

# MĀNDŪKYOPANIṢAD

(with a Summary of Gaudapāda's Kārika)

294.5921

Sa 77



SRI RAMAKRISHNA MATH

MYLAPORE, MADRAS



**INDIAN INSTITUTE OF  
ADVANCED STUDY  
SIMLA**

Abdul Majid Khan.  
9. 9. '53.

**DATA ENTERED**

**CATALOGUED**



Upaniṣad Series

# MĀNDŪKYOPANIṢAD

*Including original verses, construed text (anvaya) with a literal word by word translation, English rendering of each stanza, copious notes, Introduction and*

A SUMMARY OF GAUḌAPĀDA'S KĀRIKA

BY  
SWAMI SHARVANANDA



SRI RAMAKRISHNA MATH  
MYLAPORE, MADRAS  
1949

73

Published by  
THE PRESIDENT,  
SRI RAMAKRISHNA MATH,  
MYLAPORE, MADRAS

 Library IAS, Shimla



00014532

296.592 1 M  
S. 77

*Sixth Edition*  
*(All rights reserved)*  
XX, 3-49

14532  
16/9/66

1182

Printed by  
KABER PRINTING WORKS,  
TRIPLICANE, MADRAS

## INTRODUCTORY NOTE

THIS Upaniṣad is so named probably after its seer Maṇḍūkha. It belongs to the Atharva-veda group of Upaniṣads. Among the Upaniṣads it is the most difficult inasmuch as within the short compass of twelve passages, it speaks of the entire range of human consciousness beginning from the waking state and ending with the supreme absolute state of super-consciousness where all objective relations and perceptions of duality are completely negated. According to the Mukṭikopaniṣad, it forms the epitome of all the hundred and eight Upaniṣads. The authoritative Upaniṣads contain but few passages which assert unequivocally that the absolute Reality is non-dual (advaita) and attributeless (nirguṇa), and it is noteworthy that this small Upaniṣad contains one or two of them.

The Māṇḍūkyopaniṣad is also noted for clearly enunciating a method of approach to Truth that we come across in the Upaniṣads alone in the whole of the world's philosophic literature. The method consists in the analysis of the three states of waking, dream and deep sleep, which are common to all men. Through a study of these states, a way is pointed out, even for those who are not willing to accept any theological pre-supposition, to form the necessary intellectual background for cultivating the higher life. Owing to the terseness of the Upaniṣad, these philosophic implications of it are only just hinted in the text. In later times these were elaborated in the famous Kārikā on this Upaniṣad by Gauḍapāda, the grand-preceptor (paramaguru) of Śaṅkarācārya. Without a study of his Kārikā, one of the best philosophical works in Sanskrit, one cannot get an insight into the unique system of thought that forms the background of this Upaniṣad. We are therefore giving as Appendix a summary of the Kārikā, in the hope that it may help the reader to have an idea of this very original feature of Vedānta philosophy.

## NOTE ON TRANSLITERATION

IN the book Devanāgarī characters are transliterated according to the scheme adopted by the International Congress of Orientalists at Athens in 1912 and since then generally acknowledged to be the only rational and satisfactory one. In it the inconsistency, irregularity and redundancy of English spelling are ruled out: f, q, w, x and z are not called to use; one fixed value is given to each letter. Hence a, e, i and g always represent अ, ए, इ and ग् respectively and never ए, इ, ऐ and ज् or other values which they have in English; t and d are always used for त् and द् only. One *tialde*, one accent, four macrons and ten dots (2 above, 8 below) are used to represent adequately and correctly all Sanskrit letters. *The letter c alone represents च्*. Since the natural function of h will be to make the aghoṣa ghoṣa (e.g. kh, ch, ṭh, th, ph, gh, jh, ḍh, dh, bh), it would be an anomaly for a scientific scheme to use it in combinations like ch and sh for giving च् and ष् values; hence ch here is छ् and sh ह्. The vowel ऋ, is represented by r̄ because ri, legitimate for रि only, is out of place, and the singular ři is an altogether objectionable distortion. *The tialde over n represents ण्, णि*. Accent mark over s



gives श्, ś; dots above m and n give anusvāra (◌̣), ṁ and ङ्, ṅ, respectively. Dots below h and r give visarga (◌̣), ḥ, and ऋ, ṛ, respectively. Dots below s, n, t and d give their corresponding cerebrals ष्, ण्, ट् and ड्, ṣ, ṇ, ṭ, and ḍ; and macrons over a, i, u and ṛ give ā, ī, ū, ṝ respectively. Macrons are not used to lengthen the quantity of e and o, because they always have the long quantity in Sanskrit. Sanskrit words are capitalized only where special distinctiveness is called for, as in the opening of a sentence, title of books, etc. The scheme of transliteration in full is as follows.

अ a, आ ā, इ i, ई ī, उ u, ऊ ū, ऋ ṛ, ॠ ṝ, ए e, ओ o,  
 ऐ ai, औ au, ◌̣ ṁ, : ḥ, क् k, ख् kh, ग् g, घ् gh, ङ् ṅ, च् c,  
 छ् ch, ज् j, झ् jh, ञ् ñ, ट् t, ठ् ṭh, ड् ḍ, ढ् ḍh, ण् ṇ, त् t,  
 थ् th, द् d, ध् dh, न् n, प् p, फ् ph, ब् b, भ् bh, म् m,  
 य् y, र् r, ल् l, व् v, श् ś, ष् ṣ, स् s, ह् h.

॥ ॐ तत् सत् ॥

PEACE INVOCATION

ॐ भद्रं कर्णेभिः शृणुयाम देवाः भद्रं पश्येमाक्ष-  
भिर्यजत्राः ।

स्थिरैरङ्गैस्तुष्टुवाꣳसस्तनूभिर् व्यशेम देवहितं यदायुः ॥

ॐ शान्तिः । शान्तिः । शान्तिः ॥

देवाः O gods (or worshipful Ones) कर्णेभिः with the ears (of the teacher and the disciples) भद्रम् what is auspicious (i.e. words of the scripture etc.) शृणुयाम may we hear. यजत्राः efficient to sacrifice (वयम् we) अक्षभिः with eyes भद्रम् what is auspicious (sacrifice, worship, etc.) पश्येम may we behold. स्थिरैः perfect (lit. firm) अङ्गैः limbs and organs तनूभिः bodies (युक्ताः वयम् we having) देवहितम् allotted by the Lord आयुः span of life व्यशेम may we obtain fully.

Om. O worshipful Ones, may our ears hear what is auspicious. May we, efficient to worship, see with our eyes what is auspicious. May we, who sing thy praise, live our allotted span of life in perfect health and strength.

Om Peace : Peace : Peace.

# MĀNDŪKYOPANIṢAD

ओमित्येतदक्षरमिदं सर्वं, तस्योपव्याख्यानं, भूतं  
भवद्भविष्यदिति सर्वमोङ्कार एव । यच्चान्यत् त्रिकालातीतं तदप्योङ्कार एव ॥ १ ॥

इदम् This (visible) सर्वम् all ॐ Om इति एतत् this  
अक्षरम् letter. तस्य its उपव्याख्यानम् explanation, भूतम्  
the past भवत् the present भविष्यत् the future इति  
सर्वम् all ओङ्कारः the Om एव verily. अन्यत् the other  
च and यत् what त्रिकालातीतम् past, present and future  
beyond time, तत् that अपि also ओङ्कारः Om एव verily.

