

*Satsang with Swami Dayananda Saraswati in Saylorsburg
October 4, 2008*

Chuck: We generally ah...you know, we generally talk about ignorance as being the lack of knowledge. You know, it doesn't have any particular attributes or anything like that.

Swamiji: Nay, nay, but ah...

Chuck: It doesn't have *vikñepa* [the power to project] and...

Swamiji: The...there are a few people who have been telling that ah...absence of knowledge is ignorance.

Chuck: Yeah

Swamiji: So it'll create all the problems, (laughs) because ignorance creates. Absence cannot create. See, ignorance of a *vastu*, an object. You know object is, but what is that object, you don't know. Ignorance is only up to that. Then that...what is that object. When you don't see clearly, so you see something else in its place. That is caused by what? That ignorance. That what you have ignorance that causes...projects that.

Chuck: No, but what about a normal...just a...you've never seen a sock. You're a baby when you're born, just simple lack of knowledge.

Swamiji: Huh?

Radha: Simple...

Chuck: Just simple. Yeah. No, a normal...not...not for ah...knowing Brahman, just for a..a regular object.

Swamiji: Yeah. Yeah.

Chuck: If you're a baby, you grow up. You've never gone to India, so you don't know what India is.

Swamiji: Yeah. Yeah.

Chuck: You've heard of it, or you've...you know...any object.

Swamiji: Yeah

Chuck. It's just the lack of knowledge...

Swamiji: Yeah

Chuck: It's simple. And that's what we call 'ignorance' normally.

Swamiji: Yeah, that's correct.

Chuck: Is that...

Swamiji: That is okay. That's the same thing what I am talking.

Chuck: Oh, okay.

Swamiji: Natural, yeah. So, until you know, ignorance is. That's what a...until you know, ignorance is. It is absence of knowledge, it is true. But also, you have to say. That can be a simple expression. Whether this ignorance is a...is opposed to knowledge? That is the question.

If it is opposed to knowledge, ignorance goes. So ignorance goes means, 'til then it was there. That is why it could create a distorted version, error. So if it is not there...absence cannot create, a technical, little.

Chuck: Yeah

Swamiji: Absence cannot create anything. Because it has got an existence until it goes, like anything else, so it can cause distortion. Therefore, that can be negated in the...in the wake of knowledge. That gets negated in the wake of knowledge, which is its opposite. Absence doesn't require any *nivātti* [removal]. And in every knowledge *ajjāna-nivātti* [the removal of ignorance] is there.

And another thing, there is no new knowledge. Therefore, there is no absence of knowledge. One...one consciousness is all knowledge. Therefore, there is no absence of knowledge, because there is no new knowledge. And there is only scraping of ignorance. So, ignorance is *āvaraëa* [covering], and denying the knowledge, covering the knowledge. So, it can be removed by *vātti* [thought modification], *buddhi* [knowledge].

Chuck: Isn't that changing...I feel like that's changing standpoints, though. All knowledge is the...is the whole.

Swamiji: Yeah.

Chuck: You know, and I feel like, when you are talking about individual, ignorance is a different ah...commodity.

Swamiji: Yeah.

Chuck: You know, because the individual doesn't ah...

Swamiji: Have all knowledge.

Chuck: Yeah, and...

Swamiji: That means, inhibited. The individual...

Chuck: Yeah.

Swamiji: is inhibited, because there is individuality. But that can be...so this can be a... a...this can be owned freely, or this can give rise to an identity, an individual identity, absolute, real, identity, that's due to *ajñāna* [ignorance]. It's called, *āvaraṅga* [covering]. Some veil is there. This veil...reality of the veil is further established in psychology, and also in our dream, in all our mistakes, very real. This *āvaraṅga* is very real. In all delusions and all that, (laughs) you make your own reality.

Radha: Swamiji, in...in...just to pursue that a little bit, when we say that the entire creation is *Ēçvara*'s manifest knowledge...this is what I was trying to ah...get to yesterday. We have three words that Swamiji's using, manifest knowledge, word, and meaning. So, when you use word and meaning instead of subject object, or Swamiji doesn't really use the word 'object' anymore. He uses the word 'meaning,' right?

