

*Satsang with Swami Dayananda Saraswati at Arsha Vidya Gurukulam*

*January 2, 2007*

Radha: Swamiji, you said you had some more to say about deep sleep and memory and the relationship.

Swamiji: Yeah. See, memory is stored impressions of an experience gone through in time, which you retrieve at another point of time. So that's what memory and recollection is. And two points of time are involved. Recollection and a gathering. So gathering of an experience in time. That's what memory is.

Now, deep sleep—is it memory? Somebody says: “*sukhamahamasväpsam*” “I had a good sleep, and therefore, there was sleep.” If you say like this, then memory becomes a means of knowledge. Memory cannot be a means of knowledge. Memory doesn't reveal anything new. And therefore, memory itself is due to knowledge gathered through something else, some other means of knowledge. Again, it cannot be a means of knowledge. You can't say that I had good sleep because of memory.

Then you say: No, no, memory is...we are not quoting memory here. We had the experience, and which is *säkñivedya* [known by the witness], *säkñipratyakña* [direct perception by the witness]. Therefore, deep sleep is *säkñipratyakñam*, like emotions are *säkñipratyakña*, time is *säkñipratyakña*. This is...even timelessness is *säkñipratyakña*. ‘I don't know’—timelessness means absence of time—is also *säkñipratyakña*. That I didn't experience anything is *säkñipratyakña*. Therefore, even if you say there was a *sükñma-ahaikära* [subtle I-notion], but *säkñé* continues, you know. *Ahaikära* [I-notion] itself is variable, and therefore what is invariable is *säkñé* [witness]. *Ahaikära* is blessed by *säkñé* again. It is not separate from *säkñé*. Therefore, it is *säkñipratyakña*. So, *pratyakña* [perception] is the means of knowledge. *Pratyakña* is sensory perception, or witness perception. Here, it is witness perception. That is what we are quoting, “*Sukhamahamasväpsam akiicidavediñam iti*” [“I slept well last night. I didn't know anything.”] Therefore it is not born of memory. This is what I said.

Radha: Okay, Swamiji.

Terry: So, Swamiji, so the *sākñīpratyakñā* really has to be the underlying. The sensory perception is merely *sākñīpratyakñā* mediated by sensory perception.

Swamiji: Yeah.

Terry: So it's all really *sākñīpratyakñā* but simply appears to be mediated by the senses.

Swamiji: Yeah, yeah. There is...*sākñīpratyakñā* [witness perception] when you say, 'without sense organs.' See, *sākñé* is always there. That is invariable. But with senses in between, then we call it *indriyapratyakñā* [sense perception], because *indriya*'s [sense organ's] presence is there. When *indriya*'s presence is not there, then we say purely *sākñīpratyakñā*. So we can understand. So *sākñé* is invariable. Not *sākñé* is displaced by senses. Senses are addition.

Terry: Value addition.

Swamiji: Yeah, that's mediation. Yeah. Therefore, *indriyapratyakñā*, or pure *sākñīpratyakñā*. So that means *sākñé* was there even when *indriyapratyakñā*.

Terry: So you're sort of stripping away layers.

Swamiji: Yeah. Suppose you say oral karma, mental karma and *käyikam* [relating to the body, physical] karma. So in mental karma, mind is there. Oral karma, mind is there. In *käyikam* karma, mind and oral karma, both are there. *Väk* [speech], *manau* [mind], both are there. When you do puja *manas* and *väk*, plus limbs are involved. In oral karma, mind and *väk* are involved. Then mental karma is only mind involved. So mind is there in all the three. Therefore, when you say, though *käyikam* karma, so it's not that body alone is involved. *Väk* karma means *väk* alone is not involved; mind is involved, mind and *väk*. Mind, *väk* and limbs. And mind alone, called '*mänasaà karma* [mental action].' So mind is invariable. Like *sākñīpratyakñā*.

Raman: Swamiji, when a person is in coma, how should we take it? There is no...he is not aware even when ...there is nothing.