All<sup>1</sup> this world is the syllable Om. Its further explanation is this : the past, the present, the future—everything is just Om. And whatever transcends the three divisions of time—that, too, is just Om.

[NOTES—1. *All this world etc.*—According to the Vedic philosophy of creation, the universe, the creation of which begins with the vibration of the primal energy, Prakṛti, has a sound symbol, and that is Om. As no idea can be dissociated from the denoting appellation or name, so no object can be thought of

without the help of its sound symbol. In sanskrit philology, the relation between śabda (sound) and artha (object) is considered inseparable. So in that sense Om, which is the most universal, all-inclusive sound utterable by man, can only be the fit name for the whole universe, visible and invisible. And as the universe is nothing but an emanation of the Divine in an objective form, so Om is ever considered by the followers of the Vedas as the most suitable sound symbol of the Supreme Deity, with the help of which the devotee can realise the Truth. Here Om is spoken of as all that exists in all times and even as what is transcendental, i. e. Brahman in His saḡuṇa (with attribute) and nirḡuṇa (attributeless) aspects, with a view to make the aspirant look upon this sound as the best means to attain realization by meditating upon it, as described in the subsequent passages. Cf. notes on Praśnopaniṣad, V. 7 and also Kāthopaniṣad II. 15-17]

सव ह्येतद् ब्रह्म, अयमात्मा ब्रह्म, सोऽयमात्मा

चतुष्पात् ॥

एतत् This सर्वम् all हि assuredly ब्रह्म Brahman. अयम् this आत्मा the Self ब्रह्म Brahman. सः that अयम् this आत्मा Ātman चतुष्पात् is with four quarters (has four conditions).

For<sup>1</sup> truly, everything is Brāhman. And this<sup>2</sup> Self within (Ātman) is Brahman. The Self has four<sup>3</sup> quarters.

[NOTE—1. *For truly etc.*—In the previous passage the whole of the objective existence has been indicated as the form of Om or Brahman. But lest it should be misunderstood that Brahman is only in the objective existence and has no relation with the subject, this passage clearly states that Brahman is not only the visible objective world but the very Self of the subject. It is Ātman. By this it is clearly indicated that the objective existence is nothing but an emanation of the Reality that is even behind the subject. This Reality manifests in the subject in four conditions, viz. the waking state, the dreaming state, the state of deep sleep, and super-consciousness. These four aspects of Consciousness are called here the four feet or conditions of the Ātman.

2. *And this Self within*—This is one of the Mahāvākyas or the sacred formulæ which indicate the unity of the individual Self and the Supreme Self. This is the Mahāvākya of the Atharva-veda.

3. *Four quarters*—The translation of the original will be 'with four quarters' or 'with four feet'. Śaṅkara points out that the figure is not what is implied by the latter, as it is not like the four feet of a cow, but like the four parts or quarters of a coin. The idea is that each quarter resolves into the one next to it, and when the three resolve into the fourth, that fourth is the whole coin. Śaṅkarā points out that even in this conception of four parts, the fourth stands on a different footing; for the fourth is a 'quarter' in the sense of being this *object* of enquiry, while the others are so only in the sense of being *instruments* or *guides* directing the attention to it.]

जागरितस्थानो बहिःप्रज्ञः सप्ताङ्ग एकोनविंशति-  
मुखः स्थूलभुग् वैश्वानरः प्रथमः पादः ॥ ३ ॥

जागरितस्थानः Whose field is the waking life  
बहिःप्रज्ञः whose consciousness is outward सप्ताङ्गः seven-  
limbed एकोनविंशतिमुखः nineteen-mouthed स्थूलभुक्  
enjoyer of gross objects वैश्वानरः Vaiśvānara (lit.  
common-to-all-men) प्रथमः first पादः quarter  
(condition).

The first quarter is Vaiśvānara ('com-  
mon to-all-men' or the material condition) with  
the waking state for his field, outwardly  
cognitive, seven-limbed,<sup>1</sup> nineteen-mouthed-<sup>2</sup>  
and enjoying gross objects.

[NOTES—1. *Seven-limbed*—It is described else-  
where in the Śruti (Ch. Up. VI. 18. 2) that the head  
of Vaiśvānara or Viśva is the heaven, the sun His  
eyes, the air His breath, the sky His body, water His  
lower organ and the earth His feet. So these are  
the seven limbs of Viśva referred to here.

2. *Nineteen-mouthed*—These are his five jñānen-  
driyas (sensory organs), five karmendriyas (motor  
organs), five prāṇas (aspects of vital energy) and four  
antaḥkaraṇas (aspects of the mind). These are called  
mouths, because through these He enjoys the exter-  
nal world.

The gross macrocosmic aspect of the Universal  
Soul is called Virāṭ and the microcosmic is known as

Vaiśvānara. The Upaniṣad describes here only the Viśva or the Vaiśvānara, and not the Virāṭ. Thereby it tacitly alludes to the fact that the same Ātman who is viewed from the individual standpoint as the individual soul, is also the Universal Soul.]

स्वप्नःस्थानोऽन्तःप्रज्ञः सप्ताङ्ग एकोनविंशतिमुखः  
प्रविविक्तभुक् तैजसो द्वितीयः पादः ॥ ४ ॥

स्वप्नस्थानः Whose field is dream state अन्तःप्रज्ञः whose consciousness is inward सप्ताङ्गः seven-limbed एकोनविंशतिमुखः nineteen-mouthed प्रविविक्तभुक् enjoyer of the mental impressions only (lit. enjoyer of loneliness) तैजसः the Taijasa (lit. one of shining element) द्वितीयः the second पादः quarter.

The second quarter is the Taijasa (the 'brilliant' or the mental condition) with the dream state for his field, inwardly cognitive, seven-limbed, nineteen-mouthed, and enjoying subtle<sup>1</sup> objects.

[NOTES—The macrocosmic aspect of Ātman in the subtle or mental state is called Hiraṇyagarbha. Like Virāṭ, Hiraṇyagarbha is here alluded to in unification with the microcosmic Taijasa or the individual's dream consciousness.

1. *Subtle objects*—In contrast with the waking state, in which the enjoyment is of gross objects only. These subtle objects are the impressions of waking life stored up in memory.]

यत्र सुप्तो न कं चन कामं कामयते, न कं चन स्वप्नं पश्यति, तत् सुषुप्तम् । सुषुप्तस्थान एकीभूतः प्रज्ञानघन एवानन्दमयो ह्यानन्दभुक् चेतोमुखः प्राञ्ज-स्तृतीयः पादः ॥ ५ ॥

यत्र Where सुप्तः the sleeping (man) कम् चन any कामम् desirable object न कामयते does not desire for, कम् चन any स्वप्नम् dream न पश्यति does not see, तत् that सुषुप्तम् the deep sleep. सुषुप्तस्थानः whose field is deep sleep एकीभूतः experiences all unified प्रज्ञानघनः cognition reduced to an indefinite mass एव alone आनन्दमयः full of bliss हि verily आनन्दभुक् enjoyer of bliss (or peace) चेतोमुखः mouth of knowledge (gateway to definite cognitions) प्राञ्जः the Prājña (lit. one who knows properly) तृतीयः the third पादः quarter.

