

Satsang with Swami Dayananda Saraswati in Saylorsburg

August 24, 2007, Part I

*Om saha nāvavatu saha nau bhunaktu saha vīryān karavāvahai |
tejasvi nāvadhītamastu mā vidviṣāvahai |
om śāntiḥ śāntiḥ śāntiḥ ||*

May He protect us both. May He nourish us. May we acquire the capacity to study and understand the scriptures). May our study be brilliant. May we not cavil at each other. Om peace peace peace.

The *śāstra* [scriptures, the Upaniṣad] has two stands, it takes two stands. And they are opposite stands. *aupaniṣadam puruṣam brūhi* [May you speak of this Self revealed in the *upaniṣads*]. This *vastu* [the reality], the subject matter of Vedanta, is only known through *upaniṣad*, which is in the form of words. So through the words of Veda, Vedanta, this *vastu* is to be understood. *Vedāntavedyatvam* [that which is revealed by Vedanta], *śāstrayonitvam* [the *śāstra* being Its source], *śāstrameva yoni* [the *śāstra* is its source], *pramāṇam* [valid means of knowledge], for this knowledge, the knowledge of *Brahman*. So *śāstrayonitvāt*. [“Because of being the source of the scriptures.” Or “(Brahman is not known from any other source), since the scriptures are Its valid means of knowledge.” BS 1.2 (translation by Gambirananda) This is one stand. That means, through the words of the *śāstra*, *ātmā* [the Self] being *Brahman* [the infinite Self], the cause of the world, is understood. One stand.

Then the other stand is *yadvācā' nabhyuditaṁ* [that which cannot be uttered by speech (from Kena 1.5)] *yato vāco nivartante* [from whom the words return. (Tait. 2.4.1)]. This is an opposite stand. Words come back. That which cannot be objectified by words.. How do you reconcile this? Then, *yanmanusā na manute* [that which cannot be comprehended with the mind (from Kena 1.6)]; *ko'pi puruṣaḥ* [Who is the Self?] No one can objectify this by mind. *manasā eva anudṛṣṭavyam*. Only by the mind it has to be gained. These two contradictory, seemingly contradictory, statements of the *śruti* need to be reconciled. When they are reconciled, we understand what is teaching. Look at this. Now, in the *mahāvākya*, whole Vedanta is reduced to one sentence. And that is the *akhaṇḍārthabodhakavākyaṁ* [the sentence that reveals the nondual meaning]. The

sentence that reveals the oneness of the two sides. One side is *jagat-kāraṇam Īśvaraḥ* [the Lord, who is the cause of the world]. *Brahman*. *Brahman* as *jagat-kāraṇam* only. And the other is *jīva* [the individual]. *Tvamasi iti jīva* ["You are" refers to the individual] is addressed. You are that. So this is the whole Vedanta.

Now in this, the sentence is to be understood, and we have to enquire into the word forming the sentence, each word. Therefore, in the methodology of teaching, there is the *tvampadavicāra--tatpadavicāra* [analysis of the word "you"—analysis of the word "that"] that we don't do without doing this *vicāra* [analysis]. So *tvampadavicāraḥ* inquiry into *tvam*, you, means *jīva*. Inquiry into the word *Īśvara*, *tat*—*tat* is *jagat-kāraṇam*, the cause of this entire world, all knowing, all pervasive almighty, *Brahman*, *Īśvara*, *sarvajñah* [all-knowledge in general], *sarvaṅvit* [all-knowledge in particular] also. Here, *alpajñah* [limited knowledge] *alpaśaktimān* [limited power] this *jīva*, here, individual. So, this individual is equated to *Īśvara*, which is obviously not possible. Even two individual things, Devadatta cannot be Somadatta. A table cannot be chair. You can sit on the table, but it won't be the object that is referred by the word "chair". And the word "chair" cannot be table, table cannot be chair, even two different objects cannot be the same. So where is the question of *jīva* being *Īśvara*? That doesn't exist. But then here, seriously it is taught, it is not just passingly mentioned. It is seriously taught. There is *abhyāsa* [repetition]. There is *upakrama* [the beginning]. There is *upasamhāra* [the summation]. There is beginning, there is end, there is repetition. There is no question. There is a *tātparya* [the purport]--means there is a commitment to convey the individual being the cause of the world. And, therefore, in the methodology, the *tvampadavicāra- tatpadavicāra* is inevitable.