Swamiji: You can use the word 'object.'

Radha: No, but there's a subtle difference.

Swamiji: Yeah. Yeah.

Radha: And I wanted Swamiji to talk on that.

Swamiji: See, the pot, it's not an object.

Radha: Right.

Swamiji: And ah, because we try to see the object. Common language is 'pot is object.' But when you look into the pot, all that is there is clay. And the pot you cannot say, 'sitting upon the clay.' It's not off the clay. It's not in the clay. Therefore, pot is a kind of a *mithyā* attribute. It's a *mithyā* attribute, superimposed attribute.

And ah...that's not intrinsic to clay. And it cannot be put elsewhere too. It's not elsewhere. It only belongs to pot, in a way. So, how will you say it's an object? So, from the...from the common understanding you have to...you have to move away to see what it is.

Once I say 'object,' then it becomes a substantive, then object, and attribute and all that. So, becomes a solid substantive. And there is nothing solid about it. So, when there is nothing tangible, made belongs to clay, the weight of pot belongs to clay, the strength of pot is the clay strength. If you touch the pot, you touch clay. So there is no pot. But at

the same time, you can't dismiss it. It holds water.

And therefore, we have to...we have to accept that there is pot, the word and *nāma-rūpa* [name and form]. *vācārambhaëaà vikāro nāmadheyam* [modified form is centered on speech and is a name alone]; *vācārambhaëaà nāmadheyam ; nāmamātram ityarthaù* [it is name alone, this is the meaning]; *dheya*, that suffix added to *nāma* [name] emphasis the same meaning *svārthe dheyapratyaya* [the suffix, "dheya," is in the same sense]. So, the word meaning is emphasized. That means only, *nāma-mātram*, only the name. It's all very definite, only name, which has a meaning, and that is a form, which includes function too. The function itself another name, if you analyze that.

Radha: But when we use 'word and meaning' we're only talking about manifest knowledge, really.

Swamiji: Yeah, that's...

Radha: We're only talking...on every level, even the level of the individual.

Swamiji: Yeah.

Radha: So, our whole experience is just one of knowledge. The whole experience is...is only knowledge.

Swamiji: Yeah.

Radha: So that's where this...

Swamiji: Yeah

Radha: understanding the *avidyā* [ignorance].

Swamiji: That's what is astounding.

Chuck: Yeah.

Swamiji: (Laughs) You say, 'a wall,' there is no wall. (Laughs) There is no wall. A cement is not wall, brick is not wall, wood is not wall. And there's a wall. It obstructs you. You can't cross. That is *vyavahāra* [empirical reality], really no wall. If you go to the level of particles, there is no wall. But even, we're...we're ah...that is one...one way of looking, particle level and all that. There it is explained the micro, and macro and all that, but ah...what we talk is little different.

We say, the wall is a word for which there is a meaning. It's not a meaningless word. So that meaning then if you try to see what makes this wall, this meaning attribute. Wallness belongs to what? You should ask like that. So wall is an attribute. So an attribute means there must be a locus, a substantive. The substantive cannot be a wall. The wallness has

got to be of something else. So already wallness is only an attribute, *mithyā* attribute. Then, what is *satyam* [the truth]?

Then you have to say in a dry wall, another word, another attribute, dry wall. So (laughs) then afterwards you've got wood. Wood is not wall. The pulp is not wall. Molecules are not wall. Atom is not wall. Particle is not wall. Keep going.

Therefore, the wallness belongs to non-wall, and the non-wall, you cannot stop anywhere. There is only one non-wall which is self-existent. And the self-existent, self-revealing... Self-existent has to reveal itself. Otherwise it cannot be self-existent, because existence has to be revealed. Therefore self-revealing alone can be self-existent. Every other existence has to be revealed. It's object of your knowledge. Then only you can say, is, is not.

Therefore, so that non-wall is *nirguḍāà brahma* [brahman, which is free from attributes]. So non-wall, non-dry wall, non-wood, means woodness belongs to non-wood. Ha! So the whole thing is *brahman*. It's ah...it's amazing.

