

Satsang with Swami Dayananda Saraswati at Arsha Vidya Gurukulam

January 1, 2007

Radha: Swamiji – the knowledge of *Éçvara* [God] - can Swamiji talk about the understanding and knowledge of *Éçvara* in terms of the *pramāna* [means of knowledge], direct knowledge, indirect knowledge. What exactly... what type of knowledge is the knowledge of *Éçvara*?

Swami: There are two statements – *éçā väsyam idaà sarvam, yad idaà sarvam ésvaraù*. [All this is pervaded by *Éçvara* (*Éçā Upaniñad v. 1*); all this is *Ésvara*.] So all that is here is *Éçvara*, if you say...if this is the *pramāna*. *sarvam asājata* [he created everything (*Taittiréya Upaniñad 2.6.1*)] *sarvam abhavat* [he became all]. These are *pramānas*— *pramāna vakyas*[scriptural statements]. This *brahmätmä* [the infinite self]— *satyam jänam anantam brahma* [brahman, which is existence, consciousness, limitless (*Taittiréya Upaniñad 2.1.1*)], --being *jänam* [knowledge/consciousness], it is *ätmä* [the self]. This *brahmätmä*, *so' kämayata* [he desired]—this *brahmätmä akämayata asājata*—created everything. (*Taittiréya Upaniñad 2.6.1*)

Then one more statement along with that, *sarvam abhavat – satyaà cänātaà ca satyamabhavat--satyaà brahma* [he became everything—truth became the true and the untrue (*Taittiréya Upaniñad 2.6.1*)—truth is *brahman*] became everything, created everything, became everything. So that means the cause for this entire *jagat* [creation] is only one. The *nimitta* and *upādāna* [efficient and material (cause)] So *nimitta upādāna* both the causes are one and same, if you say, how do I assimilate this? Maker and material cause is one in the same means—How do I assimilate this?

Then *Éçvara*, the cause, is presented as *sarvajñā* [all-knowing in general] *sarvavit* [all-knowing in detail], is all knowing, in general, in detail also. In general and in detail. So, *sarvajñā sarvavit* (*sarvaà jñāti* [he knows everything], *sarvam vetti* [he knows everything]). Because they are together we have to understand, it's in general, all knowing, in detail all knowing.

General all knowing, when you say – all that is here is *brahman* [Infinite Self], and that

brahman ahamasmi [I am the Infinite Self], if you say. *Sarvajñāṭi*, *sarvaṭ kalvidāṭi* *brahma, idaṭ sarvam* [the one who is all-knowing, all this is the Infinite Self, all this] All that is here is *brahman* and that *brahman* I am. So, I become *sarvajñāṭi*.

But *Éçvara* is *sarvavit* [all-knowing in detail] also. So *upādhi* [conditioning adjunct] is important for *sarvajñāṭvam*, *sarvavettāṭvam* [being all knowing in general, being all knowing in particular.] *Upādhi* is important.

Otherwise, *brahmāṭmā* [the limitless self] is *satyaṭ jñānam anantam* [existence knowledge limitless]. It is pure *caitanyaṭ* [conscious]. So *upādhi* you require, to become a *sarvajñā*, *sarvavit*. Then if I look at myself through the *upādhi*, my *upādhi* is *vyaññōi* [individual] *upādhi*, individual *upādhi*. Therefore maximum I can become *sarvajñā*, *sarvavettāṭvam* is not possible. *sarvavettāṭvam yugapat* [simultaneously]. Simultaneously you must be knowing without faculty. Through a faculty if you know, only one by one you will know. So that means the *sarvavettāṭvam* is not possible. And therefore *Éçvara* with the *upādhi* of *māyā*, *kāraṭa* [causal] *upādhi*, becomes *sarvajñā*, *sarvavit*.

