

Swami Dayananda Saraswati Talk

at Piercy, California, June 9, 1982

Drk drisya bheda, the so-called difference between the subject and the object is itself the *bheda*. The difference is a *kalpita* difference. And if it is a *kalpita* difference, we will see how it is *kalpita* later, if it is a *kalpita* difference then there is no difference. A difference that is *kalpita* is not true. So *drk-drisya-yoho, yo bhedah*, the *bheda* obtaining between *drk* and *drisya kalpita*, is purely *kalpana*. If it is *kalpita*, it means it is apparent, not real. Why because, the *drisya* is an object of *vr̥tti* [thought modification; it goes out through the senses and pervades the object]. An object of *vr̥tti* when you say, it is awareness conditioned by a *vr̥tti* enjoying an object. And that is what they call the *visaya-chaitanya* or *vr̥tti-gata-chaitanya*. So the content of the *vr̥tti* is *chaitanya*. So the *visaya-prameya-avachina-chaitanya* is the *dr̥sya*. The *chaitanya* conditioned by the object of the *vr̥tti* is called *dr̥sya*. The *drk* is not *jada*, *drk* also is *chaitanya*. But then, *pramatru avachina chaitanya*. The seer, the subject, is *chaitanya*, but it is *pramatra avachina chaitanya*, the subject conditioned *chaitanya*. So between the two, the *pramatra-gata-chaitanya* and the *vr̥tti-gata chaitanya* there is no difference in terms of *chaitanya*.

Therefore, from the standpoint of the *chaitanya*, of awareness, the seer awareness called *drk* is not separate from the seen awareness. That which is not separate from the seen awareness is established by the *dr̥shya* being, the seen being, never away from awareness. If the seen is never away from awareness, the difference between the seer-seen is only *kalpita* in the sense if you don't look into it, then there is a seer, there is seen. If you look into either the *drisya* or the *drk*, either way it is the same. If you look into the *drisya*, you will end up in only one *chaitanya*. You look into the *dr̥shya*. You need not even turn towards yourself. It is not necessary. So you take the *drisya*, this flower. And now if it is an object, you look into this *drisya*, a flower, the flower that is recognized by you, seen by you. It is a *drisya*. And if you look into the *drisya*, the object itself, being an object obtaining in your cognition, it is available as an object of cognition, the cognition involves *chaitanya*, awareness.

The object of cognition involves naturally *chaitanya*. Why because, the cognition minus the object is no given cognition. You remove the object from the cognition, there is no cognition. If that is so, the cognition and the object, this is the trick, the cognition and the object are one and the same. It is all for purposes of *vyavahara*. So object of cognition, cognition and so on are used for analysis sake. But if you get into a given object, *drisya*, the *drisya* reduces itself into simple cognition. Why? Because there is no cognition minus its object.

And therefore it is not that you have a cognition and there is an object other than the cognition. Therefore, the object is non-separate from the cognition. The cognition and the cognized and the *darsanam* and the *drisya* are not separate things. Because *darsanam*, cognition, involves an object. Minus the object there is no cognition, *darsanam*. And similarly *darsanam* without an object also is not there. Therefore, you can't say there is cognition, but I have no object. Nor you can say I have an object but there is no cognition. Therefore, you can't remove the object from cognition and have cognition, nor you can remove cognition and still have the object of cognition. So that makes it clear, between the *drisya* and the *darsanam* there is no separation at all.

If that is understood, so *drisya* and the cognition are non-separate. Now the question is, does the cognition stand separate from the cognizer? Now look. And when I say I am the cognizer of the flower, there is status of cognizer, *drk*, there is a cognizer on my part without the cognition. It is the cognition that makes me a cognizer. So I assume the status of cognizer because of the very cognition itself. So the name of the cognition is not cognizer. Neither a cognizer is there without the cognition. Neither the status of cognizer is there for me without a cognition. And therefore, I am a cognizer because of cognition and I am no more a cognizer without a cognition. Therefore, the *drk* is non-separate from the *darsanam*, the *darsana* is non-separate from the *drisya*, so *drisya, darsana, drk iti* -- all the three of them are one and the same. So the cognizer, the cognition, and the object of cognition - all the three of them are inter-dependent or one and the same, I would say, in the sense one is not there without the other.

