

MANDUKYA UPANISAD WITH KARIKA

By Swami Paramarthananda

Transcribed by Sri S. Chandrasekaran, USA



Published by :

Arsha Avinash Foundation

104 Third Street, Tatabad, Coimbatore 641012, India

Phone: + 91 9487373635

E mail: arshaavinash@gmail.com

www.arshaavinash.in

Māṇḍūkyaopaniṣat and Kārikā

Āgamaparakaraṇam

Transcript of classes given by

SWAMI PARAMARTHANANDA

MK-1 = Introduction

In this tradition, the primary scriptures are called the *Veda* and are known as *śruti*. All the other scriptures based on the Veda developed by the ṛṣis later are secondary scriptures including *purāṇas* and epics and are called *smṛti*. Veda is called so because it is the source of knowledge that cannot be obtained by conventional instruments of knowledge at the disposal of human beings. Veda is an independent source of knowledge. Veda is known as *śruti* because it has been heard by the ṛṣis in their meditation. They did not gather the *Veda* by any regular method but they directly gathered them because of their extraordinary *sāttvika* mind. The ṛṣis did not invent the Veda but they only received the Veda and it is believed that the Veda originates from the Lord himself. Therefore, *Bhagavān* through the ṛṣis has given us the Veda. Transmitted by *Bhagavān*, the Veda *mantras* are already present in the creation. We with our ordinary minds will not be reception centers but the ṛṣis who had done extraordinary *tapas*, received the *Veda* mantras. This Vedic teaching, which was heard by the ṛṣis, is called *śruti*. *Śruti* means “heard wisdom”. Later from the ṛṣis, the Veda *mantra* came only through *karṇa paramparā*. *Karṇa paramparā* means that the Veda was never written or printed. That is why we do not have Sanskrit script by itself. Scripts of other languages were used and Sanskrit does not have a script by itself. Veda was orally transmitted to the disciples and they in turn taught orally. Since it comes in the form of *karṇa paramparā*, it is called *śruti*.

This Veda is a very vast literature and gradually much has been lost and we have got only a limited part available. It is said that *Sāma-Veda* had thousand branches out of which only two branches are available now. Similarly in *Yajur-Veda*, etc., totally one thousand one hundred eighty branches were there out of which not even one hundred are available now. These *Veda* mantras are broadly classified into four: *Ṛg-Veda*, *Yajur-Veda*, *Sāma-Veda* and *Atharvana-Veda*. In *Ṛg-Veda*, the mantras are in poetical form. *Yajur-Veda* is in prose form. *Sāma-veda* mantras are in musical form. In *Atharvana-Veda*, most of the mantras are given by the ṛṣi named Atharva. The name Atharva is introduced in the first mantra of the *Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad*.

These four Vedas are broadly classified into two sections, *Veda-pūrvā* and *Veda-anta*, beginning and final parts respectively. This *Veda-pūrvā* section talks about varieties of *karma*. *Karmas* are rites to be done. Therefore, it is called *karma* section (action-section). *Veda-anta* section does not focus on action but on knowledge. *Veda-pūrvā* section gives benefit by doing. *Veda-anta* section gives benefit by knowing. Therefore, *Veda-anta* section is called *jñāna* section (knowledge-section). In all the four Vedas, *karma* section and *jñāna* section are found. Veda expects every follower of Veda to start with the *karma* section, the religious way of life. *Jñāna* section deals with the spiritual life. One should start with religious life and graduate into spiritual life. Without religious life, spirituality will not work. Without spirituality, religious life is incomplete. Therefore, the follower of the Veda should follow a religious life and go to spirituality.

The activities in the action-section of the Veda are divided into three types: physical activity including *pūjā*, pilgrimage, etc.; verbal activity including chanting, *japa*, etc.; and purely mental activity as instructed by the scriptures, mental *japa*, mental chanting, elaborate mental *pūjā*, etc. Mental activity associated with *Īśvara* is called *upāsana*. All the activities produce benefit as promised by the Veda. These benefits are broadly classified into three types: *artha*, *kāma*, and *dharma*. *Artha* is all forms of wealth that will give security to a person namely land, house, gold, relationship, etc. Once one is secure, one looks for *kāma*, which is pleasure, entertainment and relaxation. Many rituals for the fulfillment of *kāma* are prescribed in the Veda. People next seek *dharma*, which is *puṇyam* (merit). *Kāma* and *artha* are used only in this birth. Only *puṇyam* follows the dead and is useful for future lives. Thus we have three kinds of *karma*, physical, verbal and mental; and three kinds of results, *dharma*, *artha* and *kāma* associated with the *karma* section of the Veda.

All these results are wonderful in giving security and entertainment and can even take us to heaven as Kṛṣṇa says in the *Bhagavad Gita*.

Having worshipped Me through yajñas, those people who know the three Veda, who drink the soma-juice (in somayaga), and who are thus purified of sins pray for access to the heavens. Having reached the sacred world of Indra, they enjoy the celestial pleasures of the gods in the heavens. (9:20)

Three Intrinsic Defects of all Results

However, all the *dharma*, *artha* and *kāma* results have three intrinsic defects. These defects are:

1. *duḥkha-miśrī tattvam*: All these pleasures are also mixed with pain in their acquisition, maintenance, and loss. Kṛṣṇa himself says in the *Bhagavad Gita*.

Having enjoyed that vast heavenly world, they come back to the world of mortals when their puṇya is exhausted. Thus, the seekers of sense-pleasures who have taken to the rituals of the Veda attain (only the lot of) arrival and departure. (9:21)

2. *atr̥pti karatvam*: All these pleasures are finite in nature. Because *karma* is finite, *karma* benefit is also finite and does not produce satisfaction. This is discontentment.

3. *bhandakatvam*: These pleasures create dependency. Initially, they are used and enjoyed, but later a need for them develops, still later life without them becomes impossible.

The instinctive desire of every living being including animals is independence. Unknowingly we are working against this instinctive desire and human spirit. Thus we all go from dependence to greater dependence in the course of our lives. Modern life increases this dependency. In the action-section of the

Veda, the triad of actions (physical, verbal, mental), the triad of results (*artha, kāma, dharma*), and the triad of defects (pleasure mixed with sorrow, discontentment, dependency) are seen.

