
I AM THE MOST SIGNIFICANT

Swami Dayananda

Abstract

In samskrtam the means of knowledge is called pramanam. Prama means knowledge. Ma also means knowledge, pramakaranam pramanam. The means for knowledge is called pramanam. Sensory perception and witness perception are called pratyaksa. The colour and the form become evident to you because of your eyes. Colour doesn't become evident to you if your eyes are colour blind. When you say that a thing exists, it exists because you happen to know. The objects in the world do not have a capacity to reveal themselves without your knowing them through the appropriate means of knowledge. In our iastra, a beautiful imagery is employed to drive home this idea. You have eyes that are capable of sight. The Swami standing on the dias is an existential fact. But still, if the Swami was not available for reflecting light, you would not be able to see the Swami, since the body is not self-radiant and also because your eyes cannot perceive anything without picking up light. Sight is always in terms of picking up light. You will not be able to see me unless this body reflects light. If my body is self radiating, then I would not require the body to reflect any light.

Keywords: samskrtam, pramanam, pratyaksa, iastra, bhakti, anubhati.

In samskrtam there are these two words - bhakti, meaning shines and anubhati, shines after. We have to know these. Anu is a prefix whose literal meaning is 'after'. So this physical body does not shine on its own. But it is lighted. It shines after the light above me. Therefore, the physical body is anubhati, whereas the light is bhati. We will use these two words to cover a few things that we know. The eyes can pick up both bhati and anubhati.

You can pick up anything that is bhati and also everything that is anubhati. The sun bhati – shines without requiring any other light. The eyes can see the sun. But the moon cannot be seen by us due to its being opaque. It has to shine after the sun. All objects which are opaque in nature, themselves being not self-radiant, are picked up by us only in terms of reflected light. Therefore all of them depend upon – note this sentence – another source of light to reveal themselves. The chair on which you are sitting, comes to light reflecting a light from above. Thus the entire world, except the self luminous objects like fire, the sun, the stars, lamp or bulb and even a glow worm, shines after. Each luminous body shines, bhati. Once this imagery is clear, we can now take off. These sources of light like sun etc. do not reveal themselves to me if my eyes do not have light. Here, the word light is used in a different connotation. In the light of the sun my eyes see objects. The sun itself, being self-luminous, doesn't need an external source of light to illuminate it. But if the eyes are blind, the sun is not going to be bright for me. Though the sun is self luminous, it is not luminous enough to enter into me as an object of light unless I

happen to light up the sun. Therefore, if the sun has to be a luminous existent object for me, it has to become an object of my eye sight. So the light in my eyes lights up the sun. The light in my eyes is not physical light. It is a light which helps me perceive. It is unlike the other light that we know. It is a light of perception. It is the light of awareness. I am aware of the sun and therefore, the light in my eyes is the light of awareness because of which I am aware of the sun, moon, stars etc.

A story that comes to my mind here is of Lord Krsna as a boy. He asked his mother:

"Mother please give me a cup".

Mother Yasoda gave a cup to Krsna and then asked him,

"What do you want the cup for?" "I want to drink milk".

"I am sorry there is no milk now".

"Please tell me when will it be available?"

"At night".

"What is night?"

"Night is darkness" she said. Then Krsna stretched his hand with the cup saying, "Give me milk". His eyes were closed!

It is true. If your eyes are closed darkness has come. The boasting sun and the flashing lightning do not come to light unless my eyes light them up. The entire world of forms and colours comes to light in the light of my eyes. That is why the Upanisad says there is an eye within your eye – "caksusah caksuh". The light in your eyes lights up all colours and forms. There is a light behind your ear which lights up all the sounds and symphonies. The music that we hear is lighted up by the light of the ears. Where is music if this auditory organ is not there? There is a light behind each sense organ that lights up the world of sound, the world of smell etc. The entire world of sensory perception has to be lighted up, because it cannot enter into me by itself *jadatmakatvat svayam*. It is *jada* in the sense that it is opaque. Therefore the world comes to light, shining after the light in my sense organs. Therefore we should say *indriyasamuham bhati*.

