been nothing more than a piece of steel hanging from a string which one of the mandali would strike with a mallet.) The passage has been emended according to this reading.

11TH FEBRUARY 1927

1. ComD 2: ff. 118–29.

2. The "Tiffin Lectures" sources (TTL/FF p. 154, TTL p. 154, TLD/FF: 6-2-27 draft A, p. 4 & 11-2-27 draft A, p. 1, and TLD/FF: 6-2-27 draft B, p. 4 & 11-2-27 draft B, p. 1) refer to a diary account here through the phrase "vide diary." This probably refers to the 11th February 1927 entry in Chanji's Diary (ChD 20: pp. 18–26), in which Chanji devotes nine pages to the events of this day. It is also possible, however, that the reference is to the 11th February entry in "The Combined Diary" (see previous endnote).

3. TLD/FF: 11-2-27 drafts A and B, p. 3 give this reading—"Guru or Cause." TTL/FF p. 155 and TTL p. 155, however, give the reading "Guru or Gurus." Either reading is plausible. But since the previous passage has talked about "Guru" and "Cause" in the original manuscripts, and since this lecture has emphatically stressed fidelity to the Master (in the singular) without reference to the unusual case of a disciple with several Masters, the TLD/FF reading seems preferable and has been selected here.

4. The original "Tiffin Lectures" text is somewhat confused: "[Chhagan] was quite firm, resolute, determined to stick to Shree, renouncing all else, and to that end, he actually disobeyed and broke a series of Shree's orders, specially given to him to go to his family and wife etc. in advance before a party arrived at the destination, and he creditably stood all the trials and tests intentionally put on him by Shree" (TTL/FF p. 156 and TTL p. 156; TLD/FF: 11-2-27 drafts A and B, p. 3 read similarly). Literally this sentence indicates that Chhagan disobeyed Baba's

orders given prior to their arrival in Akolner—to the effect that he should stay with his family. Yet we know from "The Combined Diary" that Baba's order given previously while still at Meherabad was just the opposite of this. The editors have emended in light of the diary account and the underlying idea, which is that Chhagan should have ignored the orders which Baba gave publicly in front of his family so that he could obey the prior order (to stick to Baba no matter what) that Baba had given privately.

5. TTL/FF p. 157, TTL p. 157, and TLD/FF: 11-2-27 draft A, p. 4 all read "Shree and Man." Conceivably, "Man." could be intended as an abbreviation for "mandali." TLD/FF: 11-2-27 draft B, p. 4, however, provides the reading "Shree and Mah." In several other passages in the source manuscripts in various places in the "Tiffin Lectures" collection "Mah." has stood as an abbreviation for "Maharaj"; and ChD 20: p. 19—a source for the very passage under consideration—may indeed contain a reference to "Maharaj" under that name, though the text is difficult to make out. Now since both Meher Baba and his Hindu Sadguru from Sakori were viewed with extreme skepticism among many traditional Brahmins at this time, it seems not at all unlikely that Chhagan's family would have denounced the two of them together. This reading has accordingly been preferred. ("The Combined Diary" gives no pertinent information on this textual crux.)

6. The next few sentences on "grasping the shadow" as they appear in "Tiffin Lectures" were in another version published as saying no. 97 in "Sayings of His Divine Majesty Sadguru Meher Baba," *Meher*

11TH FEBRUARY 1927 (CONTINUED)

Message, vol. 2, no. 8 (August 1930), p. 1. For further information, see Appendix 5, Table 10, p. 514.

7. The “Tiffin Lectures” sources (TTL/FF p. 157, TTL p. 157, and TLD/FF: 11-2-27 drafts A and B, p. 4) read: “For, though he is near you, never beyond imagination . . .” This contrasts with Baba’s usual way of characterizing God as “beyond imagination and conception.” If the text here is not corrupt, probably it means that God belongs to the immediacy of the here and now; He does not stand at some remote distance, beyond imagination, separated from where we are.

8. TTL/FF p. 157 reads: “It is so easy [a] task as all think . . .” (TTL p. 157 and TLD/FF: 11-2-27 drafts A and B, p. 4 read similarly). The word “not” appears to have been inadvertently left out of this sentence; the editors have reinstated it.

