

Samādhi
Part Two
Swami Dayananda Saraswati²

We have two types of meditation. One is internal (*antah*) and is with reference to any thought that occurs; the other is external (*bahih*) and involves any object perceived outside.

Let us look at the external (*bahih*). We have seen that any given thing “is” (*asti*) and as an object of consciousness, it shines (*bhāti*). When you say that space “is” it means space consciousness is. Space, the object, shines as an object of consciousness. You can convert that sentence into “Space consciousness is.” Space shines as an object of consciousness. “Shines” means it is revealed as an object of consciousness, like this body “shines” for your eyes to see. If this body does not shine, that means it is not visible. If there is no light coming from this body, then you cannot see it. This body is seen because it is bathed in light. This is what we mean when we say “*bhāti*”—shines. Really speaking, this body does not shine of its own accord. It shines in light from another source, a light that lights up this body. This body reflects that light; it throws back the light, and that is how it shines. If it absorbs the light, then it becomes a black hole, where matter is so dense that even light does not bounce back. But this body reflects light and, therefore, the body “shines”. In Sanskrit we have two words: “shines” (*bhāti*) and “shines after” (*anubhāti*), literally translated (*anu* means after). In this example, the light shines (*bhāti*) and the body also “shines”, but shines after, *anubhāti*. The sun *bhāti*, but the moon *anubhāti*. See the difference. The sun shines; the moon reflects the light, and therefore, *anubhāti*, shines after. Any object about which you say “is”, also “shines” (*bhāti*).

What is *bhāti*? Brahman “is”, Brahman *bhāti*, and everything else is *anubhāti*. Your mind— *anubhāti*. Your eyes, the pair of eyes— *anubhāti*. The pair of ears— *anubhāti*. Then the objects of the eyes, objects of the ears, every one of them, *anubhāti*. Every object *anubhāti*. Then what shines (*bhāti*)? That which is self-existent, self-revealing, the consciousness that is, that alone *bhāti*, *asti*. The meaning of both *asti* and *bhāti* is one consciousness. Consciousness is; it is self-existent and self-revealing. Shining after consciousness alone is the mind. The mind shines, the eyes shine, ears shine, all sense organs shine, and their objects all shine. Therefore, who lights up the whole thing, the *jagat*? Brahman. Brahman not only is the existence of

¹ Published in the Arsha Vidya Gurukulam 17th Anniversary Souvenir, 2003

² From classes on *Patanjali Yoga Sutras* at Arsha Vidya Gurukulam, Saylorsburg, September 2001., transcribed and edited by Constance DiMartino.

everything, lending existence or being to everything; Brahman lights up everything. That “is” that is Brahman also reveals everything through the mind and senses.

This Brahman is just you, the conscious being. Naturally, therefore, it is present in the subject who recognizes the object, as well as in the object. The object shines because there is awareness or consciousness, and existence involved there. And the onlooker or observer, the knower, also is consciousness. The knower “is” and that “is” is consciousness Brahman. The knower is conscious because of the presence of consciousness. Then whatever makes a knower a knower, and the known the known—this division—is *mithyā*. It is like our dream. There is a knower and a known there, but on waking, we understand that there is no real knower-known division. Once we are awake we are not afraid of that knower-known division because we understand that it is not real. Here too, we are not trying to eliminate the knower/known. We understand that the knower who is me is consciousness, that is Brahman, and the known also is consciousness that is Brahman. The knowledge whereby the known is known is not going to be any different. It also is the same consciousness, which is Brahman. Therefore, the knower, the known, and the knowledge—all three—are one Brahman. This is wholeness, limitlessness. The knower is not limited by the known, nor is the known limited by the knower, because both have their being in the same Brahman that is consciousness. Therefore, the knower/known do not add anything to that one limitless consciousness. Remove them, and it is limitless consciousness, add them, limitless consciousness. Add waves to the ocean and it is ocean; remove the waves, and still it is ocean. To infinity you add a number and it is still infinity. You remove a given number from infinity and still it is infinity. The knower, known, and knowledge do not really count. What counts is only one thing and that is *satyam* Brahman.