Then, *sarvajñā*, *sarvavit* is also material cause for the world; means there is no separate material cause. The nature of the world if you analyze, is purely in the form of knowledge only, *nāmariṭpāṭmaka* [of the nature of name and form] and *çāstra* [scriptures] talks about that. Therefore, *tadananyatvam ārambhanaṭ çabdāvidyaṭ*. [meaning and Sanskrit unclear—check back later] The *jagat* [creation] is not separate from *Parameçvara* [Supreme Lord]. So not separate means we must understand it is *sarvajñā*. *Jagat* is *sarvajñā*. Therefore, the *jagat* if it is *sarvajñā*, so the object of *sarvajñāṭvam* is to be understood in terms of the *jñā dhātu* [the verbal root “to know”]. *jñā dhātu* is a transitive *dhātu*. *Jñāṭi* [he knows]. There is an object. If you say, ‘I know,’ *jñāmi* [I know], then I have to say, ‘What do I know?’ *Kim jñāsi?* [What do you know?] There is object. So, object is inevitable in *jñā*, *jñā dhātu*

So *sarvaṭ jñāṭi* [he knows everything] if you say— *sarvaṭ vetti* [he knows everything]—same meaning—so that means there are objects. So these objects are *sarvajñā*. That means, the meaning of all the words are *Éçvara*. The meaning of each word is *Éçvara*. So, the meaning of each word, when you say, that means there should not be an object

other than the meaning. That is the truth. *vācārambhaēaà vikāro nāmadheyam māttiketyeva satyam* [all modifications have speech as their basis and it is name only. Clay alone is real (from the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* 6.1.4)] *nāmadheyam vācārambhanaà vākāmbhanam nāmadheyam* centered on your tongue, the word is exactly the truth of this creation. These are all *ṣruti vākya* [scriptural statement], *mātikā eva satyam iti*. [clay alone is real] Clay alone is *satyam* [truth]. The pot, lid, cup and all that, *vākāmbhanam*, centered on your tongue. Means words, *nāmadheyam* [words], *nāmamātram* [only names]. And that means, pure meaning of words.

So *Éçvara's sarvajīatvam* [omniscience] is in terms of the knowledge of all. When you say, 'of all in detail,' because *nāmni nāmāni* [names in the name]. Everything is word. In one word there are many words. If you say 'car,' it's only one word. But inside if you look into the car what is there? Steel is there. Door is there. Door is steel. Engine is there—steel. Tire is there—rubber. Again *nāma* [name]. *Nāmni nāmāni* [names in the name]. In any one word you take there are words. So, you have word, meaning, it's a bunch of words all the time.

And the words and their meaning not an ordinary thing. It is *Éçvara*. It is knowledge. Because if you say 'eye'—it's a word. What is eye if you analyze? Again it becomes many words. Eyelids are there. Then, cornea is there. Pupil is there. Retina is there. And there are a lot of other words. So in one word there are many words. That is the *sarvajīatvam*. In one word so many other words. That is the *sarvajīatvam*. *Sarvasāñōikartātvam* [the state of being the creator of the entire creation].

Radha: Swamiji, there's a quite a jump, and that's why I want to see exactly where the *ṣruti pramāēa* [the scripture as a means of knowledge] comes in.

Swamiji: Huh?

Radha: There's a jump here in logic that requires the *ṣruti pramāēa*, and that's what I want Swamiji maybe to address next. For instance, because I have an *antaùkaraēa* [mind], everything that I experience is known, and I can see the *sarvajīatvam*, but only in reference to my own mind. But how can we say that the entire

creation reflects consciousness, or is known? Because it could be that *brahman* – just as *sat cit ānānda* [existence, consciousness, fullness]—since there’s no knowership, there is no duality there, we have to...How do we assume...how do we know that the entire *jagat* [creation] actually has *sarvajīatvam*? Because that means from its own standpoint, it is like an infinite mind.

Swamiji: Yah.

Radha: There is no way for me to know that. There is no *aparokṣa jñānam* [direct immediate knowledge] there.

Swamiji: Yah. We don’t need to know. That’s why, *sarvavettātvam* [omniscience—all knowledge in detail] is not possible. Only...that is why...from the stand point of *satyam* [that which truly exists], *mithyā* [dependent reality]. So *satyam brahma*, that *brahman* is self-evident *ātmā*. Therefore, there is no problem in knowing all that is here is *brahman*.

Radha: But...Swamiji, isn’t the recognition or understanding of the entire creation as *Ēçvara* ...