Then when you analyze what constitutes the *tvampada* you, the word "you." There is a complex being. Body is there, senses are there, *prāṇa* is there, mind is there, the person is there. It is called the *kṣetrajñah* [the knower of the field (of experience)]. The *śāstra* uses the word "*kṣetrajñah*," the conscious being, who is conscious of the *kṣetra*. And the *kṣetra* is all these, mind, senses, body also *kṣetra*. Whole world is *kṣetra*. And therefore, here, this situation, where what is construed as an individual is accepted as one consisting of body mind sense complex, a given body mind sense complex. And it is also accepted that it is *sṛṣṭam*, it is created, *sṛṣṭam jagat* [the created world], it is put-together *jagat*. Understand. So this body mind sense complex is included in the *sṛṣṭam jagat*.

The methodology should be, should be adequate; it says what is put together, is *nāmarūpa* [name and form]. It is *nāmarūpa*. That means is *śabdavācyam...śabdavācyam* [the immediate meaning of the word]. *Nāma* and *rūpa* is *vācyā*. *Nāma* is the name, word, *śabda* [word]; and the *rūpa*[form] is it's meaning. There is no such thing two things, *nāma* and *rūpa* and all that. There is a word, and its meaning, you see together; they are inseparable. And therefore, the *śabdavācyam sṛṣṭam jagat* [the created world is the immediate meaning of the words], including your body mind sense complex. And therefore, what is *sṛṣṭam* [created]--*vācārambhanam vikāro nāmadheyam mṛttikā eva satyam*. [the clay alone is real, the modification is a name only, born of words,.(Chandogya 6.1.4)] These are all important things. So when you say "it's a pot," that's purely a word having some meaning; word means there's a meaning. That's all what is there, knowledge. Meaning is knowledge. If you know the meaning, it is knowledge. If you don't know the meaning, then it's a group of sounds. That is the knowledge you have. The knowledge of a group of sounds, syllables, right? And therefore, and so, *sṛṣṭam jagat* [created world], is non separate from *satyam* [the reality] *jagatsatyam-- mṛttikā eva satyam--sadeva satyam*. [the truth of the world—clay alone is the truth--existence alone is the reality.] In the *śāstra*, the beginning is *sadeva saumya idamagra āsīt ekamevādvitīyam* [Oh dear one, in the beginning this was one nondual existence alone]-- what was there is one nondual and that is *sat*. That is the word; *Brahman* is not used there, *Sat*, the word is used. It's all the same. This entire *jagat* was only one nondual *sat*. But it was not said there was only *sat*. There is no question of whether—it was what it was. The *jagat* was *sat*, it is said. The *jagat* was *sat*. *idam āsīt prāk* [before this was]; *sṛṣṭeḥ prāk idam āsīt* [before the creation this was]; *sat āsīt* [existence was]; *idamśabdārtha* [the meaning of the word existence]... *idamśabdavācyam* [the immediate meaning of the the word "this"] and what is *satśabdavācyā* [the immediated meaning fo the word "existence"] both of them have got *sāmānādhikaraṇyam* [the same locus]. That means *idam jagat* [this world]was *sat* [existence] because of *sāmānādhikaraṇyam* [referring to the same locus]. It was not an attribute of *sat*. It was *sat*. *Idam āsīt* [this was] as *sat*; that's a setup. That *idam* is what, like—the setup is, all these earthenwares, pots and so on, were clay before their creation. They were just clay. A limited example. But here the clay cannot think to become pots. That is inadequacy of the example. Whereas *satyam brahma* had the knowledge of what was going to come. Knowledge was there. *Idam sarvaṃ sat āsīt* [all this was existence]. That was knowledge. This is knowledge. That is knowledge. *pūrṇamadaḥ pūrṇamidam* [that is infinite, this is infinite]. Before the

