

*Satsang with Swami Dayananda Saraswati in Saylorsburg*

*August 22, 2007*

Radha: Swamiji, can we continue on with the teaching methodology. I wanted to give you a few questions, Swamiji, that maybe you can work with those questions and with whatever else Swamiji has to say.

One is when we say that Advaita Vedanta is a *śabda-pramāṇa* [a means of knowledge born of the use of words]. How does that *śabda-pramāṇa* actually work? How does it take place? How does knowledge take place in the *antaḥkaraṇa*, in the mind? And what is the relationship between knowledge and experience and the self-evident nature of the self and experience? Because all of these things need to be understood in order to see how knowledge takes place, Swamiji, with the *śabda-pramāṇa*. And there is a lot of confusion over looking for something to happen as opposed to recognizing the self evident nature of yourself. So that is the reason, Swamiji.

Swamiji: Yah. Let us look at the self-evidence question first. An experience, whether it is a direct perception, it is an experience. Or, it's just an imagination, a fancy, is an experience. A recollection is an experience. Or a deliberate resolve—that's an experience. Or inquiry. Every persistent, consistent inquiry into a topic, any topic, is also an experience. If I dream, it's an experience. If I sleep, that's another experience. And if there is a twilight zone, neither dream nor waking—that's also an experience. Therefore, there is nothing outside experience. In this, whatever I experience is not self-evident; it is evident to the self. Whatever I experience—a dream experience—is evident to the self. I don't experience is also evident to the self. I know this object is also evident to the self—experience is another word. It is all evident to the self, to I, which is self-evident being. What is self-evident is what is invariable in all evidence. In all evidence, the object is not invariable. The experience is invariable. When I say "self-evident," it is self-experienced, it is in the form of *anubhūti-svarūpaḥ* [it's nature is experience]. *Anubhūti*, experience. Otherwise we can say, in every experience there is object consciousness.

Put it the other way. So the experience has got an object. There is an object consciousness, sleep consciousness, dream consciousness, waking consciousness,

which is form consciousness, color consciousness, sound consciousness. It's all one consciousness. The consciousness that reveals, itself is self-evident. Consciousness reveals an object and it is self-evident. This is what we say, self-evident, which is experience. In other words we can say, it is experience, itself. It is not experience *of* something. It is experience, itself. So, we are not talking about a non-experience when we say, "*ātmā*" [the Self]. We are talking about what we experience all the time. That which is in the form of experience. Then, when I say, whatever I experience is because of *ātmā*, *ātmā* is invariable, and therefore, we are not presenting *ātmā* as something to be experienced, because every experience is *ātmā*. That is our bread and butter. If every experience is *ātmā*, then the experiencer is *ātmā*, the experienced is *ātmā*, the experience also is *ātmā*. For that, you need Vedanta. You need it. To prove the experience is the *ātmā*, you have to understand *Īśvara* [the Lord] properly. Without understanding *Īśvara*, there is no question of understanding what you experience and experiencer—both of them—are one *ātmā*. Because our orientation is, suppose somebody tells, "You are only witness of everything." That is only dissociation. That is a problem of dissociation. That creates a problem of dissociation. Then *mano-buddhi-ahaṅkāra- cittāni nāham* [I am not the mind, the intellect, the ego, nor the memory.]-- "I am not the mind; I am not the *buddhi* [intellect]; I am not the *cittam* [memory]"—that causes a problem of dissociation. Or, if I say that *Īśvara* is somewhere in Goloka Vrindavan [a heavenly abode], again, I am talking about my being nobody. That is not worthwhile talk. There is nothing to pursue in terms of knowledge; it is purely some kind of a wrong belief, mistaken belief. First, we say *Īśvara*, and then we give that person a location, and give a body, etcetera—it sounds just ridiculous, childish. Therefore, the self-evident nature implies only one thing—that I don't need a means of knowledge to prove my existence. That's all self-evident? I don't need to see whether I am there or not. I don't need to objectify, because I am already there to objectify—who will objectify. If I say the self, I, exists, and this has to be proven by some evidence, then there should be another self to which the existence of this self becomes evident, that self must be self-evident. Otherwise, you won't have the self because it goes to regression, infinite. One thing should be self-evident, and everything else becomes evident.