9. The “Tiffin Lectures” manuscripts (TTL/FF p. 157, TTL p. 157, and TLD/FF: 11-2-27 drafts A and B, p. 4) read: “A question of the disposal of the dead was discussed from M’s desire to bury him on

the hill) . . .” The phrase “M’s desire to bury him on the hill” leaves open the question, who is “him”? Possibly “him” represents an infelicitous use of what should have been the pronoun “himself,” and the whole phrase should have been, “from M’s desire to have himself buried on the hill.” Since no other obvious interpretation offers itself, the editors have emended accordingly. Presumably “M” is one among the mandali; his wish to be buried (if we accept this interpretation) implies that he was not a Hindu, and his presumption of the prerogative to be buried on Meherabad Hill suggests that he was one of the original mandali and perhaps an older man. Baba’s uncle Masaji presents himself as the most likely candidate; but we cannot be sure.

10. The passage in “Tiffin Lectures” that provided the source for the last three sentences has been rendered in another form as saying no. 98 in “Sayings of His Divine Majesty Sadguru Meher Baba,” *Meher Message*, vol. 2, no. 8 (August 1930), p. 1. For further information, see Appendix 5, Table 10, p. 514.

13TH FEBRUARY 1927

1. ComD 2: f. 130; this entry attributes the source to Chanji’s Diary: “vide Chanji’s note-book.” On the other hand, Chanji’s own personal diary seems to indicate that Baba gave this talk on the preceding Saturday (12th February), which occasioned “general discussions on ‘Workings of the Mind.’ What is it that always turns like a wheel? . . .” (ChD 20: p. 25). Presumably these two diary references are to the same Tiffin Lecture, in which case, the date in “The Combined Diary” is to be preferred.

2. TTL/FF p. 160 and TTL p. 160 give the following: “Exactly the same way, those who are realized . . . easily realize the vast difference between the two states – the Highest and the Lowest, and also their merits and demerits etc.” (TLD/FF: 13-2-27

drafts A and B, p. 2 reads similarly). Now this last phrase is ambiguously expressed; whose merits and demerits are being spoken of? Clearly Baba could not be referring to the merits and demerits of the two states, since the “Highest” (presumably the state of God-realization) altogether transcends such categories; nor could the pronoun “their” very well refer to “those who are realized,” since merits and demerits do not pertain to God-realized persons in the ordinary way. In context of the Tiffin Lecture as a whole, the expression “merits and demerits” best applies to the Sadguru’s circle members, since Baba’s main theme in this talk has been the work that the Sadguru carries out on their behalf. The sentence has been emended in light of this interpretation.

22ND FEBRUARY 1927

1. This account is based on ChD 20: p. 44, with some editing and supplementary information incorporated from the rendering in *LM* (Man), vol. 3, p. 915; *LM* (Mown), vol. 2, p. 274.

2. A summarized version of TTL/FF p. 161 and TTL p. 161, which provide the source for this the first section of this Tiffin Lecture, was published as “Fragments from the Spiritual Speeches of His Divine Majesty Sadguru Meher Baba. (19) On Three Different Aspects of the Highest State,” *Meher Message*, vol. 2, no. 7 (July 1930), pp. 7–8.

The text in the “Tiffin Lectures” manuscripts (TTL/FF p. 161–63, TTL pp. 161–63, TLD/FF: 22-2-27 draft A, unnumbered pp. i–ii and TLD/FF: 22-2-27 drafts A and B, pp. 1–2) exhibits a major redundancy that has necessitated the most extensive editorial revision in the entirety of *Tiffin Lectures*.

TTL/FF p. 161 and TTL p. 161 (TLD/FF: 22-2-27 drafts A and B, unnumbered p. i likewise) begin with the basic information that has been reworked to comprise Figure 32 (for further details see Notes on the Figures, p. 534). The remainder of the page describes the three mārgs or yogas—bhakti, karma, and jñān. After completing one rendering of this, TTL/FF p. 162 and TTL p. 162 (as also TLD/FF: 22-2-27 drafts A and B, p. 1) start over with a new sub-heading, “THE THREE DIFFERENT ASPECTS OF THE HIGHEST STATE KNOWLEDGE BLISS AND POWER.” This is followed (in TTL p. 162) by a gap sufficient for about ten lines of type (filled in with figures in TTL/FF p. 162 and TLD/FF: 22-2-27 drafts A and B, p. 1); and then the text resumes with a somewhat fuller version of the content on the previous page—indeed, much of the verbiage is identical. Clearly the content of TTL/FF pp. 162–63 represents a

somewhat revised and improved version of what appears as a first draft on TTL/FF p. 161. Perhaps Chanji neglected to cross out or suitably mark up the handwritten pages in his diary that served as the source for TTL/FF p. 161, and in consequence the typist, whoever it was, wound up typing up both versions of this same material sequentially in the typescripts of “Tiffin Lectures.”