creation what was there was knowledge. Knowledge was in the cause. That is *satyam*. *Brahman*. So *Brahma sarvajñam bhavati* [Brahman is all-knowledge]. *sarvaśakti sarvajñam brahma* [Brahman is all-powerful, all-knowledge]. Then it got....you know, different shapes. That *jñānam* [knowledge], undifferentiated, *nirvikalpaṃ jñānam*, is differentiated. *Vijāti* [division by species], *sajāti* [division within species] difference, *vijati* difference, *svagatabheda* [division within one member of a species] difference. Differences. Like, if you take tree. Tree is not a cow, not an animal. It is *vijāti*. Among the trees also there are many differences. And in the tree itself there are differences, *svagata*. Leaf is there, branches are there, trunk is there, bark is there, roots are there. Endless. Differences. And therefore, undifferentiated is cause. Undifferentiated knowledge is cause. Means we cannot see. With the eyes, etc. They themselves need to be differentiated. Okay? There should be eyes, the creation *sṛṣṭi* [creation] of eyes. The *sṛṣṭi* of ears. Then, you can see the differences, the forms, the color, the sounds, etcetera. So for this, this entire *jaḡat*, if you analyze what it is, so you find again words, words, words, *nāmni nāmāni* [names in the name]. If you say *vṛkṣaḥ nāma* [the name tree]. It is one word. Then you look into the word, there are *nāmāni*, there are many words. So every word requires to be inquired into. And when it is done, then you find more words. The first word is gone. First word has no substance. So is a substanceless word, like the table, there is no substance, there is only wood; table is gone already, leaving the wood behind. And wood will be gone, if again you inquire into. And therefore, you find in one word, many words. A very bold statement. Only Vedanta can do that. I used to, when I first heard this, I was flabbergasted. To hear, they are all words, just words? And we are dealing with words...All the tangible things are all words? Just words and words, knowledge. The whole *jaḡat* [world] is knowledge. Recognizable through individual words. This is what we say, *śabda vācyam* [the immediate meaning of the word]. *yat śabdavācyam tat mithyā* [that which is the immediate meaning of the word is *mithyā*]. Any *śabda* [word].. *yatśabdalakṣyam tat satyam* [the implied meaning of the word is the truth (existence)]. This is the truth. Therefore, there is no contradiction when we say "it is beyond words" because *satyavastu* [the true reality] is beyond words. And it has to be understood only through words. Because it is the *lakṣya* of *śabda* [the implied meaning of the word]. Therefore, from the standpoint of the *lakṣya*, the real content of the word, which is the content of every word. Even though we use some special word, *satyam*, *jñānam*, [existence, knowledge] like these words we are using, *ānandam* [infinite (fullness)], that is to negate our conclusions.