Swamiji: No, no. What is the question? Question. This is important, that all that is here is *satyaà brahma. sarvaà kalvidaà brahman*. [all this is *brahman* alone.] That is an important thing to know, then only it is easy. So, if everything is *brahman*, then what is this everything? It is *nāmariipa* [name and form]. Everything is *nāmariipa*. You take one *nāmariipa* and analyze that, that is what the *çāstra* does to make you assimilate.

Radha: That is clear.

Swamiji: Yah, and therefore we just tell that *mâtikā eva satyam* [clay alone is real]. You take one series—cause effect series--and then tells that one, all that is there is the cause order. Cause, one cause creates, plus a few other words.

That’s the *sāññōi* [creation]. That *sāññōi* I understand the *sarvajīatvam* of *Ēçvara* in terms of my own experience of dream.

Radha: Yes.

Swamiji: Therefore, dream experience is very important in assimilating the fact that the maker and the material are one and the same—means the created world is non-separate from the maker, in understanding that. And the created world is nothing but consciousness.

Aah – that also is pointed out - *jyoti brähmaëä* in *Bâhadâraëyaka*, [the *jyoti brähmaëä* is a section of the *Bâhadâraëyaka Upaniñad*] it just says this whole thing is *jyotiù*, *jyotis* means light—light of consciousness. So the whole *jagat* [creation] in the dream is my knowledge.

Radha: The dream illustration makes exactly clear what the *çruti* is trying to say in terms of the...*Éçvara's* experience,

Swamiji: Yah

Radha: But without the *çruti pramâna*, there is no way for me to logically establish...

Swamiji: Yah. Without *çruti pramâna*, you can't arrive at *Éçvara* at all. So... because *aneka Éçvaras* [many Gods] logically you have many *Éçvaras*. Logically... *yo yat kartä* (remaining Sanskrit unclear). And, you know, it can go this *yat käryam tat sakartâkam*. [that which is created has a creator] Anything created implies there is a cause *a nimitta käraëam*, *sakartâkam* [an efficient cause, it has a creator]. So *yad yad käryam tat tat sakartâkam käryatvat ghatavat*. [whatever is created has a creator, because of being a created, like a pot.] Being a product like a pot, any *kärya* has got a *kartä*. Therefore, *jagat* is *käryam* [effect], being put together, and therefore, *sakartâkam* [it has a creator]. It implies a creator.

Then they question that. Why, because if the *käryam*—the cause [word unclear on tape] is here—if the *käryam* is complex, *nänätmakam* [manifold/diverse], *anekätmakam* [many], then the *kartä* [creator] also are *aneka* [many]. The *kartä* becomes *aneka*, because

käryasya anekätmakatvät [because of the effect being many]. *kärya* being *anekätmaka*. *Präsädädivat*, like even a mansion, etc. [*Präsäda* means mansion.]

Radha: That's interesting. I haven't heard that one.

Swamiji: Hah! Like a mansion. So the mansion has got a lot of things there. You require carpenter. You require masons. You require architects. You require skilled and unskilled labor. So *anekätmakatvät*, therefore, *anekakartâtvam*. [So because of (the effects) being many, therefore many creators.] There are many *kartäs* [creators]. This is logic.

So you can not establish one single. But once the *çästra* says *aneka kartäs* [many creators] means *aneka kartäs* also require *aneka kartäs*, so end up in regression.

So *aneka kartäs* also again require more *kartäs*, more *kartäs*. It becomes an infinite regression. So there again it is not final. The logic is not final. You cannot establish *aneka kartä* [many creators] or *eka kartä* [one creator]. So, if you say *eka kartä*, I can prove *aneka kartä*. If you say *aneka kartäs*, then I will say that *aneka kartäs* means, so the *kartäs* also require *kartäs*. There should be *eka kartä*. So logically you cannot arrive at.

Therefore, *çästra* says *sau asäjata* [He created]. And another thing the *çästra* points out is *sarvam brahma* [brahman is everything], *pürëamadau pürëamidam* [that is infinite, this is infinite]. When it says, 'the cause is *pürëam*, the effect is *pürëam*,' it is making it clear, the effect is *mithyä* [dependent reality] and cause is *satyam* [absolute reality].

So, *satyam mithyä* is established. Afterwards there is no...we don't have a problem in understanding. So what the *çästra* says cannot be negated. It stays. It cannot be negated, all because of self-evident *ätmä* being limitless.