Since it would be senseless to replicate this redundancy in the edited text here, the editors have combined the two versions, that is, the version on TTL/FF p. 161 with that on pp. 162–63, for the most part following the latter version (which is more fully and adequately expressed).

All of this “Tiffin Lectures” text represents the write-up of twelve handwritten lines in Chanji’s Diary (the last four lines in ChD 20: p. 44 and the first eight in ChD 20: p. 45). The same material is repeated in a somewhat clearer form in ComD 2: ff. 142–43. These basic diary accounts have been greatly elaborated upon and specified in the course of producing the “Tiffin Lectures” version and cannot compare with it. The Chanji’s Diary version lacks the diagram that is supplied in TLD/FF: 22-2-27 drafts A and B, p. 1 and TTL/FF p. 162, as discussed, again, in Notes on the Figures.

3. Here *sākṣātkār* appears to designate the state in which one stands in the immediate presence of God and sees Him face to face. The word is used with varied meanings in “Tiffin Lectures”; for further discussion, see Glossary.

4. This discussion of sanskaras in “Tiffin Lectures” (TTL/FF pp. 163–65, TTL pp. 163–65, and TLD/FF: 22-2-27 drafts A and B, pp. 2–4) is based on five lines of handwritten notes in ChD 20: p. 45, which is effectively repeated in ComD 2: f. 143.

10TH AUGUST 1927

1. TLD/FF: 10-8-27 drafts A and B, p. 1 fills the lacuna in TTL p. 166 with the Marathi sentence: “*kasehī karm kele tar māyechā pāsh lāgat nāhī*”; this text has been slightly edited to make it fit into the greater sentence grammatically. Remarkably enough, this original Marathi sentence is written in the Devanagari rather than the Gujarati script—a rare occurrence in this body of manuscript material. In fact, TTL/FF p. 166 appears to provide a (Gujarati) comment on the matter: “*marāṭhī lakhāṇ?*” That is, “written in Marathi?”

2. Until this point, the edited text of this lecture has been based on the usual “Tiffin Lectures” sources—TTL/FF p. 166, TTL p. 166, and TLD/FF: 10-8-27 drafts A and B, p. 1. At this juncture, however, three new sources come into the picture. The first is another draft from the Filis Frederick collection, TLD/FF: 10-8-27 draft C (which begins on p. 1a and runs to the end of the lecture on p. 4; p. 1 is missing).

Yet the other two additional sources differ curiously from what we have seen until this point. One of them presents itself as a follow-up to the final Tiffin Lecture of 30th August 1927 whose typing concludes on TTL/FF p. 174. The immediately following series of pages, that is, TTL/FF (handwritten) pp. 175–80, provides a handwritten continuation (in a handwriting that does not appear to be Chanji’s). The text of this continuation corresponds almost exactly with that of our main “Tiffin Lectures” sources for the latter part of the lecture of 10th August 1927, that is, TTL/FF pp. 166–70, TTL pp. 166–70, TLD/FF: 10-8-27 drafts A, B, and C, p. 1a, and TLD/FF: 10-8-27 drafts A, B, and C, p. 2–4. Further (and this is the third of the additional sources alluded to above), this same text appears still again in a separate typed version in ChD 62: pp. 245, 247, 249, and 251. Thus our manuscripts collectively provide us with seven versions of this material, six typed and one handwritten.

Perhaps this portion of the talk was dictated separately at a later date and inserted as a retrospective editorial act into this present lecture of 10th August 1927. The evidence of TTL/FF p. 174 and TTL/FF (handwritten) pp. 175–80, taken on its

own, would suggest that this material was indeed dictated on 30th August, as a sequel to Baba’s lecture of that date. For the last page of that lecture in that manuscript (TTL/FF p. 174)—a page that has as its own running head the page number “174”—has a handwritten note in Gujarati at the bottom of the page, below the typing, that reads:

*bijā-ḥhellā (4) pānā-āmā nathī –
te thaīp karavā paḍashe –*

That is, “another last (4) pages are not here — that needs to be typed.” The following handwritten pages (TTL/FF (handwritten) pp. 175–80) have as headers phrases like “continued (175),” “176,” etc. It would seem, then that these handwritten pages were conceived as a follow-up to that lecture (of 30th August 1927).

