

UNITED WISDOM

You Are That: Advaita Vedanta as a Formula of Recognition

World and Consciousness

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

W31 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

You Are That: Advaita Vedanta as a Formula of Recognition

Religions · An authorial series

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

A father heats a piece of iron. His son watches. When the metal is hot, the father hands it to the son and says one and the same sentence — nine times over. He does not explain, does not argue, does not persuade. He brings the hammer of meaning down on the same spot until the spot takes shape.

The sentence is still repeated today, two and a half thousand years later, on four continents. Tat tvam asi. And that's how you are. This is not faith. Not doctrine. Not a promise. It is a pointing at what is already here, before any effort.

This article is about what Advaita Vedanta offers — not as a religion and not as a philosophy, but as a way of reading one's own experience.

I. Nine blows of the hammer

In the sixth chapter of the Chāndogya Upaniṣad, the brahmin Uddālaka talks with his son Śvetaketu. The son has just come back from his teacher's house, where he spent twelve years studying the Vedas. He is proud of what he knows. His father asks whether he ever requested from his teacher that teaching by which the unheard becomes heard, the unthought becomes thought, the unknown becomes known. The son says nothing. He knows a great deal, but not this.

The father takes his son as an interlocutor and walks him through simple experiments. He takes a lump of clay and says: everything made of clay is only clay; "clay" is a name, the differences are speech, the reality is one. He takes a banyan seed — the boy splits it open and sees nothing inside; and out of that nothing an enormous tree grows. He puts salt into water — the salt disappears, but the water is salty everywhere alike.

What was there has stayed — invisible, and everywhere.

In each of the nine examples Uddālaka ends with the same sentence: sa ya eṣo'ṇimā aitadātmyam idaṃ sarvaṃ tat satyaṃ sa ātmā tat tvam asi, Śvetaketo. Patrick Olivelle translates it: "The finest essence here — that constitutes the self of this whole world; that is the truth; that is the self (ātman). And that's how you are, Śvetaketu." (The Early Upaniṣads, Oxford University Press, 1998.)

Nine blows in one place. The same sentence, different images, different approaches — clay, the tree, salt, sleep, rivers running into the ocean, bees making honey out of different flowers. The text does not explain "and that's how you are." It shows — on household things that lie within reach of anyone — that between the witness inside and what lies at the base of the world there is no seam.

Advaita begins with this scene.

II. What it says literally

The traditional translation of tat tvam asi is "That thou art." That is how Europe read the formula from the nineteenth century onward, in Max Müller's Sacred Books of the East; that is how it is quoted in ordinary speech now. Modern Indologists — Joel Brereton, Patrick Olivelle in the Oxford translations — propose a different reading. Olivelle: "And that's how you are, Śvetaketu." Brereton: "In that way are you, Śvetaketu."

The difference is not cosmetic. "That thou art" sounds like a metaphysical equation: A equals B. "And that's how you are" sounds like a pointing: look, this is exactly how you are made. Not "two have merged into one," but "there were never two."

Uddālaka is not making a statement of identity in the logical sense. He is pointing at a structure: the finest essence of the world is your essence. Not "you will grow into This." Not "you will merge with This." There is no merging anywhere in it. Simply — look closely at who is looking.

This sentence became what the tradition calls a mahāvākya, a great utterance.

III. Four mahāvākyas: one formula, four angles

Advaita is built around four such utterances, one from each of the four Vedas. The renderings are Olivelle's.

prajñānaṃ brahma — "brahman is knowing." Aitareya Upaniṣad 3.1.3, from the Rigveda.

aham brahmāsmi — "I am brahman." Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad 1.4.10, from the Yajurveda.

tat tvam asi — "and that's how you are." Chāndogya Upaniṣad 6.8.7, from the Samaveda.

ayam ātmā brahma — "brahman is this self (ātman)." Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad 2, from the Atharvaveda.