Critically. Three words are used, *sat*, *cit*, *ānanda*, or *ananta* [existence, consciousness, fullness or limitless]. We need those three words. Because, three conclusions are there. And these three conclusions I am ignorant, I am a mortal, I am insignificant. I am *saṁsārī*, *sukhī*, *duḥkhi* [a limited person, an experience of pleasure, an experiencer of pain]. So these conclusions are negated by *sat* and *cit* and *ānanda*. Any one word you take, in any language, or a dialect, and stay with it, you will end up with *satyam Brahman*. And therefore *yato vāco nivartante* [that from which the words return]. The words have their own limitations. And the words that we have are colored from our *vācya* [the immediate meaning of the word]. Our knowledge of the world. Pot, table, chair, cup and saucer. These are all our words, and we are talking about, what is not available for any one *śabda* [word], any one *śabda*, or many *śabdas*. Because all these are *Brahman*; *Brahman* is not all these. How do you say? Only by *śabdavācya* and *lakṣya* [the immediate meaning of the word and the implied]. So *tvampada* [the word you], also, when we do *vicāra* [inquiry, (analysis)], there is *vācya* and *lakṣya*. *Lakṣya* is *saccidānanda*; *vācya* is *pramātā* [the knower], the *ahaṅkāra* [the limited sense of I]. The knower, seer, hearer, thinker, *sukhī*, *duḥkhi*. All this body mind sense complex put together. This is the *vācya*, *śabda vācya* [the immediate meaning of the word]. There also *jāgat-kāraṇam Brahma* [Brahman which is the cause of world]. So the *jāgat-kāraṇam Brahma* is equated to *jīva* [the limited individual]. And the equation is not possible because of the contradiction. *Sarvajñatvam* [being all-knowledge], *alpajñatvam* [being of limited knowledge], *alpavyāpitvam* [limited pervasiveness]. All this, all these contradictions you cannot resolve. They have to be resolved. Unless, suppose, this is one reality. The *śabdavācya* [the immediate meaning of the word] is not meant by the *tattvamasi* [you are that]. Something else is meant. What is meant? Then are two different things. Then, I am in part *Brahman*. In part I am not *Brahman*. You know. Partially I am *Brahman*. Partially I am *abrahman* [non-Brahman]. That's not going to help me at all. Partially I am, I cannot recognize myself, I am partially *Brahman*. Means I am a part of *Brahman*. Doesn't make me any...doesn't make me whole. Before also I was a part. I was as a part of everything, I am just a, I am just one individual in the society, in the whole. And after study I am again part, what is this part? It doesn't solve the problem. I need to be the whole. I have to be the whole, not part. This is *mithyā* [that which depends on something else for its existence (e.g. the pot depends on the clay)]. *śabdavācya* is *mithyā*. That is so important in this. That *mithyātvanīścayam* [the clear understanding of *mithyā*] *Īśvaratvam* is *mithyā*, *jīvatvam* is *mithyā* [the status of being *Īśvara* is *mithyā* and the status of being the

jīva is mithyā] . The *adhiṣṭhāna* means, without which *mithyā* cannot exist. *Mithyā* means *adhiṣṭhāna -ananyat* [that which is not separate from the *adhiṣṭhāna*] is *mithyā*. So that is why among the various definitions of *mithyā*, I only go by *adhiṣṭhāna-ananyat*: that which is not independent of its *adhiṣṭhāna* is *mithyā*. That is the thing. All other words are all meaningless, I mean there are so many definitions. We don't need all that. They are confusing. *Adhiṣṭhāna-ananyat* is *mithyā*. That's what the *śāstra* does. *mṛttikā eva satyam* [clay alone is real]. We go by *śāstra*. Because it gives you the key. The methodology is there.

Vācārambhanam vicaro nāmadheyam mṛttikā eva satyam [clay alone is the reality, the modification is a name, based in words]; *sadeva satyam* [existence alone is the reality]. *Sat* is *vastu Brahman*. *Satyam* is what we understand, in terms of reality. *Sadeva satyam*. Like even *mṛt* (clay) is the truth of, *ātmā* [the self] of pot. My understanding of *mṛt*, clay, is *satyam*. Means that is the truth, the other thing is *mithyā*. The word is not there, we have to supply the word. The pot is *mithyā*, drawing its being from *satyam*. *Satyam* is a word revealing my understanding of the reality of the pot. The reality of the pot. Here, pot clay. It's an example. *mṛttikā eva satyam* [clay alone is the reality]. Then, later, the *śāstra* tells *sadeva satyam*. What is that *sat*? Originally *prakṛtam* [that which is under discussion]; originally, first, the *pratijñā* [the initial statement of fact] the *vastu* [the reality]. *sadeva saumya idamagra āsīt* [In the beginning this was existence alone, oh dear one] , *idam sarvam sadeva āsīt* [all this was existence alone], *tat satyam* [that is the reality], *tat tadeva satyam* [tat alone is the reality], *sadeva satyam, tat satyam* [existence alone is the reality, that is the reality]. That which is the cause of everything, that is *satyam*. That *satyam* is *sa ātmā* [the Self]. That is the *ātmā*. Don't think *satyam* means it is some third person. It is *ātmā*, it is the Self. Self also is waiting there, there is a Self inside, there is a third person. There is a third person. There is a third person. Therefore, *ātmā ātmānau ātmānaḥ* [one self, two selves, three or more selves]—means this fellow will have all these *śabdāḥ* [words], singular, dual, plural. That is what his life is. First he was *ātmā* [one self], then he got married, *ātmānau* [two selves], then he had children, *ātmānaḥ* [three or more selves]. And therefore he thinks there are, this is the *ātmā*. Therefore, the *śāstra* tells, *tat satyam, sa ātmā, tattoamasi śvetakeko* [that reality, that Self, you are that, Oh Śvetakeku]. That *satyam tvamasi* [that reality you are], you are that *satyam*, you are that *satyam*, the *ātmā*, you, you husband, there are many you's—there are not many you's.... there are not may you's. You know, You, once I say, that becomes I, I, I. So, *aham tat satyam* [I am that reality]. I am the *satyam Brahman* I am the reality which is Brahman]. So here, the *jagat* [world] also