Therefore, once I say that I am the cognizer and that being a cognizer, the cognition has come, the object of cognition has come, between the *chaitanya*, the cognizer and the object of cognition, the connection is there. The object of cognition and the cognizer all are connected by what? By a common *chaitanya* alone. That is the reason why it is *abeda*, so there is a common *chaitanya*, a common basis of awareness in the sense that in the cognition there is no cognition without awareness, there is no cognizer without awareness and there is no object of cognition without cognition, and therefore, minus awareness there is no object of cognition. The object of cognition, being cognition and the cognition being non-separate from awareness because every cognition involves awareness, *chaitanya*, and the cognition itself is not separate from the *drk* consciousness because if *drk* is a conscious being, the cognition is a conscious thing, between the consciousness of the seer and the consciousness which is involved in the cognition, what is the difference? What kind of difference is there?

So between the *darshana* and the *drk*, if there is something that is in-between, if you draw a line, if there is an in-between line between the *drk*, the seer, and the cognition, the sight, if there is an in-between, what will that be? Will it be a *chaitanya* or will it be *jada*? What is it that is there between the *chaitanya* or the *drk* and the cognition that is there? There cannot be anything that is there. If there is anything that is there, then we have the same problem of a new sight. You are again recognizing another object of cognition. Between the *drk* and the previous cognition, there is another cognition and between that cognition and this *drk*, then again what is the difference? If there is a difference, then there should be another cognition. There is no such thing.

It seems to be an endless process. It is not endless because I see the flower. There is an end for it. The moment when I see the flower, there resolves the remoteness of the flower. The non-recognition of the flower resolves immediately as I see the flower, or the flower is sighted. There is a flower. And therefore, I cannot have a regress thing, because it doesn't go regress. That's an important thing in the whole thing. Since there is no regress, in the sense that it's not that once I see the flower, it keeps going, going, going for a resolution to take place at the end to say that this is a flower. It doesn't take place like that. From that it's clear, there is no regress involved.

When there is no regress involved, definitely between the *cognizer* consciousness and the cognition consciousness there is no in-between, *antara* is not there. *Antara* means a gap is not there. And between the cognition and the *drisya* also there is no *antara* because the cognition itself is a *drisya*, the *drisya* itself is cognition, there is no *antara*, there is no *beda*. Suppose I look out and see an object outside, that object is a *drisya*. So the *drisya*, the object, and the *drk*, the seer, the cognizer, between the cognizer and the seen object there cannot be any kind of in-between, a factor to divide the external-internality. There is no externality involved here because there is no dividing line to divide the *drk* from the *drisya*, in-as-much-as the dividing line itself is a *drisya*.

So the physical body, if it differentiates the *drisya*, the external object, if that is the dividing line, that is also a *drisya*. Nor if you say that something else divides, what is that something else I would ask? Anything else that divides, like a time *kala* or *desha* a place, there is a time or place or anything that divides, that is also a *drisya*, therefore all the way there is no *antara*. Neither between the object and the cognition there is *antara*, nor between the cognition and the *drk*, there is *antara*. *Antara* means something in-between, a gap. There is no *antara* because if there is a gap, that itself assumes a status of an object and the *drk-drisya beda* will be there between this and *drk*. So again the same problem, therefore. Between the *drk svarupa* and the *drisya svarupa*, and the object of consciousness there is no *antara*, there is no dividing line whatsoever.

When you say all that is there is *tat pada*, it means that all that is here is *tat pada vacha*. *Tat pada vacha* means all the *nama rupas* that are here, known and unknown, *viditam aviditam sarvam*. That is what is called *tat pada vacha*. *Viditam*, things that are known to you, or things that are outside the scope of your knowledge. *Viditam aviditam*, that is called *tat pada vacha*, the meaning of the word *tat*.

And therefore, between one object of the *tat pada vacha* and another object which is also *tat pada vacha*, there is no *beda* again. There is no difference between them. Suppose I say that *Isvara*, the Lord is the *tat pada vacha* and *Isvara* is non-separate from the whole creation, then all the *nama rupas* form one *samasti*, what we call the physical world, thought world, everything. So if all the *nama-rupas* form one single *samasti*, between one member of the *samasti* and another member of the *samasti* there is no *beda*. What *beda*? What differentiates *Isvara*'s one *nama-rupa* and another *nama-rupa*? What differentiates? This is also *Isvara*, that is also *Isvara*. If everything is *Isvara*, therefore, there is no un-*Isvara* at all.