When one who is asleep feels no desires, sees no dreams—that is deep sleep. The third is Prājña (the 'cognitional' or the intellectual condition) having this state of deep sleep for his field, with experiences<sup>1</sup> all unified, with cognition<sup>2</sup> reduced to a mere indefinite mass, full<sup>3</sup> of bliss, enjoying bliss, and forming<sup>4</sup> the gateway to all definite cognitions.



NOTES—1. *Experiences all united*—The significance of it is that all the experiences of the waking and the dream states dissolve in the experience of deep sleep. They are not destroyed, but remain in potentiality as a unity without particularization.

2. *Cognition reduced to a mere indefinite mass*—Indicates perhaps the contradictory qualities of potentiality and haziness characteristic of deep sleep. In a sense the whole of the past experiences of the sleeping man is potential in it, yet awareness is so hazy that he cannot clearly say on analysing his experience whether he was conscious or unconscious. If one accepts the existence of consciousness in deep sleep, one has to say it is either contentless or is of the negative kind.

3. *Full of bliss*—This bliss is only one of quiescence and is negative in character. It is different from the positive and transcendental bliss of Samādhi.

4. *Forming the gateway to definite cognitions*—In a sense we may say that deep sleep is the antecedent condition from which we pass on to the definite cognitions of waking and dream states. ]

एष सर्वेश्वर एष सर्वज्ञ एषोऽन्तर्याम्येष योनिः  
सर्वस्य प्रभवाप्ययौ हि भूतानाम् ॥ ६ ॥

एषः This सर्वेश्वरः lord of all, एषः this सर्वज्ञः the omniscient, एषः this अन्तर्यामी the indweller and controller of all, एषः this सर्वस्य of all योनिः the cause

हि verily, भूतानाम् of all beings प्रभवाप्ययौ the cause and dissolution.

This is the Lord<sup>1</sup> of all—their knower, their inner controller, their source, their origin and dissolution.

[ NOTES—1. *Lord of all*—Prājña, identified with deep sleep is equated with Īśvara, the Lord of all; for just as Īśvara is the creator of the whole universe, from the consciousness in deep sleep spring the whole phenomena of waking and dream states. In it they subside too. ]

नान्तःप्रज्ञं न बहिःप्रज्ञं नोभयतःप्रज्ञं न  
प्रज्ञानघनं न प्रज्ञं नाप्रज्ञम् । अदृष्टमव्यवहार्यम-  
ग्राह्यमलक्षणमचिन्त्यमव्यपदेश्यमेकात्मप्रत्ययसारं प्रपञ्चो-  
पशमं शान्तं शिवमद्वैतं चतुर्थं मन्यन्ते स आत्मा स  
विज्ञेयः ॥ ७ ॥

न Not अन्तःप्रज्ञम् inwardly cognitive न nor बहिःप्रज्ञम् outwardly cognitive न उभयतःप्रज्ञम् nor cognitive both-wise न प्रज्ञानघनम् nor an indefinite mass of cognition न प्रज्ञम् nor collective cognition न अप्रज्ञम् nor non-cognition ; अदृष्टम् unseen अव्यवहार्यम् un-related अग्राह्यम् inconceivable अलक्षणम् uninferable अचिन्त्यम् unimaginable अव्यपदेश्यम् indescribable ;

एकात्मप्रत्ययसारम् the essence of the one self-cognition common to all states of consciousness ; प्रपञ्चोपशमम् the negation of all phenomena ; शान्तम् peace शिवम् bliss अद्वैतम् non-duality चतुर्थम् the fourth (foot) मन्यन्ते consider (विवेकिनः the sages). सः He आत्मा the Self ; सः He विज्ञेयः (is) to be realized.

The Fourth (Turiya), the wise say, is not<sup>1</sup> inwardly cognitive, nor<sup>2</sup> outwardly cognitive, nor<sup>3</sup> cognitive both-wise ; neither<sup>4</sup> is it an indefinite mass of cognition, nor<sup>5</sup> collective cognition, nor<sup>6</sup> non-cognition. It is unseen,<sup>7</sup> unrelated, inconceivable, uninferable, unimaginable, indescribable. It is the essence<sup>8</sup> of the one self-cognition common to all states of consciousness. All phenomena cease in it. It is peace,<sup>9</sup> it is bliss, it is non-duality.<sup>10</sup> This is the Self, and it is to be realized.

[NOTES—It must be noted that the fourth (Turiya) described herein is not one of the states like the others. As it will be shown herein, it is present in all the states and is the whole of reality. It is called Turiya (i. e. the Fourth) only in the order of analysis, but when one arrives at it, one reaches the Whole, just as, when calculating the value of a coin from the first quarter to the last, one gets the whole value of it on reaching the fourth. The fourth part is a part only in name, but is in reality the whole.

1. *Not inwardly cognitive*—As contrasted with the dream state or Taijasa.

2. *Nor outwardly cognitive*—As contrasted with waking or Vaiśvānara.

3. *Nor cognitive both-wise*—This wards off the notion that it might be an intermediary state between waking and dream.

4. *Neither is it an indefinite mass of cognition*—As contrasted with deep sleep or Prājña.

5. *Nor collective cognition*—This is to show that Turiya or the Fourth should not be identified with God or Īśvara who experiences the whole of phenomenal existence in one act of cognition. As shown in the previous passage, Īśvara is identified with the consciousness of deep sleep, and we have seen that that state is one in which all experience is unified.

Here we may say a word more about the distinction drawn between Turiya and Īśvara. Turiya is the conception of Pure Consciousness in itself, quite unrelated to the phenomena as their cause or substratum. Īśvara, on the other hand, is Pure Consciousness conceived as the cause of all phenomena. And He (Īśvara), is identified with sleep because all experience seems to rise from and sink into the consciousness of sleep.

6. *Nor non-cognition*—As distinguished from mere insentiency.

7. *Unseen, unrelated etc.*—None of the ordinary methods of knowledge as perception, inference, etc. is applicable to it.

8. *Essence of etc.*—It may be asked how one is to strive for its realization, if it cannot be perceived by any of the ordinary means of knowledge, and one may even doubt that it is a mere negation or at the

most something verbal only. But this epithet denies this possibility. If we investigate all the experiences of the three states, we find a sense of self-identity on the subjective side running through them all. It is not said that this sense of individuality or self is in itself the Turīya but that it gives the clue to it. The Turīya is recognized only when the essence of this Self is realized, and this can be had only when thought becomes absolute in the highest Samādhi. One who has attained Samādhi recognizes the Turīya in all perceptions of the three states, even after he comes to the plane of relative consciousness. In fact, for him the Turīya is the only existence, and all experiences of the other states are only its objectifications. These facts also give us the reason why the Turīya should not be classed as one of the states, like the other three. For it runs through all the states, and eventually proves itself to be the Whole.

9. *Peace etc.*—It should be noted that the Turīya is peace itself and bliss itself. The adjectives peaceful or blissful cannot, therefore, be applied to it as to Prājñā or deep sleep; for these are not qualities of it, but its very substance.

10. *Non-dual*—The significance of this epithet is to distinguish the Turīya from the numerical one which it is not. For that 'one' is only the correlative of two, while the Turīya is the Absolute One.]