is *mithyā*. That means the *kāraṇatvam* [being a cause] is *mithyā*. The status of being a cause is *mithyā*, the status of being all-knowing *mithyā*; *mithyā* means you have to understand, *adhiṣṭhāna*, *ananyatvam*, nonseparate. Then, both are one and the same? No. If they are one and the same it is not *mithyā*. What was the *vastu* [the real thing], became like this, that is called *pariṇāma*, modification. The *vastu* became what it has become. Not like that. Without undergoing change, the change has come about, called *vivarta-upādānatvam* [the material cause which does not undergo a change to become the effect]. It's all methodology--*vivarta-upādānatvam*--so that's a very important component in the teaching. So it has not undergone change whatsoever. Remains the same. And , therefore, so *tatpadalakṣyam* [the implied meaning of the word "that"] is *satyaṁ jñānāmanantam brahma* [Brahman, which is existence, knowledge, limitless]. *Yatvoampadalakṣyam* [the implied meaning of the word "you"], also, *satyaṁ jñānāmanantam brahma* And that is *satyam*. There is nothing other than *satyam*. In the *nāmarūpas* [name and forms] there a difference. The *nāmarūpas* [name and forms] there'll be difference. That is the miracle. It's all one *satyam*. It's all one *satyam*. *Brahman*. Every *nāmarūpa*. And therefore every *nāmarūpa* is one *satyam* *Brahman*. *Brahman* is not a *nāmarūpa*. So from this what we understand, the whole *jagat* creation is *māyikam*--it is purely, it's a, neither you can dismiss it as non-existent, nor can you take it as existent. That's, that is what they call miracle. That is what we say *māyā*. That is the miracle. *Sadasadbhyāmanirvacanīyam*, *mithyā* [*mithyā* is that which cannot be defined as existent nor as nonexistent] . And therefore, now, in the teaching, when there is *mahāvākya*, the *mahāvākya upadeśa*, after having done the homework, *tvampada* is done and *tatpada* is done. After doing the homework, when you are told you are *tat satyaṁ Brahma* [that reality which is Brahman], what happens inside? What happens inside? That my thinking that I am a limited individual confined to this body mind sense complex, is a well-entrenched idea. And that is equated to *jagat kāraṇam Brahma* [Brahman which is the cause of the world] which includes my body mind sense complex also. Which includes *pramātā*, *pramāṇam*, *prameyam* [knower, means of knowledge, the object of knowledge], all the three. In this, being (is) *satyam*. You know, there is a *satyam*, there is the invariable presence of *satyam* *Brahma* in the *prameya*, in the object known. There is the invariable presence of *satyam* in *pramāṇam* [the means of knowledge]. There is invariable presence of *satyam* in *pramā*, knowledge. There is invariable presence of *satyam* in the *pramātā*, the knower. So in the known, means *jagat* has come. There is the invariable presence of *Īśvara* , in other words, in everything that is. Correct? *Īśvara* is everything ??? put them all