Radha: But Swamiji, I could say, or easily understand *sarvam brahman*, everything is only *brahman*. But that's different than saying the entire *jagat* [creation] reflects consciousness, because in my experience the *jéva* [individual] reflects consciousness, but not the rug. So there's a jump there. It says...I could say...

Swamiji: No, no. First you establish the self-evident consciousness is limitless.

Radha: But it's not a knower. Self-evident consciousness...

Swamiji: It is not a knower.

Radha: Right, because...

Swamiji: Limitless if you say—knower, known, knowledge—all the three are one. That's all the limitlessness. There is no other limitlessness.

Radha: Yes, that's clear

Swamiji: Aah. Knower, knowledge, known. All the three are one *cāitanyam* [consciousness].

Radha: But *sarvajñatvam*, means that the *māyā upādhi*, *Éçvara's upādhi*...

Swamiji: Yah, *çāstra*.

Radha: And that's where *çāstra* comes in.

Swamiji: Yah, *māyinaà tu maheçvaraà--māyāà tu prakāttià vidyāt māyinaà tu maheçvaram* [Know the material of the creation to be *māyā* and the Lord to be the wielder of *māyā*]-*vākya* [statement (in the *sāstra*)]. *Sāstra* has to talk about it. And it does talk about it. Therefore, assimilation only I am talking. What the *çāstra* says. That, in the dream, my knowledge is the dream world. There is nothing other than knowledge. And knowledge is non-separate from consciousness. And all that is there is knowledge. In the waking also, when I say '*jagat*,' ['the creation'] it is knowledge. Haa!

Radha: That's very powerful.

Swamiji: Yeah. Yeah. Knowledge is non-separate from consciousness, *jñātā jñānam*

jñeyam [knower, knowledge, object of knowledge].

So, here we have to bring in *Éçvara*, because there are two types of *mithyā*. I think, therefore, it is. It is, therefore, I know. So, it is, therefore I know, when you bring in, then *Éçvara* comes into picture. So, it is like in the dream. I create some fellows, and they see the world that I have created. They will swear that it is outside there and I see. They will definitely say. So, every fellow who is in the dream I have created will see an external world. That external world so will make him separate, because external. Once external means you have already carved out yourself for an individuality, a confine. So, the person is confined to this body mind sense complex, and then external, so duality.

That fellow will not understand this. It takes a lot of... a lot of *çāstra*. You have to make him understand all that is here is one consciousness. You have to tell him. Your *ātmā* [self], is consciousness. It's all the same. He also... suppose he commits a mistake. I have to point out this is a rope snake. That is, you think, therefore it is. And it is, therefore you think. Then what is, is what we call *Éçvara*.

What you see is *Éçvara sãñöi*. [the Lord's creation] And you assimilate that *Éçvara sãñöi* as non-separate from your knowledge. And neither it is separate from *Éçvara's* knowledge, nor it is separate from your knowledge

Radha: Why isn't it separate from *Éçvara's* knowledge? How did Swamiji make that jump?

Swamiji: Because *Éçvara's* creation. He is the *nimitta upädäna kãräëam* [efficient material cause]. So *nimitta upädäna kãräëam* we have to assimilate properly.

He is the maker. Material means, material is not separate from the maker. That means the created *jagat* is not separate from the maker. The maker is a consciousness being, all knowledge, and therefore the whole *jagat* is all knowledge, like in dream

Radha: Yes, Swamiji, I think that when we say that *brahman* is all knowledge, that really resolves the problem of knowership.

Swamiji: Yeah

Radha: Just knowledge, just pure knowledge

Swamiji: Pure knowledge

Radha: Like, instead of consciousness, we use the word 'knowledge,' and everything's an expression of that knowledge

Swamiji: Yeah, and you are the same consciousness, and again it is knowledge, pure knowledge. It is not separate from knower, known, knowledge. You need not know everything. So, once I say – knower, known, knowledge is all one—then, what is it I should know, I should not know? Know *Éçvara*.

Radha: That's wonderful.

Swamij: Yeah.