It is limitless, and this is called *ānanda*. This is what, experientially, you love to have. Limitlessness is the nature of *sat* and *cit* but it is taken for limited, and therefore, in your self-experience, you miss only the limitless. You don’t miss existence; you miss limitless existence. You don’t miss consciousness; you miss the recognition of limitless consciousness. That means that what is missing is a recognition of the limitless. Therefore, the seeking is not for “is”, existence, it is only for continuity of that existence. The seeking is not for consciousness; the seeking is only for knowledge because I conclude that I am ignorant. Really speaking, I am limitless consciousness—I am not ignorant. Once I conclude that I am ignorant, then I have to be knowledgeable. But the more I know, the more I come to know how much I don’t know. This is called *saṃsāra*. The conclusion that I am ignorant never goes away. The conclusion itself, however, is wrong. I am limitless consciousness, which is neither knowledge nor ignorance.

Knowledge shines after consciousness; ignorance also shines after consciousness. Ignorance “is”, and that “is” is Brahman; it is consciousness. Knowledge “is”, and that “is” is Brahman, that is consciousness.

This means that we are always seeking limitlessness from different standpoints. That limitlessness is what is called *ānanda*. In terms of time there is limitlessness. I can't accept the fact that I am a mortal. That is why if anybody dies, we cannot accept that. We think that person is totally gone. In one way it is true; in another way it is not true. Only what can go, goes; what is, always is.

This erroneous conclusion about myself as limited is a very well-entrenched conclusion. All that I am seeking is so that I can be secure. In fact, there is nothing more secure than myself. Any security is because of my presence; I give being to everything. I am not subject to time; time itself is given a being because of this presence, *sat*. I want to live a day more, without being ignorant and unhappy. Why? Happiness is my nature. Ignorance is not my nature; consciousness is my nature. And I want to live because I conclude that I am a mortal, time-bound, but I am timelessness itself. Therefore, I can say “I am existence, consciousness which is limitless,” (*saccidānando'ham*). That is why any object that evokes that pleased person and is able to suspend, for the time being, the notion that I am unhappy, inadequate, insecure—that object becomes an object of love, of like. And you love the object so much that you hold on to it and end up strangling it, because the need and pressure to have it is so great. This is why we have books with titles like, “The Woman Who Loves Too Much,” or “The Man Who Loves Too Much.” The need and pressure come from a wrong conclusion. Basically the problem is spiritual, but psychologically also, there is a certain reality which we accept.

These three, *asti*, *bhāti*, *priyam*, constitute Brahman. They are the *lakṣaṇas*, the words which reveal one Brahman that is myself, limitless consciousness which is. Everything else is dependent for its existence upon me—not upon Brahman, but upon me, because Brahman is me. There is no other Brahman. The self, *ātman*, is Brahman. I am *ātman-brahman*. Everything shines after me, and therefore, I am all-pervasive in the sense that both subject and object, essentially, are the same.

If this is understood, I have words of the *śāstra* to work with to reinforce my understanding of this fact. This is *śabda-anuvidha-savikalpa-samādhī*. In this practice we focus on the meaning of a given word from the *śāstra*, like *pūrṇa*. The self is *pūrṇa*; Brahman is *pūrṇa*

(*ātmā pūrṇaḥ brahma pūrṇam*) What does *pūrṇa* mean? *Pūrṇa* is that which fills up everything, the whole. What is the whole? How do you see yourself as the whole. You don't look around you and think, "There also I am; there also I am." Though the *śāstra* says that above, below, left, right (*ūrdvam adah dakṣiṇathaḥ uttaraḥ*) all that is here is one Brahman, you don't try to see Brahman to the right of you, Brahman, to the left, etc. That would mean that there is such a thing as left and there is such a thing as right. There is no right and left; it depends on which direction you are facing. These are referential words. What is said here is that the subject, the object and the knowledge of subject/object—all three—are *pūrṇa*. This is true all the time. All are one. When you hear, when you see, when you smell, when you taste, when you touch, when you think of an object, what is thought of, the very thought and the thinker, what you see—the seen, the sight, the seer—all three are one. The heard, the hearing and the hearer; the word and its meaning and the one who understands the meaning, all three are one— *pūrṇa*, the whole. Therefore, this is called *śabda-anuvidha*.