together. And that *Īśvaratvam* being *mithyā*. The invariable presence of *satya-ātmā* is there in all. In you, *pramātā* [the knower] also. Therefore, the *ṛtti* [thought modification] that removes the confusion and all of its ignorance, not knowing, is a *ṛtti* that recognizes, through the *lakṣyārtha* [implied meaning] of the words, *tvampadalakṣya tatpadalakṣya* [the implied meaning of the word 'you,' the implied meaning of the word 'that'] is one and the same and it is just myself, self-revealing-me. So, the separation of the world from *satyam* is gone. The world doesn't exist independent of *satyam*. *Brahman*. And *satyam Brahma aham asmi* [I am the reality which is Brahman]. The world means *jagat*, *jagat* means my body mind sense complex, all of them are not independent of *satyam Brahma*. That *satyam Brahma aham asmi* means what? Self-evident, the self-evident being, mean *satyam Brahma*. This *ṛtti* [thought modification] is called *akhaṇḍa ākāra-ṛtti*. Why is *akhaṇḍa* [undivided, whole]? Because, generally the words in a sentence are syntactically connected as a subject and object. Subject is different from the object. And therefore, if I say "Please fetch me a glass of water," water is different, glass is different, and the one who is going to fetch is different. For whom it is fetched also, are different. But not here. It's not one and the same also. Suppose you say "*rāmaḥ dāśarathih*" [Rāma is the son of Daśaratha]. Because there are many *Rāma*'s are there. Many *Rāma*'s. So there is a *Balarāma*, there is a *Paraśurāma*. Therefore, which *Rāma* are you talking about? Say *Dāśarathih*, *Rāma*, the son of *Daśaratha*. Only one person, *rāmaḥ dāśarathih*. *Sāmānādhikaraṇyam* [they refer to the same locus] *rāmaḥ dāśarathih* words are in apposition. But here it is different. The *jīva* is *Īśvara*. Different. *Īśvara* is not an adjective to *jīva*. There is no *viśeṣaṇaviśeṣyabhāva* [attribute-substantive relationship]. Nor *jīva* is an adjective to *Īśvara*. Therefore *Īśvara* cannot have the *jīvatvam* attribute. *Jīva* cannot *Īśvaratvam* attribute. Therefore, it's not *viśeṣaṇaviśeṣyabhāvasambandha* [the connection is not one of attribute-substantive]. The relationship is not a relationship of substantive and attribute. It's purely *lakṣya*, *lakṣaṇalakṣyasambandhaḥ*. Therefore what happens, the *nirodhārtha* [the meaning which is opposed] goes away. The *lakṣyārtha* [implied meaning] remains. This is the *akhaṇḍārthabodhakavākya* [the sentence which reveals the nondual meaning]. *Ṛtti* is called *akhaṇḍa-ākāra-ṛttiḥ*. That is purely based upon a stand. That is, we understand things in a certain way. So when you see, when you see an object, then this object is loaded in your thought. In other words, a thought has assumed the *ākāra* [form] of the object. And the thought is called a *tadākāraṛttiḥ*, *viśayākāraṛttiḥ* [the thought modification in the form of "that," the thought modification in the form of the object], If it is a cup, then the *ṛtti* assumes the

form of the cup. Along with its location, everything. Whatever you see, that is the *ākāra* [form] of the *vṛtti*. One thought. You may see a hundred different things here, but it is all one picture, like a snapshot. *tadākāravṛtti*. Then this *ākāravṛtti* when it assumes the *ākāra*, you cannot say no more, you can say the cup is no more outside my knowledge. Means it is no more unknown. Cup is no more unknown. The *ajñāta* [unknown] cup has become the *jñāta* [known] cup. Correct? You know what is cup, but what is in my hand is a cup--it's a new knowledge. Purely new knowledge it is. So, the unknownness of the cup, the *ajñātatvam* [unknownness] of the cup, in my hand, is no more. This is what *vṛtti* does. The cup being an object of my thought, my thought being *pramātā*, the subject, the one who knows, his thought. So opposed to the cup is *pramātā*, the knower. And therefore the *pramātā* looks upon the cup not as himself. Ahh! That is how we deal with the world. This is subject/object. So, the *pramātā*, the onlooker of the cup in the thought distinguishes himself as the knower of the cup. Cup is known. Even though it is simultaneous. These two operations. One is, the cup becoming the object of the thought. *Ajñātatvam* [ignorance] is gone. Then your recognition of the object in your thought. That is another operation.