Swamiji: Yah. In a coma, also, so that, ah...the *sūkñma ahaikāra* [subtle I-notion] also is not present. The *sūkñma ahaikāra*. That is why it is different from sleep. *Sūkñma ahaikāra* also is not present. So, therefore, he won't say, when you call him, "Aah." He won't say that. In deep sleep, if you call him, he will after some time, he will say, "Yes, ama." He will say, "Yes." If you shake him, he will get up. Because *sūkñma ahaikāra* is there to respond. In coma it is not there, or general anesthesia it is not there, until anesthesia goes.

Terry: But the *kāraëa çaréra* [causal body] still had to be there in the form of ...

Swamiji: Yah. But then he wakes up from the general anesthesia, he picks up from where he left.

Raman: So it's a different state?

Swamiji: So from that even he picks up from where he left, in between he was there. If he was not, then he cannot pick up. One who left and one who picks up is the same. Ha! So he was there. Again, presumption, *arthāpatti* [presumption].

Raman: Is there any name for this particular state beyond the sleep? Is there any name, you know, for that sleep when a person is in coma? Is there any name for that?

Swamiji: *Mürchä*. We say *mürchä*, *mürchä*. State of coma is *mürchä*.

Radha: Swamiji, what about the placement of *mäyā*? Is *mäyā* in *brahman*? Is *mäyā* intrinsic to *brahman*? What wording does Swamiji use for the relationship between *mäyā* and *brahman*?

Swamiji: Nothing intrinsic to *brahman*. Intrinsic to *brahman*, you cannot say anything. Because, then it should be there, in its *svariipa* [one's own nature], and *svariipa* is only *jñānam* [knowledge], *caitanya* [consciousness]. And, therefore, nothing intrinsic. And, *mäyā* cannot exist also elsewhere, like pot cannot exist elsewhere, so it has to be *mithyā* [dependent or apparent reality]. In terms of reality, it is *mithyā*. *Mithyā* is a reality word. They think it is some kind of substance word. It is a reality word.

Radha: Sometimes, Swamiji, I have used the term “intrinsic” for *māyā* as *mithyā*, only because *māyā* can’t be any place else and it is never away from *brahman*.

Swamiji: It has to be in *brahman* alone.

Radha: But because it is *mithyā*, it doesn’t...

Swamiji: You don’t use the word “intrinsic.”

Radha: Yeah.

Swamiji: Nor it is extrinsic. It is not elsewhere. So it’s *anirvacanēya* [inexplicable], *mithyā*. *Sadasadbhyāmanirvacanēya* [that which can neither be defined as existent nor nor nonexistent]. It’s not a parallel reality.

Radha: But *mithyā*... *brahman* is never without *mithyā*. *Brahman* is never without *māyā*. It’s just that *māyā* is *mithyā*.

Swamiji: No, no. *Brahman* is understood without *māyā* alone.

Radha: Yes, the word “*brahman*” is understood without *māyā*, just as *sat-cit-ānanda* [existence-consciousness-fullness].

Swamiji: Yeah, yeah.

Radha: But the *māyā* is never...

Swamiji: Is never understood without *brahman*.

Radha: Yes, that’s better.

Swamiji: Yeah. That’s better. Because *māyā* is *mithyā*.

Radha: But *māyā* as *mīthyā* is never not there. Even if it is in unmanifest condition or manifest condition, the *māyā* is beginningless.

Swamiji: Yeah. See, whether it is...Manifest *jagat* [world, creation] also is *māyā*. Unmanifest, also is *māyā*. And therefore, *māyā* doesn't exist without being *brahman*, being *mīthyā*. And it makes *brahman sarvajām* [omniscient], *sarvakāraëam* [the cause of everything].

Radha: Yes.

Swamiji: *Sarvajām*, *sarvakāraëam*, both. And ah...but that *māyā upādhi* [the conditioning adjunct of *māyā*] itself makes *brahman sarvajām*.

Radha: And the *māyā upādhi* is in *brahman*, even though it is not in *brahman*. There is no other place for it to be.

Swamiji: When we say that we mean, it is only *mīthyā* [dependent or apparent reality].

Radha: I just like to hear Swamiji's language around that.