Radha: The...when you say 'wallness,' it has to resolve into some...what Swamiji's saying is that like wallness or chairness or objectness of some sort, that 'ness' means it has to resolve into a substantive, and you can't find a substantive. The only substantive is...is *brahman*.

Swamiji: Yeah. Yeah. Yeah.

Radha: But...

Swamiji: See, because once you say...you first you analyze. What is this? This *Aparokānubhuti* [A text attributed to Shankara] gives this trick. I use this all the time, but ah...it's nice to find out it has got that. This...this ah...first ah...you have to (taps table) look for the table. Where is this table? (Taps table and laughs) Look for whatever that is object around you. So, this table is very good thing. So, look for the table.

And wherever you look, there is no table. There's only...there's only wood. And even if there are a few other things, nail is there or something, that's also not...not table. So, this table is an attribute. First we arrive at attribute. This is just an attribute, because there is no substantive.

Once you say, table is an attribute, it is tableness. Table cannot be an attribute unless it is tableness. It's not a substantive. Therefore, it has got to be abstract quality, and therefore, tableness. Once it is tableness, then you have to find a substantive. Tableness has to qualify a substantive, being an attribute. And the substantive cannot be another table. You will get into regression and all kinds of problems.

And so...so the tableness is an attribute of a non-table. So non-table means what? What

is non-table? Anything other than table is non-table. Chair is non-table. Wood is non-table. Steel is non-table. It's all non-table.

But if you look at any...every one of them, again it is attribute of non-that something. And therefore, attribute free, self-existent, *vastu* should be there as the substantive for this table (taps table.)

So this is the attribute of *brahman*. *idaà sarvaà khalu brahmaiva; sarvaà khalvidaà brahma* [all this is Brahman alone] That is the meaning for that (taps table) *neha nānāsti kīcāna* [there is no duality here].

Radha: If Swamiji uses a different type of language, like if I were to say, "What is the table made of?" Like we can say, tableness has to be an attribute of non-table. But I would arrive at the same...in the same...would I arrive place if I asked, "Well, what is... what is the table made of?" That's...then I'm looking for the substance of the...of the table.

Swamiji: Okay

Radha: And so then I say, "Well, the table is made of wood." But that's a different...it's a different...

Swamiji: Yeah that...that...

Radha: I just want to make the relationship between those two.

Swamiji: that will confusion, because you can...you can get there by...by using that kind of expression also you can get there. But we have to see in communication what happens there, what happens to the listener's mind. So, this is what we have been doing anyway.

So, the table is made of wood. So, wood...wood all put together in a certain way, it's a table. And we think that 'it's a table' is a substantive, another substantive, created. That's the orientation. Then we say, 'wooden table.' So wood becomes an adjective to table, wooden table. Hah! That's the orientation. We keep on counting tables.

And that is called *dvaita* [duality]. That is duality, because we don't count what is. We count what appears. And the...but the substantive you count, two tables, three tables, four tables, and the dining table, and the coffee table, tea...tea table, tea pot. Ha! Whatever. So, this...this ah...if you...if...in the language of the *Çruti*, this is...this is purely *kāraëam* [cause]. *tadananyatvamārambhaëaçabdādibhyaù* 'Brahma Sūtra'[Swamiji is quoting the Brahma Sutra: "*tadananyatvamārambhaëaçabdādibhyaù*, 2.1.14" that refers to *çrutis* such as *vācārambhaëaà*, as substantiating the non-difference of cause and effect.]

The *ananyatvam* means non-separate from the cause. So the object is non-separate from the cause. In fact, it is the cause. But still there is a word *vācārambhaëaà* [is centered on

speech]; *ārambhaëaçabdädibhyaù*; *käraëa-ananyatvaà käryasya*. [the effect being non-separate from the cause]

That means *käryam* is *käraëam*. Effect is cause. *Ārambhaëaçabdädibhyaù*; *väcārambhaëää vikāro nāmadheyam* [modified form is centered on speech and is a name alone]. From all these words we've come...we come to understand what is there is only a word and meaning, name and form. Name and form, I say, 'word and meaning,' so to make it more telling.