These two operations are called this...the object is covered by the *vṛtti* [thought] and therefore the whole *viśaya* [object] is *vyāpta* [pervaded] by the *vṛtti*, this is called *vṛttivyāpti* [pervasion by the thought]. It removes the *ajñātatvam*, the unknownness of the object. Then, what is that object is recognized by you simultaneously. That is called *phalavyāpti*. You relate to that object as *aham* [I] this. I am the knower of this object. That is why we use the word *idam* [this] all the time for object. *Idam sarvaṃ* [all this]. *Idam sarvaṃ jagat* [this entire world]. *idantayā dṛṣyate* [it is seen as "this"]. By the *aham*, therefore the *pramātā* is *aham* [the knower is I]. It is *idam vṛttiviśaya* [this is the object of the thought]. This thought. And therefore, this because of the *vṛtti*, *viśayaakaaravṛtti* there is a knowledge of the *viśaya* [object] on the part of the knower. The result of this seeing goes to the *pramātā*, not to the cup. The result goes to the *pramātā* for making the *pramātā* more informed. He is the *phalabhak* [the experiencer of the result]. He is the enjoyer of the result of knowing. Therefore, the *vyāpti* is called *phalavyāpti*. I see the pot, I recognize the pot. This is a pot. Therefore this is what we say *phalavyāpti*. Now if you look at the *ātmajñānam* [self-knowledge]. I am *ātmā brahman*. This Self is *brahman*, *aham* is *brahman*. *Vṛttijñānamapekṣyate* [it is dependent on the knowledge born of the the thought modification]. *ajñātatvam*

[ignorance] is there. *Ajñātatvam* has to go. *Ajñātatvam* has to go; confusion goes when *ajñātatvam* goes. Correct? There is a confusion. If a shell is taken for silver, there is ~~*ajñātatvam* of silver~~, *ajñātatvam* [ignorance] of shell, *ajñātatvam* means the status of being not known. This *ajñātatvam* is there, the unknownness of the *adhiṣṭhāna*, ~~the silver~~, and then, I mean the shell, then I don't remove silver, I can keep on removing one after the other. I'm not removing any projection. I am removing the cause of projection. The cause of projection is *ajñātatvam*, *ajñānam*, and that goes away the moment I see the silver, I mean the shell. Then, along with it goes all the other projections. Similarly, also, here, *ātmā* is not a *kartā bhoktā* [knower, enjoyer], whereas *kartā bhoktā* is all *mithyā*, *kartṛtvam* [knowership] is *mithyā*, *kartā* [the knower] is not *mithyā*. In the *kartā* there is *saccidānanda ātmā* also. Therefore, we should not throw away the baby along with the water. *Saccidānandaātmā*. When you say *kartā* [knower], there is a being; *bhoktā* [enjoyer], there is a being. This is another mistake, a modern Vedanta mistake. Nothing works. *Kartṛtvam* is *mithyā*, *bhokṛtvam* is *mithyā*. In other words, *jīvatvām* is *mithyā*. *Īśvaratvam* is *mithyā*. *Vastu* [the reality] is clear. And that is a *vṛtti* necessary. That takes place in the teaching. There are many areas also, it's not one type of, one type of this thing. There are many ways, and I suppose I say I am *baddhaḥ* [bound]. My focus is now bondage. I am *baddhaḥ* means I am bound. Then what is bondage, what binds you, who is bound, etc.— you analyse the whole, *vicāra* [analysis, inquiry]. Then you say I am *muktaḥ* [liberated]. *muktaḥ brahma tvamasi* [You are Brahman, who is liberated (by nature)]. *Nityamuktaḥ brahma tvamasi* [You are Brahman, who is eternally liberated]. You are *nityamuktābrahma*. You are *nityasuddhaḥ brahma* [Brahman, who is eternally pure]. Because that fellow has got the opposite view, that means *ajñātatvam* [ignorance] is there. In terms of that. Therefore, there are certain critical areas of this, certain orientation. Critical areas of orientation, opposed to the truth of one's Self. Therefore, we have so many important words: *nitya-śuddha-buddha-mukta-svabhāvaḥ brahma ahamasmi* [I am Brahman, whose nature is eternally pure, knowledge, free]. Like this a few more words you can add: *pūrṇam* [whole, full], *asaṅga* [unattached], *asaṅgo'pi ayam puruṣaḥ* [This Self is also unattached]. Let the *śāstra* itself give you all critical words, these are all critical words. Because this *saṅga* [attachment] is a problem. *Asaṅga* [unattached] is the solution. Because that is my nature. My nature is my solution for the problem. Problem is unknownness. My not knowing what I am is the cause for the problem. Therefore we highlight that word. Every time that is done there is *akhaṇḍākāravṛtti*. It's not that one time that *vṛtti* takes place and then it is gone.

