

*Satsang with Swami Dayananda Saraswati in Saylorburg
October 4, 2009*

Radha: Swamiji, I want to take up where we left off on Friday. Swamiji was talking...

Swamiji: Give me two topics.

Radha: Two topics?

Swamiji: No, a question.

Radha: Two questions?

Swamiji: I can...one or alternative, another one...so to discuss, whatever.

Radha: Okay. Either *antaùkaraëa-çuddhi*—you know, how to be with the different introjects inside—or Swamiji has often talked about how to...how to be with, kind of, the inner child in order to let different parts of the psyche mature. That's one question. And another would...maybe, perhaps to continue on with the discussion we had on nonduality.

Chuck: Yeah. Good topic. Anything related to nonduality.

Swamiji: Just now, in the...in the text there's a discussion, very interesting discussion. The discussion is based upon the *svärtaù parärthaù*, these two words. This is one approach. This is not the only approach. *svärtaù parärthaù* —the chair is *padärtha*; it is meant for some use, and the use is for the conscious being. And therefore, these *acetana padärthas*, the objects which are insentient, are meant for *cetana*. And ah...therefore, *cetanaù*, the one who is a conscious being, is *svärtaù*, and he does things... various, all for his own...for his own wellbeing. And whereas, even suppose he does service, that's all for his own wellbeing. He has got a bigger circle. He is mature enough to include a few more. *Parärthaù* means...so, what is not...what doesn't have it doesn't have its own...its own ah...consciousness, and therefore not endowed with consciousness. And therefore, it is always *parärthaù* like a plate, like a cup and saucer and all that.

Then, there was a *pürvapakña*. It's very interesting *pürvapakña* by the *çinïya*. It's that... the employer-employee. There are two fellows. The employee for his own sake alone is there with the employer. The employer employs the employee for his own sake. Therefore, there are two *svärtas*, the endowed with consciousness, this particular expression. There are two *svärtas*. Therefore, *advaita-häniù*, there's no *advaita*.

Radha: Oh, I see.

Swamiji: Aah! One for each other. There are two sources of consciousness. That's where

Çaikara says...I told you that the...whatever you objectify is *parārthau*; and the one who objectifies is *svārtau*, means he's *cetana*. And here you are talking about two sources of consciousness. When I say this fellow is *cetanavän*, this *cetanavän*, the *caitanya*, the consciousness...endowed with consciousness means not two fellows. Two things are involved here. There is one person who is endowed with consciousness, like a *daëdè*. When you say *daëdè*, *daëdè* *asya asti*, *daëdè*, that *pratyaya* reveals *asya asti*. Therefore, he is a *daëdè*. And when you say this *matup pratyaya*...and that is...so *cetanävän*, *caitanya* if you say that. That's a *pratyaya* revealing possession, so the one who possesses consciousness. There is a lot difference between the one who possesses a walking stick and the one who possesses consciousness, because the consciousness is "the one." There is no possession. There is no possession and possessor. There is no duality there. There is only one consciousness, *caitanya*.

Therefore, *agni-uñëavat abheda*. There is no difference between *cetanävän* and the *caitanya*. There is no such...and ah...the *cittimat*, it was said...*citti*, *cittimän*. *Citti* means consciousness, and so *cittimän*, one who has got consciousness. Hey, the one who has got consciousness is consciousness. Therefore, there is no second source of consciousness. Why? Because, this *açeña* [?] *pratyaya*, all without any exception, all the *pratyayas*, including the subject and all forms of objects and their perceptions, modifications of the mind, all of them together—this fellow says, "What about me who is aware of all of them? I also undergo change." When I see a...when I see an object, a colored object like a blue yellow[?], then I recognize it's blue yellow[?]. And the blue yellow[?], if I recognize, the recognizing person also undergoes some change. Otherwise, how will you recognize discrete objects? And therefore, there is a small change on the part of *upalabdhâ*, *upalabdhâ/upalabdhâ* means the subject, the knower.