But our sastra says *indriyasamuham tu na bhati, anubhati* - the sense organs do not themselves shine, but shine after. If each one of them *bhati*, shines by itself, it can never be objectified. But you do objectify and know it. These eyes and ears shine after a light behind them. When you are listening to this talk you need not hear me all the time, even though you have the capacity to hear, for in between your mind can go elsewhere. I may trigger off a line of thinking in your mind and you cease to hear. Why? The mind is elsewhere. How many times your eyes draw blank? There are objects passing but you don't notice any one of them because, you are worried about something else. Your mind is committed elsewhere. A mind committed elsewhere, is not behind the senses. That is the reason why you eat and wonder whether you ate!

When your mind is not there you don't even taste what is on the tongue. The mind has to be on the tongue if the sense of taste has to appreciate the taste. Thus indriyasamuham, the group of senses na bhati but anubhdti. Manah bhati, the mind shines. Is that true? You will never be able to see a thought if the mind shines itself. If the mind is the subject it will not be available for objectification. You will never know what happens in your mind. If you don't know what's happening in your mind, you will not know what's happening outside too. After all, perception is in terms of what happens in your mind. As it often happens, if there is a rope in front and if what you see inside is a snake, you will see only the snake not the rope. You see what your mind projects. Why? It is because, you don't see the world more than what occurs in the mind. Your counter to encounter the world is only in terms of what happens in your mind. Manah na bhati;- manah anubhdti. The mind shines after. Whether it is memory or a piece of knowledge or even ignorance, any emotion, every thought shines after. Who shines? Aham dtmd bhati. T, dtmd shines while everything else only shines after – anubhati. Therefore everything else is unlike atmd.

I am unlike anything

Veddnta is not speculative. It states the facts as they are. "Na tatra suryo bhati na candratdrakam na imd vidyuto bhdnti kutah ayam agnih, the sun, moon, stars and even the flashy lightning do not light up whom and because of whom all these come to light, tameua bhdntam anubhdti sarvam that alone shines, being there all the time. It does not have a comparison. This is a very important fact to solve some of our psychological problems. All our psychological problems will remain solved, if this fact is understood, as we will see. There is nothing like dtmd. In fact, even in English as in other languages, we have this particular fact revealed in common expressions. If you analyse any language there are pronouns. That which stands for a noun is a pronoun, like 'He'. It's very important in every language, otherwise it's a problem as you see here :- Rama broke the bow. Rama married Sita. Rama went to the forest. Rama lost Sita. Rama asked the trees. Rama went to Lanka. Rama killed

Rama, Rdma This won't even sound like a schoolboy's composition. You must have pronouns. Rama went to the forest. He ... That's how we use a pronoun. We have pronouns like he, she, it, you, I, etc. Now, I just want you to look into this a little bit. How many 'he's are available in this world? From your dog to God we use the word 'He'. We use the word 'He' to any male. The word 'She' can stand for any female, from a river onwards to Mother Kali. We have the word 'It' to denote a neuter object. Thus you find there are many objects for 'He'; there are many objects for 'She'; there are a million objects for 'It'; there are many objects for 'You'. I can use the word 'You', to address any of you. Whereas in how many places can you use the word T? The word T can be used by you to denote only one entity, yourself. - The locus for T is only yourself. It does not have any other locus. That is why I told you I

am significant. I thought I was insignificant. But, just simply by analysing the very language that we use, I see myself as being very significant because there is no one else whom I can call T. Therefore, there is only one locus for T, and everything else is other than T. I am not insignificant. I am significant.