We have to discover these three defects by ourselves. In *Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad*, it is shown how to discover the limited nature of all our pursuits.

Examining the experiences gained by doing actions and meditation, may the discriminative person discover dispassion. Mokṣa, which is not created, cannot be gained through action. Therefore, to gain the knowledge of Brahman, he must go with sacrificial twigs in hand to a teacher who is well versed in scriptures and who has clear knowledge of Brahman. (1.2.12)

An intelligent seeker should go through a religious life and discover these three defects. This discovery is called *vairāgyam*, dispassion. Worldly ends are all wonderful but they are limited and we are looking for something else. Most people do not recognize these defects and go beyond. Only a few intelligent people want to go beyond the worldly ends as Kṛṣṇa says in the *Bhagavad Gita*.

Among thousands of human beings a rare one strives for liberation. Even among those seekers who strive, a rare one knows Me in reality. (7:3)

These seekers want to know if there is something that is free from these three defects. The action-section of the Veda can provide only results with defects but what is of interest is a defect-free solution.

The Defect-Free Solution

When a person sincerely asks, Veda says that there is such a solution. In the *Bhagavad Gita*, Kṛṣṇa refers to this defect-free solution.

Here itself birth is overcome by those whose mind is established in sameness. Brahman is indeed the same and defect-less. Therefore they are established in Brahman. (5:19)

There is something that is free from these three defects and it is called Brahman or *mokṣa*. In *Kaṭhapaniṣad*, the three defective pursuits put together were called *preyas* and *mokṣa* is called *śreyas*.

Śreyas and preyas approach the human being. Having very clearly considered them, the discriminative (person) distinguishes (them). Indeed, the discriminative one chooses śreyas rather than preyas. The indiscriminate one chooses preyas for the sake of acquisition and preservation. (1.2.2)

The action-section of the Veda is non-relevant for *śreyas*. *Veda-anta* becomes relevant then and Vedānta (knowledge-section) when asked for *mokṣa* gives a shocking statement. Vedānta says that there is

Brahman, there is *mokṣa*, which is free from all defects, but never look for that Brahman because *tat Brahma tvam asi*, that Brahman you are! We have missed to look at ourselves. Even though Vedānta declares that, we will not easily accept it because we already have a conclusion about ourselves. Our conclusion is that we are miserable *jīvas* but Vedānta says that we are the wonderful Brahman. Our conclusion has been arrived at due to our experiences over so many years. *Saṃsāra* is helplessness, anger, frustration, and depression. Life has become a meaningless, burdensome, boring struggle. ‘We are miserable *jīvas*’ is a conclusion that we have arrived at but Vedānta says otherwise. Which one is correct? We have to enquire. Thus begins self-enquiry as to whether we are miserable *jīvas* or wonderful Brahman. Vedānta, being a means of knowledge, helps us do that enquiry.

MK-2 = Introduction

In summary, the journey of a spiritual seeker is from the action-section of the Veda to the knowledge-section of the Veda after he discovers that all the goals presented by the action-section of the Veda, viz., *dharma*, *artha* and *kāma* are intrinsically defective. Therefore, the student asks for a defect-free goal. Veda says that that goal is *mokṣa*, the fourth pursuit. Vedānta deals with Brahman or *mokṣa*. When Vedānta is approached, Vedānta makes a shocking statement to the student that that Brahman is not an object that you arrive at but it is you yourself, *tat tvam asi*. After listening to this, the student now has a conflict because what he has concluded through all his experiences is that he is a helpless, miserable *jīvātma* whereas Vedānta tells that he is none other than the wonderful Brahman or *paramātma*. Now the question is who is he? Both he cannot easily reject. One is arrived at by long experience and the other is coming from the Veda. Therefore the student decides to make a self-enquiry to determine which one is the fact. Thus self-enquiry or *ātma-vicāra* starts.

Means for Self-Knowledge

What is the instrument of knowledge that I am going to use to make this enquiry? To study the microbes, I need a microscope and to study the farthest stars I need a telescope. Without an appropriate instrument called *pramāṇam*, we cannot make an enquiry into anything called *prameyam*, object. What is the *pramāṇam* used for *ātma-vicāra*? Six *pramanams* are recognized in Vedānta: *Pratyakṣa*, direct perception; *anumāna*, inference based on data; *arthāpatti*, presumption based on data; *upamāna*, based on comparison; *anupalabdhi*, based on absence; *śabda* based on the words used. Of these six *pramanams*, five are ruled out for *ātma-vicāra* because *pratyakṣa*, direct perception using the sense organs is meant to study the objective universe, the *anātmā*. Sense organs cannot be used for studying “I”, *ātmā*, the subject. The others also will not be useful because they are used based on the data collected through sense organs. Sensory data are the basis for *anumāna*, *arthāpatti* and *upamāna*. Since the sense organs cannot function with respect to *ātmā*, sensory data will also be useless and so four *pramanams* are eliminated. *Anupalabdhi* is a unique *pramāṇam* used to know the absence of things, which is not meant for knowing the presence of things. Here we are talking about the *ātmā*, “I” that is present. So *anupalabdhi pramāṇam* is also ruled out. So we end up with *śabda pramāṇam*, spoken and written words. *Śabda pramāṇam* is divided into worldly *śabda* and scriptural *śabda*. Worldly *śabda* is all the words given out by human beings based on research and analysis. All those words are useless with respect to the study of the subject because they are based on *pratyakṣa* and *anumāna* from the study of the objective world. Thus we are left with scriptural *śabda*, words coming through revelation in the Veda. Vedic *śabda* is also divided into action-section and knowledge-section (Vedānta). The action-section deals with rituals, various deities and various worlds, which are all part of the objective world and so this *pramāṇam* is also useless.

We are now left with Vedānta, the Upaniṣads. Vedānta exclusively deals with “I”, the *ātman*. It does not turn me outward but turns me inward towards myself. Convex and concave lenses will show me objects outside of me but a mirror will never turn me extrovert but it will turn my attention towards myself. Similarly, the Upaniṣads are a unique form of mirror. They do not talk about the objective world. They do not even talk about my body and mind, which are objects of experience, but they talk about me who is aware of the body and mind. They talk about the nature of *ātman*. Therefore, for self-enquiry, we have to study the Upaniṣads.