Swamiji: My language is: *māyā* is not independent of *brahman*. *Brahman* does not include *māyā*. *Brahman* is *brahman*, while *māyā* is not. Therefore, when we understand *brahman* as *kāranam* [cause]--*jagat kāraëam* [cause of the world]--we understand *brahman* with *māyā* alone, as *sarvajām*. And then if that *Éçvara* [the Lord]— *brahman* with *māyā* means *Éçvara* — that *Éçvara* is you, equated. The equation is between you and *brahman* as *kāraëam* of the entire *jagat*. *Kāraëam* of the *jagat* is *brahman*, means *Éçvara*. That *Éçvara* is you. And therefore, the obvious difference is the basis for equation, the *hetu* [cause] for the equation. Why there is an equation? Because of obvious difference. When the difference is obvious, there cannot be equation. There can be equation if the non-difference is *satyam* [true]. Ha, ha.

Radha: Swamiji, in reference to that—just to follow up on that—even though *māyā* is *mīthyā*, this is a question that comes, in terms of *advaita* [non-duality]. There's *brahman*, and there's *mīthyā māyā* [*māyā* which is apparent]. But even though *māyā* is *mīthyā* —

*mithyā mäyā* is there—so there is a type of *dvaita* [duality]. There is *brahman* and *mithyā mäyā*.

Swamiji: Ha, ha. That is because we are giving reality to *mithyā*. The word “*mithyā*” itself is to negate that reality. Otherwise we will say only “*mäyā*”. And “*mithyā*,” the word, is ontological word. It is to make me understand that *mäyā* is *sadasadbhyāmanirvacanēyam* [can neither be defined existent nor non-existent]. It is not categorical. Once it is not categorical, you cannot say one plus. *Brahman* plus *mäyā* — we cannot say that. So duality to come, so there should be the same status of reality. Then only one plus one is possible. So you cannot have one plus *mithyā* is one. See, one plus *mithyā* being one, you cannot have one plus *mithyā* is two. Still it is *advaita*. One plus *mithyā* is one. One plus... One plus *satyam* [that which is true, or that which truly exists] ... One *satyam* plus another *satyam* is two—that *satyam* doesn't exist. *Satyam* is always one. And therefore one *satyam* plus *mithyā* is one. One plus one is one. And one plus many also is one. That is what *pürëamadaù pürnamidam*. [that is infinite, this is infinite..] Ha! Ha!

Terry: Swamiji, what is the...if we say that *ätmä* [self] as such, has no limitation; *jéva* [transmigrating soul] is defined by the fact of limitation, what is then the nexus, where is the point; can we even say a point, at which *avidyā* [ignorance] exists? In other words, what is the nexus of the problem of ignorance? Can you define that?

Swamiji: The problem of ignorance is only for the one who is ignorant. And therefore, when somebody asks this question, Çankara answers. “Where is...For whom is ignorance?” He said: “For the one who is asking the question. *Prañöuù*. [for the questioner]” “*Kasya ajänam?*” [For whom is the ignorance?] “*Prañöuù*,” he says. *Prañöuù* means for the questioner, the one who is asking the question, there is ignorance. And then that means *prañöä* is *sacciddänanda ätmä*. There is no other *prañöä*. There is no questioner except *sacciddänanda ätmä*. *Sacciddänanda* alone is the questioner, with the *upädhi* [conditioning adjunct]. Therefore, I say the locus of anything is the *ätmä*, not only *ajänam* [ignorance]. The locus of anything is *ätmä*. The *nämarüpas* [names and forms] —locus also is *ätmä*. And *vidyā* [knowledge] also is *ätmä* only. Because once you say *ätmä* is *satyam*, there is no other locus.

Terry: And ask the question, “Why?” You can’t answer that question...

Swamiji: And another thing: if it is elsewhere, then I need not know *ätmä*. To remove that, I need not know *ätmä*. Because if my *ätmä ajiänam* [self-ignorance] is the *hetu* [cause] for my being a *jéva*, then the *ajiänam* [ignorance] must be only in the *ätmä*. It cannot be elsewhere. Because the self-revealing *vastu* [real object] is *ätmä*. There alone *ajiänam* is possible. Because in the *acetana* [insentient, non-conscious] *ajiänam* [ignorance] is not possible. Only *cetana ajiänam* [conscious ignorance] is possible. The conscious being alone can afford to have ignorance. Therefore, ignorance means there is a knowledge possibility. So without knowledge possibility there is no ignorance. Therefore, *cetanam* [consciousness] alone can be the locus of ignorance. Only a conscious being can be the locus of ignorance. And the conscious being is only *ätmä*. So, by knowing that I am *sat cit änanda*, ignorance goes. Ignorance goes for whom now? It is for *sat cit änanda*. So, *sat cit änanda* had ignorance? Yes, *sat cit änanda* had ignorance. How can it have ignorance? That’s why it went away. (All laugh) Ha, ha. *Mithyä!*