Name and form means, you might think that there's name and form.

Radha: (Laughs) That's right.

Swamiji: Because...because one of ah...one of my senior disciples...ah... was giving a talk and I listened to him. Sometime I happened to be there, and I just listened for five minutes. So, he was talking about name and form.

"Form is created," he was telling something.

Therefore I thought, so some...this name and form is not a great ah...translation for *vikāra*. So, I thought I should...I should change. So, I learn from my students, you know. So, what I should say. What I should not say. (Laughs)

Because this communication, you keep on...ah...keep on changing, so that ah... there is nothing taken for granted. Because the words become mechanical and then you simply say something without meaning anything.

Radha: Swamiji, could you contrast the use of these...these two, I guess I'll call them *prakriyās* [teaching methodologies]. The tableness, non-table, and then when Swamiji goes ah...in terms of shirt, fabric, yarn...

Swamiji: Yeah.

Radha: What that also ends up in the *vastu* [the reality]. But what are the subtle differences between these...using these two *prakriyās*? What is...what is the difference there, Swamiji?

Swamiji: Yeah. The problem is there...that is fine. That is only to point out everything is 'non.' Fabric also is an attribute. Fabricness is attribute of a non-fabric, which is yarn. And when you hear the word 'yarn,' you don't include fabric in it. Your understanding doesn't include.

This is *Shankara*. This is *Shankara* (laughs.) In the...in the second chapter *Géta* he talks about that. *nāsato vidyate bhävau* ['for the unreal (*mithyā*), there is no being...'] from BG 2.16] There in that verse, he talks. You cannot imagine an object without the substance. That's what he says. You can't imagine an object without a substance. And the substance

is the object. But you think that this object is substance. Object has no substance. It's an attribute.

And therefore, in order to point out, it is a 'non'...non-fabric, I say, 'yarn.' Non-yarn is fiber. So, this *parampara*[[succession](#)] is used only to prove whole thing is...every one is an attribute of 'non.' Therefore...therefore fabric is not the *kāraḥa*, the cause, for...for ah...for shirt. Shirt...the cause for the shirt is not...mean, the substantive for the shirt is not fabric, because that also 'ness.' That also is an attribute of 'non.' And everything is an attribute of 'non,' 'non' of that. And therefore, so there is only one substantive, which is non-attribute.

Radha: But within *māyā*, that's an infinite regress, right? Within *māyā*, Swamiji, it's an infinite regress, in the sense that everything...every *nāma-rūpa* [[name and form](#)] for...

Swamiji: Yeah. Yeah.

Radha: Every attribute is ah...the 'ness' of the 'non'

Swamiji: [can't make out words]

Radha: So, that's infinite regress. What is the...

Swamiji: We don't bring in *māyā* here.

Radha: No, no, I know but I...

Swamiji: *Māyā* is the *nāma-rūpa*. *Māyā* is *pariḥāma* [[change, transformation](#)].

Radha: I meant everything within duality.

Swamiji: Yeah

Radha: That logic is an infinite regress. There is no end to it.

Swamiji: Yeah

Radha: So, how do you make the jump, then to...

Swamiji: That infinite regression only proves the point that that kind of inquiry is wrong. It is illogical to inquire like that, because you are trying to find out something. But this... this logic gives you that you will go into a regression, if you continue with that kind of inquiry. That's...that's not...that's not rational.

Radha: Right.

Swamiji: So, what is rational is find out with...once you say, 'non,' a given thing is an attribute of the 'non' that something. You call it table. It's a non-table. Tableness is the attribute. We have to place it in a non-table. The non-table is *brahman*. The non-table cannot be anything else except non-everything. Ha! Ha!

So the infinite regression points out the non-everything. Non-everything is *nirguëaà brahma* [brahman which is free from attributes]. So the *nirguëaà brahma*, attribute free *vastu* that is self-revealing. So then the next question will be, how will you know the attribute free?