In the traditional reading they stand as four stages of a single movement.

The first is descriptive: knowing is that ground. The second is the student's self-recognition: I am that ground. The third is the teacher's pointing: and you are so as well. The fourth is the formula of immediate recognition: this witness here is the Absolute.

Four sentences from four Vedas, set down at different times, by different schools, by different sages — repeating one gesture from different sides. Advaita will later gather them into a single teaching.

IV. What "advaita" means

The word advaita means, literally, "not two." Not "one." The grammatical distinction matters.

"One" is an assertion. It becomes an object of thought immediately, and then an "other" appears, in relation to which it is "one." "Not two" is a negation. It does not assert unity; it refuses to grant separateness.

Shankara, who systematized Advaita in the eighth century, keeps insisting on this: we do not say that there is "one being." We say that there is no place where a seam can be drawn.

Fabian Völker, following Paul Hacker, puts it more precisely. Dvaita is not "duality" but the state in which a second is present. That second is what the Upaniṣads call prapañca: the world as a proliferation of representations. Advaita therefore means that only Brahman is real, and that the world as multiplicity is not fully real — not as a fact, but as a way of describing.

V. Adhyāsa: the error of superimposition

In the preamble to his commentary on the Brahma Sūtras, Shankara introduces the notion without which Advaita cannot be understood. Adhyāsa — superimposition. It is the basic operation the human mind performs: it lays the properties of one thing over another.

The classic example: at dusk, in half-light, a man sees a rope on the path and takes it for a snake. There is no snake. But the fear is real, the body reacts, the breath goes wrong. Come closer, bring a light, and it is plain: a rope. The snake was not destroyed — it was never there. Knowledge does not create the rope. It removes the superimposition.

Shankara says we do the same thing to the witness. The witness is pure awareness, ātman. Onto it we lay the body, thoughts, emotions, a biography, a name, a profession, the fear of death. And we say: "I am tired," "I am suffering," "I was born in such a year." These are not errors of description. They are errors of address. Tiredness happens in the body, but "I" is not the body. Thought happens in the mind, but "I" is not the thought. The knowledge Advaita offers is not the acquisition of new information. It is the undoing of superimpositions.

The light in which it becomes visible that the snake is a rope.

Advaita therefore promises no attainment. There is nothing in it to attain: ātman is already here. One can only stop overlooking it.

VI. Neti, neti: the method of subtraction

The method of Advaita is called neti, neti — "not this, not this." It first appears systematically in the Bṛhadāraṇyaka: to every possible candidate for "I" the tradition answers with a negation. Am I the body? The body changes, falls ill, sleeps, can be described from outside — and the witness cannot be described. Not the body. Am I the feelings? Feelings come and go, I observe them. Not the feelings. Am I the thoughts? Thoughts arise and vanish, I remain. Not the thoughts. Am I the mind? The mind is a current. Am I the memory? Memory is contents.

Ramana Maharshi, the twentieth-century Indian teacher, states this with almost engineering precision. In the archive's rendering: “The gross body made of seven elements is not I; the five organs of perception apprehending sound, touch, color, taste, and smell are not I; the five organs of action are not I; the five vital airs are not I; even the thinking mind is not I; even the state of ignorance without objects is not I. If I am none of these, who am I? After rejecting all of them as ‘not this, not this,’ only that Awareness remains: that is I.”

Nisargadatta Maharaj goes further in *I Am That*: even the feeling “I am” is eventually relinquished. The archive renders his point as: “‘I am’ is the last door. Once you pass through it, you become what ‘I am’ was pointing toward.”

The method of subtraction does not arrive at emptiness. It arrives at what is left when everything observable has been subtracted. At the witness. At ātman.

VII. The witness and the seen

Here Advaita introduces a distinction that will later become central in many traditions. There is dṛśya — what is seen. And there is draṣṭṛ — the one who sees.