Our orientation is, when you make a statement that there is *avidyä*, then our orientation is—immediately we count it as a category. Therefore, one plus we take. Because one plus is there. So, we have to reorient ourselves to understand the nature of *mithyä* properly. *Sadasadbhyämanirvacanëyam*. Never count it as one. And don’t dismiss it as non-existent. Then that’s not *mithyä*. That cannot account for problems. We have to account for it. So, in between. *Mithyä* is...whole *jagat* is *mithyä*. Your body is *mithyä*. All *vyavahära* is *mithyä*. And the whole *käarakas*, all the *käarakas* [grammatical syntactical relations]—subject object, means, etc.—all *mithyä*. That is why we say, “*brahmärpäëà brahma haviù brahmägnau brahmaëä hutam.*” [“The act of offering is Brahman, the oblation is Brahman, which is offered by Brahman into the fire.” BG 4.24] All *käarakas*, subject, object, the means, all *mithyä*. When it is *mithyä*, then we can say being *mithyä* the subject is *brahman*; object is *brahman*; *käaraëam*, the means, is *brahman*; the purpose, *sampradänam* [dative case], is *brahman*; *apädänam* [ablative case] is *brahman*, *adhikaraëam* [locative case] is *brahman*. Every genitive *ñañöhé* [genitive case] is *brahman*. The whole...The whole thing is *brahman*--singular, plural, duality, everything is *brahman*.

Radha: Swamiji? Swamiji?

Swamiji: Yeah.

Radha: Can I ask one more? Just two minutes.

Swamiji: Yeah.

Radha: Swamiji, so many students will ask, especially western students, “Do we need to believe in *karma*, reincarnation, heaven worlds, and hell worlds, *puëya* [dharmic act], *päpa* [adharmic act] *Éçvara* in order to have, to really understand this knowledge, to have *jñānaniñöhä* [well-rooted knowledge]? Are these beliefs necessary? I’d like Swamiji to address that.

Swamiji: You know, it is necessary in *vyavahära* [empirical reality], in understanding *vyavahära*, in order to transcend *vyavahära*. So adequate understanding of *vyavahära*, *vyävahärika sattä* [empirical reality] to understand is not possible, because it has no bottom. Any one thing—you take physics in *vyavahära*—there is no last word. You take biochemistry or biology—you have no last word. That means nobody can completely understand *vyavahära*. But you must have adequate knowledge of *vyavahära*. The adequate knowledge implies also *puëya päpa*, the accounting for diversity, etc. Accounting for prayer, accounting for *adāñöa* [subtle results of action]. So, it is important. Heaven and all that is neither necessary nor it is unnecessary. I mean, it doesn’t figure. It has no place in the scheme. In the scheme of Vedanta, heaven doesn’t have a place. And if there is one, it is only for dismissal.

Radha: But that is not to say that it’s not there...

Swamiji: No, that is not ...that is a wrong understanding. It is not there, you cannot say. You have no *pramäëa* [means of knowledge] for it. Nobody can say that it is not there. That means he has not understood how *pramäëa* works. Therefore, he has to understand how a *pramäëa* works. Therefore, neither you can say that it is...you can prove it is there, nor it requires proof. It doesn’t require proof. Why? Because that is why it is *apürva* [subtle results of action], that is why it is a means of knowledge. It’s not available

for proof. It is a *nitya-parokña* [eternally indirect knowledge] it is. And similarly, if that is so, you cannot prove it is not there. So, you cannot disprove, you cannot prove. You don't need to prove. But are you interested? That is the question. I am not interested. So in the scheme of *mokña* [liberation], it figures only to dismiss it. Because some people have a commitment for it, and therefore it has to be dismissed—*vyavahāra*. But *puëya*, *pāpa* have to be understood because the parentage, prayer, all this is a value, so...

Radha: What about *Éçvara*, Swamiji? Sometimes, westerners like to escape *Éçvara*.