A Teacher is Necessary for Self-Enquiry

But the Upaniṣads face a serious problem. They have to use only words to reveal the *ātman*. All the words that we have learnt deal with *anātman*, the objective world. The objective world has five features: *dr̥śyatvam* (can be objectified), *bhautikatvam* (materiality), *saguṇatvam* (having attributes), *savikāratvam* (changing nature), and *āgamāpāyitvam* (subject to arrival and departure). All the words talk about *anātman* and using this vocabulary, the Upaniṣads have to reveal the *ātman*, which has got the opposite nature. Thus the Upaniṣads have a tough challenge. Whenever the Upaniṣads describe Brahman or *ātman*, our tendency is to look for that *ātman* because we think that *ātman* is another object in the universe. We will either search outside or inside. **The Upaniṣads have to describe in such a way that we never try to know the *ātman* but we learn to claim that we are the *ātman*.** As even the descriptions come, we should not objectify Brahman. Brahman can never be realized by meditation because Brahman is never an object of realization. The person sitting for realization is Brahman but our tendency is to objectify. Upaniṣads have to teach in an ingenious manner. They have to use different techniques, paradoxes, *adhyāropa-apavāda nyāya* (method of false attribution and subsequent retraction), etc. Therefore, we should know how to extract the message from the Upaniṣads and when we come out of the Upaniṣad class, we should not look for Brahman but should claim that we are that Brahman. This is not easy. Therefore, the Upaniṣads should never be studied by oneself. Self-study will lead to the idea that Brahman is some mysterious thing that has to be realized later. That objectification orientation of the student has to be broken. The words of the Upaniṣads have to be employed properly. So the Veda instructs that the Upaniṣads should be studied with the help of a *guru*. If I study the Upaniṣads by myself, I will say that I know Brahman but I have not experienced Brahman. This is objectification of Brahman. A *guru* has to take care of this misconception. One should never say that he has to experience Brahman. The one who says that happens to be Brahman. **Therefore, the Upaniṣads are a *pramāṇam*, a means of knowledge, when they are studied with the help of a *guru*.** In *Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad*, we saw:

Examining the experiences gained by doing actions and meditation, may the discriminative person discover dispassion. Mokṣa, which is not created, cannot be gained through action. Therefore, to gain the knowledge of Brahman, he must go with sacrificial twigs in hand to a teacher who is well versed in scriptures and who has clear knowledge about Brahman. (1.2.12)

In the *Bhagavad Gita*, Kṛṣṇa says,

May you gain that (knowledge) by prostration, by service, and by proper enquiry. The wise sages will impart (that) knowledge to you. (4:34)

Stages in Self-Enquiry

1. Śravaṇam

So *ātma-vicāra* should be done by listening to the teaching of the Upaniṣads coming from a competent *ācārya*, in a process called *śravaṇam*. *Śravaṇam* is consistent and systematic study of Vedāntic scriptures for a length of time under the guidance of a competent *ācārya*. When the study is done systematically, the *guru* talks about the consciousness principle, which makes the body alive and sentient and talks about the nature of consciousness with these five features:

1. Consciousness is not a part, product or property of the body.
2. It is an independent principle that pervades and enlivens the body.
3. It is not limited by the boundaries of the body.
4. It continues to exist even after the body dissolves.
5. The surviving pure consciousness is not accessible for transaction.

After hearing this description of consciousness, the tendency of the student will be to look for that consciousness and then the Upaniṣads will say to not look for that consciousness, that consciousness cannot be known, and that consciousness is not a known object. You can never know consciousness as an object. You can know consciousness in only one way. Knowing is claiming that I am that consciousness. All this should happen in *śravaṇam*. Once I claim myself to be consciousness, the body and mind should be understood as part of the world, which is an object of consciousness. World, body, and mind are objects but I, the experiencer of the body, mind and the world, am the *ātmā*. Whenever I am complaining about myself, they are all complaints about the body and the mind. By mistaking the body as myself, the mind as myself, all their limitations have been taken as my limitations. When the body is old, I never say that body is old. I say that I am old. When the mind is disturbed, I never say that the mind is disturbed but I say that I am disturbed. Therefore, I should understand that I am the *sākṣī* (witness) consciousness different from the body and mind. I do not have all these problems, which are associated with *anātmā* and I, *ātmā*, am free from all the problems. Any problems I mention belong to one of the *anātmās*, world, body or mind. Therefore, I am problem-free Brahman. All these, I have to gather during *śravaṇam*.

Then the Upaniṣads will talk about the world. What is this world that we are experiencing? The Upaniṣads will say that the *anātmā* world is only an effect. In *Taittirīya Upaniṣad*, the evolution of a human being from Brahman is described:

From that (Brahman,) which is indeed this ātmā, space is born. From space air (is born.) From air fire (is born.) From fire water (is born.) From water the earth (is born.) From the earth plants (are born.) From plants food (is born.) From food the human being (is born.).... (2.1.2)

The entire creation is an effect and therefore only name and form. Thus I am Brahman and the world is name and form. *aham satyaṃ jagan mithyā* – I am *satyaṃ* and the world is *mithyā*. This we have to grasp. In every class, we get a little bit of this teaching. We have to nourish ourselves during several sessions of *śravaṇam*. Initially we will reject it outright. Thereafter, we might think that it might be true. Then, it might appear to be fact and only then we will accept. This process is called *śravaṇam*. The message is *aham satyaṃ jagan mithyā* and the world cannot disturb me.

2. Mananam

Even though the central message is received from the *guru*, the intellect will have several questions. As long as doubts are there, knowledge will not be knowledge. It is as good as ignorance. Doubtful knowledge cannot give much benefit. Therefore the process of *mananam* by which I remove all the doubts is done either by myself by going back to the previous Upaniṣad or I have discussions with other students. Otherwise I have to go to the *guru* himself for clarification or I have to study the advanced Vedānta books, which are exclusively meant for removing doubts, books like *Brahma Sūtras*. Through *mananam*, I should convince my intellect. I need not convince other people. That is not relevant for me. *Śravaṇam* gives knowledge and *mananam* gives unshaken knowledge.