There is no object that has got un-*Isvaratvam*. There is no object for which you can say "this is *Isvara*, this is un-*Isvara*". You cannot differentiate "*Isvara-unisvara*", that this is *Isvara* and that is un-*Isvara*, you cannot say. Therefore, even for the *tat pada vacha*, the separating, dividing line: "this is *Isvara*, this is *jiva*" you cannot make any difference. And again, from the *Isvara chaitanya*, just look at it from another way, from *Isvara*'s *chaitanya*, from *Isvara*'s awareness, is there anything *jada* or *cetana*? The *jada*, an inert thing, and the *cetana*, there is nothing that is separate from the *Isvara caitanya*. *Isvara* itself is the whole thing that is here, *nama-rupa*.

Therefore, which is *jada*, which is *cetana*? There is no *jada*, *cetana* etcetera. Unless you can shake off an object which is entirely different from the *cetana* – you can shake off one object from the *cetana*, and keep it away from the *cetana* – then you can say it is outside the *cetana*, it is outside consciousness. So from *Isvara*'s standpoint, everything is within the *cetana*, because it is *samasti caitanya*. From your point also, from the *caitanya* standpoint, which is non-separate from the *Isvara caitanya*, there is nothing that is outside the consciousness, there is no given object. No given object can be outside the consciousness.

If no given object is outside consciousness, what can be outside? If at all we talk about outside, what is it that we talk about as outside? From the *deha*'s standpoint we say this is a perceiving entity and outside is an object of perception. I draw a line somewhere and say this is external, this is internal, all with reference to a certain dividing line, which we take as something which is *vyavahara*, which we take it as something real.

It is a problem of recognition of reality or non-recognition of reality. Therefore, since there is no object away from *Isvara-caitanya*, then any object, any single object, I say it is the whole. Therefore, you can never imagine the whole. Can you imagine? With this mind, how are you going to imagine the whole?

Suppose I say, the Lord is the whole! Which whole are you talking about? The Lord is the whole, if I say, then what do you mean by the whole? Is it a known whole? Or an unknown whole? Therefore, we say *viditam*, *aviditam*. Then it is ok. The known and the unknown. Because, even this flower is known and unknown. The flower if you say that you know it, it is wrong. If you say you don't know it, also it is wrong. Why? Because it is known and unknown. Because there are areas in the flower which no one knows! One single flower can open up islands of ignorance. And even if you cover that, again new islands of ignorance come because you don't require any object to discover how ignorant you are. You just pick up anything. A piece of cloth is good enough.

Therefore, any one single thing you take, and that itself opens up areas of ignorance. Therefore, any object is *viditam-aviditam*. If any object is *viditam-aviditam*, when I say *sarvam*, *idam sarvam*, I mean *viditam-aviditam*. Once it is *viditam-aviditam*, I have to settle account only with one object. Because one object also *viditam-aviditam*. A hundred objects also *viditam-aviditam*. And a million objects also *viditam-aviditam*. All of them form what we call the universe, for nobody understands that the Lord means everything that you know and you don't know. Therefore, we get the *sarvam*. That is why *sarvam* is not experiential. *Sarvam* is never experiential. We can understand how the *anantam* is not a matter of being experiential in the sense that suddenly I don't come into contact with all that is here. There is no such thing because any single atom itself is good enough to open up deserts of ignorance.

Naturally, therefore, once you say *viditam-aviditam*, then there is *sarvam*. If that is so, that it is not just experiential, it is in fact a recognition of a fact. Unless there is something like my becoming at one with the whole thing that is there, then it is experiential we can say. *Sarvam aham idam sarvam* to say that, I should become one with everything that is there and everything that is there is not known, nor can you know. It is impossible to think that everything I know. We don't know because our sense organs and mind etc. are all meant only for buying hamburgers etc. They are meant for too many things. They are just meant for making a hamburger and living your simple life and not much more than that. It is capable of knowing, it is not capable of experiencing the *sarvam* because it is not meant for it.

In fact, it is capable of experiencing everything in reverse, in the sense, you will see something that is not there. But it is capable of knowing and that too how? Not in detail. In detail it can never be a *sarvagna* because any one thing has that aspect of *viditam* and *aviditam*.

So *viditam-aviditam* is loaded in every object. You take a flower, *viditam-aviditam*. Take a petal, *viditam-aviditam*. Take the very color itself, *viditam-aviditam*. You may give a theory, but that is still available for further theories. Because it has to go from the petal onwards, why it is made, who has made it, what is the *karta* for all these things? What is the intelligence? How did it get this color etc. How this should be so? Why not the other flower is like this? If you ask these questions, then you go giddy. Therefore, the Lord has created a capacity for the mind to go giddy so that you will stop. That is another great blessing that we have got. You give up. Why? Because *viditam-aviditam* is all the way. It must be understood. If it is all the way then there is no experience of omniscience for a *jiva*. If anybody says so, that is wrong. Nor coming into contact with the whole creation etc. is again certain. Because you don't come into contact with the whole creation. You don't come into contact with your own universe. Why all that? Why don't you come into contact with the flower? You don't see all that is there. Otherwise, how would you come into contact with it unless you now recognize that it is there? So it is very clear, if anybody says "I am in harmony with the world", it means he is at once in harmony with whatever that he recognizes.