Radha: Yeah.

Swamiji: I need not know. Why should I know? If it is self-revealing, I don't need to know, because that...that...that infinitive to know, implies subject-object. But here, there is no subject object. *Jiä-dhätu jänäti* [the verbal root *Jiä* (to know) he knows . *kaü jänäti* [Who knows?] *kiä jänäti* [What does he know?]] So, you have got subject object, all the *käarakas* [the relations between a noun and verb in a sentence]. You don't need *käarakas* here. So, it's self-revealing. Therefore, what is self-revealing is always free from attributes.

Radha: Why? Why is what is self-revealing...

Swamiji: Because if...all attributes are *mithyà* to *satyam* [depend on the real for their beng]. Ah, (laughs) Therefore, *satyam* is 'non,' *nirguëa brahman* all the way. Therefore, *sarvaà brahma* [everything is Brahman].

Radha: That self-revealing, Swamiji, sometimes I think that that can ah...be a point of confusion. What it really means...when you say that *brahman* is self-revealing, there can still be a point of confusion.

Swamiji: Why?

Radha: Um, because...I think because the knower known relationship is so strong that... that the self-revealing is still often considered to be something that requires the *upädhi* [conditioning adjunct] in order for it to be known. And so, that needs to be made clear.

Swamiji: We are...we are talking with the *upädhi* only. Therefore, we generally know things with a subject object relationship. And that itself reveals...that itself reveals there is something that doesn't require to be revealed so that we can know things.

So, that only establishes the...when we say, *brahman* is self-revealing, we mean *ätmä* [Self]...*brahman* as *ätmä*, self-revealing. *Ätmä* is *brahman*. *Brahman* is self-revealing. *Ätmä* is self-revealing.

What it is, already we have negated. Even if you don't negate, I am, is self-revealing. Conclusions are negated. So, if you negate properly all the conclusions, then...then...

then the word will work. *Satyā jñānam anantam* [existence, knowledge, limitless], all these words will work.

So, one confusion I know what it is, and that is when we are talking about *pramāḥa* [means of knowledge]. *Çāstra* is a *pramāḥa*. This is little more *çāstric*. So, *çāstra* is a *pramāḥa*. It's a means of knowledge. So once you say 'means of knowledge,' then ah... they will think what is revealed by that is the object of revelation. Therefore, *çāstra* takes care to avoid that, you know. So then they...we use paradoxes, like it has to be known, but it is not...an *aprameya* [it is not available as an object of knowledge]. It is not available for mind, but it has to be known. The knower of *brahman*...

Look at this particular *mantra*: “*yato vāco nivartante/ aprāpya manasā saha ānandaḥ brahmaḥo vidvān/ na bibheti kutaçcaneti* !” [from Taitt 2.9.1 “that from which words return , having not reached along with the mind; the one who knows Brahman as *ānanda*; he is not afraid of anything.]; *yataḥ yasmāt vācaḥ nivartante* [that from which words come back]. All words come back from what, and along with the mind. The mind also tries to objectify. It cannot objectify, along with the mind, and the words come back. So, these are the things that we have.

So mind cannot...cannot objectify. That means it's not an inferential conclusion, much less perception. Because...so, if you don't directly perceive through the senses, then also mind is involved. And then you can infer. Then also mind is involved. In direct perception, mind is involved. In inference, mind is involved, reasoning. Both have been dismissed now.

Then words are the *pramāḥa* [means of knowledge]. So, words can give rise to knowledge. That also is included *vāco nivartante/ aprāpya manasā saha* [words return together with the mind]. All the means of knowledge gone, and you have to know. Next line *ānandaḥ brahmaḥo vidvān-- brahmaḥaḥ ānandaḥ vidvān*. *vidvān*, the one who knows *brahman* as *ānanda*, or *brahmaḥaḥ ānandaḥ* [the *ānanda* of Brahman] which has no *ñāñōi* [sixth case— the genitive case (the genitive case is not being used in the sense of possession)] there . *Brahman* that is *ānandaḥ*.