Everything that can be named, described, located, measured belongs to dṛśya. Body, emotion, thought, biography, fear, joy, the stream of consciousness, the very notion "I" — all of it is the contents of experience. The draṣṭṛ is not contents. It is that before which contents appear.

Swami Sarvapriyananda, in a lecture given at Harvard, makes the argument this way: Vedanta does not ask us to begin from mystical experience, because most of us have none. It asks us to begin from the ordinary — waking, dreaming, deep sleep. What stays the same across all three? Not the contents; those change. The one who witnesses them. And that is precisely what we take for "I," without noticing that we are confusing the witness with what is seen.

The method of Advaita is to step back one pace. Not to "get into" the witness, but to notice that the witness is the one who has been looking the whole time.

VIII. Turīya: the fourth state

The Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad, the shortest of the principal Upaniṣads, describes four states of consciousness.

jāgrat — waking, the perception of outer objects.

svapna — dreaming, the perception of inner objects.

suṣupti — deep sleep without dreams; there are no objects, but there is "I fell asleep, I slept, I woke."

turīya — literally, "the fourth." Not a separate state but the ground of the other three; what does not change when the three change.

Gauḍapāda, the teacher of Shankara's teacher, is quoted in the Russian archive as saying in the *Māṇḍūkya Kārikā*: "Turīya does not appear in the other three states, but illuminates them all." This is the archive's wording, not a newly checked quotation.

This is an important turn. Turīya does not come and does not go. Waking gives way to sleep, sleep gives way to waking — and the witnessing of those changes does not itself change. This, says Advaita, is ātman.

Dreamless sleep is interesting as evidence. On waking, a person says "I slept well." How does he know it? There were no thoughts, no emotions, no perceptions. But something knew the absence. Advaita calls that something the witness.

IX. Shankara: the systematizer

Advaita existed in the Upaniṣads long before it became a school. What made it a school was Shankaracharya (roughly 700 to 750 CE). In a short life — he died at about thirty-two — Shankara wrote commentaries on the ten principal Upaniṣads, on the Brahma Sūtras and on the Bhagavad Gītā, founded four monasteries in the four corners of India, held a series of famous public disputations, and left behind a system in which Advaita acquired a finished face.

The Brahmasūtrabhāṣya is Shankara's central text. In it he defends three claims: only Brahman is real; the world is vyāvahārika satya, truth at the level of ordinary transaction, not pāramārthika satya, truth at the ultimate level; and the jīva, the individual soul, is not other than ātman. Knowledge — jñāna, not action — is the road to liberation.

With Shankara, Advaita took on two features it would never lose. The first is apophasis: Brahman can be spoken of only through negations. Any positive characterization — Brahman is such and such — limits Brahman and makes it one of the objects of the world, whereas it is the ground of all objects. The second is the two levels of truth. From the standpoint of ordinary

transaction, vyavahāra, the world exists, people exist, suffering exists, spiritual practice makes sense. From the standpoint of ultimate reality, paramārtha, there is only Brahman. Shankara did not deny the ordinary. He refused to confuse its levels.

X. Gauḍapāda: the radical voice

The teacher of Shankara's teacher, Gauḍapāda, was more radical still. His Māṇḍūkya Kārikā (roughly sixth to seventh century) develops the doctrine of ajātivāda — "non-origination." The claim is simple and absolute: nothing has ever been born.

If Brahman is unchanging and one, then nothing can "arise" out of it, because arising requires change. If the world is an appearance of Brahman, then it is an appearance, not a separate reality. Gauḍapāda compares the world to a dream: in a dream a man sees mountains, people, cities, feels fear and joy, and all of it seems real. In the morning it turns out that none of it was there. Not "arose and vanished" — never was.

“How can birth happen to the Unborn?” asks Gauḍapāda, in the archive's attribution to Kārikā 3.48. To a modern reader this sounds like a metaphysical declaration. The article reads him as proposing not belief but a test: look at whether the structure of dreaming differs from waking, apart from waking into another scene in one case and not in the other. The wording and verse attribution are inherited and remain unverified.