What is odd about this, however, is the fact (as we have already indicated) that this very material had already been included in TTL/FF pp. 166–70, pages which belong to the same numbered series (with the running heads “166” through “170”) as does TTL/FF p. 174 (with the running head “174”) where the Gujarati handwritten note has been jotted down. Perhaps the writer of the note was unaware that this material had already been typed up and included in the very manuscript that he was appending his note to.

In view of the evidence of the handwritten continuation in TTL/FF (handwritten) pp. 175–80, ought these pages to be shifted out of the lecture of 10th August 1927 and added to the end of the lecture of 30th August? Standing against such a course of action is the fact that four of the typed manuscript versions place this material explicitly in the 10th August lecture. That is to say, TTL pp. 166–70, TTL/FF pp. 166–70, and TLD/FF: 10-8-27 drafts A and B, p. 1 all give 10th August as their date. (TLD/FF: 10-8-27 draft C gives no date, since its p. 1, where the date would by the normal practice have appeared, is missing, though every indication is that that date would have been 10th August; and ChD 62: pp. 245, 247, 249, and 251 have no date citation at all.) In short, we do not know as a certainty why these pages of content were incorporated in the

10th August lecture in most of the most authoritative manuscripts: maybe Baba dictated it on that date after all, or maybe Chanji thought that this content would fit better in the earlier (10th August) lecture than in the later one (of 30th August). In any event, the editors have deemed it best to leave this content where they have found it—in the lecture of 10th August—whatever its ultimate source may have been.

3. TTL/FF p. 167 and TTL p. 167 read: “Now—‘to get a knowledge’ when and why this Finite state was given (created) to the ‘Sat’, is said to be the ‘Perfect’ state, i.e. to Realize the Original State ‘of God’ which was the first state.” [sic]; TLD/FF: 10-8-27 drafts A, B, and C, p. 1a and TTL/FF (handwritten) p. 175 read similarly. This garbled sentence seems to say, in its first part, that perfection consists in gaining knowledge of ignorance, and in its second part, that it consists in gaining knowledge of original Godhood.

4. In the handwritten version of this passage in TTL/FF (handwritten) p. 179, in the margin

immediately to the left of the paragraph opening with the words “Such Sadgurus,” these words appear: “7-12-29/ to begin from here. →”

(The editors cannot determine with surety whether the handwriting of this marginal note matches that of the passage—TTL/FF (handwritten) pp. 175–80—as a whole, though it may well be so.) Now the annotation “7–12–29” presumably designates the date, 7th December 1929. At that time the *Meher Message* was completing its first year of publication; short selections from the “Tiffin Lectures” material were being published serially as “Spiritual Speeches of His Divine Majesty Sadguru Meher Baba” (for further details, see Appendix 5, pp. 510–14). The editors have not found this particular passage in any of the *Meher Message* articles, however.

30TH AUGUST 1927

1. ComD 2: f. 369. The 30th August 1927 entry covers more than three pages, from the middle of f. 368 to almost the bottom of f. 371.

2. The reference to the Upanishads does not appear in “The Combined Diary” entry but in its source in Chanji’s Diary (ChD 29: p. 27). The Upanishads are famous for their revelation that the soul (Ātman) is one with the Oversoul (Brahman).

3. Some of the contents of this Tiffin Lecture are recorded in abbreviated form in the 30th August 1927 entry in “The Combined Diary” (ComD 2: ff. 368–71). That entry notes that Baba was explaining certain points to “Dastoorji”—that is, K. J. Dastur, who later became the editor of the *Meher Message*. An edited version of some of this discussion on chaitanya was published in the *Meher Message*, vol. 2, no. 8 (August 1930), pp. 2–5, in that issue’s installment in a series entitled “Fragments from the Spiritual Speeches of Shri Sadguru Meher Baba,” item 21, “On Chaitanya” (pp. 2–3); the subsequent section 22, “On Miracles” (p. 3), appears

to draw on the discussion of that subject as presented on pp. 401–3 below. The contents of item 21 in Dastur’s article were reproduced verbatim in the supplement to *Infinite Intelligence*, pp. 608–9.