I am free from complexes

Therefore, how can T become a subject for a complex? Aham bhumi, I shine - atma anubhati essentially. Sarvam anubhati - everything else anubhati. How can you develop a complex, please? You are whatever you are. If you are the sole occupant on this earth can you develop a complex? What is a complex? It is always born of comparison. Without comparison, you can't develop a complex. If there is another person who has a more shapely nose than yours, complex comes. For a complex there must be comparison and the comparison is not between dissimilars. It is always between members of the same species. A human being is not going to develop a complex comparing himself with a water-buffalo, nor does he become jealous on seeing a rock. Whether it is sunshine or thunderstorm, the rock sits like a rock at peace with itself. It doesn't have any agitation whether we sit on it or spit on it. Nor does it want to become different. But if you are a musician and another person is a Rock Star you can become jealous. There is a lot of difference between a musician and a singer. A singer can sing a song but can't teach music. A musician can sing but at the same time make another person a musician.

Here is a musician, who has learnt music for years whereas the Rock Star singer can just sing some songs. But the modern day Rock Star gathers a huge mass of people unlike the musician. The musician can become jealous of the Rock-Stars. The Rolling Stones who gather masses! That is because comparison is always between similars. Whose similar to you now? Only one person, T, bhati while everything else anubhdti. The body, mind etc. shine after T, dtmd, awareness. I do not objectify another dtmd, even if I know how to /read your mind or inferentially objectify your mind. There is only one dtmd. That is yourself and everything else is not dtmd. Therefore how can you have any complex unless you take what shines after, anubhdti, as the dtmdl. If the physical body - sarira - is taken to be bhati, the one that is dtmd, then you have had it! Then you have a locus for all complexes since there is not just one physical body available. There are many and different types of bodies. There is a body which seems to have a certain gait about it. There is a body which is fat. There is a body which is tall. There are varieties of bodies and if you see them you can develop a complex like "I am not beautiful".

Body-Mind-Sense-Complex is Always Wanting

Well, when I take the physical body as T, in spite of my looking at the body like anything else, I begin to compare because there are many bodies. But if the 'T' is placed where it should be, and then I have a special relationship with this body. At

the most I can say "this is my body" but I can never say body is T. "My house" is different from T being the house. If I am as good as the physical body then all the limitations of the physical body, would be mine and no physical body is free from limitations. Health wise it is limited. On the lines of concepts of beauty also the body is wanting. From the standpoint of longevity it is mortal. It's again found wanting. Since the body includes senses and the mind, I am found wanting from the standpoints of knowledge and skill too. If I know more and more I understand more of what I do not know. Ignorance is bliss only if it is total. But I am ignorant and I know I am ignorant. From the standpoint of the power of memory, I am of course wanting. If I am asked, what was eaten for lunch on April 3rd, I won't remember.

If this karya-karana-sanghata or the physical body-mind-sense-complex is I, I am wanting and I am insignificant. No psychology, or psychotherapy can be of help because "I am insignificant" becomes a fact. Psychology deals only with the emotional person. It is not going to shift the person. Naturally the same insignificance will continue to be there. They will only validate your emotions. That is psychology. It's helpful alright for people to become normal. And to be sad is normal. To be angry is normal. To be complaining is normal. Everything is normal. That is psychology, for people who are abnormal and for those who see more than what things are; they require therapy. But then you are normal and still insignificant. Where is the solution in psychology? In the vision of Vedanta, there is no problem at all because you - atma, are the only one that bhakti. Not only this, Vedanta equates this atma to Paramesvara, the Lord and $tat tvam asi$ is an equation. That is the ultimate equation. Look at this equation, $e = mc^2$ where m stands for matter, c represents the speed of light and ' e ' stands for energy, Energy is formless. Matter has form. The formful matter is equal to formless energy. How? It is because the form is only 'mithya', but the essential thing is energy. Similarly, here is an equation. The formless awareness, T shines like the sun shines. Even as the sunlight is necessary for seeing an opaque object so too the light of awareness, atma, is necessary for my mind, senses and the world to shine. Look at this situation. I am standing now in front of you.