3. Nididhyāsanam

After *śravaṇam* and *mananam* I have got the clear knowledge that ‘*aham satyaṃ jagan mithyā* name and form’, which cannot affect me at all, but my old habitual thinking about myself will continue. Any habit will not go that easily. After knowing that the name of the city of Madras is changed to Chennai, getting used to saying Chennai when referring to the city will take some time. Here ignorance is not the problem but the subconscious has the Madras *vāsanā*. For a few days, I have to be careful to say the correct name of the city. Any habit has to be removed gradually. Habits are formed gradually and they are removed gradually. **Therefore, the way I look at myself must change because Vedānta is talking about me.** I have entertained a strong opinion about myself not for a few years but from beginning-less time.

Our normal opinion is in the form of a triangular format. The triangular format is that I am an individual victimized by the world and the world is a problem giver, the victimizer, and I being so small the world

being so big I cannot manage things so I have to regularly rush to a God who has to be a savior. This is *Jīva-Jagat-Īśvara* triangular format. In this format, I can never come out of *saṃsāra*. As a *jīva*, I can never come out of *karma*. This triangular format must go. This is called *dāsoham-bhāvanā – Bhagavān* is the master and I am the helpless *jīva*. In the name of *bhakti* and humility, I have looked down upon myself. Vedānta says not to look down upon oneself. After *śravaṇam* and *mananam* I have to stand erect. I am not an ordinary *jīva*. I am none other than Brahman. The entire world is nothing but name and form, which exists because of my support. Just like the dream world projected by me cannot touch me the waker, this world projected by me cannot touch me the Brahman. This new habit I have to develop. This is called binary format: *aham satyam jagan mithyā*. Where should I run to get *mokṣa*? To run is impossible because I am all-pervading.

This binary format is presented in the five capsules of Vedānta:

1. I am of the nature of eternal and all-pervading consciousness.
2. I am the only source of permanent peace, security and happiness.
3. By my mere presence, I give life to the material body and through the material body I experience the material universe.
4. I am never affected by any event that happens in the material world or in the material body-mind complex.
5. By forgetting my real nature, I convert life into a burden and by remembering my real nature, I convert life into a blessing.

These five capsules should be assimilated and they should inform my life. This new vision should displace my old habit. So meditation on these five capsules should be done until they become natural to me. This assimilation of these five capsules is binary format assimilation and triangular format must go out of my life. When I talk to other people, I should use the language of the triangular format. I should never use the binary format in worldly transactions. But in my private thinking, inner conversation, and internal chattering of the mind, the language of binary format should be used. This process of assimilating the binary format and displacing the triangular format is called ***nididhyāsanam***. Thus through *śravaṇam*, *mananam* and *nididhyāsanam* with the help of *guru-sastra pramāṇam*, when I come to the binary format, I claim my ever liberated nature.

This is the journey. This knowledge itself is liberation because I am already liberated. This teaching of *ātmā* in the *Veda-anta* portion is known by two names: *jñāna* section and Upaniṣad. Upa-ni-ṣad is the functional name of this knowledge. ‘Upa’ means *ātmā*, literally whatever is closest to me, ‘ni’ means *niścaya jñānam*, doubtless knowledge, ‘ṣad’ means destroyer, *jñānam* the destroyer, the destroyer of *saṃsāra*. *Saṃsāra-nāśaka-ātmajñānam*, *saṃsāra*-destroying-self knowledge is the meaning of the word Upaniṣad. This Upaniṣad is found in all the four Vedas. This teaching is in the form of *guru-śiṣya*

(disciple) dialog. Many such dialogs or discussions have been seen in some of the Upaniṣads and now we are entering into *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad*, which is the *ātmajñānam* discussed in *Atharvāna-Veda*.

MK-3 = Chapter 1, Mantras – 1, 2

In the last two classes, we discussed the spiritual journey of an individual covering all the introductions given in the previous Upaniṣads. We said that self-enquiry is necessary because there is a difference between what we understand about ourselves and how Vedānta looks at us. We look upon ourselves as *saṃsāri jīvātma* but Vedānta looks upon us as *asaṃsāri paramātma*. Therefore, our aim is to find out which vision is the right one and which is the wrong one. For that purpose only, we do *śravaṇam*, *mananam* and *nididhyāsanam*. If we go through that systematically, clearly and correctly, then the conclusion we arrive at is that our vision of ourselves is a misconception.

What the Upaniṣads reveal about us alone is the right vision. “I am *jīvātma*” is the wrong understanding and “I am *paramātma*” is the right understanding. Upaniṣads do not introduce some new *paramātma* or Brahman. It is only a question of enquiry about an already available entity, “I”. Whether I exist or not is not doubtful because I should exist first to even doubt that I exist. The doubter cannot be doubted. Upaniṣads only talk about myself that is already present questioning about the vision that I have about myself. According to Vedānta, we have taken ourselves for granted without making an enquiry. This is similar to the geocentric view of the universe that was held by all for a long time. When it was told for the first time that that view was not correct and that the heliocentric view is the correct one, it was not readily accepted. It took a lot of time for people to accept it. Mankind does enquiry and research about everything else besides the human beings because we think we know who we are. Vedānta does not introduce a new truth, a new God, or a new Brahman. It only questions our understanding about ourselves. Brahman is not a new thing but it is the name that Vedānta gives to our true nature through its teaching. Brahman is a new vision about us. Vedānta does not question our existence but only challenges the understanding of our status. We claim we are *jīvātma*. Vedānta says that we are *paramātma*. This is the only debate.

If a student systematically and consistently goes through *śravaṇam*, *mananam* and *nididhyāsanam*, he can come to the conclusion given by the Upaniṣad. What Vedānta says is that as long as I look upon myself as *jīvātma*, the *saṃsāra* problem will not be solved irrespective of my efforts to change the world or myself. *Saṃsāra* will go only by changing my vision about myself. This is called *mokṣa*. This teaching is called Vedānta, knowledge-section and Upaniṣads. This teaching will put an end to the wanting mind. That we want is common to all of us but what we want changes with each person. The wanting-self is replaced by the fulfilled-self. This is *mokṣa*.