सोऽयमात्माध्यक्षरमोङ्कारोऽधिमात्रं पादा मात्रा  
मात्राश्च पादा अकार उकारो मकार इति ॥ ८ ॥

सः अयम् This आत्मा Ātman (Self) अध्यक्षरम् when considered as a single syllable ओङ्कारः (एव) is identical with the syllable Om. अधिमात्रम् (तु) when considered as composed of mātrās (elements or parts) पादाः quarters मात्राः are parts or elements मात्राः च and parts or elements पादाः are quarters. (मात्राः the mātrās, elements or parts are) अकारः *A*, उकारः *U*, मकारः *M*, इति it is to be thus known.

This Ātman (described before) is to be identified with Om, when<sup>1</sup> Om is considered as a single syllable. When<sup>2</sup> Om is considered as composed of parts, the quarters of the Ātman are to be identified with the parts, and the parts with the quarters. The parts of Om are—*A*, *U* and *M*.

[NOTES—In the foregoing passages the Ātman has been described from the standpoint of the states of waking, dream and sleep, and of Turiya—i.e. from the standpoint of the meaning of, or the subject indicated by, Om. From here onwards the same Ātman is described from the standpoint of the sound Om, the Vedic name for the Ātman. The object of it is to facilitate meditation by employing sound symbols to indicate abstruse metaphysical truths.

1. *When Om is considered as a single syllable—*This sentence purports to indicate meditation on Ātman in a general way, taking it as a whole without considering its quarters or states. Hence Om too is

taken as a single syllable, without analyzing it into its elements or parts (mātrās)—*A, U* and *M*.

2. *When Om is considered as composed of parts—*This refers to more thoroughgoing meditation, and for this purpose Om is analyzed into its constituent sound elements or parts—*A, U* and *M*—with a view to indentify them with the different states in the succeeding passages. ]

जागरितस्थानो वैश्वानरोऽकारः प्रथमा मात्रा,  
आप्तेरादिमत्वाद् वा, आप्नोति ह वै सर्वान् कामाना-  
दिश्च भवति य एवं वेद ॥ ९ ॥

जागरितस्थानः Whose field is the waking state  
वैश्वानरः the Vaiśvānara अकारः the letter *Ā* प्रथमा the  
first मात्रा part ; (यतः because) आप्तेः on account of  
pervasiveness आदिमत्वात् on account of having a  
beginning वा or. यः who एवम् thus वेद knows, सः he  
ह वै verily सर्वान् all कामान् desirable objects आप्नोति  
attains, आदिः the first च and भवति becomes.

Vaiśvānara, who has the waking state for his field, is the letter, 'A', the first part of Om, because they are both all-pervasive<sup>1</sup> and have a beginning.<sup>2</sup> One who knows this, obtains verily all desires and becomes the first.

NOTES—1. *All-pervasive*—According to Sanskrit orthography, the letter *A* is included in all other

sounds, because no sound can be produced without opening the mouth and first sound produced on opening the mouth is *A*. Hence it is all-pervasive. Similarly this Upaniṣadic passage maintains that Vaiśvānara, identified with the waking state, pervades everything. Moreover all knowledge of other states is from the waking state, and hence it may be said to pervade them.

2. *Beginning*—‘*A*’ being the first letter, it has no preceding letter or sound. So also the waking state, identified with Vaiśvānara, is known from the commonsense point of view to precede dream and sleep states.]

स्वप्नस्थानस्तैजस उकारो द्वितीया मात्रा,  
उत्कर्षाद्भयत्वाद् वा, उत्कर्षति ह वै ज्ञानसन्ततिं  
समानश्च भवति ; नास्याब्रह्मवित् कुले भवति य एवं  
वेद ॥ १० ॥

स्वप्नस्थानः Whose field is the dream state तैजसः the Taijasa उकारः the letter *U* द्वितीया the second मात्रा element. उत्कर्षात् on account of superiority उभयत्वात् on account of being the middle between the two वा or. यः who एवम् thus वेद knows (सः he) ज्ञानसन्ततिम् the flow of knowledge or thought उत्कर्षति increases, समानः equal (to all) भवति becomes. अस्य his कुले in the family अब्रह्मवित् person ignorant of Brahman न भवति is not born.



Taijasa, who has the dream state for his field, is the letter 'U', the second part of Om, because they are both superior<sup>1</sup> and in<sup>2</sup> between. One who knows this, becomes great in knowledge and the equal of all. No one ignorant of Brahman is born in his family.

[NOTES—1. *Superior*—The superiority of Taijasa, identified with the dream state, consists perhaps in the subtleness of dream, which helps one to realize the world to be made only of ideas. *U* is said to be superior only apparently, because it comes after *A*.

2. *In between*—In the syllable Om, *U* is in between *A* and *M*. So also dream is in between waking and sleep, and Taijasa, identified with dream, in between Vaiśvānara and Prājña.]

सुषुप्तस्थानः प्राज्ञो मकारस्तृतीया मात्रा, मितेर-  
पीतेर्वा, मिनोति ह वा इदं सर्वमपोतिश्च भवति य  
एवं वेद ॥ ११ ॥

सुषुप्तस्थानः Whose field is deep sleep प्राज्ञः the Prājña तृतीया the third मात्रा element मकारः the letter *M*; मितेः from its being a measure अपीतेः on account of its being the end वा or. यः who एवम् thus वेद knows (सः he) ह वै verily इदम् this सर्वम् all मिनोति measures (by his knowledge), अपीतिः comprehending everything within himself च and भवति becomes.

11.532  
11/11/16

Prājña, whose field is deep sleep, is the letter 'M', the third part of Om, because they are alike the measure<sup>1</sup> and the end<sup>2</sup> of the others. One who knows this, measures everything by his knowledge and comprehends everything within himself.

[NOTES—1. *Measure*—When the syllable Om is uttered and re-uttered, the first two elements of it, *Ā* and *U*, seem to sink into *M*, the third element, and come out of it again on the re-utterance of the syllable. So also waking and dream states seem to subside in sleep, here identified with Prājña, and emerge from it afterwards. Hence *M* and Prājña are compared to a measure into which grain is put and from which it is measured out afterwards.

2. *End*—When the syllable Om is uttered, its first two elements seem to merge or end in *M*. So also waking and dream seem to merge into deep sleep, here identified with Prājña.]

अमात्रश्चतुर्थोऽव्यवहार्यः प्रपञ्चोपशमः शिवोऽद्वैत,  
एवमोङ्कार आत्मैव, संविशत्यात्मनात्मानं य एवं वेद  
य एवं वेद ॥ १२ ॥

अमात्रः Without parts अव्यवहार्यः transcendental (lit. beyond all usages) प्रपञ्चोपशमः devoid of all phenomenal existence शिवः the supreme bliss अद्वैतः non-dual चतुर्थः the Fourth. एवम् thus ओङ्कारः the

syllable Om आत्मा Ātman एव verily. यः who एवम् thus वेद् knows (सः he) आत्मना by his own self आत्मानम् the self संविशति enters.

The syllable Om<sup>1</sup> in its partless (i.e. soundless) aspect is the Fourth,<sup>2</sup>—transcendental, devoid of phenomenal existence, supreme bliss and non-dual. Thus the syllable Om is verily the Self (Ātman). He who knows this, merges his self in the Self.

[NOTES—1. *Om in its partless aspect*—The syllableless or soundless Om is what is inherent in Om as a manifested sound just as Turīya is inherent in all the states. It is the unmanifested and transcendent sound of which all manifested sounds, including Om, are expressions. Hence the appropriateness of identifying it with Turīya.