Viditam-aviditam, if this is understood clearly, *aviditam* also is an object, *drishya*. *Viditam* also is *drishya*. Both of them are *drishya*. Therefore, one single object is good enough so that for me that is *Isvara*. It is non-separate from *Isvara*. Therefore, it is not that it is a part of *Isvara*, if the whole it is *Isvara*, *adah purnam*, *idam purnam*, if that is *purna*, this is *purna*. Therefore in *purna*, *purna* is not made out of fractions and thoughts. Like even the space that obtains in the needle's eye, that space is whole space. It is not a fraction of space. So the needle's eye, you know the eye that is there, the space that is there, that space is the whole space, really speaking. Why? Because you are not making a fraction into that space. It is not available for such making into bits. And therefore, any object is *Isvara*. Any single object is *Isvara*. Therefore I would say, the flower is *tat pada vacha* and the seer is *tvam pada vacha*. Between the *tvam pada vacha* and *tat pada vacha*, there is *abeda* according to the teaching. *Tat tvam asi*, when it says, there *tat pada vacha* is indeed *tvam pada vacha*. There is no difference. You seem to be a *drk* and this is *drishya*. *Drishya* is *tat pada vacha*. *Drk* is *tvam pada vacha*. Between *tat-tvam -ayoh* there is *abeda*, that is *tat tvam asi*, that flower you are. Reduce *Isvara* to a flower, then everything works better. That flower you are.

That flower you are, means how do you say that flower you are in? Please think of that. Please think of the flower non-separate from the *drk*, non-separate from the *sat*. What is the differentiating line to have an external object and an internal *drk*? What is the differentiating line? There is no differentiating line. Space or time or whatever, that is also *drishya*, and therefore, all the way it is *drishya*, *drishya*, *drishya*. Then between the last *drishya* and the *drk*, what is the separating line? It is again *drishya*. And what is the separating line? *Drishya*. And what is the separating line? *Drishya*. And what is the separating line? *Drishya*. Therefore, what is the separating line? There is no separating line. *Drk* is never separate from *drishya*.

Between *drk-drishya-yoho*, if there is no *beda*, then *tat-tvam-pada-yoho*, there is no real *beda*. If there is a *beda* such as a flower, I would say it is *nama-rupa*. That is a *nama-rupa*. If I assume the status of a seer, that is also a status, I would say, *nama-rupa*. Cognizer with reference to object of cognition is also another *nama-rupa*. That particular status is again a *mithya* status and therefore it comes under *nama-rupa*. Therefore, *drk* also is *nama-rupa*, *drishya* also is *nama-rupa*, and *drg-drishya* is *nama-rupa*, what is there is 'is'. You bring the *drk* and the *drishya* will come. *Drishya* you bring and the *drk* comes. Then, nobody comes, really speaking.

Therefore, what happens is there is a situation of *drg-drishya*. That situation goes. Then there is whatever that is the *svarupa* of that *drk* and *drishya*. That is there and you bring in *drg-drishya* or you remove *drg-drishya*, there is only one without movement. Motionlessness is the basis, *adhistana*, the basis for *drk* as well as for *drishya*. Therefore, there is no *antara*, there is no *beda*. Therefore, *drk avachina chaitanyam*, *drishya-avachina-vrtti-gata*, *drishya avachina chaitanyam*, that *chaitanya* is one and the same and therefore, *drg-drishya-yoho*, no *beda*. That's what *tat tvam asi* is.

Tat tvam padartha is indeed the *drk* and *tat padartha*, *tat pada vacha*. *Drk* means you are the seer, that is the *tvam pada vacha* and this is *tat pada vacha*. And so, between the *drk* and *drishya* a dividing line being not there, there is no dividing line, so the externality and internality goes. Only one aspect, maybe, that *nama-rupa* is different from the *deha* etcetera. *Nama rupa*, then that you deal with it purely from the *sat-tat*. You deal with it as a *sat*.