That's why the whole teaching becomes a method. That's why I say the Vedantic teaching itself is a method, because we are not solving a problem. We are not solving a problem. We are shifting the vision of the person to himself and that implies *vṛtti*. That is called *akhaṇḍākāravṛtti*. But we are not going to look at it as an object. You can't say that I saw *brahman* yesterday. Because I am *brahman*. Self-evident being is *satyaṁ brahma*. Correct? Self-evident being is *satyaṁ brahma*, you don't require to objectify. Whereas, in every other piece of knowledge you need to objectify. Then only you get *pramāṇaphalam* [the result of knowing]. The result of knowing is accrued to you. Here the result of knowing is not accrued by my seeing anything. Because I am self-evident being. And therefore only what happens is all the negation takes place, leaving me what I am. And I see the *lakṣya* [implied meaning], I am the *lakṣya* of the *vākya* [sentence]. *satyaṁ brahma tvamasi*. *Nityaṁ brahma tvamasi* [You are Brahman, which is free from time]. *Suddhaṁ brahma tvamasi* [You are Brahman, which is pure]. *Svaprakāśaṁ brahma tvamasi* [You are Brahman, which is self-effulgent]. *akhaṇḍaṁ brahma tvamasi* [You are Brahman, which is whole, nondual]. *Sarvaṁ brahma tvamasi* [You are Brahman, which is everything]. *Tvam asi* means you are. *Pūrṇaṁ brahma*. You are *pūrṇaṁ brahma*, *ānandaṁ brahma*, *anantaṁ brahma* [You are Brahman which is infinite/wholeness, Brahman which is fullness, Brahman which is infinite/endless]. So all these words keep coming all the time. And then, that's me. Because I am construed as *alpa* [limited], as someone located here, *deśa*, *kāla*, [time, space] etc. That's not true. *Deśa*, *kāla* are objects. Time and space are my objects. They are *mithyā*, they depend upon me. There is no time without me. There is no space without me. But, I am not time and space. So when this is told, Yes, you say. When you say yes, that is *akhaṇḍākāravṛtti*. It is self-evident. The self-evident *ātmā* doesn't require to be seen for the *phala* [result]. I am the *phalam*. The content of the knower is the *phalam*, without whom, without the presence of whom, knowing is impossible. You know. Without whose presence knowledge is impossible. *yadvācā' nabhyuditaṁ yena vājabhyudyate--* By words it is not revealed, by which words are revealed, and their meanings are revealed. That is you. *tadeva brahma tvam viddhi nedaṁ yadidamupāsate*. *Kenopaniṣad* [verse 1.5 "That which cannot be uttered by speech but because of which speech can be uttered—know that alone to be Brahman, not that which people worship as an object."]. That is Brahman understand. Each individual is Brahman. So. Individual *ātmā* is not individual, it is *sarvaṁ brahma* [Brahman which is all].

Om pūrṇamadaḥ pūrṇamidam pūrṇāt pūrṇamudacyate |

pūrṇasya pūrṇamādāya pūrṇamevāvaśīsyate |

om śāntiḥ śāntiḥ śāntiḥ ||

[That is Fullness. This is fullness. From fullness fullness comes forth.
Having perceived the fullness of the fullness, fullness alone remains.
Om peace peace peace.]