Swamiji: Without *Éçvara*, there is no equation. You will only be understanding consciousness. Consciousness is nothing. That is dissociation. Because...why it is dissociation? Because I am not this; I am not that; I am not that, is consciousness. Then what is not this is *Éçvara*. So that is called dissociation. So you are creating duality. What is not this is another thing sitting there; it is as real as whatever you have negated. Whatever you...What is balance? The balance after negation is as real as what is negated. I always say, “You eat banana and throw away the banana peel.” And if you say, “Because what is useful is real, and what is thrown away is not real.” But this banana peel will prove itself to be more real. Because this fellow what he did, and he ate the banana, threw away the banana peel as an Indian. And he threw away, and he forgot about that he had thrown away. And it was there on the driveway, and he walked, and then put his foot on it, and then went sprawling down. And then the banana he ate came out. And therefore, which is more real now? The banana peel is more real than the banana. So my logic is very tight.

Radha: Swamiji, I don't know if it's appropriate, but you know the story, the joke that you told? Remember the joke that you told at the end of the satsang?

Swamiji: Yeah.

Radha: Could Swamiji tell us the joke again...or not.

Swamiji: No, no, no. I am ready to tell that. This fellow was writing a book. He is a missionary. And he was writing a book about the ancient churches—old churches, not ancient—old churches, in all over the world, with photographs, illustrations. It's a nice

book. It will be a good book. And so he wanted to travel the whole world.

He went to China first. And in Peking, there are some old cathedrals. And he went to this cathedral and he saw in one corner, near the pulpit, he saw this huge phone, and it was gold in color. And he wanted to check up whether it was really gold. And it was shining like gold, and then he found it was gold. And when he found it was gold, then he was curious why this golden telephone is here; it's a waste of money. Then he found, down below written: "\$10,000 dollars per call." He asked the priest, "\$10,000 per call? So what kind of call is that?" "It is a call to God in heaven. Hotline. You can call God." Then he didn't have any money, nor he wanted to call, and he left.

Then he went to Japan. There also he went to this old cathedral. Again, he found it was there—a golden phone. And again there was \$10,000 per call—call to God. Then he went to Indonesia. There is one Catholic island. It has recently become a separate country. He went there. There was a new...new church. It's a big church. And he went inside the church and it was the same...call. I mean, the phone was there, and written \$10,000 per call. And, of course, he was amused, but he didn't...he didn't have money to call.

He came to India. He wanted to go to all Indian old churches. He landed in Chennai. And then, as he was planning to go to Saint Thomas Church, San Thom Church...San Thom Church, and ah, 'San Thom,' they say. He wanted to go to the church. On the way, he saw this temple, Mailapur Temple. And then he went to this temple. And there again there was this golden...golden telephone. He thought, "My God, even here also there is telephone!" And he was little amused. And then...but he looked at this...what is the...what is that written down below? There was this sign was there: "One rupee per call." And he asked the priest, "This call to whom, one rupee?" And he said, "It is call to God." "And God?! These fellows charged \$10,000 per call." "Yes, we know, but God is a local call. (laughter) It is not long distance." (Laughter) Very telling.

Question: You made it up yesterday, Swamiji?

Swamiji: Huh?

Question: You made the story yesterday? You made it up yesterday, while you were giving there, on the spot?

Swamiji: I have been waiting for some time. (Laughter) It came in time. I saw it in some form, somewhere. It is all edited. It's all made suitable for me. So, I always make it mine. And then, he decided not to become a missionary, not to continue as a missionary. He gave up his missionary job also. Then he was recruiting people to take them to God, in heaven! He found he is locally available! (Laughter) It's all further development.

Terry: Great, Swamiji.

Swamiji: Nice, very effective.

Durga: Swamiji, can I ask you one question about the deep sleep and the coma? Why is it that we seem to remember deep sleep but we have no memory at all of coma? I mean, coma is like...or anesthesiology. One second you are there; the next second you are back. But deep sleep we seem to have some type of memory of it. Why is that?

Swamiji: Memory of...?

Radha: Swamiji, in coma or if you have an anesthetic, you go in...there's no...

Swamiji: Yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah.

Radha: Why is that...?