Therefore, I would say, there are two things which exist. One is *pramāṇa-siddha* [evident/known by a means of knowledge] The other is *svatas-siddha* [self-evident]. What is *pramāṇa-siddha* is that which becomes evident through a means

of knowledge. *Svatas-siddha* is what is self-evident. This *pramāṇa* [means of knowledge] is, there is a witness perception— *sākṣī pratyakṣa* [directly perceived by the witness], *indriya pratyakṣa* [directly perceived through sense perception], then *anumāna* [inference], *arthāpattītyādi* [postulation, etc.]. Therefore, without *pramāṇa* [means of knowledge], only one thing that is *siddha* [evident], that is *ātmā* [the Self]—*svatas-siddha* [self-evident]. Because *ātmā* is *svatas-siddhi*, then *ātmā* can become a *pramātā* [knower]. And in the vision of Vedanta, as we will be seeing, it is both *pramātā*, *prameya*, and *pramā*. It is the subject, it is the object, it is the very cognition, *pramā*, knowledge. Knower, known, knowledge. That is what we have to discover. That is called *advaita* [nondual]. Knower, known, knowledge is only one thing. There is no second thing. Then, if there is *Īśvara*, it has to be known—means all that is known is *Īśvara*. The knower also is *Īśvara*. And all possibilities are *Īśvara*. Even knowledge is non-separate from *Īśvara*. That is why, *abādhitam jñānam* [knowledge which can't be negated]. Because you can't negate *Īśvara*. Knowledge is *Īśvara*. What cannot be negated is *jñānam* [knowledge], and that is *Īśvara*. Therefore, we need to see how this is arrived at, this knowledge. The *upadeśa*, the teaching, is using a *prakriyā*, a method. A *prakriyā* is *adhyāropa-apavāda-prakriyā*. *Adhyāropa-apavādābhyāṁ niṣprapañcaṁ prapañcate*. *Adhyāropa* is superimposition, *apavāda* is negation. *Adhyāropa-apavādābhyāṁ niṣprapañcaṁ prapañcate*. You will find this *adhyāropa-apavāda* method—*adhyāropa* is superimposition, *adhyāropa* is negation—you will find this method employed in all *prakriyās* [methods]. This is the common basis for all *prakriyās*. No matter what type of *prakriyā* you use, this *adhyāropa-apavāda* [superimposition/negation] method has to be employed.

Let us look at one method, the *kāraṇa-kārya* [cause/effect] method. So, *sadvastu* [the reality which is existence] *sadeva saumya idamagra āsīt* [Dear one, in the beginning this was existence alone]. *Idaṁ jagat agre āsīt*. *Idaṁ jagat*—this entire *jagat*—was there, *sṛṣṭeḥ prāk*, before the creation, as *sat*, *sadvastu*. *Idaṁ jagat sadeva āsīt*. [this world was existence, alone]. Like this tree was there in the seed. So, this tree was there in the seed. Look at this. This tree was there in the seed. That seed is such a small, little thing. How can this huge tree be there in that seed, that orange seed? This orange tree. How could this tree abide in that seed? How can you say this tree was in the seed? Now you tell me where it was? If it was not in the seed, why do you sow the seed? Why do you sow the seed? You sow the seed for what? For the tree to come, the orange tree to come. If you want the orange tree, then you should use, sow orange seed. So, that

means, you knew the orange tree will come. A non-existent orange tree, from the seed, how will it come? Why, if it can come, then any tree can come from any seed. If non-existent orange tree can come from any seed, non-existent orange tree comes from the seed, then in a mango seed, also, there is non-existent orange tree, correct? Being non-existent, it should be everywhere. So, if a non-existent orange tree comes from some seed, from any one seed, then any tree can come from any seed. “No, no, no no.” Only from orange seed orange tree can come. That means what? There is the connection between one and the other. What is the one? It is an orange. Orange seed comes as a rule. Even the time and place, from the seed. If it’s a Florida orange, a Florida orange—big. And if it is our Manipuri orange, small. We used to go the tree. Therefore, from that state only, that tree comes. So, I should assume there is a connection between the cause and effect.