For a chart representing the various states of Consciousness in its individual and universal, or microcosmic and macrocosmic aspects, together with the relation of the various parts of Om to these states, the reader may look at the end of Section II of the Appendix.]

## APPENDIX

### A SUMMARY OF MĀṆḌŪKYA-KĀRIKĀ

BY SVĀMI TYĀGĪŚĀNANDA

[NOTE: *The Māṇḍūkyopaniṣad, though very brief in size, is supposed to contain the quintessence of the teachings of all the Upaniṣads. Owing to its brevity, this Upaniṣad, more than any other, requires elucidation, and this was done in ancient days by the great Vedāntic teacher Gauḍapāda in his Kārikā (gloss) on it. So important is Gauḍapāda's work for the understanding of this Upaniṣad that it has now become an integral part of its study. We have, therefore, thought it fit to include a summary of it in this new edition of the Upaniṣad.*]

#### I

The Māṇḍūkyā-kārikā is a short treatise on the Advaita system of Vedānta philosophy, consisting of two hundred and fifteen verses in Anuṣṭubh metre. Śrī Gauḍapāda, its author, is reputed to be the spiritual preceptor of Śrī Govindapāda, the Guru of Śrī Śaṅkarācārya. His treatise on the Māṇḍūkyopaniṣad constitutes one of the earliest attempts to systematize the teachings of the Upaniṣads on

rational lines and to evolve a consistent philosophy out of the spiritual experiences of the great sages. It is not very safe to locate definitely the time and place of the author's birth. We may not perhaps be far wrong if we place him earlier than Yuan Chwang, inasmuch as some of the verses of the Kārikā are found quoted in a Tibetan version of Bhāvaviveka's *Tarkajvālā*, which scholars assign to a period earlier than the great Chinese traveller.

From a perusal of the work, however, it is clear that the author was a staunch devotee of the Upaniṣadic lore, and that he lived at a time when Vedic religion and philosophy were reasserting themselves during the days of decadent Buddhism. Śrī Bādarāyaṇa had already evolved a system of philosophy out of the Upaniṣadic material; but his work was mainly theological in character, being based primarily on the supreme and undisputed authority of the Vedas. However successful his attempt might have been in settling vexed questions of doctrine and in preventing the faithful from going astray, it could scarcely have appealed to sceptics and to followers of other religions like Buddhism, who could scarcely be expected to have the same reverence for the authority of the Vedas. It was at such a time that Gauḍapāda appeared on the scene with his treatise, prepared to convince even such sceptics and heterodox thinkers as would not accept the authority of anything except their own reason. His Kārikā is therefore peculiarly suited to the needs of the present scientific age, which insists on applying the tests of reason and experience before accepting anything as true. Indeed, its purely

rationalistic bent is so pronounced that there have not been people wanting, who look upon it as a sanction for agnosticism and atheism. It is perhaps to safeguard unprepared minds from falling into such gross misconceptions that orthodox tradition allows it to be taught only to Sannyāsins, the highest type of spiritual, aspirants. The real fact, however, is this: It evinces no doubt, a spirit of scepticism on every page, but it is a healthy, scientific scepticism, which cares for nothing but the absolute Truth and refuses to be satisfied with the next best. It demolishes every kind of dogma, however high its source or sanction might be; it dethrones every idol which fear and superstition have installed in the hearts of men. But in doing so, it seeks only to establish the truth of the Upaniṣadic Brahman-Ātman in all its purity and grandeur, by the method that beats the sceptics and rationalists on their own ground, and demonstrates to them the absurdity of their position with the help of that very faculty of reason to which they pay allegiance.

## II

Of the four chapters of the work, the first one called the Āgama-prakaraṇa, or Scriptural Dissertation, is predominantly based on the Māṇḍūkyaopaniṣad itself, being but an expansion of the ideas contained in it, sentence by sentence. Its subject-matter is the exposition of the unity of Consciousness in the three states of waking, dream and sleep. In this respect Gauḍapāda is unique; for unlike the ordinary philosophers, he is not content with an explanation of the

world from the waking standpoint alone. He is emphatic that any such explanation will only be a partial truth, and that the philosopher should dare to take into account the whole totality of experience. The subject which persists through all the vicissitudes of age, education, etc. of the waking state disappears, and another takes its place in the dream state. The waking subject is thus not permanent and cannot, therefore, be the Reality which we are trying to find out. This ephemeral subject is known as the ego. The same is the fate of the ego of the dream state too. That also disappears in dreamless sleep. Neither the subject nor the object of the waking and dream states remains in deep sleep. But still we have, in this state also, some subject experiencing happiness and the absence of all worldly phenomena; for it would otherwise be impossible to explain the phenomenon of remembrance of the state of deep sleep when we wake up, since no remembrance is possible unless there be an experience first. This Self, experiencing happiness and cognizing the absence of all phenomena in deep sleep, is a fact which one cannot get over. Since the whole world dissolves, as it were, in this deep sleep and emerges when one comes back from it to the dream or waking state, we have to conclude that it remains in a latent form in the dreamless sleep-consciousness, and is projected again at the time of re-manifestation. This consciousness must, therefore, be supposed to be the source from which the world has come and into which the world dissolves. Since the description of Īs'vara (God) in the scriptures exactly tallies.

with our observation and analysis of this dreamless consciousness of sleep, the Upaniṣadic seers had this consciousness in mind when they spoke of Īśwara (God) as the source from which the world has come and as the substance into which it dissolves.

The question of a cause of the world, however, arises only when man is in the ordinary plane of thought : for time, space and causality are the framework of thought. They cannot exist when there is no thought itself. When thought vanishes and man ascends to a plane of consciousness higher than thought itself, where the limitations of the mind are transcended, as in nirvikalpa-samādhi, the question of cause does not arise at all. Truth appears in all its nakedness unclouded by the intellect and its defects. The Self knows itself and no other. This is direct knowledge.

We have seen that the ego of one state disappears in other states. It is impossible, therefore, for the ego of one state to cognize the ego of another state. But we still know that we have had the different experiences of waking, dream and dreamless sleep. This is explicable only as a case of memory, but it is not possible for one to remember the experience of another, and so it would be impossible for the waking ego to compare notes and analyze the various experiences as we have done, unless there is a Self which cognizes all the various states and their experiences, and persists throughout as the permanent and constant witness. This permanent and constant witness which does not undergo any change along with the change in the states, is known as the real Ātman or the



Turiya. This Ātman or Turiya is the Reality behind all phenomena, which no reasonable man can deny, unless he be so mad or foolish as to deny himself. But such a feat is impossible, for no one can think of one's own non-existence.

Moreover, there cannot be such a thing as pure non-existence; for if there is, then non-existence itself must exist. Since existence cannot be without consciousness, and since pure conscious existence must always be bliss, it is this Turiya that is spoken of as the Absolute Brahman—the Sat-cid-ānanda or existence-knowledge-bliss Absolute of the Upaniṣads. Reason and self-analysis are thus shown to lead to Brahman as the only self-existent, unchanging, pure substratum of all changing phenomena, and as this changing world of phenomena could be nothing but this Brahman-Ātman, the Upaniṣadic statement that everything is Brahman stands vindicated. Thus Gauḍapāda very shrewdly answers all the objections that could possibly be raised by the agnostics and nihilists of the Buddhistic school of thought and provides a rational support for the Upaniṣadic teachings.