In Buddhism, the Madhyamaka of Nāgārjuna (second century) develops a similar thesis about non-arising. Gauḍapāda mentions Buddhism with respect and argues against it — but the methodology of the two schools is strikingly close.

XI. Ramana Maharshi: "Who am I?"

Advaita might have remained a system for the study. Ramana Maharshi made it living again.

In 1896, at sixteen, a boy from a South Indian family goes through a sudden fear of death in a room at home. Not an imagined fear — a real, bodily one. He lies down on the floor, imitates a dead body, and puts the question to himself: the body will die; will I die with it? And in that moment what he would later call realization takes place. Not a theoretical understanding — a direct recognition: what says "I" in me is not the body, does not die with the body, and has been here the whole time.

He leaves home, makes his way to the sacred hill of Arunachala, sits down at its foot and spends the next fifty-odd years there, until his death in 1950. He writes no system. He founds no monastery. He is silent most of the time.

His method, ātma-vicāra, self-enquiry, fits into one sentence: "Who am I?" Not as a philosophical question but as a way of holding attention. When a thought arises, do not follow

it. Ask: to whom did this thought arise? The answer: to me. Then — and who is this "I"? And do not supply an answer out of memory; hold attention on the sense of "I" itself until it returns to its source.

Ramana said this is the only method that works directly. All other practices — meditation, breath, mantra — are useful, but they work on the contents. Ātma-vicāra works on the witness.

XII. Nisargadatta: the sense "I am"

Ramana's contemporary in Bombay, Nisargadatta Maharaj (1897 to 1981), sold beedis in a small shop. Europeans, Americans and Indians came to him and recorded the conversations. In 1973 those records appeared as the book I Am That, translated from the Marathi by Maurice Frydman. It became a classic of Western interest in Advaita.

Nisargadatta led toward the same thing as Ramana, but from another side. Not "Who am I?" but presence. The sense "I am" — prior to any "I am such and such." Not "I am Andrey," not "I am a man," not "I am suffering," not "I am a seeker." Simply: I am. It is the first thing that appears on waking and the last thing to go on falling asleep. It is not a thought. It is the palpable ground of all thoughts.

The archive gives Nisargadatta's teaching in these words: “Hold to ‘I am’ as the only thing you have. Do not move into ‘I am that’ or ‘I am this.’ Simply remain with the feeling of presence. Gradually it becomes apparent that this too is a concept. ‘I am’ is the last door. Once you pass through it, you become what ‘I am’ was pointing toward.”

This is the same neti, neti, but not as a philosophical exercise. As a long attentive looking into the threshold of one's own presence.

XIII. A parallel: hesychasm and the prayer of the heart

Advaita does not stand alone. In Orthodox mysticism, in the tradition of hesychasm — from Symeon the New Theologian to Gregory Palamas and the elders of Athos — there is the practice of the prayer of the heart. It consists in the unceasing repetition of the Jesus Prayer, concentrated "in the heart." The mind is gathered to a single point. Attention stops leaping across thoughts. A state arises that the hesychasts describe as the uncreated light, the light of Tabor.

There is no identity with Advaita here. Orthodoxy holds to the reality of a personal God and a personal human being; they do not merge. Gregory Palamas in the fourteenth century defended precisely this distinction — between the essence of God and his energies, in which a human being can participate without becoming God in essence.

But the structure of the experience is strikingly similar. An attentive looking into the source of "I." A refusal of the wandering mind. Long silence. The gradual discovery that beneath the thoughts there is something that does not belong to them. Theophan the Recluse writes in the nineteenth century: "The principal thing is to stand before God with the mind in the heart, and to go on standing before Him unceasingly day and night, until the end of life." (The Art of Prayer, compiled by Igumen Chariton of Valamo, translated by E. Kadloubovsky and E. M. Palmer, Faber, 1966.) This is not Advaita. But it is the same optics — attention turned toward the source of attention.