Then, he says, this *upalabdhâ*, if that fellow undergoes change, are you conscious that there is a change? Yes. And that's okay. That's okay. That change you are conscious of, and therefore the *upalabdhâ*, the knower, and all that is knowing and everything that takes place in the mind, all *açeña-pratyayas*, all of them. All lighted by what consciousness, changeless *küöastha*. And that is what I say *ätmä küöasthau*, and that is what *advaya* is, the subject-object. So he is talking about two subjects: one subject, *svārta*, the other subject, *svārta iti*. He is talking about subjects, but really, if you see what is being talked as *ätmä*, that is the old confusion, is the superimposition— *kärya-käraëa-saigäta*, *kartätvam*, everything superimposed upon the *ätmä*. And therefore, you can get *kartärau*, duality. You can get duality, *kartä kartärau kartärau*, the *kartä* duality, *bhoktâ* duality, the doer duality. There are many doers, and there are many experiences, but all of them are to be lighted by a changeless consciousness. Otherwise, you will never

recognize change. And that accounts for nonduality.

Now, that limitless *küöastha-caitanya* is called *brahman*, and the *jagat* is nothing but that *brahman*. *sarvaà khalvidaà brahma neha nänästi küccana*, all these are nothing but *brahman*, a second thing doesn't exist. A second thing separate from *brahman* doesn't exist. And then, the question is raised, "What about *mäyä*?" What about *mäyä*? *mäyä* is *jagat*. *Jagat* is *brahman*. Where is the second thing? *Jagat* is *brahman*, words and meanings. *Jagat* is words and meanings, and they are *brahman*. Therefore, the *anirvacanéyatvam* is important here. *Mithyä* and all that, we say. Then, still, there is nondual...is affected, because...nondual is not affected, because *Mithyä* is *satyam*. Nonduality remains, because it's all from a...from ah...the perceiver's...the perceiver's point of view. There is a *nämarüpa*. The one who is looking at the world, he sees, she sees, subject-object...in other words, subject-object. This subject-object is what we say *mithyä*. That...this is *brahman*, which has got this attribute of being a subject and being an object. This is more precise way of dealing with it.

Being the subject, being an object, does it affect *brahman* in any way? Does it in any way inhibit nonduality? You have to count. Duality means you have to count. If you can't count, subject is *brahman*, object is *brahman*. And, therefore, where is the second thing? Subject is *brahman*. Object is *brahman*. There is no third thing. Second thing, third thing, fourth thing is not there. Subject is *brahman*. Object is *brahman*. Then why do you use the word subject? Then why do you use...what is the necessity for using the word subject? That is the glory. Without this subject...without the subject there is no subject matter to even discuss. There is no subject matter. Subject is there. And therefore, there is a subject matter. There is a discussion, and there is an object and all that. So subject-object is the manifestation, if you want to use the word "manifestation." It is not *satyam*. It is not *asat*. To dismiss that it is *asat*...*asat* word has got two meanings. One is *tuccham*. *Tuccham* means non-existent, and that's only a...just an expression, "non-existent." That also is not a correct thing. It's not *tuccham*. And then again, there is false, like subjective and *prätibhäsikam*, like dream etc., like the rope snake. That is called *prätibhäsikam*—you project. It's all within the *nämarüpa*. There is *vyävahärikam*. There is *prätibhäsikam iti*. The *prätibhäsikam* is very useful for us to explain how the subject can be confused. And the subject and the object, and for which there is a...there is this...on the part of the subject there is this conclusion that "this is false," "this is real." That "real" is under discussion. False we are not discussing. It's all *asat*; there's nothing to discuss.

What do you call real, the real pot? We are not discussion rope-snake. We are talking about real pot that holds water, that reality. Is it a plus? There's no plus or anything. We don't use the word "plus." There is no plus. Alright, what is that reality? We say, "You