This teaching occurs at the end part of every Veda. To indicate that this teaching should be obtained from a *guru*, most of the teaching is presented in the form of a dialog between *guru* and disciple. Examples of one *guru*-one disciple, one *guru*-many disciples and many *gurus*-many disciples are found. Originally, there were 1180 Upaniṣads spread over all the Veda, of which only 200 or so are available today. Commentaries are available for 108, of which Śāṅkarācārya’s commentaries are available for only

ten. Therefore these ten are called the principal Upaniṣads only because Śāṅkara's commentaries are available. The major Upaniṣads, *Muṇḍaka*, *Kena*, *Kaṭha*, and *Taittirīya* and the minor Upaniṣad *Kaivalya* were studied.

Now we are entering the sixth major Upaniṣad, *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad*. It belongs to the *Atharvana Veda* and it is called *Māṇḍūkya* because it is associated with a *ṛṣi* by name Maṇḍūka. The word has the meaning frog and some people call this Upaniṣad frog Upaniṣad because the teaching in this Upaniṣad makes a big leap like a frog! It is a small Upaniṣad, the smallest of the major Upaniṣads consisting of only 12 *mantras*. For this Upaniṣad, a great *ācārya* has written an analysis called *kārikā*. *Kārikā* is not a commentary, as a commentary deals with every word of a verse, but it is an analysis in verse form. This independent analysis is called *Māṇḍūkyakārikā* written by Gauḍapādācārya. Gauḍapāda is the *guru* of Śāṅkarācārya's *guru*. He is considered to be an important link in the *guru* lineage that according to the tradition started with the Lord Nārāyaṇa himself.

Gauḍapāda's work is *Māṇḍūkyakārikā*, which consists of 215 verses. Each verse is called a *kārikā*. Śāṅkara writes a commentary on the 12 *mantras* of the Upaniṣad and the 215 *kārikās*. We will study both the Upaniṣad and *kārikās*. These 12 *mantras* plus the 215 *kārikās* are divided into 4 chapters. The first chapter is called *Āgamaprakaraṇam*. This chapter contains the entire Upaniṣad and 29 *kārikās*. The second chapter is called *Vaitathyaprakaraṇam* containing 38 *kārikās* on the *mithyā* nature of the universe. The third chapter is titled *Advaitaprakaraṇam* containing 48 *kārikās* dealing with the non-dual nature of *ātmā*. The fourth chapter is called *Alātaśāntiprakaraṇam* containing 100 *kārikās*, which clear all the possible objections to the teaching contained in the Upaniṣad. We now enter into the first chapter.

The Upaniṣad starts with a *śāntipāṭha* (prayer). In this prayer, the student prays to the Lord asking for three blessings. The first is the physical fitness, sharp intellect, clear mind, and sufficient span of healthy life to successfully conclude *śravaṇam*, *mananam* and *nididhyāsanam*. The second is for the spiritual journey to be free from obstacles. The third is for freedom from obstacles due to three sources: *ādhyātmika* (one's body-mind-sense complex), *ādhibhautika* (fellow human beings and other life forms), and *ādhidaiivika* (factors over which one has no control). The student prays for fitness, smooth spiritual journey and freedom from obstacles. Now we go into the Upaniṣad proper.

Mantras 1, 2

ॐ इत्येतदक्षरं इदं सर्वं तस्योपव्याख्यानं
भूतं भवद् भविष्यदिति सर्वमोङ्कार एव ।

यच्चान्यत् त्रिकालातीतं तदप्योङ्कार एव ॥ १ ॥

om ityetadakṣaram idagṃ sarvaṃ tasyopavyākhyānaṃ
 bhūtaṃ bhavad bhaviṣyaditi sarvamoṅkāra eva ।
 yaccānyat trikālātītaṃ tadapyoṅkāra eva ॥ 1॥

The syllable Om is all this. (Now follows) a clear and complete exposition of that (syllable.) All this belonging to the past, the present, and the future is Oṅkāra only. And anything else, which is beyond the three periods of time is also Oṅkāra only. (mantra 1)

सर्वं ह्येतद् ब्रह्मायमात्मा ब्रह्म सोऽयमात्मा
 चतुष्पात् ॥ २ ॥

sarvaṃ hyetad brahmāyamatma brahma so'yamatma
 catuspāt ॥ 2॥

All this is indeed Brahman. This ātmā is Brahman. This ātmā has four quarters. (mantra 2)

MK-4 = Chapter 1, Mantras 2, 3

Mantras 1, 2

ॐ इत्येतदक्षरं इदं सर्वं तस्योपव्याख्यानं
भूतं भवद् भविष्यदिति सर्वमोङ्कार एव ।

यच्चान्यत् त्रिकालातीतं तदप्योङ्कार एव ॥ १ ॥

सर्वं ह्येतद् ब्रह्मायमात्मा ब्रह्म सोऽयमात्मा
चतुष्पात् ॥ २ ॥

In the first two mantras, the Upaniṣad introduces two types of enquires. The first is *oṅkāra-vicāra*, analysis of *Oṅkāra*, introduced in *mantra* 1. *Oṅkāra* means the syllable *OM*. The second is *ātma-vicāra*, self-enquiry, introduced in *mantra* 2. The actual enquiry is conducted from the third mantra onwards. *Mantras* 3 to 7 deal with *ātma-vicāra*. *Mantras* 8 to 12 deal with *oṅkāra-vicāra*.

First we will see the meaning of *mantra* 1. The Upaniṣad says that *Oṅkāra*, the word or syllable *OM*, is everything in the creation and that a thorough, comprehensive and an intimate analysis into the *Oṅkāra* is going to be done. When the Upaniṣad says *Oṅkāra* is everything, what is meant by everything? The Upaniṣad itself explains that everything belonging to the past, present and future, whether they are inert objects or sentient living beings, are all nothing but *Oṅkāra*. *Taittirīya Upaniṣad* also refers to *Oṅkāra* in a similar manner briefly in the 1st chapter: (*One should meditate upon*) *Oṅkāra* as Brahman (*because,*) *all this is Oṅkāra alone* (1.8). That statement is elaborated here. There is something called the ultimate reality or truth which is beyond all time and other than the universe. Whatever the ultimate or absolute reality is, which is beyond past, present and future, is also *Oṅkāra*. Thus what falls within time and what lies beyond time is nothing but *Oṅkāra*. Since *Oṅkāra* is within time and beyond time, by analyzing *Oṅkāra*, we are analyzing everything. Thus *Oṅkāra* is a precious syllable. *Oṅkāra* is everything and so understanding *Oṅkāra* amounts to understanding everything within time and beyond time. Thus *oṅkāra-vicāra* is very important. The actual enquiry will be conducted later in mantras 8 to 12.