XIV. A parallel: Zen and the original face

The archive attributes to the Sixth Patriarch Huineng (638–713) this response to a pupil: “Show me your original face, the one you had before your parents were born.” The attribution and formulation are preserved as the archive gives them; they have not been freshly checked against a source edition.

This is a koan. Not a riddle with a solution but an instrument that breaks the ordinary working mode of the mind. No answer out of memory, out of biography, out of thought will do. A face "before one's parents were born" is not a face in the sense of features. It is a pointing at the witness.

Hakuin Ekaku (1686 to 1769) formulates a new koan in the eighteenth century: what is the sound of one hand? The same device. The mind cannot find an answer within the categories of sound and silence. Attention slips off the contents onto that which perceives sound. Zen calls this kenshō — seeing into one's nature.

The parallel with Advaita is not accidental. Zen is a fusion of Indian Mahāyāna Buddhism and Chinese Daoism; through Buddhism it inherits a tradition of questioning about the "I" that is not Sanskrit but structurally close. The terminology differs: Advaita says ātman, Zen says buddha-nature, emptiness, original mind. The method is the same — attention returns to the source of attention.

XV. A parallel: the Sufi fanāʾ

In Islamic mysticism, in Sufism, the central notions are fanāʾ and baqāʾ. Fanāʾ means annihilation, dissolution — the dissolution of the ego, of the individual "I," in God. Baqāʾ means abiding, subsistence: the life afterward, in which the dissolution has already happened but the person returns to ordinary things carrying it within.

Al-Hallāj (858 to 922) said the sentence for which he was executed: anā'l-ḥaqq, "I am the Truth." At the level of ordinary transaction this is blasphemy. At the level of Advaita it is simply

aham brahmāsmi — I am brahman. Al-Hallāj was unlucky in his era. The metaphysical gesture is the same.

Ibn ʿArabī (1165 to 1240) and Jalāl ad-Dīn Rūmī (1207 to 1273) develop the line further — in the doctrine of waḥdat al-wujūd, the unity of being, and in Rūmī's poetry, where the lover and the Beloved turn out to be two faces of one. The distance is enormous: the Arab world, Islamic theism, an I-Thou relation instead of an impersonal Brahman. And still — the same structure.

XVI. A parallel: Meister Eckhart

In Christian mysticism, in Europe in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, the Dominican Meister Eckhart says things in his sermons for which the Archbishop of Cologne pursues him. One of them: "The eye with which I see God is the same eye with which God sees me: my eye and God's eye are one eye, one seeing, one knowing, one love." (German Sermon 12, in Meister Eckhart: The Essential Sermons, Commentaries, Treatises, and Defense, translated by Edmund Colledge and Bernard McGinn, Paulist Press, 1981.)

This is not a metaphor. Eckhart insisted: the seeing in me and the seeing in God are not two different seeings. He distinguished Gottheit — godhead, the impersonal ground — from Gott, the personal God of Christian doctrine. Eckhart's Gottheit is almost indistinguishable from Shankara's Brahman.

Eckhart died before he was condemned posthumously in 1329. Pope John XXII declared twenty-eight of his propositions heretical. But the texts survived. And in the twentieth century they came to be understood as one of the purest cases of apophatic mysticism in the West.

This does not mean Eckhart "read the Upaniṣads." He did not know them. It means that one structure of experience arose independently in different cultures and was formulated in the language of each.

XVII. A parallel: Plotinus and the One

The Alexandrian philosopher Plotinus (204 to 270) founded Neoplatonism, the last great school of ancient thought. In the Enneads he describes a hierarchy: the One (to hen), Intellect (nous), Soul (psychē), matter. The One is beyond being and non-being; nothing can be said of it affirmatively; the soul returns to it through epistrophē, turning back.