This is the world for you now. This object, the body shines as an object of awareness. In the light of awareness of your eyes the world comes to light. The senses themselves are backed by the mind which in turn is backed by awareness. The mind undergoes change. Awareness doesn't undergo any change.

In Vedanta there is another example used by one of the darsanas. This awareness is like a theatre lamp - *ndaka-dipa*. It is like a lamp on the stage. Think of an auditorium which is semi circular, where there is a stage. On the stage stands a *nartaki*, dancer, with accompaniments. There is music going on. The person who has organised this, is also on the stage in a corner. There is an audience in front. This is

the scene. The dancer dances. When she dances not only is there dance but also a lot of communication. The eyes, the lips, hands, hand-gestures and posture, all communicate. She communicates different rasas. There is viryam, valour; bhaya, fright; srngdra, love; hasyam, laughter; sauryam, courage and soka, sorrow. She conveys all these varieties of emotions. This is the imagery. Look at the scene here. There is only one very bright, beautiful lamp in the theatre. This huge lamp lights up the stage and also lights up the audience. Here everything anubhdti. Atma is like the theatre lamp, the buddhi is considered to be the dancer; the senses are like the accompaniments. Buddhi dances to their tune. When there is something nice seen, there is an emotion. If there is something bad seen, there is another type of emotion.

The audience is the world. The dancer, the buddhi, goes on changing. Now coy and shy; now brave and bold; now all love and laughter. There are varieties of emotions during the day for this buddhi. It goes on changing, but the sdxsi dtmd does not undergo any change, whatsoever. Kutasthah - kutavat tisthati iti kutasthah. It is like a kuta which means an anvil. The anvil is a block of iron which itself does not undergo any change. You bring the various bits of heated iron, and beat them to any shape that you want. They undergo change due to the hammer blows but not the kuta. Similarly all these changes are lighted by that light of awareness which never undergoes any change.

You Are Detached

It is asanga, detached. You don't have to detach yourself from anything. You are the solution already. Only when you are attached, you need to detach yourself. The very anxiety for detachment is an attachment. Why do you want to detach? It is because you think you are attached. That means even if you are detached you are going to be attached. You are already detached. The awareness doesn't take on to itself anything that happens in the mind. Let there be muck or junk, but still the junk belongs to the mind. Awareness lights up the mind. • It stands ever detached. It's not away from the mind, it's very much with the mind. At the same time, remains untouched, like space, which is very much with the world but keeps itself pure. There is no spatial pollution even though we talk of space pollution. It's only pollution of the atmosphere. Space is always nirmala and very much with the world but stands untouched. Similarly atma which can only be pure light of awareness remains ever untouched.

All these different words are lighted up by one single light. The mind undergoes change as the words are different, and as they are understood. The light of awareness always lights up. Even the subject ahankara is an assumed status. That also anubhuti. The nature of the subject is pure simple awareness. What form does it have? The formless is atma. When you say 'I am' you mean 'asmi', which is 'am' in English 'aham asmi' means 'I am', 'I exist'.

By what means of knowledge do I say 'I exist'? I don't require any means of knowledge because I am self-evident, even as I don't require a flash light or a torch to find out whether the sun is up or not. I am self-evident. And everything else is evident to the self. Because of being self-evident it is self-existent. Its existence is self-revealing. That is called self-existent. The existence of I or the existence of awareness is by awareness being there. The awareness revealing itself is called self-existence. Therefore I am self-existent. I am self-evident awareness free from any form. What form can you impute to this awareness. It has no form. Even for the light you can't give any form. What form would you give to this awareness which lights up all forms. Formless awareness!

If this is formless how big is this awareness? What's its height, volume, dimension and width? If it is awareness which lights up this body, what is its height? Being formless, it has no height, no width nor any dimension. It is formless like space. Awareness is that because of which I am aware of space and time. In the framework of time and space I light up the jagat. Awareness has no dimensions whatsoever. This is Vedanta. Ayam dtmd is brahma. Desatah limitless. Spatially there is no location for awareness because it is limitless. In fact, the whole world that you see is in the same awareness alone. Your physical body, the world, space and time, are in awareness. They are all shining in awareness. They have their being in awareness. Therefore awareness is limitless. Limitless is called Brahma.