While “The Combined Diary” constitutes the primary diary source and/or analogue for this Tiffin Lecture, at the same time, the Tiffin Lecture contains material absent from “The Combined Diary” entry, and that entry, in turn, has material missing from the Tiffin Lecture. Rough notes in Chanji’s Diary (ChD 29: pp. 31–32) seem to constitute the further source for the version in “The Combined Diary,” but not for the Tiffin Lecture. A note in that same 30th August 1927 entry in Chanji’s Diary alludes to what may be the original human scribe for this present lecture: “In the afternoon, Shree again gave some nice explanations, before Doctor, Dastur, Dad[achanji] & others (vide Dr’s notes)” (ChD 29: p. 33). One gathers from this that Dr. Ghani took notes on that occasion, as he had done for another talk of Baba’s two days earlier (which, again, Chanji specifically mentions in ChD 29: p. 29). Perhaps this

30TH AUGUST 1927 (CONTINUED)

present Tiffin Lecture is a write-up based on Ghani's notes. If so, this is the only instance we know of in which the manuscript "Thursday Tiffin Lectures" has been based on notes taken by anyone other than Chanji. (For more on this point, see also endnotes 8 and 14 below.) (Earlier it was suggested that the Lonavala lecture of 29th November may have been typed by someone other than Chanji; but recent manuscript discoveries have established that Chanji was the original diarist on the basis of whose notes the Lonavala lectures were composed. For further details, see pp. 441-45.)

Another unique feature of this lecture—the last in the "Tiffin Lectures" collection—deserves mention. In its four typed versions (TTL/FF p. 171-74, TTL pp. 171-74, and TLD/FF: 30-8-27 drafts A and B, pp. 1-4), this lecture of Baba's differs from all that preceded it in its typography. While the previous lectures were double-spaced with the same double-spacing between paragraphs, this lecture, through its first pages (TTL/FF p. 171-73, TTL pp. 171-73, TLD/FF: 30-8-27 draft A, pp. 1-2, and TLD/FF: 30-8-27 draft B, pp. 1-3), is single-spaced with double spacing between paragraphs. But the last page in all four typed versions of the lectures (TTL/FF p. 174, TTL p. 174, and TLD/FF: 30-8-27 drafts A and B, p. 4) reverts to the usual double spacing that prevailed through the 170 pages that came before. (TLD/FF: 30-8-27 draft A, p. 3 is a mixed production, intermingling single with double spacing, though this is not the case with TLD/FF: 30-8-27 draft B, p. 3.)

4. The "Tiffin Lectures" manuscripts (TTL/FF p. 171, TTL p. 171, and TLD/FF: 30-8-27 drafts A and B, p. 1)—like the article entitled "On Chaitanya" in *Meher Message* cited in the previous endnote—opens with a list of words separated by dashes:

Atma – Self – Purusha
Chaitanya – Thinking – Mind
Prana – Energy
Akash – Matter

The source manuscript for *Infinite Intelligence* contains many such lists where hyphens or equal signs are used to express various different kinds of relationship. In the four lines above, the hyphens

seem to designate equivalence. The editors have, accordingly, replaced them with equal signs.

5. Again, TTL/FF p. 171 and TTL p. 171 present this material merely as a list of items separated by hyphens (TLD/FF: 30-8-27 drafts A and B, p. 1 read similarly):

Chaitanya - Energy - Sanskars - Consciousness of the universe (false consciousness) - Jiva.

Chaitanya - Energy - Self consciousness (true consciousness) Shiva - realized being.

This content makes sense only if the two lists are being contrasted. The "false consciousness" of the "jiva" in the first list is made so by the fact that chaitanya and energy are clouded by sanskaras; in the second case the "Self consciousness" is made possible by the absence of these sanskaras. The editors have adjusted the presentation of the content to express this.

6. TTL/FF p. 172 and TTL p. 172 read: "The sanskars remain as they are, while on the contrary new ones are accumulated viz. the plane Sanskars" (and TLD/FF: 30-8-27 drafts A and B, p. 2 read similarly). The implication here, particularly in the phrase "on the contrary," seems to be that this process fails on both accounts: on the one hand, the old gross-sphere sanskaras remain undestroyed, while new sanskaras—of the inner spheres—are gathered.