Radha: Swamiji, another question that comes frequently has to do with deep sleep. How do we know...how do we know that we had deep sleep? How do we know that the consciousness, or that the *ätmä*, continues through the deep sleep? What is the means of knowledge for deep sleep? What is the significance of deep sleep, in terms of waking, dream, deep sleep? That's all doubts. There are so many doubts around that. And what is the deep sleep?

Swamiji: We don't need deep sleep at all to prove the nature of *ätmä*. That is a certainty. We have to...we shouldn't bother about deep sleep at all. Because that there is *ätmä*—that I am a self-evident being—that's enough, and that is *anvaya* [the invariable constant]. Self-evident being in all my experiences, there is *anvaya*. *Anvaya* is, when the mind is awake—let us say. When the mind is awake, and there is *caitanya* [consciousness], this *caitanyam* is invariable. Variable are the experiences. And that *caitanyam* is limitless, etc. It's over. That is about the *caitanyam*.

In sleep the mind is in a *sükñma* [subtle] form. In a *sükñma* form. Why? Because the

fellow really wakes up when you call him, even if he is in sleep. So the response is there because it is in *sūkñma* form. The *våtti* [thought modification] is there. Without *våtti*, you don't exist. *Våtti* is important. There is again some kind of a *våtti* must be there—*ajjāna våtti*—‘I don't know’ *våtti*.

And in the deep sleep state, that there is sleep—you are asking me about sleep—that is because you have the experience of sleep. And therefore, when you have the experience of sleep, then only you can ask me, what is sleep, etc.

So, experience for whom?

Radha: That's nice.

Swamiji: Yeah. Experience for whom? Because there is a knower, known relationship is not possible. There is no object experience. Therefore, when there is no particular object experience, the pronounced subject won't be there. And therefore the subject object relationship doesn't exist in deep sleep. That is the only thing that you can talk about. That there subject object absence is also known to you.

Radha: But, Swamiji, the argument could be: Yes, that's all true, but I am not there in deep sleep. So I'm not there in deep sleep. Therefore, I must be the mind. Because the mind goes into un-manifest condition—there's no knower, known—there's no subject, object, and I have no experience of myself being there

Swamiji: Alright. You take it...mind is the *ātmā*, you take it. Your mind *ātmā*, you take it. Which mind you are talking? Which thought you are talking? Thought is *kñāëika* [momentary]. Mind means *kñāëika våtti* [momentary thought modification], and therefore momentary consciousness. The momentary consciousness is *ātmā*. So this *våtti* goes. What is the thing that connects all the *våttis*?

Radha: But in deep sleep, there seems to be a gap in my experience. In deep sleep there's a gap in my experience.

Swamiji: Yah. Gap is for whom? There is a *sākñé* [witness]. So, in deep sleep there

is a *sākñé*.

Radha: But there's no recognition of the *sākñé* in deep sleep.

Swamiji: No. At that time there is no...there can not be a...because there is no object.

Radha: But the *ätmä* is *svaprakäsa* [self-luminous]. It's self-evident.

Swamiji: Yeah.

Radha: So that self-evidentness of the *ätmä*, doesn't continue through sleep.

Swamiji: No. How can you say that? If *ätmä* is self-evident. And, it is also self-evident, why? Once the word 'self-evidence' comes into the picture. Why? Because, everything becomes evident to the self. Therefore we say it is self-evident.

Radha: The self-evident is really the *svaprakäsatvam* of the self. If I get rid of the entire creation...

Swamiji: No, no. That is because everything becomes evident to the self. And the self is *svaprakäsa*. It is self-evident. But everything, when we say, 'self-evident,' it should include also a state of experience. Then everything becomes self-evident to the self.

And even the deep sleep also is evident to the self...is evident to the self. And what is evident to the self is not self-evident. Sleep is evident to the self; the self, therefore, there is *sākñé*. *Sükñma vätti* [subtle thought modification] is the there. Because otherwise you cannot say, 'I slept well.' This 'I' has got *anvaya* [invariable constant]. 'I slept well' is *anubhava* [experience] 'I slept well' is *anubhava*. There must be a *sükñma ahaikära* [subtle I-notion]. A *sükñma ahaikära* is there, and then *ahaikära* is there, then *ätmä* is there. So, *ahaikära* is *ätmä*. *ätmä* is not *ahaikära*, but *ahaikära* is *ätmä*. *Sükñma ahaikära* is there to say, 'I slept well.' The modern psychology also talks about the sleep, and in their own language, they talk about the presence of ego.