tell me. What is that reality?" Pot, you say, is an attribute; potness is an attribute, that which has got pot. That which has got potness is pot. Alright, what is that potness? Where is that potness. Is it for clay? Because there is no substantive called pot existing there to have the potness. Substantive pot being not there, this potness should be an attribute of clay. You better don't tell clay, because clay doesn't want to be confined to potness. If you say clay has got the attribute of potness, we will ask so this...this potness... "Oh clay, do you have potness?" "What?!" "Pot...no, potness? Do you have potness?" What does it mean? "Is it your attribute?" "Hey, I'm clay." Where is potness?" If it is its intrinsic attribute, *yatra yatra* potness, wherever there is clay there is potness; wherever there is potness there should be clay. Both are not true. Wherever there is potness it can be plastic, it can be steel, it can be copper. And therefore, potness is not an intrinsic attribute of clay. Then, "extrinsic attribute" somebody said; it is an attribute away from clay. That has nothing to do with clay anyway. "Why do you discuss with me?" clay says. "If it is external to me, so why do you discuss with me?" "No, no, it's kind of an incidental attribute." "Incidental attribute how?" "Because we look at you as a pot in some places." "Oh, that's information. That's okay. As long as I am what I am, whatever you see you see. I remain clay. I always remain clay," *māttikā eva satyam*. And therefore, it is a superimposed attribute; *mithyā* attribute, let us say the superimposed means. Then, there are other issues involved in that. It's a *mithyā* attribute. What does it mean? *sadasadbhyām anirvacanéyam mithyā*. There are two definitions of it, *adhiñöhāna ananyat* is *mithyā*, *sadasadbhyām anirvacanéyam mithyā*. So, that which cannot be dismissed as *asat*, and that which cannot be said *sat* at all, that is *mithyā*.

Therefore, where is *advaita-hāni*? Because, one more *sat* is there, then, only, *advaita-hāni*. *hāni* means the destruction of *advaita*. So, one more *sat* is not there, one more reality is not there. And ah...and this *anirvacanéya* is the...is what we say the glory, *vibhūti*, of *éçvara*. *Brahman* as *jagat*-cause is *éçvara*. And therefore, this *anirvacanéya*, *çakti* also. You can say *çakti*, *mäyā-çakti*. Anything you say, it is *anirvacanéya*. The causal level also is *anirvacanéya*. The unmanifest has got the potential to become manifest. And therefore, *brahman* has this *anirvacanéya-çakti* from the *jagat* standpoint, from the *jagat* standpoint. From its own standpoint, there is no *anirvacanéya çakti*, like even the clay doesn't know that I have...I have the attribute of potness. The clay doesn't have the attribute of potness, but the onlooker has got a pot to see. And therefore, he attributes this potness to clay. And this...similarly here, from the standpoint of the *jagat* etc., there is this attribute. Because, we cannot...if everything is *brahman*, we can't say we are imputing some attribute, but we see the *jagat*, we experience the *jagat*, we are trained to understand the truth of this *jagat*. We are not trying to understand the truth of something else. We are trying to understand what we confront, the subject-object, and the

subject-object truth happens to be *brahman*, and both of them are *brahman*. And *brahman* by...in itself, when I understand that, it happens to be the self, and it's a self-revealing self. And therefore, I cannot even dispute that it has got any other attribute or anything. And therefore, it's free from attributes.

Then, when I look at as the subject and object and all that—okay. Add to the limitless consciousness, *küöastham brahma—küöastham*, changeless—to that *brahman* add all these, subject-object. Subject-object is enough. Don't add anything else, subject-object. Object can be *devatäs*. Object can be anything, subject-object. And the subject, being subject, is an attribute. Object is another attribute. Both these attributes, subject-object attributes, are neither *satyam—satyam* is already self-revealing *brahman*—nor it is false, which is subjective. “False” also *nämariüpa*. “False” also is *nämariüpa*, is a possibility of committing a mistake, because the onlooker-subject can commit mistakes. And therefore, the subject's mistake. That is also a possibility, and that possibility doesn't exist for a table, for a chair. It can't commit the mistake of taking itself to be something different; or the chair will not commit the mistake of taking the table as another chair and whatever. It's all within the creation. And therefore, the...within the field of objects the subject-object addition is not an addition. The necessity for *pürëamadaü pürëamidam* is that, you know. That is, cause is *pürëam*, effect is *pürëam*, and the effect came from cause, *pürëam*; this *pürëam* came from that *pürëam*. And from that *pürëam* this *pürëam* is removed, somebody said. We don't remove anything. This *pürëam* is viewed as that *pürëam*, original *pürëam*, non-separate from that *pürëam*. *pürëasya jagataü, pürëamädäya, pürëam gâhétvä, pürëam brahma iti gâhétvä*, knowing that it is *pürëam brahma, pürnameväviçñyate*. What is there is *pürëam*.