What does it accomplish when you say "I am the whole, *pūrṇo'ham*"? The feeling, "I am small; I am insignificant; I am persecuted by the world," is negated. For the world to persecute you, you must be different from the world. There must be a persecuting world and you, the persecuted person. Everyone has some sense of persecution because as a helpless baby everyone felt persecuted. There is a sense of persecution that is natural to everybody. Even the child that is highly protected, highly cared for by his mother and father, still feels persecution. That is because if an ant or insect crawls on or bites the baby, it cannot do anything; it is helpless. These small creatures persecute the baby. That is the baby's feeling, and it is a wordless feeling, so it is more difficult to remove. With cognitive words you cannot remove those feelings. Cognitive words can remove wrong cognitions that are due to wrong understanding, which can be verbalized. Something that cannot be verbalized cannot be removed by words. It is a feeling—the baby's feeling, without language. That is why you cannot remove these feelings through language. And those feelings have to come out. How do they come out? They come out all the time in the underlying, non-verbal feeling, "This world persecutes me," in the feeling that somebody is taking advantage of me. It is the baby's feeling, which comes out in an adult form, highly verbalized, and argued. This is the reason for the necessity for contemplation. Therefore, I contemplate. *Pūrṇo'ham*, and in that *pūrṇa* I include this feeling of being persecuted. I am not standing against the feeling. When the feeling of persecution comes, the feeling *pūrṇo'ham*, I am *paraṁ brahma*, is also there. You should be able to say that. The feeling is Brahman; the feeler is Brahman, the felt is Brahman. This is contemplation. Here you are not avoiding anything; this

is the beauty of it. You are not avoiding anything. It serves as a therapy, too, because you are not denying anything. You are not playing the role of a survivor, either; you welcome the feelings. A survivor cannot welcome feelings of being persecuted, etc. You are able to welcome the feelings because of the cognition that you are *pūrṇa*. The cognition gives you that welcoming attitude. You can say, “I am not afraid of the feeling because the feeling is me—I cannot be afraid of it.” This is the cognitive space, the space that is given to me by the cognition *pūrṇo’ham*. Therefore, I welcome all feelings in my practice of meditation, or contemplation. I welcome the feelings. The feeling is me, the felt is me, the feeler is me. Then who am I? I am neither the feeler, nor the feeling, nor the felt. Only then can I be all three. If I am all three, then I can transcend all three; I am the truth of all three.

When you say “I am the whole, *pūrṇo’ham*,” you can highlight this *pūrṇa* with reference to a feeling, or with reference to an object outside, the external world (*jagat*). You take any one object and see that it is yourself. Take something that bothers you, and then the feeling of being bothered, both of them, and bring to bear your understanding of *pūrṇa*. This is what we mean by being everything (*sarvātma-bhāva*)—“I am everything,” the understanding of which comes later. Here, *pūrṇo’ham* is contemplation, and is called *śabda-anuvidha-savikalpa-samādhi*. *Śabda* is a word, not a sound. As a sound, *śabda* is something different; here *śabda* is a word that you have come to understand through the *Vedānta-sāstra*. Only for the one who has understood, who has been exposed to the teaching does it have meaning. For a person who does not have that understanding, it has no meaning. It is important to appreciate that it is not just a word whose meaning I know. The word has to be handled properly so that it reveals what is *pūrṇa*. Otherwise, you will look around and say “I am *pūrṇa*.” One swami asked me this question: “Swamiji, I understand Vedanta very well, but one thing—how can I feel all- pervasive?” He wants to feel all-pervasive. There was a buffalo standing there, and the swami asked this question: “How can I feel that I am there in the buffalo also?” Why should you feel that you are in the buffalo? He wants to see the buffalo and have the experience of being a buffalo. What we have to know there is the ‘isness’. The buffalo ‘is’. That ‘is’ is me. In the name and form (*nāma-rūpa*) of buffalo, that ‘is’ is me. Whatever the trappings—your body, mind, senses—they are all *nāma-rūpa*. Any given thing is like that. This is how you are all-pervasive, being the *satyam* of everything. Therefore, only for the person who has understood the *sāstra* is there contemplation.