7. The adverbial qualifier "almost" does not appear in the original text of the "Tiffin Lectures" sources, which read: ". . . the sanskars of which viz. the supernatural powers invariably prove their undoing" (TTL/FF p. 172 and TTL p. 172; TLD/FF: 30-8-27 drafts A and B, p. 2 read similarly). The earlier part of the sentence, however, suggests that yogis do succeed in avoiding this pitfall in certain "rare" cases: "It is very rare that a Yogi can go beyond the fourth plane. . . ." The editors have interpolated "almost" to make these two parts of the sentence consistent with each other and to confirm the implication that failure for yogis on the fourth plane is not inevitable.

8. This handwritten word appears only in TLD/FF: 30-8-27 draft A, p. 2, where it has been written in the Urdu script; in TTL/FF p. 172, TTL p. 172, and TLD/FF: 30-8-27 draft B, p. 2 a lacuna appears at this spot. As explained in endnote 3 above, this particular Tiffin Lecture may have been based on notes by Dr. Ghani, who, of course, was fluent in Urdu, as Chanji was not. If TLD/FF: 30-8-27 draft A, p. 2 is an original typed draft of this lecture, perhaps this Urdu word was handwritten in by Ghani himself; and if TTL/FF p. 172 was a subsequent copy created on the basis of this as its source, perhaps the mandali who did this copying work could not read the Urdu and left a lacuna in his typescript.

9. A one-sentence version of the content of this paragraph appeared as saying no. 41 in "Sayings of His Divine Majesty Sadguru Meher Baba," *Meher Message*, vol. 1, no. 9 (September 1929), p. 1. For further information, see Appendix 5, Table 10, p. 514. In a more expanded form it was published as "Fragments from the Spiritual Speeches of His Divine Majesty Sadguru Meher Baba. (22) On Miracles," *Meher Message*, vol. 2, no. 8 (August 1930), p. 3.

10. TTL/FF p. 173, TTL p. 173, and TLD/FF: 30-8-27 drafts A and B, p. 3 read: ". . . which makes him see everything white, while in reality all things are colourless." Now, it contradicts ordinary human experience to assert that the things of the world are colorless; what the text appears to mean is that true vision interjects no filter between the eyes and the world, which would give what one sees a prevailing tinge or tint. Objects of sight are "colorless" when they appear in their natural colors without a hue or bias superimposed. The editors have emended the text so as to clarify this sense.

11. TTL/FF p. 173 and TTL p. 173 read: "He works towards removing the already put on white spectacles thereby enabling one to see things as they are, that is colour less [*sic*] or nothing" (TLD/FF: 30-8-27 drafts A and B, p. 3 read similarly).

12. TTL/FF p. 173, TTL p. 173, and TLD/FF: 30-8-27 draft B, p. 3 read: ". . . it is for this reason that a Sadguru looks upon chamatkars with disfavour, and also the practice which lead to that end" (TLD/FF: 30-8-27 draft A, p. 4 reads similarly). The editors have construed the phrase "to that end" to refer to the procurement of these powers or chamatkars.

13. The remainder of this paragraph, and the two paragraphs that follow, do not appear in the "Tiffin Lectures" versions of this talk; for a full explanation, see the next endnote.

14. This section, like the preceding few sentences (see the previous endnote), does not appear in the "Tiffin Lectures" sources (TTL/FF p. 173, TTL p. 173, TLD/FF: 30-8-27 draft A, p. 4, and TLD/FF: 30-8-27 draft B, pp. 3-4) but has been brought in by the editors on the basis of the account in ComD 2: ff. 370-71. Though the "Tiffin Lectures" and "The Combined Diary" have been relating their own accounts of this same lecture by Baba, in their final paragraphs they part company. Again, this difference may be explicable through the supposition that we are dealing with the notes of two different mandali, Chanji and Ghani (see endnote 3 above). In this edited text we have added the paragraphs from "The Combined Diary" and integrated them with the "Tiffin Lectures" version, since the two bits of material seem to interrelate and follow one to the other.

15. This same analogy (of the hand and the spoon) is developed at greater length in *Infinite Intelligence*, pp. 344-48.

16. In TTL/FF p. 174, below the conclusion of the typed text, there appear two handwritten lines in Gujarati. For a full discussion of these lines and their significance, see endnote 2 on pp. 584-85 above.