The one who knows has no reason to have any fear--*na bibheti kutaçcaneti* There is no second thing to fear. He's free from fear. So, there...there the word is, all the means of knowledge gone, but there is a *vidvān* [one who who knows]. *vidvān* means previously *avidvān*. There is no *vidvān* unless he was *avidvān* before. He did not know before. Now he is *vidvān*. *brahmavid āpnoti param* [the knower of brahman gains the supreme] Therefore *avidvān san vidvān bhaviṣyati* [the one who doesn't know becomes the one who knows.] Previously *avidvān*, he did not know. Now he knows. That *vidvān* has no reason to fear. So, that means knowledge takes place.

So, what is that knowledge? How does it take place? By negation and assertion, so. Assertion through *lakṣya*, implied meaning. And that implied meaning is possible because I am self-revealing. Otherwise, it's not possible. In that sense we use the word 'self-revealing' *brahman*. (Laughs) All technical, so enough.

Janani: Swamiji, this is technical too, so if you want to...in that they say...first when they say *kadācaneti* and they say *kutaçcaneti* in that particular *Taittiréya Upaniñad* [Tait 2.4.1 uses *kadācaneti*, while 2.9.1 uses *kutaçcaneti*]

Swamiji: What is that?

Question: Um, is there...does it matter ..

(Discussion, several people speaking at the same time)

Another Questioner: *kadācaneti*, Swamiji. She's asking the difference between *kadācaneti* and *kutaçcana*.

Swamiji: Yeah

Janani: Because the first time it's *kadācaneti* then in the second it's *kutaçcaneti*.

Swamiji: Yeah. Yeah. That's the difference (laughs)

Janani: Is there...like...

Swamiji: *yato väco nivartantel apräpya manasä sahal änandaà brahmaëo vidvänl na bibheti kadācanetil*[Tait 2.4.1] That is *manomayakoña*. *Upäsana*. There again *vyañöi samañöi*. [individual-total] *Vyañöi* [individual, *jéva*] does the *upäsana* of *samañöi*—*Éçvara*. That is prayer, meditation.

kadācana means, so he's not...he doesn't have...because he goes to *loka* [a world]. There there is no fear of death. Why? Because *Mātyu* [Lord Death] doesn't go. You go to *Mātyu* [to Lord Death]. (Laughs) There is no fear of death because there is no aging. In the *loka* there is no aging, and therefore there is no fear death. (Laughs) Very nice. But you end up in his hands. He doesn't bother. He says, "He will come back. I...why should I bother?" *Mātyu* doesn't go there. Therefore there there is no fear of death and aging and all that, *upäsana-phalam*. [the fruit of *upäsana*—prayer, meditation].

But here knowledge, *jñāna-phalam* [the fruit of knowledge]. *Kutaçcana* means there is... from nothing else you have fear. *Kutaçcana*--there is no other thing. So, because second thing is not there. And there because the second thing doesn't seem to affect you for the time being. Second thing is time. Time doesn't seem to affect you for the time being. *Kadācana*. (Laughs)

Durga: Swamiji, I have a question about objects. I have a little confusion about this. Is it that objects are known because they themselves are *brahman*, and *brahman* is self-existent and self-revealing, so that's why we know the objects. Is that true?

Swamiji: Huh.

Durga: Is that too confusing?

(Laughter)

Swamiji: An object, yeah. Every object is revealed.

Durga: Yeah

Swamiji: Whereas *brahman* is not an object because it is self-revealing.

Durga: Yes, but the objects are revealed by...because they are *brahman*, isn't it, or is it not?

Swamiji: Nay. Nay. That ah...they are *brahman*, correct, but they can't reveal themselves unless they have a...All are *brahman*, but that doesn't mean that I know...I know each object. It's only generally you can say, "All is *brahman*, known or unknown." You...you put these two words *viditam-aviditam*, known or unknown is *brahman*. But each one of them comes to be known through your senses, and that senses have to reveal the object. So, that is because of the individual has the faculty of knowing. Individual has the faculty of knowing and the ignorance is always there. The veil is always there, and veil has to go. So, faculty is there for which...so you have to know individual object.