Since the absolute Truth is realised only from a plane higher than language and thought, all the descriptions of it could be only in negative language. That is why the very name of this philosophy is Advaita or non-dualism; for words are used in it only to negate everything conceivable or expressible. To translate the word Advaita as monism is wrong; for that would mean predicating oneness of the Ātman. What the Advaita does is only to negate duality.

Another common mistake also has to be avoided. The Turiya is often translated and understood as the fourth state. The Turiya, however, is not a state at all. It is identical with existence itself, and it is this that appears as having the three states.

It is not implied thereby that the world is unreal; for it could not be unreal inasmuch as it is nothing but the real Ātman itself. From the standpoint of this highest realization, there could be no relation between the world and God, for both are the same. God exists as the creator only so long as the world of appearances is considered as a reality, and a cause is sought for it. In other words, God is as much real as the world; neither of them should therefore be considered as mere illusion. The absurdity of the conception of a creator God is, however, pointed out by showing that no act of creation is possible without some motive, and the attribution of a motive implies some kind of want on the part of a perfect being. The only reasonable and consistent answer from the standpoint of causality is that it is the nature of the creator to create. But this is a subtle way of evading the admission that the relation of the creator and the created cannot be explained in terms of causation. In fact the creator God is only the highest reading of Reality from the plane of causality. So long as one is still in the plane of causality, and has not realized the Turiya, one is still in Saṁsāra (ignorance). But when one realizes oneself as the Turiya, then one finds oneself free from birth and death as well as from all evil and misery. This is the highest Mukti or immortality spoken of in the Upaniṣads.

The last portion of the chapter is wholly taken up with the exposition of the Praṇava or Om as a complete symbol of the Ātman in its pure as well as relative aspects. The chapter closes with an exhortation to meditate on the meaning of Praṇava in both its higher and lower aspects.

In this summary we have not dealt in detail with the Upaniṣadic analysis of the states of Consciousness in its microcosmic and macrocosmic aspects. The Upaniṣadic text and the notes given in the body of the book make this analysis clear. For easy comprehension, a chart of it is given below :

	INDIVIDUAL or MICROCOSMIC	UNIVERSAL or MACROCOSMIC
Waking State	{ Vaiśvānara or Viśva = Physical condition. 'A' of Om	Virāṭ = Cosmic manifestation
Dream State	{ Taijasa = Mental condition, 'U' of Om	Hiraṇyagarbha = Universal mind
Sleep State	{ Prājña = Intellectual condition, 'M' of Om	Īśvara = First Cause or God
Turiya	{ The Fourth or the Transcendental that runs through all the states and forms the basis of the sense of self-identity felt with regard to the changing states. Though called the Fourth it is really the Whole, being the Brahman-Ātman. Soundless aspect of Om.	

## III

The second chapter is called the Vaitathya-prakarṇa or Dissertation on the Illusoriness of the World. It is so called because it is devoted to the exposition of the unreality of the world of duality. It is not mere coherence, or correspondence, or practical efficiency that is accepted by Gauḍapāda as the criterion of reality, but absolute, eternal, unchanging existence, uncontradicted and uncontradictable by anything else at any time. 'Satya' (truth) and 'nitya' (permanence) are convertible terms, and that which is not 'nitya' cannot be 'satya' according to the Advaitins. The world of duality has not got the same reality as the Turiya, from this standpoint. While it may be conceded that it has 'vyāvahārika-satyatva' or relative reality, it is not really real in itself, i.e. it lacks 'pāramārthika-satyatva' or absolute reality.

Gauḍapāda proceeds to demonstrate this by showing how waking experience is similar to dream. While all agree that dream is unreal, they are not willing to admit that waking experience also is only as real as dream. This is because they have not closely compared the two. In fact, as in dream, so in the waking state also, it is only ideas that are really cognized.

Even modern science agrees that the so-called external object, even if it be taken to exist independently of the mind, cannot be cognized by the mind directly as it is. As Kant puts it, nobody can know the thing-in-itself or *ding-an-sich*, which at best can be admitted scientifically to produce certain reactions

in the mind through certain vibrations set up on the sensory and brain mechanism. Physically, only these vibrations exist for us as the possibility of sensations; what is really cognized is the image or idea that is called up in our mind through this external stimulus. But in dream, we know there is no necessity for any external stimulus even, and so the assumption of an external object in waking state also is not quite necessary to explain the consciousness of an object. If the mind can have an idea and cognize it in dream without a corresponding external object, why can it not create and cognize ideas in waking state also? The conception is not inherently improbable. The feeling that the object experienced is external to oneself, is common to both the states. To say that there is a difference between the two, because the objects of the waking state are not, as in dream, known only to one-self but to all alike, is not correct. For in dream also, so long as the dream lasts, the dreamer feels the consciousness of external objects exactly as they are seen by dream people with whom he feels himself as communing in that state. This has to be granted because we cannot otherwise have dream relations with others. To say that dream objects last only for a short time while objects of the waking state last longer, is not correct; for dream objects last long according to the standards of dream time in precisely the same way as waking objects last long according to the standards of waking time. To say that the one lasts longer than the other, the standard or unit of time must be the same. But the dream time and waking time are not the same. And to judge the

one from the standard of the other is neither just nor fair. If, however, we do judge the one from the standard of the other, then the objects of waking state must also be judged by the dream standard. Then each would be seen to be unreal from the standard of the other.

This argument applies not only to time but also to space and causation. The dream space and causal relations should not be expected to agree with the waking standards, nor waking space and causality with dream standards. Each is independent of the other. If the one appears to be possible in the waking state from the standpoint of space, the other is as much possible in the dream state. Thus what appears quite reasonable in the waking state, seems unreasonable in dream and *vice versa*. If dream is contradicted by waking phenomena, the latter is contradicted by dream phenomena. So the saner view is to admit that both are alike. If it is pointed out that, unlike dream objects, which do not appear regularly and consistently every time one goes to sleep, the objects of the waking state do appear regularly and consistently every time we wake up from sleep, it may be replied that even this regularity is something which is seen only in the waking state. In dream state also we have the same regularity for a long number of dream years. When, after every dream-sleep, we wake up in dream, we see the same objects appearing with a regularity and consistency that are in no way different from what we experience with regard to the objects of the waking state. To say that water in dream does not quench thirst is not

true, for dream water quenches dream thirst as much as water of the waking state quenches the thirst of the waking state. Thus it is very difficult to find out any real difference between waking experience and dream.<sup>1</sup>

The test, that what does not exist in the beginning and in the end is necessarily non-existent in the middle also, is applicable equally to dream and waking; and both are shown to be unreal from this standpoint also.

Imagination is thus shown to be at the root of world phenomena, in which are included both the individual souls and their experiences, subjective as well as objective. It is the Ātman that is variously imagined to be different things such as vital airs, elements, dispositions of Nature (guṇas), worlds, gods, time, space, mind, intellect, virtue, vice, etc. He alone has grasped the true import of the Vedas, who knows that it is the one non-dual Ātman that appears as the variegated world of subjects and objects.