So the *bhasaka bhasya bhava*, *drk drishya beda*. Or *bhasaka bhasya bhava*, *bhasakah* is the one who illumines and that which is lighted up, on that basis you swallow externality. What is external is swallowed. Internal-external is swallowed, I tell you, *anantya* is achieved. Because what denies *anantya*, what denies limitless, is only some kind of a division, a special division. I am inside, that denies *anantya* to the *atma*. It's a pure *desha pariccheda*.

If *anantya* is divided, *anantya* is denied. Means the recognition of *anantya* is denied purely by the concept of things that are internal and external. If there is nothing internal and external, because there is no dividing line between *drk* and *drisya*, then *anantya* is not denied at all. That is *anantya*. I can say, *aham idam sarvam*. Why? Because all that is there is *viditam aviditam*. That's all that is there. If I settle account with one object *viditam aviditam*, then I settle account with everything.

The problem of not recognizing the *anantya*, is due to the problem of things that are external coming into contact with me, they seem to impinge upon me. I seem to be the person who is impinged upon. Therefore, there is object-subject and this is the problem. But from the *drk* standpoint, there is nothing external, nor internal at all. Why? Because the *samsara mithya* also is bliss and the *deha* also is bliss, the object also is bliss. The particular time also is bliss. *Desha* also is bliss. *Kala* also is bliss. Everything is bliss only. The *drisya* is not separate from *drk* as there is no separating line, and therefore, there is no external or internal whatsoever. I am *anantya*. I am limitless, so it cannot be a matter of my proper seeing. If the seeing of *anantya* is experienced, that's fine. We can call it experience, it's a recognition.

You do have experience of *anantya* in deep sleep. You do have *anantya* between two thoughts. There is *anantya*; there is nothing to limit the *anantya* and *caitanya*. Therefore there is *anantya*, in a great *sukha* there is *anantya*. *Anantya* is there, but then, there is no such thing as I am the entire creation because the entire creation is not available for a given mind. *Vrtti apaksagatva* is there. The entire *vrtti* at once cannot be seen. If one thought occupies your mind at this time, all other things are elbowed out. And therefore, wherever a *mithya apeksa* is there, the entirety is not there, except if you just accept the recognition of *viditam aviditam iti*. That kind of *vrtti* is there, *sarvam viditam aviditam* is there, with reference to which you can see the absence of separation, the difference not being there.

With reference to any one thing you take as *viditam aviditam*, that is *sarvam*. That is why whether one thought is there, the thought is of a given object, or the thought is of a complex of objects, or one object with one thought, or the whole universe as you can see, if that is the occupation of your mind, then it is a thought with reference to which I settle account with *aham drk aham drisya*. Outside also I see the same thing. There is no *antara*, dividing line. That is how the *anantya* is able to be seen.

Even from the standpoint of *kala*, time, the moment you think of the past, the past also is a *drisya*. The future also is a *drisya*. The present if it has a length of time, the present also is a *drisya*. Even though the length of time of now is anybody's guess. That's why when somebody says "Now I am coming", they usually come after ten minutes. His concept of time is ten minutes. When you use the word "now" again a certain length of time is involved. When you say, "right now" it is again *drisya*.

If a length of time is not there, there is no *drisya*. There is no event either. Your self alone is there; there is nothing else. If 'now' has a length of time, you take it as a *drisya*. Past is taken, *drisya*; present is taken, *drisya*; future is taken, *drisya*. Therefore, from the standpoint of *kala*, there again you find yourself in that *kala* as the awarer, *drk*, of *kala*. Between the *kala drk* and the *kala drisya*, again there is no *bheda*, *antara* is not there. It is *kalatah*, *deshtaya* .

Then, *vastu*, any object you take, between the object and the *atma caitanya*, there is no *beda*. In-between there is nothing. If there is nothing in-between, there is nothing to divide the *drk* from the *drisya*. Therefore, *kalatah*, *deshatah*, *vastutah* - there is no question of any kind of in-between between *drk* and *drisya*, any *beda*. That is what we call *anantam*. Therefore the recognition is clear, the absence of the dividing line, if there is a contemplation on this basis, it is seeing the absence of a dividing line between *drisya* and *drk*. That will settle the issue. If between the *drisya* and the *drk*, if you go after the dividing line, that will be interesting. You can sit there with eyes open and watch between *drk* and *drisya* the dividing line. That will be very interesting. And so, that's the *anantya*. There is nothing that can really limit the *aham*. There is no limiting factor at any time. No world can limit, because there is no such thing as being separate from the *drk*.

Om tat sat.