Therefore, there is no *advaita-häni*. Added also, *advaita-häni* is not there, because it doesn't count. Without adding, also, there's no *advaita-häni*. The beauty of it is you can...you can be the subject and object. It's not a melting-pot *advaita*—everything gets dissolved, and then *advaita*. Then, it becomes *dvaita*. When the subject-object is there, *advaita* is not there; when the subject-object are dissolved, then *advaita* is there. This is...some kind of thinking is there. Some people say that—if all the thoughts disappear, then *advaita* comes. That's not *advaita*. Means, when the subject disappears then *advaita*.

Radha: Yeah.

Swamiji: That is not *advaita*. There's no subject-object, that's all. That happens every day in sleep; nobody is enlightened. If *advaita* is ah...is the absence of subject-object, there's no *advaita*.

Radha: But, Swamiji, could I get a point of clarification? How can Swamiji make the

capacity, the very capacity for the manifestation of knowledge, the *çakti* itself, *mithyā*? In other words, there's *brahman*, and there is this *māyā-çakti*, the very capacity for the manifestation. We can look at the manifestation and say, "This is *mithyā*," but how do you make the *çakti* itself, the existence of the *çakti* ...

Swamiji: A word. It's only a word.

Radha: But I need Swamiji to do it.

Swamiji: Yeah, yeah. The...you have to use the word manifestation.

Radha: But the *çakti* itself that brings about the manifestation. That is...

Swamiji: We can use the word "*çakti i.*" It's only for us to understand, because we see a world. And then, we see a world here, *nāmarūpa*. There is subject-object. This subject-object can be either unmanifest or manifest. It's a cycle. Therefore, that it can be unmanifest, can be manifest, is also *brahman*, is also *brahman*. That...once we look at the *jagat* and then we accept subject-object, and then...then there is a discussion. This subject-object, are they *brahman* or separate from *brahman*? We need to understand, this subject-object are *brahman*. If the subject-object are *brahman*, sometimes they come, like in sleep. So, subject-object don't exist in sleep. In the dream, they come to manifest. In waking, they come to manifest. In deep sleep, they don't come to manifest; they become unmanifest. And then, again, come to manifest. This is how *brahman* is. The subject object are *brahman* whether they are manifest or unmanifest. The subject-object are *brahman*. If they are unmanifest, that is only pointing out that there is no...this, the creation...it only negates creation.

This manifestation, unmanifestation, these two words negate creation, the beginning of creation, because there is an *ārambha-vāda*. There is a stand taken by the logician who says the whole thing is created. What is *abhāva*, previously it was not there, and it is created; and therefore, it is *satyam*. There's no such thing. What is not before created cannot be *satyam*. Then we redefine the *satyam* for that fellow. "Hey, come on! What was there before, what is now here, what will ever be, that is called *satyam*." Then he says, "*Because it is created from absence, it is satyam.*" No. For him *abhāva-pratīyogī* is *satyam*; so, that which is opposed to its absence *satyam*. They dismiss that fellow. What I say, the whole idea of manifestation, unmanifestation, itself is to point out that there is no such thing as beginning. Beginning is only for one cycle, beginning, and itself had no beginning. That is what we say unmanifest. The same *jagat* was there undifferentiated, now differentiated again to become undifferentiated. This is *brahman*. "*Then, this is how brahman is you can tell.*" No. It happens to be the self-revealing consciousness, and

therefore we have no doubts about the...they are *brahman* alright. So, *brahman* is free from all of them. That we need to understand. Therefore, this is the *advaita*. This is *advaita* that is talked about by the *çästra*. There is no other *advaita* we are talking about. We are not talking about melting-pot *advaita*. We are talking about subject-object are *advaita*. Aah! All the differences...so, are *advaita*. The vision of *advaita* is not...is not subject to any dent because of subject-object. That...then, only, there is *advaita*. Thank you.

Radha: Thank you, Swamiji.

PAGE

PAGE 7