Owing the cause-seeking tendency of the intellect, there is a tendency among many thinkers to trace the

<sup>1</sup> One is reminded here of what Descartes says in his *Meditations*: "When I consider the matter carefully, I do not find a single characteristic by means of which I can certainly determine whether I am awake or whether I am dreaming. The visions of a dream and the experiences of my waking state are so much alike that I am completely puzzled, and I do not really know I am not dreaming at this moment." So also says Pascal, "If a dream comes to us every night, we should be as much occupied with it as by the things we see every day, and if an artisan were certain that he would dream every night for fully twelve hours that he was a king, he would be just as happy as a king who dreams every night for twelve hours that he is an artisan."

origin of the world to ignorance, this tendency being supported by the fact that without the dispelling of ignorance by discrimination, the non-duality of the Ātman cannot be realized. But really why this Ātman appears as different from itself is inexplicable, and it is this inexplicability that is denoted by the word 'māyā'. The illustrations of dream, illusions, the castle in the air and the like are given only to show the inexplicable nature of world phenomena and to emphasise the capacity of ignorance to cloud the real nature of a thing and make it appear as something different. These and other illustrations are not to be taken as arguments for proving the unreal nature of the world phenomena, as ignorant opponents of Advaita are prone to do. Illustrations are always meant only to illustrate particular points and should not be stretched to cover all points; for they would then cease to be mere illustrations.

Gauḍapāda is positive that from the standpoint of the highest realization there is really neither death, nor birth, nor bondage, nor release for the Ātman, and there is thus really no seeker after liberation or anyone liberated. All these are only relative terms and hold good only in the relative world of ignorance. Realization of the highest Truth is always accompanied by freedom from attachment, fear and anger, and it behoves all to live always in this Pure Consciousness, free from all imaginations. A realized man of this type is above all praise and blame, is no slave of Vedic injunctions and rituals, and is always contented with what chance brings to keep up his body. He derives bliss only from the non-dual



Ātman which is one with everything including himself. Thus in this chapter Gauḍapāda convincingly shows the unreality, or ephemeral and relative nature, of all phenomenal world by a penetrating analysis of the dream and waking states, and stresses how the realized man is never moved by considerations of the reality of such objects. Hence the chapter is called Vaitathya-prakaraṇa or Dissertation on the Illusoriness of the World.

## IV

The third chapter is called the Advaita-prakaraṇa or Dissertation on Non-duality. The Advaita philosophy is shown here to have the support of all criteria of right knowledge like perception, reasoning, revelation and spiritual experience. That He, the One, may manifest Himself as the world phenomena without undergoing any real change is brought home to us first by a consideration of the illustration of ākāśa or space. We do daily observe how space is apparently cut up into different portions and different forms and given different names. But has space really undergone any change in its own nature? Has it ceased to be itself? It is clear that the various subjects and objects into which the Ātman has apparently cut itself up need only be as real as the divisions of space. As the ghaṭākāśa (the space in the jar) is not different from mahākāśa (unrestricted space), the individual jīva is not really different from the absolute Ātman. Just as nothing new has come out of mahākāśa when we cognize the ghaṭākāśa, nothing new is produced when we cognize various different individual Jīvas, as their limiting

adjuncts are not in any way different from that which appears to become limited. As with creation, so with preservation and dissolution as well as all other changes that appear to take place in the Ātman. Every change is only imaginary. Again as one ghaṭākāśa is not soiled by the smoke or dirt in another ghaṭākāśa, one Jīva's conditions of happiness or misery need not necessarily affect another. Thus the differences based on form, function and name do not necessarily lead to any real difference in the Ātman as in the case of space. Again as the ghaṭākāśa cannot be considered as a part of the mahākāśa or as an effect of it, so the Jīva too is not a part or an effect of the Absolute. Just as space does not really get dirty by the presence of dirt in it, although children may consider it to be soiled, so really the Jīvas are not affected by any impurity or sin.

The statements in the scriptures also corroborate this non-dual, inherently pure, indivisible, unborn, self-existent Absolute. The Taittirīyopaniṣad analyzes man into 'pañca-kośa' or the 'five sheaths'. The Maṇḍūkyaopaniṣad is shown to support this non-dual Absolute Ātman. The descriptions of the differences in Brahman and the world, met with in the ritualistic sections of the Vedas, are only figurative. So also similar statements in some portions of the Upaniṣads describing creation are only meant to point out the identity to the ordinary minds. Thus all creation theories are alluded to in the scriptures only to support non-duality. The rules regarding division into castes and stations of life are

prescribed only from the standpoint of the relative consciousness or avidyā. They are meant to suit the comprehension of ignorant persons, and are not meant for those who have got the right understanding. Unlike the dualists, the realized man has no conflict with anybody, because everything is Ātman for him and there is nothing else that exists with which he can come into conflict. To the Advaitin, the unity holds good before as well as after creation, where-as to the dualist it can hold good only before creation; so there is no possibility of conflict even if the appearance of duality continues, as it is only the cause that becomes the effect also. If in creation the world comes as a new product different from its cause, then the scriptural statement that the cause is unborn will be contradicted, and as all born things must die, the Ātman too would become mortal. It will also contradict the statement of the scripture that the Ātman is changeless, since if change is real, freedom from change must also be real. The saner view in interpreting scriptures is to accept as correct only such statements as appear reasonable especially when apparently contradictory interpretations are possible. Scriptural statements (like Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad, IV. 4. 10, 19; III. 9. 28; II. 3. 6; Kāṭhōpaniṣad, IV 10. II; Iśāvāsyopaniṣad 12; etc.) all corroborate the view that there is no duality really brought about by a real creation.

Reason also says that there is no necessity for an already existing thing to be born again while a thing that never existed previously cannot come into being, say, like the son of a barren woman. Since it is the

mind that imagines duality as evidence by dream, it naturally follows that if the mind ceases to imagine as a result of the realization of Truth, all duality must inevitably vanish, and it does really vanish in Samādhi and deep sleep. When these imaginations cease, the mind loses its character as mind and appears in its true character as Ātman, as there is no object to be cognized ; for it is really only the Ātman that is called the mind when it cognizes objects. Really the knower and the known are the same, and in the highest spiritual experience the Ātman is simply Pure Consciousness.

A difference has, however, to be noted between the experiences of sleep and Samādhi, although they appear to be similar so far as non-cognition of objects is concerned. Gauḍapāda is very particular in emphasizing this difference. The mind is only withdrawn in sleep, while in Samādhi it realizes its oneness with the Ātman, which is eternally free from all sleep or dream. He is no more subject to the injunctions of the Vedas and has nothing more to achieve. This Samādhi is called asparśa-yoga. The ordinary Yoga is different from this Yoga. The ordinary Yogis depend upon forcible control of the mind which they attempt to suppress, while Vedāntins do not suppress the activities of the mind ; for mind itself is Brahman to them. Ordinary Yogi is after the supreme enjoyment possible in the trance condition, but the Vedānta requires this also to be given up. If the mind becomes inactive, Vedānta requires it to be awakened and made active again, but if it is over-active and distracted, it should be

brought back to tranquillity. Until it reaches complete equilibrium it is likely to draw us to Saṃsāra again as the seeds of ignorance are not lost completely. Even the bliss of Samādhi is not to be enjoyed. The mind must rise above such cravings by constant effort at discrimination and dispassion. When the mind reaches the supreme state—a state attaining which it neither merges in oblivion nor gets distracted by desires—then it verily becomes Brahman. This is the highest bliss of Brahman.

Thus according to Gauḍapāda, the highest Truth is that the Self is never born at all. Hence this view is called Ajāti-vāda. This view is shown in this chapter to have the support of all criteria of right knowledge. Advaita is thus established on a firm foundation, and hence the name Advaita-prakaraṇa, or Dissertation on Non-duality, for this chapter.