Radha: Another argument for this that Swamiji has used—that maybe Swamiji can elaborate on a little bit—is that in the deep sleep, there is no time. Right? Because—*deça* [space], *kāla* [time]—the time space—is resolved, experientially, when the mind is in causal condition

Swamiji: Yah.

Radha: And so, because there is no experience of time, there can be no...

Swamiji: Memory

Radha: Memory...no gap. I mean...for this particular argument, there's no gap in the experience of one's being. There's no experience of time.

Swamiji: Yah?

Radha: So, I am talking, Swamiji, about the experience of the gap in terms of the *svaparakāsatvam* [self-luminosity] of the *ātmā*.

Swamiji: The idea is, that there is no experience of time, is also an experience, you know. No experience of time.

Radha: But it's a recollected experience.

Swamiji: Recollection of whom? For whom? There must be a *sākñé* [witness] for the whole thing. So, recollection for whom? This is all *sāhasa* argument, you know.

Radha: All...excuse me?

Swamiji: *Sāhasa*. Means, just as they go on holding on—holding on to one thing. This argument is old argument. And they say that the deep sleep there is no *ajñānam* [ignorance]. There is only *sākñé*, *svaparakāça ātmā* [self-luminous self]. This is one argument. In deep sleep there is only *svaparakāça ātmā*. This is an argument.

Radha: That's that guy.

Swamiji: Yah. Yah.

Radha: I forget his name.

Swamiji: There is *svaprakāṣa ātmā*. There is no *ajñānam* or anything. There is no *adhyāsa* [superimposition]. And there is no *ajñāna*. *Mūla ajñānam* [root/causal ignorance] is not there. That is their argument. And, if *mūla ajñānam* is not there, then why that...if that *brahman* is there, and he is *sarvajām* [omniscient] why I am not *sarvajām*?

My mind is there to be *alpajñā* [limited knowledge]. When my mind is there, I become *alpajñā*. Then why not I am *sarvajñā* [omniscient] in deep sleep then? If *brahman* is there, and he is *jagat kāraëam* [cause of the world], I should be *sarvajñā*. Why I am not *sarvajñā*?

Therefore, all the unmanifest—my own *prārabdha* [karmas responsible for this birth]--- to be unfolded, it cannot be in the *sūkñma çaréra* [subtle body]. It has to be in the *kāraëa* [cause]. So you require my *prārabdha* to unfold. This is all after assumption, you know, after the...after understanding karma, etc., then only it comes, that argument.

Radha: That's right...

Swamiji: So, ah...

Radha: This question comes a lot, Swamiji.

Swamiji: This is always a problem— *tamo'bhibhütassukhariüpameti* [overwhelmed by ignorance (the self) gains a state of being happy]— *upaniñad väkya*— *ātmā tamasä abhibhütaü sukhariüpameti*. *Ātmā* gains a state of being happy, comfortable. *tamasä abhibhütaü* [overwhelmed by darkness], *ajñānena abhibhütaü* [overwhelmed by *ajñāna*] overwhelmed by *ajñāna*. That is called sleep. This is the *upaniñad*, *kaivalyopaniñad*.

It is called *puratraya, puratraya* —three cities—three worlds—waking, dream and deep sleep. The one who is invariable in all the three *puras* is *ätmä*

Radha: Swamiji, one of the confusions, I think, is that in the waking state, in the dream state, there's the experience of duality, but in the deep sleep there's still the experience, but the experience is one of pure *ajänam*.

In all three cases, the duality—waking, dream, and the deep sleep—are experiences, which are competing, in a sense, with just the *saccidänanda*, just with the *ätmä*. And so, from the deep sleep state, we're looking back at that through memory. And the experience that we're having, when we look back at the deep sleep, is the experience of *ätmä* with *ajänam*. It is not just my being. The experience, the *vätti* [thought modification], nature of the *vätti* is causal. It's *ajänam*.

Swamiji: No. See...

Radha: Just like, if I remember a dream. If I remember a dream, I have...there's my being, and there is the dream situation. If I remember deep sleep, there's my being, who I am, and there's the deep sleep situation. The deep sleep is its own *vätti*. It's a *sükñma vätti* [subtle thought modification].