Pierre Hadot, who reconstructed Plotinus in the twentieth century, stresses that for Plotinus this was not a theory but a description of actual experience. Porphyry, his student, reports that in the six years he spent beside his teacher, Plotinus reached that experience four times (Life of Plotinus 23, in A. H. Armstrong's Loeb edition). He did not live in it permanently, but he

touched it. And in that touch there is a recognition: what I took for myself and the One are not different.

The parallel with Advaita was noticed long ago. Paul Deussen, the nineteenth-century Indologist, called Advaita and Neoplatonism two independent formulations of one mystical metaphysics. That is a simplification, but the pointing is not empty. When pure apophasis meets radical introspection, it arrives at a similar form.

XVIII. Schrödinger: the multiplicity is only apparent

In 1944 the Austrian physicist Erwin Schrödinger published What Is Life?, a book on the physical basis of the living. In its epilogue — a short chapter called "On Determinism and Free Will" — he makes a turn that surprised his colleagues.

Schrödinger writes: "There is obviously only one alternative, namely the unification of minds or consciousnesses. Their multiplicity is only apparent, in truth there is only one mind. This is the doctrine of the Upanishads." He goes on to say that the doctrine is not the Upanishads' alone, and that it is not the whole of what he is prepared to believe — but that it remains the only intelligible way out of two facts that are otherwise incompatible: that his own consciousness is real, and that the consciousness of others is real too.

And he quotes the formula directly: tat tvam asi.

This was neither an accident nor esoterica. Schrödinger read Indian philosophy all his life; German volumes of Vedanta and Deussen's translations remained in his library. He was one of the founders of quantum mechanics, and he took a step his colleagues avoided: he applied a formal logical argument to the problem of consciousness and arrived at Advaita.

This is not an argument that Advaita is "scientifically correct." It is an example of how radical honesty in thinking can arrive at the same point as an ancient tradition, by another road.

XIX. The neuroscience of nonduality

In the twenty-first century it became possible to look not only at texts but at brains.

Zoran Josipovic, a neuroscientist at New York University, has spent twenty years studying what he calls nondual awareness — in his definition, "a background awareness that precedes conceptualization and intention and that can contextualize various perceptual, affective, or cognitive contents without fragmenting the field of experience into habitual dualities" (Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, 2014). This is the state in which, by the account of practitioners of Dzogchen, Mahāmudrā and Advaita, the ordinary waking structure of subject and object falls away.

Josipovic's fMRI work shows that nondual awareness comes with a particular pattern of brain activity. Ordinary waking divides the brain into task-positive networks (outward attention) and the default mode network (self-reflection, thoughts about oneself); the two normally take turns. In the nondual state, in experienced practitioners, the activity of these two networks becomes correlated — they run at the same time.

Josipovic is careful. He does not say that Advaita has been proved by neuroscience. He says that there is a state of consciousness described in several independent traditions, and that it has a reproducible neural correlate. That is enough to stop treating nondual experience as a subjective fantasy.

XX. The transparent self

A parallel line runs through the work of the German philosopher Thomas Metzinger. His Being No One (2003) and the later The Ego Tunnel (2009) argue that the "I" is a model the brain builds, and that the model is normally transparent. We do not see it as a model; we see through it, and it seems that "I" is not a construction but a given.

Metzinger draws on contemporary neuroscience and phenomenology, not on Vedanta. But the description coincides with Shankara's adhyāsa almost word for word. Shankara also says: ātman is pure awareness; onto it a model of "I as an individual" is laid, and the model seems to be the self, because we do not notice it as a model.

When the model becomes opaque — which happens in meditation, in psychedelic experience, in cases of derealization — it emerges that beneath it there is an awareness that is not a model. In Metzinger this is minimal phenomenal selfhood; in Shankara, ātman.