You see, *brahman* is self-revealing. Self-revealing means not outside object is revealing. Self-revealing means only self is self-revealing, and self is *brahman*. And self is everything also. And everything if it has got to reveal itself to me for which I have eyes and ears and things, depending upon what it is, so appropriate means of revealing.

Durga: But when we say, 'the object is,' that isness is *satyam*.

Swamiji: *Brahman*. That is *brahman*. That's why *asti*, if you say *bhāti*, that is *brahman*, *asti*[it is] *bhāti* [it shines]. If you say, '*bhāti asti*,' if you say...means it shines, means it is an object of my knowledge, *bhāti*. Sanskrit is wonderful. *Bhāti* is...it's an object shining in my...in my consciousness, *bhāti*. So, then it is *asti*, because *bhāti* it is *asti*. If it is *asti*, it is *bhāti*. Therefore, *brahman asti bhāti*. And therefore, even an object is and *bhāti*, it comes to be an object of knowledge, that is *brahman*. *Asti bhāti, sat cit* [existence consciousness]. Then whatever that is you have to use your eyes, ears and that's all.

Durga: The *bhāti*, the shining, somehow I thought the shining also existed in the object itself that...that because the object shines somehow it's known.

Swamiji: That shine that is consciousness, and that doesn't reveal what it is. So only ah...see, when you look out, it's very simple. When you look out and you see an object, in this object there are...there are these four things are there. The object is. Once you say 'is,' shines, *bhāti, asti, bhāti*. For that you don't require anything. It is self...it is the *asti* of self, *bhāti* of self. Then what it is, *āvaraṅga* [covering]. That has to go.

Then you say, 'It's a tree.' There is an object, that *āvaraëa* gone. Eyes tell you that, that it is a tree. So, there is an object, *āvaraëa* goes. Then it is a tree, *āvaraëa* goes. *Āvaraëa* means veil. Veil goes. Then it is a...it is a oak tree, goes. *Āvaraëa* goes. It must be a hundred year old tree. Further *āvaraëa* goes, guess work. So, it's not a young tree. It's an old tree. So, these are all...these are all arrived at by means of knowing, because I'm not *sarvajña* [all-knowing] in this form. I'm not all knowing, so *āvaraëa* has to go. But *asti bhāti is brahman*, so.

There's a verse also—

*asti bhāti priyaà rūpaà nāma cetyamçapaïcakam |
ädyaatrāyam brahmariūpaà jagadriūpaà tato dvayam || (Dāg-dāçya-vivekaù, 20)*

Asti bhāti priyam--they include *ānanda* also. In every object there is *asti bhāti priyam*, is, shines and *priyam*. *Priyam* is *ānanda*, is pleasing, is *ānanda*, *saccidānanda*, [existence, consciousness, fullness] plus *nāma-rūpa* [name and form]. First three is *brahman* and the other two are *jagat* [world], *nāma-rūpa*. All of them are one *brahman*. Very beautiful.

Terry: Swamiji, when we say, '*asti, bhāti, priyam*,' *asti* and *bhāti* are always immediately evident. *Priyam* aspect becomes a question. How can this be *priyam* [can't make out words] the mind is not focused enough to see it.

Swamiji: Because ah...because the mistake in only with reference to limitation. I am limitless is not known because you are not...So, "Am I conscious being or not?" I have no trouble. "Do I exist or not?" No trouble. You know, "Do I exist or not?" No trouble. I am. So, I am. When you say, "I am conscious and I am. I am. I exist." So, in that there is no confusion.

The confusion is I am a discreet person, confined to this body about which I have too many complaints. Therefore, I become small, insignificant. I am smarting individual, *ninja*. And so, the smallness comes out. So, the...the problem is only with the limitation. I am limited being. I don't like it. So that means I want to be free from limitation. That means I have to be the limitless, the whole. That is what *ānandam* is. And therefore, that doesn't seem to be obvious.

We also don't use it. (Laughs) In teaching we will use only *sat cit* [existence, consciousness]. And then keep that at a appropriate...to bring in at the appropriate time because that will confuse. Yeah.