The *Śāstra* tells, the effect was there in the cause. It cannot be in the physical form as it is, in a different shape and form. *Nirvikalpam āsīt* [It was undifferentiated], correct? *Nirvikalpam āsīt. Bījasyāntarivānkuro jagadidam prānnirvikalpaṁ.* [“Like the sprout inside the seed, this universe was undifferentiated before (creation)” from *Śrī Dakṣiṇāmūrti Stotram*, verse 2]. Before, *prāk sṛṣṭeḥ prāk* —before creation, *nirvikalpam āsīt*, Undifferentiated, this entire *jagat* [world]. Like even a tree in a seed. This is what we say, unmanifest. Unmanifest tree means pure *jñānam* [knowledge]. Tree also is *jñānam*. That’s another topic altogether. You can ask another question and I will talk. That’s another... You can ask a question, you said, it is all *jñānam*, you said, what is that that *jñānam*. You please ask me and I will tell you. This is for a book. So, *nirvikalpam āsīt* [It is unmanifest].

This is what we say, manifest knowledge is what we see as a tree. Unmanifest knowledge is the cause. If this is true, the unmanifest *jagat* is the cause, unmanifest knowledge of the *jagat* is the cause. Manifest knowledge is the *jagat*, knowledge of the *jagat* is *jagat*. So, from near unmanifest/manifest we go, we add one more word: unmanifest knowledge to manifest knowledge. There is nothing more. Unmanifest knowledge to manifest knowledge. Unmanifest knowledge is *Īśvara*. Manifest knowledge is but *Īśvara*. In the manifest knowledge, my body is included, my mind is included, my senses are included, means of knowledge that is involved is included, *buddhi* is included, *cittam* is included, memory is included—everything is included. This is called manifest

knowledge. Therefore, when I say “This is a book,” for a change, we will do it. “This is a book” --this is also okay. When we say, “this is a book.” “This is a book.” If we say, now, this book is manifest knowledge. One of the things, that’s all we think. If it is a whole, any one thing is whole.

If it is a whole, if the space in which this is there that is also *Īśvara*, this is also *Īśvara*, the one who holds, that also is also *Īśvara*—then what is it that makes an object separate from *Īśvara*? The beauty is that we can understand this discreetly, as an object. That’s something. That is where we have got *pramāṇa* [means of knowledge]. Otherwise, you don’t need a *pramāṇa*. *Īśvara*’s knowledge is all knowledge. If it is, no *pramāṇa* is required. It is all knowledge, *Īśvara*, that’s all, there is no *pramāṇa*. If *Īśvara* has to employ a means of knowing, then *Īśvara* will have ignorance. Because he has the means of knowing. If there is means of knowing, there is not knowing. If there is not knowing, there is ignorance. If there is ignorance, he cannot be all knowledge. Therefore, *Īśvara* to be all knowing, there should be no necessity for means of knowing. Then only *Īśvara* is all knowledge. So, all knowledge *Īśvara* is understood discreetly by me as an individual with a means of seeing, knowing, which includes senses, my mind and the *pramātā*, the knower. The knower, known, knowledge. This is *Īśvara*. And people want to know *Īśvara*, other than knower-known-knowledge. Correct? Like you see the book and you will see something else. You see something else. You see something else. I hope I don’t invoke anything! (laughter) You see something else. By seeing different things, we understand one one thing we see.

But now we want to see *Īśvara*, we want to experience *Īśvara*. We want to experience the whole. *Ātmā* cannot be experienced, already I have told you. *Ātmā* is experience. Now *Īśvara* cannot be experienced, either. *Īśvara* cannot be an object. If *Īśvara* is one object, then out of mind, out of sight. Suppose you enclose *Īśvara* in a thought. Then *Īśvara* becomes enclosed in prayer. And you are in *Īśvara*. You objectify *Īśvara*. *Īśvara* has to wait for your obliging. You have to say, “Oh, I can’t think about you now, I have to think about various other things. I am thinking about the flea market and what to buy.” Therefore, if you think of the flea, or flea market, *Īśvara* is out. Correct? Poor *Īśvara*. Therefore, how can *Īśvara* be an object of experience. If there is *Īśvara*, every object of experience is *Īśvara*. Every time you experience whatever you experience, any place, anywhere, whether here or elsewhere, it is all *Īśvara*. Every experience is *Īśvara*. So, you cannot get out of *Īśvara*. That is how *Īśvara* is to be understood.