And what coincides is not only the description but the method. Metzinger, who has read Dzogchen and worked with Buddhist practitioners, stresses the point: Western science arrived at a structural description of what the Eastern traditions described from the inside two thousand years ago.

XXI. The dangers

Advaita is powerful optics, and dangerous ones. There are three typical traps.

The first is a flattened "all is one." When "and that's how you are" is translated into the household jargon of "don't worry, we are all one," what comes out is a spiritual variety of denial. Suffering exists. Injustice exists. Another person's pain exists. At the level of vyavahāra all of it is real, and Advaita never denied it. Shankara himself lived a life full of action — disputations, travel, organization. "All is one" as a formula for refusing responsibility is not Advaita; it is a poisoned imitation of it.

The second is spiritual bypassing. The psychologist John Welwood introduced the term in the 1980s: the use of spiritual ideas and practices to avoid meeting unlived experience — trauma, fear, anger, attachment. Advaita becomes material for bypassing very easily. "I am not this body, not these emotions" sounds like Ramana, but if what hides behind it is flight from work on oneself, it is the opposite of what Ramana taught. Ramana and Nisargadatta both insisted that self-enquiry requires citta śuddhi, the purification of the mind through ethical life, honesty, simplicity, responsibility.

The third is intellectualization. Advaita turns easily into a collection of clever ideas. Mahāvākya, ātman, Brahman, turīya, ajātivāda — the vocabulary is pleasant to roll around in the mind. But Uddālaka did not give his son a vocabulary. He pointed at a lump of clay. The words of Advaita work only if they point at the reader's own experience. Otherwise they are philology.

XXII. What remains

Take away everything Advaita says and what remains is what it points at. And that "what" is not in the text, in the tradition, in the school or in the teacher. It is in the one who is looking.

This is the central shift Advaita offers the reader. Not "believe something new." Not "practice some technique." But — notice that the question "who am I?" has an answer available at every moment, one that does not depend on knowledge, biography, era or culture.

The answer is not expressed in a statement. Any statement would take it to the level of thought, and it would become at once one of the objects — dṛśya, the seen.

Advaita says: look at who is looking. And when attention turns toward the source of attention, it is found that between the witness and what lies at the base of the world there never was a seam.

Uddālaka was not trying to convince Śvetaketu of a new doctrine. He was pointing — at the lump of clay, at the banyan seed, at the salt in the water — that what his son already is, is the thing he was looking for.

Nine blows of the hammer. The same sentence.

"And that's how you are."

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut
United Wisdom · One source, many languages

Archival editorial note. This full English adaptation reuses a pre-existing website translation after comparison with all twenty-two sections of the accepted Russian archive. Expanded quotation passages were aligned back to the supplied Russian wording. Religious propositions

and comparisons are the essay's account, not scientific demonstrations. Its claims of identical methods across Advaita, Zen, Sufism, Eckhart, and neuroscience exceed what a resemblance alone establishes. In particular, Metzinger's account of a self-model does not by itself establish an underlying metaphysical ātman. Neural correlates do not establish Advaita's metaphysical truth. The opening heated-iron scene, verse and quotation attributions, Shankara's dating, Eckhart's condemnation count, and neuroscience generalizations require source-specific checking. No new evidence research or clinical validation was performed.

References Inherited from the Archive

These links preserve the archive's reference record; their contents were not newly checked for this translation.

- PDF-L001 — original PDF page 3
- PDF-L002 — original PDF page 4
- PDF-L003 — original PDF page 5
- PDF-L004 — original PDF page 5
- PDF-L005 — original PDF page 6
- PDF-L006 — original PDF page 6
- PDF-L007 — original PDF page 7
- PDF-L008 — original PDF page 8
- PDF-L009 — original PDF page 8
- PDF-L010 — original PDF page 10
- PDF-L011 — original PDF page 11
- PDF-L012 — original PDF page 12
- PDF-L013 — original PDF page 12
- PDF-L014 — original PDF page 13