Swamiji: Coma. Because there is no *ahaikāra*.

Durga: But then...and you seem to remember deep sleep because there is?

Swamiji: With *ahaikāra*, you will wake up. In anesthesia, this fellow will wake up when the surgery goes on, "Are we through yet?"

(Laughter)

Durga: In deep sleep is the....

Gita: But we do that, Swamiji. But we do that on purpose, sometimes.

Swamiji: Which one?

Gita: We wake them up. Waking up under anesthesia is done on purpose also.

Swamiji: Why?

Radha: There's a way then.

Terry: But you have to wake them up.

Gita: Yeah, ...we wake them up, like doing brain surgery, we wake them up so that they can check if the movement is there and everything. We talk to the patient, ask him to move, ask him to do things, and then go back to sleep. Then the surgeon will take out some more of tumor. We do that on purpose also.

Swamiji: That, when it's the brain, yeah, yeah.

Gita: Brain, some special surgeries that they do. You wake them up also on purpose.

Durga: But...so in deep sleep, the subtle mind is there...

Swamiji: Yeah, yeah, yeah

Durga: The subtle *ahaikāra* is there.

Swamiji: Yeah, that's the difference between coma and sleep. *Sūkñma-ahaikāra* [subtle I-notion] is there. If this *ahaikāra* is chemically knocked off, because physiologically knocked off, so it cannot come. You require to have the physiologically...an active brain

in order for this mind to operate. And when that is completely inactivated, so then nothing can happen, that's all. So that is what they do.

Q: Swamiji, but people come back from coma, too. They do come back.

Swamiji: Yeah, yeah. They all come back. When they come back they pick up the thread. So, the one who was is the one who is. *ädau asti ante asti vartmäne'pi asti*. [In the beginning, it is; in the end, it is; in the present it also is.] That is the logic. *ädau nästi ante nästi vartmäne'pi tat tathä* [In the beginning it is not; in the end it is not; in the present it is the same]. The pot was not there. Pot after destruction is not there, and during the pot existence also pot is not there. Because what was there? Clay. Later also was clay. Then what was in between? Clay before, clay later. Whatever that was there is there now also. In between, what? It has been clay. Because it was clay before, it is clay later and therefore clay in between it must be. And it is. And where is this addition called pot? *ädau nästi ante nästi ädävante nästi vartmäne'pi tat tathä*. [In the beginning it is not; in the end it is not; when it is not in the beginning and the end, even in the present it is the same.] Ha, ha. *vartmäne'pi*—even now also, *tat tathä*—it's only clay. Now you can put it other way. *ädau yad asti ante yad asti vartamäne tat tathä* [That which is there in the beginning and that which is there in the end, it is same also in the present.] ha, ha. In between also it was there. Previously it was there. Now it is not there—it looks it is not there—later it is there. So in between also it is there. Then what was not there is the mind. So, then it was my mind. This also my mind. Both are objects. And in between, the object was not there. The object is there. That's all what it is. The vastu [real object] was there. Yeah.

Durga: I think people have a hard time, a very difficult time, understanding if their mind isn't there; they are still there. The clay is still there. Most people think, if their mind is not there, they don't exist any more; they are not there.

Swamiji: They think the consciousness is epiphenomenon of brain. The physiological, model is the physiological model. Whatever they want to say one two can say that. Then, we can argue. If consciousness is an epiphenomenon, why it doesn't occur everywhere? So, under certain conditions, it occurs. Under some conditions, when there's the cell, whatever the ingredients in the cell—constituents in the cell—and they all fulfill the

condition, then the consciousness comes to manifest there. So, what comes to manifest is already there. Nothing is created. They know that. Matter is not created; energy is not created; consciousness is much less created. It is already there. It is already there. It comes to manifest. So you can call it as an adjective. An adjective means you have not created anything. You have come to recognize the consciousness is manifest. Consciousness comes to manifest in a cell. If you make a cell in a test tube and you find it becomes conscious suddenly, then consciousness comes to manifest in a cell. Cause you don't inject consciousness. You see under some conditions the consciousness comes to manifest. If it comes to manifest, it is already there to come to manifest. That is what we are talking about. It is already there. It comes to manifest. It is not epiphenomenon.

Radha: Thanks Swamiji. That was so great. Thank you.