In the second *mantra*, another enquiry is introduced. Looking from another angle, the entire creation is Brahman. This includes the past, present and future; Brahman is everything within time and as well as beyond time. That Brahman will be analyzed. By analyzing one Brahman, we can analyze everything within time and beyond time. Thus Brahman enquiry is very precious. Then the Upaniṣad itself asks the question: What is that Brahman? The Upaniṣad answers: *ātmā* is nothing but Brahman. *Ātmā* means myself. Therefore, Brahman is everything. I equate Brahman with myself. Myself is Brahman. Therefore myself is everything. *Ātmā* is everything. By *ātma-vicāra*, self-enquiry, we are enquiring into the entire creation, which is within time and beyond time. Thus the second enquiry is *ātma-vicāra*. *Mantra* 1 prescribes *oṅkāra-vicāra*. *Mantra* 2 prescribes *ātma-vicāra*.

Introducing the *ātma-vicāra* in *mantra* 2, the first important message that the Upaniṣad gives is that *ātmā*, the self, has got four quarters or parts or components or **facets or aspects**. Thus, *oṅkāra-vicāra* involves enquiry into the four components of *ātmā*. Only when I enquire into the four quarters of *ātmā*, myself, will I know the truth of the entire creation. What are those four aspects of *ātmā*? These will be analyzed in the verses 3 to 7.

Mantra 3 describes the first quarter. *Mantra* 4 describes the second quarter. *Mantras* 5 and 6 describe the third quarter and *mantra* 7 describes the fourth quarter. Before studying this *mantra*, an introduction is needed. The uniqueness of the *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad* is that it is like a steep mountain. Some explanations are necessary in some places to help us climb that mountain!

Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad is uniquely different from all the other Upaniṣads in one particular aspect, which makes it distinct, profound and difficult to grasp. What is this difference? **In all the other Upaniṣads, the first lesson taught is that Brahman is the cause of this entire universe.** Brahman is the cause and the universe is the effect. Creation models are found in most of the Upaniṣads. *Aitareya*, *Muṇḍaka*, and *Taittirīya* Upaniṣads introduce Brahman as the cause and the world as the product. Then it is said that since Brahman is the cause, it is the only substantial entity and the world, which is a product, is only name and form. Any product is only name and form. Ornaments do not exist as substance. Gold alone is the substance. Ornaments are only name and form. What is the weight of the ornament? Whatever weight we talk about belongs to the gold alone. Ornaments are only name and form. In Vedānta, we use this principle: Brahman is cause; the whole world is effect. Therefore the world is only a name and form. It does not have any substantiality and it does not have an existence of its own. When it is said that the ornament is, its existence is borrowed from the gold. In all other Upaniṣads, it is said that the world is *mithyā*, mere name and form, and does not have an existence of its own. *Mithyā* means mere name and form and no independent existence. **The world is a product born out of Brahman and so is *mithyā* just as a pot is, which is born of clay.**

In *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad*, this argument is not used. *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad* does not apply this reasoning. It uses another reasoning to show that the world is *mithyā*. That reasoning is very deep and steep and a lot of reflection is needed to grasp it. The reasoning goes as follows.

Śaṅkara says that the world is *mithyā* because we are experiencing it. Therefore whatever you experience is *mithyā* because you experience it. If everything experienced is *mithyā*, what is *satyaṃ*? That which is never experienced is *satyaṃ*. Is there such a thing that is never experienced? *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad* says that there is such a thing. There is only one thing that exists, which is never experienced and that is the experiencer, observer, or awarer that can never become the object of experience. Eyes can see everything but cannot see themselves. The seer cannot be seen, the experiencer cannot be experienced, the one who touches cannot be touched. I, the observer alone am *satyaṃ* and every other thing is *mithyā* because it is observed or experienced.

How is this conclusion reached? The reasoning by Śaṅkara goes like this. If you have to prove the existence of an object, it must be a known object. You can never talk about the existence of an unknown object. The moment you talk about the existence of an object, it is already known. **Therefore the existence of an object can be proved only when it is known for someone or the other. If there is something that can never be known by anyone at anytime, that object comes under the non-existent category.** Do we have horn? The answer is that we do not have horn. If nobody experiences horns, the conclusion is that we do not have horn. **Existence of an object is proved only when it is knowable.** Being knowable is the criterion to prove the existence of anything. Existence depends upon being knowable. Existence requires know-ability.

Anything becomes knowable only when there is a knower. Knower is I, the observer subject. So Vedānta concludes that the subject knower proves the existence of every object. Existence of an object depends on the subject. Therefore the **subject, 'I', alone lends existence to all the objects in the creation.** But my existence does not depend on the objects. Because even without experiencing objects, I know that I am existent. My existence does not depend on the external world but the existence of the external world depends upon myself. Even if I close my sense organs and mind and even if the whole world is shut out, I know that I am existent. **Existence of the subject is self-proven** but the existence of the object needs to be proved by the subject only. Therefore, Śaṅkarācārya says that I, the observer, am *satyaṃ* and that the world is *mithyā*. The only substance is "I". The entire world is name and form, *mithyā*. **In the other Upaniṣads, the world is *mithyā* because it is a product. In *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad*, the world is *mithyā* because it is an object of experience.** When I say that the entire world is *mithyā* because it is an object, what about my body? The body is observed and is an object of experience, a temporary object of experience in the waking state. The body is *mithyā* name and form. The mind is also clearly experienced by me because I am aware of the changing conditions of the mind. Thus the experienced universe, body and mind are *mithyā* name and form and I am the *satyaṃ*.

Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad divides the entire experienced universe into three segments:

1. The waker's universe, which includes this universe, body and mind, is experienced in the waking state and only in the waking state.
2. The dreamer's universe, which includes the dream universe and the dream body, is available only in the dream state. Both the waker's and the dreamer's universes are different and mutually exclusive, but both are experienced and so are *mithyā*.
3. The deep sleep state, in which the waker's and the dreamer's universe are not experienced, must contain them in potential form. Everything is in potential causal state in deep sleep. So the universe obtained in the deep sleep state is the causal universe.

The waking state universe, the dream state universe, and the causal universe are all *mithyā*. I am *satyaṃ*, the observer of all the three. These three observed universes are mutually exclusive. They are subject to arrival and departure. I do not arrive and depart. I am the *sākṣī*, the witness principle, who am aware of

the waking universe in the waking state, the dream universe in the dream state and the causal universe in the deep sleep state. I am associated with all these three as the observer.

Even though I am one, the Upaniṣad gives me the observer, three different names based on my relationship with these three observed universes. Just as one person is called father, husband and son depending on his relationship with son, wife and father, I, the one observer, am given three different names. As observer of the waking universe, I am called *prathama pāda*, *Viśva*. As observer of the dream universe, I am called *dvitīya pāda*, *Taijasa*. As the observer of the causal universe, I am called *trītiya pāda*, *Prājña*. Thus, I have three relational names. These are the first three quarters (*pādas*) of the *ātmā*. With this background, we will go to the *mantras*.

MK-5 = Chapter 1, Mantras – 3, 4

Mantra 3

जागरितस्थानो बहिष्प्रज्ञः सप्ताङ्ग एकोनविंशतिमुखः

स्थूल भुग्वैश्वानरः प्रथमः पादः ॥ ३ ॥

*jāgaritasthāno bahiṣprajñah saptāṅga ekonaviṁśatimukhaḥ
sthūla bhugvaiśvānarah prathamah pādah ॥ 3॥*

The first quarter is Vaiśvānara whose field is the waking state, whose consciousness is outward, who has seven limbs, who has nineteen mouths, and who is the experiencer of gross (objects). (mantra 3)

After introducing *Onkāra* enquiry and *ātmā* enquiry in the first two mantras, now the Upaniṣad enters into *ātmā* enquiry, which is from mantra 3 to 7. The Upaniṣad pointed out that *ātmā* has four quarters, meaning aspects or facets or expressions. These four quarters will be explained from the 3rd *mantra* onward.

An introduction is given to show how the four quarters are presented. If that total picture is clear then the *mantras* can be understood. The whole development is based on some of these fundamental principles. If these fundamentals are grasped, it is easy. We have to highlight this because the fundamental principle of *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad* is uniquely different from that of all the other Upaniṣads. In all the other Upaniṣads, the fundamental principle is that cause is *satyaṃ* and effect is *mithyā*. Cause is *satyaṃ* having independent existence and effect is *mithyā* meaning that it is name and form and is not a substance by itself. However, *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad*'s fundamental principle is not “cause *satyaṃ* effect *mithyā*”, but much more profound: I, the observer am *satyaṃ*, whatever I observe is *mithyā*. I, the experiencer, am *satyaṃ*, and whatever I experience is *mithyā* because the observed cannot exist independent of the observer. The observer is called *ātmā* and the observed is called *anātmā*. I, the *ātmā*, am *satyaṃ* and anything that I experience, *anātmā*, is *mithyā*. When I use the word I, the observer, what is the meaning of the word I? We should carefully note that it is not the body because the body also comes under the observed *anātmā*. The observer is also not the mind because the mind also comes under the observed *anātmā*. Therefore, who am I, the observer *ātmā*? The observer *ātmā* is neither the body nor the mind, but is the consciousness principle. “I, the observer *ātmā*” means the consciousness principle and not the body or mind. Consciousness is not a part, product or property of the body; it is an independent principle that pervades and enlivens the body; it is not limited by the boundaries of the body; it continues to exist even after the body falls. This eternal all-pervading consciousness principle is meant by the word *ātmā*, ‘I’, the observer and *satyaṃ*. *Mithyā* is everything that I experience including world, mind and body. *Ātmā* is *satyaṃ* and *anātmā* is *mithyā*. This is the starting point of *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad*. This is the starting point of *Tattvabodha* also.

The *anātmā* is divided into three portions: *anātmā* obtaining in the waking state, *anātmā* obtaining in the dream state, *anātmā* in potential form in deep sleep state: waker's *anātmā*, dreamer's *anātmā* and sleeper's potential *anātmā*. These three *anātmās* are mutually exclusive. When one is obtained, the others are not available. They are subject to arrival and departure. But the *ātmā*, the observer, is always present in all the three states. Therefore, in each state I am associated with the respective *anātmā*. The Upaniṣad gives three different names: 'first quarter', when I am associated with waker's *anātmā*, 'second quarter', when associated with the dreamer, 'third quarter', when associated with the sleeper and 'Turīyaṃ', when I am disassociated from all the three.

The *anātmās* of the waker, dreamer and sleeper are themselves divided into two each. Thus three pairs of *anātmās* are obtained. Waker's *anātmā* is divided into waker's body and waker's world, *anātmā* body and *anātmā* world. Dreamer's *anātmā* is divided into dreamer's *anātmā* body and dreamer's *anātmā* world. Sleeper's *anātmā* is divided into sleeper's *anātmā* body and sleeper's potential world. Thus each quarter is associated with body and world. To indicate this division of *anātmā*, the Upaniṣad gives two different names for each quarter. When I am associated with waker's *anātmā*, it is called *prathama* quarter. The first quarter associated with waker's *anātmā* body is called *Viśva* and when associated with waker's *anātmā* world is called *Vaiśvānara* or *Virāt*. The second quarter consists of dreamer's body called *Taijasa* and dreamer's world called *Hiraṇyagarbha*. The third quarter consists of *Prājña* and *Īśvara* respectively. *Turīya* is not associated with the body or the world. In the following verses, the first quarter is *Viśva-Vaiśvānara*, the second quarter is *Taijasa-Hiraṇyagarbha* and the third quarter is *Prājña-Īśvara*. Throughout the *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad*, this should be kept in mind.

Associated with the waker's body, the first quarter is called *Viśva*. The features of this *Viśva* are listed below.