## V

The fourth chapter is known as Alātaśānti-prakaraṇa or the chapter on The Quenching of the Firebrand. This is a peculiarly Buddhistic expression to convey the idea of the realization of Advaita. In this chapter, again, we find a predominant use of Buddhistic technical terms and arguments in support of Advaita. A direct reference to Buddhism is also met with in this chapter. We may take it, therefore, that it is this chapter that is mainly intended to appeal to the hearts of the Buddhist nihilists and sceptics so as to provide them with a sliding board, as it were, by which they can, with an unprejudiced mind, slide into the acceptance of the eternally

existent Brahman, the Ātman of the Upaniṣads. Gauḍapāda tries to show them that the view of the Buddhistic philosophers does not exactly tally with the teachings of the great Buddha himself. He professes the greatest respect for the Buddha as the first teacher of real Advaita and bows down to him in the first verse of the chapter. He calls him 'dvipadāṃ varaḥ'—the best among men. An attempt is made by Śaṅkarācārya to make out that the reference is to the sage Nārāyana who, they say, is the first promulgator of the Advaita philosophy. This, however, looks like a forced interpretation to suit the peculiar conditions of the age in which Śaṅkara lived. He was out for a fight against the heterodox Budhists, and to interpret the passage as referring to the Buddha would not, therefore, have suited his purpose. But if we appreciate the eagerness of Gauḍapāda to show a way for even the Buddhists to become believers in Brahman, no better setting could have been given to his teaching than commencing the chapter with a salutation to the Buddha himself. That would at once remove all prejudices from the minds of his Buddhistic readers. It would also be consistent with his view that the Advaitin is a friend of all and a foe of none. The Buddhists are not treated by him as foes to be conquered, but as spoilt children who have to be brought round to the true faith. But it would be far from the truth if we go so far as to say with Prof. Das Gupta that Gauḍapāda was himself a Buddhist, except in the sense that an Advaitin can be a follower of the Buddha without in the least giving up his Advaita. There does not

seem to be sufficient ground to refer to Nārāyaṇa at the beginning of the last chapter inasmuch as the doctrine of Advaita has no special historical connection with Nārāyaṇa. Even if there is, the salutation would have been more appropriate if it were made at the beginning of the work, as is often done by authors, but curiously enough Gauḍapāda's Kārikā has no prayer at all in the beginning.

In demolishing the dualistic theories, the author shows himself as eager as the Buddhists themselves, and he is prepared to go as far with them as reason can take him, but he has reluctantly to part company with them in the end. There is, therefore, nothing strange in the author making use of many an argument used by the Buddhist philosophers for showing the untenability of the dualistic doctrines. The cleverness of the author, however, consists in making the best use of these arguments against the Buddhists themselves in order to convince them of the reality to the Brahman-Ātman on grounds which they themselves are familiar with and can well understand. The Buddhists are shown that all their arguments can hold good only against dualism but not against the non-dualism of Upaniṣads.

Gauḍapāda's attack is directed only against the creationist theories of God, which the dualistic theists are obliged to hold because of their doctrine of the reality of the world. He is not against God as such. Here he fundamentally differs from the position taken up by the Buddhistic philosophers. He is out to show that the Advaitic conception of God is the only theory of reality which reason can listen to. In fact,

it is his anxiety to purify the conception of God so as to save it from all possible attacks that led him to combat all superstitious doctrines. He should, therefore, never be mistaken for an atheist or an agnostic or a sceptic, but should be revered as the purest of thiets who dared to love God and God alone and sought to establish spiritual life on that one and only sure foundation. This warning is necessary lest one should be carried off one's moorings, by the force of his arguments, into the mistake of losing faith in God altogether, which is far from his purpose.

So long as one is in the plane of thought, one cannot escape beyond its boundaries of time, space and causation. The world of which we are aware will always demand a cause and the question has to be satisfactorily answered. Various answers have been offered about the origin of the world but these have not satisfied all minds. The scientist, the philosopher, the mystic and others have each some answer to give. But what one offers is rejected by the other as being quite unreasonable. According to the theist or believer in God, this variegated world with all its order and regularity could have been produced only by an omniscient, omnipotent God. He therefore thinks of the God of the Upaniṣads as the creator of the universe. To some He is only the efficient cause; to others, He is both the efficient and the material cause. Among the former there are those who believe that He created the world out of nothing as well as those who believe that He could have created the world only out of something which existed before creation, while among the latter there are those who



hold that God has actually transformed Himself into the world, as well as others who maintain that God could not really have transformed Himself but only projected an illusion as the juggler does. There are again among theists, those who look upon the world as an entirely new production of God, as well as others who view it as a manifestation of what existed potentially in God. Taking their positions on the principle of causality, various schools of theists hold various views about the relation of God to the universe.

They quarrel among themselves and rationally demonstrate by means of unanswerable arguments the untenability of the views of others. Gauḍapāda sets up these controversialists one against the other, and allows them to demolish mutually all their arguments for a creator God. He points out that these mutual conflicts can be given up only if the Ajāti-vāda or theory of non-creation is accepted. The whole of this last chapter is therefore directed to point to the inevitability of every rational man accepting the Ajāti-vāda and rejecting the conception of God as creator.

Gauḍapāda takes his stand on a plane higher than causality and says from that standpoint that the Ātman alone can be said to exist. The whole world is only God or Ātman, and one has only to open one's eyes and see the Truth as it is. It is only self-delusion that sees the one real God as the world of duality, but in fact such a world of duality does not exist except in one's own imagination. Get rid of this imagination, and God and God alone stands in

all His naked simplicity. The subject, the object and the relation between the two, together with everything which these include within them, reveal themselves as God. All the misery and evil of Saṁsāra, as well as attempts to free oneself from them, are imaginary from this point of view. There is no bondage, and, therefore, there is no freedom from it, no aspirant for freedom, no birth, no death, no change, from this highest standpoint of the unclouded vision of Truth. And as only God exists, no question of the relation between God and the world really holds good at this level of enquiry. Throughout Gauḍapāda condemns the concept of causality itself as meaningless from the standpoint of this highest Reality; he does not, however, deny its usefulness in the lower plane of the intellect. He also does not deny the efficacy of spiritual practices before thought is established in this plane. This is the reason why even in the teachings of Vedic sages the concept of causality is taken as valid. All scriptural statements about creation and about the necessity of love and devotion to God as well as of other spiritual practices, should thus be understood in this light. Even the creator God, who is unreal, is helpful as a prop for sustaining one's efforts until realization. Thus Gauḍapāda has no word of condemnation for anything contained in the scriptures; he only shows their correct place in the scheme of things from the standpoint of Reality. Any man who is only in the lower plane of consciousness should take care not to run away with the idea that all religion is false and that no spiritual practice is necessary.

Another misunderstanding also needs to be cleared. Gauḍapāda is not a believer in the idea that the world will vanish into nothing when the Truth is realized. Everything may remain, but one will not consider it *real* and, therefore, will not get attached to it. This is the only result of realization, and as attachment constitutes the only bondage, there is no more bondage for one when one realizes everything as the Self. Thus 'jīvan-mukti' or liberation in the embodied state is the last word of philosophy and religion—its only rational prop and proof. It is when one realizes that that one becomes a true Brāhmaṇa.

---



Library IAS, Shimla



00014532