The word Brahma comes from a root as many words in Samskrtam do. Brhi - vrddhau. The root Brh is used in the sense of something big. The word brahma is a neuter noun. This means something big. The noun stands for an object and it is big. If I use the word 'big' as an adjective qualifying a noun then you will have something like "Brhan Mumbai", Greater Bombay. Brhat is an adjective. An adjective has to qualify a noun to distinguish the noun from the other nouns of the same species, If I say "blue lily" there are lilies that are red, yellow and violet in colour, but this is blue. An adjective is used to distinguish the given object from other members of the same species. If every lily is blue you don't require to say, "blue lily". When we say "Brhan Mumbai", it is because there is a Bombay minus the extended areas. This is Greater Bombay which includes suburbs. But with reference to previous Bombay this is Greater Bombay "Brhan Mumbai". Suppose I say "big mountain", it is because there are smaller mountains. If I ask you to look at this big mountain, definitely you'll look upwards and say, "Oh that's a huge mountain". Now look at the big elephant. You won't look upwards unless the elephant is on the mountain. If it is on the mountain it won't look big anyway. Suppose I say, "big rat" certainly it is not as big as an elephant. If I say "look at this big mosquito", you will ask, 'Where?' It is as big as a mosquito can be. When I say, "look at this big microbe", you will have to look through a microscope. Then you will have to say "Wow! So big!"

You are Limitless

Now what is the dimension of the word 'Big'? Big is a word which indicates some dimension. We thought an adjective qualifies a noun, to distinguish the object from all other objects belonging to the same species. But now we find a noun itself seems to qualify the adjective. When it is a big mountain the bigness is as good as the mountain. If it is "big mosquito", it is as good as the mosquito alone. It's still big. When it is "big microbe" it is microscopically big. 'Big' denoting dimension is determined by the qualified noun. Our sastra Converts the word 'Big' into a noun whose meaning is big. There is nothing to qualify. There is nothing to determine. Therefore it is indeterminably big. Mahatah mahiydn. It is bigger than the biggest. It is smaller than what you can conceive as the smallest - anoh anydn. Which means it has no dimensions. It is limitless*" Therefore formless awareness brahma is limitless - limitlessly big. It is a noun whose meaning is big and its dimension is not determined by any factor. This limitlessly 'big' brahma is this atma.

Ayam atma Brahma. This is Veddnta. Ayam is that which is always the shining self-evident T which is Brahma. Therefore now you find the meaning of the word T is very significant. Seeing this fact is cognitive. In psychology also a change is brought about cognitively. If there is a certain abnormal behaviour, there is a cause buried in the childhood. You surface those causes, relate properly and develop a distance. This again is cognitive. But we go one step further. That one step takes me to the Infinite. What a step is it! It is a step where you see, that I, awareness is limitless. I am the only significant thing in this creation. Everything else is significant because of me. I won't say everything else is insignificant. Everything else is not as significant, because one svayam bhati sue mahimni tisthati - one is self-shining and it exists in its own glory while everything else only shines after this awareness which is brahman.

References

1. Speliotes, Elizabeth K., et al. "Association analyses of 249,796 individuals reveal 18 new loci associated with body mass index." *Nature genetics* 42.11 (2010): 937.
2. Reiman, Eric M., et al. "Functional brain abnormalities in young adults at genetic risk for late-onset Alzheimer's dementia." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 101.1 (2004): 284-289.
3. Møller, Ann M., et al. "Effect of preoperative smoking intervention on postoperative complications: a randomised clinical trial." *The Lancet* 359.9301 (2002): 114-117.
4. Møller, Ann M., et al. "Effect of preoperative smoking intervention on postoperative complications: a randomised clinical trial." *The Lancet* 359.9301 (2002): 114-117.