Therefore, neither *Īśvara* is a matter of experience, nor *ātmā* is a matter of experience and the equation between the *ātmā* and *Īśvara*—how is it going to be experienced separately? How that will be an experience? Neither object of experience is *Īśvara* nor *ātmā* is an object of experience. It is experience. And every experience is experienced? All these are one and the same.

If all these subject/object experiences—all of this is one and the same—we need to understand *pada* [word]. And *vākya* [sentence]. Today I am going to talk there; there is one particular in this song. [Swamiji sings] *Pada-vākya-prameyam* [the word and sentence are to be known]. First *padārtha* [meaning of the word] we should know what is *Īśvara*, what is *jīva*. Vedānta is: *Īśvara* is *jīva*. *Ayam ātmā Brahma*. [This Self is Brahman.] Or *aham Brahma*. [I am Brahman] In the direct speech, you say that *tattvamasi*. [You are that.] In second person, you say, you are, in the *upadeśa* [teaching], that *Brahma tvam asi* [You are Brahman]. *Satyam tvamasi* [you are existence.]. *Satyam brahma ekamevādvatīyam brahma tvamasi*. [Existence is Brahman, you are the one nondual Brahman alone.] So, what is *Īśvara*, we have to know. What is *jīva*, also, we have to know.

Here, the *jīva* has got *adhyāropa-apavāda* [superimposition-negation]. There is *adhyāropa-apavāda* here also, is the *jīva*. In the *Īśvara*, also, there is *adhyāropa-apavāda*. So, what is *adhyāropitam* [superimposed]? What is the locus of *adhyāropa*[superimposition]? Whether the *jīva* is *adhyāropita* or *jīvatvam* is *adhyāropita*. If the entire *jīva* is *adhyāropita*, then something else is *ātmā*. If the *jīvaḥ*, when you say, then there is a being involved, *jīva*, being, involved. That being is the locus and superimposition is what makes the being a *jīva*. *Jīvatvam* is *adhyāropitam*.

[The following is a grammatical analysis of the word, *Īśvaraḥ*.] When *Īśvaraḥ*, when you say, the *pratyaya* [affix] takes a being, the *prakṛti* [substantive] tells what being. The *pratyaya* tells one being—singular *pratyaya*. “Su”. That *su* is *Īśvara + saḥ*. *Īśvaras*. And then *sakāra* becomes [Swamiji quotes some *Pāṇini-śūtras*] *Īśvaraḥ*. That *Īśvaraḥ*, that, there, you know, a being who is singular. That being, singular, is *pratyaya*. Who is that being, singular in *Īśvaraḥ*? *prakṛti*. Here also, being, singular, is there. Who is that being? *Jīvaḥ*.

Therefore, *Jīvatvam adhyāropitam* [the state of being a limited individual is superimposed]. *Īśvaratvam adhyāropitam* [the state of being the Lord is

superimposed]. That being is locus. This is called *pada* [a word]. This *pada* is very important. Without the *pada-vicāra* [analysis of the word], there is no *vākya-vicāra* [analysis of the sentence]. Vedānta is a means of knowledge only through *vākya* [sentence], not by a word. By a sentence. That is why I always say it's an equation. So, it's a sentence meaning, it's not word meaning. Difference is very big. Therefore, understanding of *Īśvara* is inevitable. Understanding of *jīva* is also inevitable. That's all what is there in this world. Therefore, understanding the whole is exactly what is involved. That is why so much is to be talked about. The *jīvatvam* is *adhyāropitam* and *Īśvaratvam* is *adhyāropitam*. Then the *prakriyā* [method] is, tell us why it is called *adhyāropitam* [superimposed]? Means, not that we decided to superimpose anything. It is not our *adhyāsa* [superimposition]. This is empirically true. So what it is all about, next session, okay?

Radha: Thank you, Swamiji.

Swamiji: Thank you.