Today also...now also I said, "*Sat cit*, plus *nāma-rūpa*," first. Then later I brought in *saccidānanda*, *nāma-rūpa*. Method, it's all method. Yeah.

Radha: Also, Swamiji, *ānanda* has in a sense been mis...misdefined as bliss.

Swamiji: That was later. That was mystifying later, because people know they seek ānanda, some pleasure. Even they don't know but they...they find themselves comfortable being happy. And therefore, they're all after happiness. And ah, sometimes they have it, and sometimes they don't have it. There are certain avenues.

So, this ah...happiness is still...it's a...it's an eluding...it's an eluding thing. It's not easily available. The same object doesn't make you happy. You become monotonous, and therefore, ah you have to go for something else. People get tired. And then there are other issues also. We have to deal with ourselves.

Therefore, I become the project, *ātmā* project. (Laughs) Therefore, we are all searching for freedom from this *ātmā* project, how to manage myself.

Yesterday there was a question. A retired man says, "How to handle disappointments?" A retired person. "We are retired couple. How to handle disappointments?"

And so, because of the whole life is handling, self-handling. And ah...then spiritual people come and tell you, "You'll have *ātmā* bliss." Then it gets mystified.

Radha: That's what I was referring to, Swamiji. It's a superlative. And when we think of our own personal experience, you can go from sorrow, to neutral, to happy, happier, happiest, bliss.

Swamiji: Yeah. Yeah.

Radha: And so then you think that *ātmā* is bliss, that means it's a superlative to be...state of experience...superlative state of experience to be achieved.

Swamiji: Yeah, that's ah...that's...that's where the mystique comes. Yeah. That's why you...you remove that kind of a thing by...by making *ātmā* communicable.

If you...if you say 'bliss,' there is no communication. Everybody's bliss is going to be different. (Laughs) I can't communicate. Suppose I have *ātmā* bliss, how will I communicate to anybody? It's not communicable. There's no teaching. There is nothing. That's why these fellows are bluffing. People are just talking about bliss and all that, they're bluffing. Themselves don't know, and they are confusing others.

But if you say, 'It's limitless, *ananta*,' it's communicable, because it is self. We have to remove all possible limitations, *deça* [space] limitation, *kāla* [time] limitation, object limitation, over. There are no other limitations. Only three forms of limitation, space, time, object. All the threefold you negate, it's *ananta* [limitless]. Then we can work on it, so.

But *ānanda*, the word, is used because that seems to be the *puruñārtha* for everybody. Through *artha* [security], and *kāma* [pleasure], and *dharma* you seek *ānanda*. They say, "You need not seek *ānanda*. See *ānanda* is you." So, they have to use that, *lakñāḥa*.

All words about *brahman* are *lakṣāḥa*. Blindly you can say, any word, even *satyam*. It is a *lakṣāḥa*. *Jñānam* is *lakṣāḥa*. All *lakṣāḥa*. *Lakṣāḥa* means you have to arrive at the meaning. It's not that I hear the word, and you get it. You have to arrive at the meaning. And that implies lot of negation.

This is what I said, *dhātvartha* [the meaning of the verbal root] you retain. Yesterday, I said. You retain the meaning of 'is,' as a *dhātu*. *Satyam* as a *dhātu*, retain the meaning, 'is.' Then our own meanings are there. 'Is' means, not yet gone. We knock off all that.

Knowledge means *jñānam*, *jñā-dhātuh* [the verbal root – to know]. And then knowledge means it's a knowledge of a discreet object, *vātti-jñānam*. So, we knock off that particular knowledge, a knower's *jñānam*. Knowledge also *jñānam*. Object of knowledge, also *jñānam*. We knock off all that. So, *jñā dhātvartha* [the meaning of the verbal root, to know]. So that becomes knowledge of knowledge. It'll become consciousness.

Terry: Is that when you said, "Knowledge is consciousness. Consciousness is knowledge," that's what it meant.

Swamiji: Yeah. Yeah. Okay.
PAGE