Swamiji: Yeah, yeah.

Radha: But that's its own experience. The deep sleep is its own...The deep sleep *vätti*, that *sükñma vätti*, is its own experience. Just like the dream state is its own experience.

Swamiji: Yeah. Yeah. But ah, the experiencer...

Radha: The *ätmä*.

Swamiji: The experiencer must be there, that is also, to narrate the experience.

Radha: But the narrator isn't there in the deep sleep. That's the difference.

Swamiji: No...

Radha: It's just the *sākñé* [witness].

Swamiji: ...there is nothing to narrate. There is nothing to narrate, because there is no particular experiences. That's all. That is what we call *sukha* [pleasure/happiness] because there is no subject object relationship. That object is not there. If object is there, it becomes dream.

Radha: But if the object is not there, there's still the *sūkñma vātti* [subtle thought modification] there, which is what we say—just pure *ajñānam* [ignorance].

Swamiji: There is a *sūkñma vātti*. The *vātti* of *ahaikāra* [I-notion].

Radha: But, Swamiji, the distinction I'm making here is that, if I were to look back on the dream...on the deep sleep, and describe it, I could say, "Oh, I slept well last night. I didn't know anything."

Swamiji: Yah.

Radha: But if I were to look back on a *nirvikalpa samādhi* experience...

Swamiji: Yah?

Radha: ...which is another *vātti*, *akhandhākāravātti* [non-dual thought modification]. I'm not going to describe that in the same way as I would describe the deep sleep state, even though both are nondual. So that means that there is an *ajñāna vātti* there, which is competing.

Swamiji: Yah. That's true. There is, ah...there is one *tamas* [ignorance/darkness] There is no question of, 'I know myself' *vātti*, 'I don't know anything alone' *vātti*—*ajñāna vātti*. When you say that, 'I don't know this object,' even waking, when I ask

something that you don't know that is Zulu language. "Do you know Zulu?" "I don't know." Total *ajjānam*.

So, I don't know. This 'I don't know' *vātti* here is opposed to 'I know.' So, this, 'I don't know'...there again 'Zulu' is only word, and that is the name of some language that is an African language. That much I know. And therefore, opposed to that is the *vātti*. Therefore, you are awake, or dreaming. Then, if that also is not there—that Zulu, that Zulu etc., 'that much I know,' that also is not there. 'I don't know.' That is called, it is *real tamas* — *tamasā abhibhūtaū* [overwhelmed by ignorance]—unopposed by another *vātti*. It's a blanket *ajjāna*. 'I don't know' *vātti*. It is entirely different from the other, the *nirvikalpa samādhi*.

Radha: It's a different *vātti*.

Swamiji: Yeah, yeah, yeah. Here, mind is awake. There the mind is sleeping. So that means the *ajjāna vātti* is there. Here *ajjāna*...that kind of *ajjāna vātti* is not there. *nirvikalpa samādhi* also, why also, is only absence of subject object. *Jjānam* is there, we don't know. It can be dumb *samādhi*.

Radha: *Jada* [inert].

Swamiji: Yeah Unenlightened. That why it's the *mūla avidyā* [root/causal ignorance] *Mūla ajjānam* [root/causal ignorance] must be there, but ah, basic *ajjānam*.

Radha: Is there a...

Swamiji: Suppose an enlightened man goes to sleep, *mūla ajjānam* won't be there, but *ajjānam* will be there, *ajjānam* of the world. So that will be there.

Radha: We could even say that what is there is the casual condition of the mind...

Swamiji: That's all.

Radha: ...which is the *ajjānam*

Swamiji: Yeah....

Radha: *kāraëa çaréra*. [causal body].

Swamiji: ...casual condition of the mind...the unmanifest *prārabdha*, they're all there.

Radha: Casual body is still there.

Swamiji: Yeah, must be there, or where is *jéva*?

Radha: I think part of the understanding also that the deep sleep is a recollection through memory, is important. That's another question that comes up.

Swamiji: Tis memory. Yeah.

Radha: It's not inference.

Swamiji: Yeah.

Radha: Some people want it to be inference. You can't...