That is why in the *Yoga-sāstra*, *yama* and *niyama* are the most important steps. They give you a way of living. In the *niyama*, Patanjali includes study of the *sāstra* (*svādhyāya*) and an attitude of surrender to the Lord (*īśvara-prannidhāna*). That assures you of everything—this knowledge, and all the preparation you require for it. Some disciplines are mentioned—*āsana*, *prāṇāyāma* and *pratyāhara*—that may assure your readiness for everything. Since there was no fully prepared student (*adhikāri*), yoga came into the picture. Even in the Upanisads, we have a lot of yoga, because it is acknowledged that nobody is a total *adhikāri*. That person exists only on paper. He heard, and the teacher was able to teach clearly, and said, “You are Brahman.” Enough care was taken that it was understood and the person got up enlightened, and went away. That is only on paper. But that possibility has to be there, because only then is it established that the Veda is a means of knowledge (*pramāṇa-siddhi*) for this. We can prove it is a means of knowledge only by operating it. You open your eyes and you see. The eyes prove that they are a means of seeing, and you don’t require any other proof. The teaching is there, you are already Brahman, and the teaching tells you, “You are Brahman,” for these reasons. You see it, and you get up and go. Then it’s a *pramāṇa*. But nobody gets up like that. What does that mean? Either it is not a *pramāṇa* or there is a lack of preparedness. A lack of preparedness is the reason. This preparedness is what is given by the *Yoga-sāstra*. But it does not cover only the preparedness. It gives you an insight, but even if you gain a certain insight cognitively, still, there can be a residual problem.

The problem of *saṃskāras*—non-verbalized feelings—remains. Therefore, we spend our time in contemplation, without a break (*nayet kālaṃ nirantaram*) until it is no longer necessary. By the practice of *śabda-anuvidha-savikalpa-samādhi*, spend your time contemplating on *pūrno’ham*. You do this contemplation for some months, then you take one more word. There should be no hurry in this. Then you take another word. In a three-year course we take the words, one by one. After spending some time on *pūrno’ham*, next I will take “I am free from everything, *asaṅgo’ham*.” After *pūrna* the word *asaṅga* will work. The object is myself. I see that clearly. The object is not outside consciousness. Outside *satyam*, nothing exists, and the knowledge of the object is but the same limitless consciousness, which ‘is’. The knower of the object is the same consciousness alone, as in a dream. If all ‘three’ are one limitless consciousness, the limitless consciousness remains unaffected by the known or the knowledge or the knower. It transcends all three. The clay cannot complain, “I am weighed down by the pot.” The clay cannot complain, “I know I am clay, but this pot is sitting upon me.” It is not sitting

upon it; the pot is clay. Then why can't we say that the clay is the pot? No. The pot is clay, but the clay is not the pot.

Do you know what happened then? The big pot noticed that the small pot was happy, and said, "Hey, midget, why are you happy today?" Then the small pot said, "I am not a midget."

"How come? You are a midget."

"No."

"If you are not a midget, then who are you? You seem to be happy." Then the midget asks, "Are you unhappy?"

"Yes, I am unhappy. I have no job satisfaction, sitting here."

"You are confused."

"I am confused?"

"Yes, you are confused," said the small pot. "Confused about what?"

"About yourself."

"I am confused about myself?"

"Yes, you are confused about yourself."

"How can I remove that confusion?" Then the midget said, "You have to listen."

"To whom?"

"To your teacher."

"Is there a teacher available here?"

"Yes, I can teach you."

Then the small pot has to tell the big pot, "You are clay; you are not affected by the pot form. The pot is weightless." If the object is you, how is it going to affect you? It cannot, unless there are two things. One plus *mithyā* is still one. How is it going to be affected? The H₂O is not affected by being a wave or a breaker or surf—H₂O continues. *Sat cit ānanda* is like H₂O. The object is *sat cit ānanda*. Unaffected *sat cit ānanda*, cannot-be-affected *sat cit ānanda*, sustaining the object, sustaining the knowledge of the object, the cognitive thought, and the cognizer—all three—is called *pūrṇa*. And the outcome is "I am *asaṅga*." What does it do? All the conclusions like, "I am subject to likes and dislikes, *rāga-dveṣa*; I am subject to sadness; I am subject to hurt; I am subject to guilt," are taken care of by saying *asaṅgo'ham*. Not merely saying, but seeing the meaning of *asaṅgo'ham*. Then you do meditation on *asaṅgo'ham* for a length of time. We have different notions about ourselves, and for every notion, you bring in the antidote, which is reality. The reality of the self is highlighted with reference to a given notion. Thereby, all notions are taken care of. This is what they mean by "*nayet kalam nirantaram*." This practice of *savikalpa-samādhi* is also called *jñāna-abhyāsa*, or *brahma-abhyāsa*.