Swamiji: Yeah, if it is inferred, you must have *liëga*. There is no *liëga*. [a *liëga* is a distinguishing characteristic that would invariably indicate sleep, like smoke is a distinguishing characteristic of fire, allowing you to infer fire if there is smoke.]

Radha: And also, it was immediate experience, like any other experience.

Swamiji: It's *anubhava* [experience]. Yeah, yeah.

Radha: *Anubhava*.

Swamiji: If it is inference, some people may not make that inference—may not be

equipped to make the inference.

Radha: Yeah.

Question: Swamiji, in deep sleep they say that your blood circulation continues and everything in your body goes on, it's because of *ahaikāra*, *sūkñma ahaikāra* [subtle I-notion]?

Swamiji: Which one?

Question: So, in deep sleep all your...what are your physiological functions continue, because of the *sūkñma ahaikāra*? Is it like that?

Swamiji: Physiological...yah...

Question: Because of *sūkñma ahaikāra*?

Swamij: Yah, Yah...That is the maintainance. Otherwise, you will be disconnected from this body.

Question: Breathing and blood circulation?

Swamiji: Yeah...

Radha: Om

Swamiji: Okay, I'll go now...It's okay?

Radha: Yes. Thank you so much, Swamiji.

Question: In the deep sleep, *āvaraëa çakti* [the covering power] continues?

Swamiji: Even, suppose an enlightened person, in sleep, then he has no *āvaraëam*. But other *āvaraëam* is there, you know, the *jagat āvaraëam* [(the power of ignorance

that) covers the universe]

Question: Okay

Swamiji: Ahhhh

Question: And that *jagat ävaraëam* is *vikñëpam* [the projecting power of ignorance] or

Swamiji: No, no. *jagat ävaraëam* is there because, in the sense there is no subject object relationship, so that *ävaraëam*, *tülävidyä* it is called.

Question: *Tülävidyä*

Swamiji: Lot of things you don't know.

Question: Right

Swamiji: That *avidyä* is there

Question: But Ishwara doesn't have *tülävidyä*, right?

Swamiji: Yeah, no. There is no *tülävidyä*.

Question: No *müla*, no *tüla*

Swamiji: No *müla*, no *tüla*

Questioner: Ishwara has mind? He has mind? How he has...

Swamiji: No, no. *Mäyä* itself makes him. Without mind only its *sarvajña* [omniscient]. Then only he can be *sarvajña*. With a mind then he will have to think like that. He will know one thing, then... Mind is necessary while ignorance is there. To remove the ignorance, you require cognitive thought. So when he's *sarvajña*, then you

don't need a mind.

Question: So how he thinks like *sarvajña*?

Swamiji: Ney, ney. *Sarvajña*, the *mâyä upādhi* itself makes him *sarvajña*.

Question: Okay, it's not *brahman* that thinks, right? *brahman* doesn't think, right?

Swamiji: *Brahman* with *mâyä* only.

Question: With *mâyä*, okay.

Swamiji: It's all *brahman*. Even *alpajña* [the one who has limited knowledge] is *brahman* only. With the *antaùkaraëa upādhi* it's *alpajña*

Question: So *mâyä* as a whole thinks?

Swamiji: Yah.

Question: As a whole it can think?

Swamiji: *Käraëa*. See, you need *sarvajñatvam*. *Brahman* is *caitanyam* [consciousness]. *Sarvajñatvam* is *mithyä* [dependent/apparent reality] for which there should be some *upādhi*. *Upādhi* is called 'mâyä.'

Swamiji: Yeah, that which makes him *sarvajñatvam* is called 'mâyä.' Don't think, some other *mâyä upādhi*, and then because of that he becomes *sarvajñam*. What makes him *sarvajñatvam* is *mâyä*. What makes *brahman sarvajñam* is *mâyä*.

Question: So *mâyä* includes knowledge and ignorance both in that case for him.

Swamiji: At our level, individual level, *mâyä* includes *avidyä* also. Our *avidyä* *Ävânöti* [ignorance covers], *mâyä çakti* [the power of *mâyä*] has got *ävaraëa çakti* [covering power] also. At our level, it covers. At *Éçvara*'s level, it doesn't cover. Yeah.

PAGE

PAGE 1