Viśva's field is the waking state: this is the first quarter of *ātmā* when it is associated with the waking state, waker's *anātmā*. It is called *Viśva* when associated with the waker's body.

Outward consciousness: as *Viśva*, the *ātmā* is turned outward through the medium of the waker's body experiencing the universe.

Nineteen mouths: this *Viśva* has nineteen instruments of transaction. These are the five sense organs of knowledge for knowing, the five sense organs of action for responding, the five-fold physiological functions without which life itself is impossible, *manas* (mind), *buddhi* (intellect), *cittam* (memory) and *ahaṅkāra* (ego); *manas* is the coordinating and emotional faculty, *buddhi* is the judging, assessing, discriminating, and rational faculty, *cittam* is the faculty of recollection and *ahaṅkāra* is the ego faculty because of which we have the I-identification with all the 18 faculties. These 19 are counters of interaction.

Experiencer of gross objects: Viśva is the experiencer of the gross, material universe. (In dream, the experienced objects are nothing but one's own thoughts and the dreamer's universe is thought universe.)

This is the first quarter associated with *Viśva*, the waker.

Associated with the waker's world, the first quarter is called *Vaiśvānara* or *Virāt*. This is the universal or cosmic person, the Lord Kṛṣṇa of the 11th chapter of the *Bhagavad Gita*. Now we come to the word "seven limbs" in the verse. This *Virāt*, *Viśvarupa ātmā* is imagined as the cosmic person for the sake of meditation. In *Chāndogya Upaniṣad*, this visualization is called *saptāṅga Virāt*. *Virat*, the cosmic *ātmā* is visualized with seven limbs to cover the totality. What are these seven limbs? The upper region, the heavens, is the head; the sun and moon are the eyes illumining everything; the entire atmosphere is the life breath; fire principle is the mouth (in Vedic ritual, offerings are made into fire; in chapter 11 of the *Bhagavad Gita*, Kṛṣṇa's mouth is likened to fire); the entire space is the body; oceans is the bladder or the lower region between navel and hip; the earth is the legs. From the earth up to the heaven *Vaiśvānara* or *Virāt* is pervaded.

Thus, I, the *ātmā*, the observer am appearing as *Viśva* and *Virāt* in the waking state. This is my first quarter. I am all.

Mantra 4

स्वप्नस्थानोऽन्तःप्रज्ञः समाङ्ग एकोनविंशतिमुखः
प्रविविक्तभुक्तैजसो द्वितीयः पादः ॥ ४ ॥

*svapnasthāno'ntaḥprajñāḥ saptāṅga ekonaviṁśatimukhaḥ
praviviktabhuktaijaso dvitīyaḥ pādaḥ ॥ 4॥*

The second quarter is Taijasa whose field is the dream state, whose consciousness is inward, who has seven limbs, who has nineteen mouths, and who is the experiencer of subtle (objects). (mantra 4)

When I get away from the waking state, I have dissociated from the waker's body, and the waker's world disappears for me. The entire waker's *anātmā* disappears. When I enter into the dream state, I the observer, the consciousness principle, am associated with the dreamer's *anātmā*. Associated with the dreamer's *anātmā*, I am given another name, second quarter, which includes the dream *anātmā* body and the dream *anātmā* world. When I am associated with the dream *anātmā* body, I am called *Taijasa* and when associated with the dream *anātmā* world, I am called *Hiraṇyagarbha*.

The features of *Taijasa* are listed below.

Inward consciousness: The *Taijasa* is turned inward because the regular sense organs are not used to experience the dream world.

Nineteen mouths: I am associated with a dream body and I use the nineteen dream instruments of transaction.

Experiencer of subtle objects: Through the dream sense organs, I experience a distinct world projected by my own mind. This internal world is called a world made of *vāsanās*, which are experiences registered in our mind. It is a distinct universe because my dream universe is available only for me. It is an internal subtle thought-generated universe.

The very same second quarter when associated with the entire dream universe at the macro level is called *Hiraṇyagarbha*. This *Hiraṇyagarbha* has seven dream limbs similar to *Vaiśvānara*.

I am *Viśva*, *Vaiśvānara*, *Taijasa*, or *Hiraṇyagarbha* depending upon the name and form I am associated with.

MK-6 = Chapter 1, Mantras – 5, 6

Mantras 3, 4

जागरितस्थानो बहिष्प्रज्ञः समाङ्ग एकोनविंशतिमुखः

स्थूल भुवैश्वानरः प्रथमः पादः ॥ ३ ॥

स्वप्नस्थानोऽन्तःप्रज्ञः समाङ्ग एकोनविंशतिमुखः

प्रविविक्तभुक्तैजसो द्वितीयः पादः ॥ ४ ॥

Of the two enquiries introduced, *ātma-vicāra* and *oṅkāra-vicāra*, the Upaniṣad has first taken up *ātma-vicāra* from the third *mantra*. The four expressions of *ātmā* known as *catuspāt ātmā* (four-quartered *ātmā*) are talked about. For that we broadly divided the entire creation into *ātmā*, the observer and *anātmā*, the observed. *Ātmā*, the observer, is the pure consciousness, and the body, mind and sense organs are included in the *anātmā*. The whole Vedāntic education is for me to claim *ātmā* as I and learn to refer to *ātmā* whenever I use the word ‘I’. *Ātmā*, consciousness has an existence independent of *anātmā* and therefore is *satyaṃ*. The entire *anātmā* is *mithyā* because only the observer can prove its existence. *Ātmā* is *satyaṃ* and *anātmā* is *mithyā*. *Anātmā* is divided into three: waker’s *anātmā*, dreamer’s *anātmā* and sleeper’s potential *anātmā*. *Ātmā* is one and not divided. Each *anātmā* is divided into two: body and world each, and in the case of the sleeper these being in potential condition. Thus the entire *anātmā* is divided into three pairs. *Ātmā* is indivisible and non-localized. This all-pervading *ātmā* is associated with the three pairs of *anātmā*. Based on this association, *ātmā* is given six different names. Even though *ātmā* is one, from the standpoint of each associated *anātmā*, the Upaniṣad gives six different names just like imaginary boundaries are given separating regions of the earth. *Ātmā* associated with the waker’s body is *Viśva* and when it is the substratum of the waker’s world it is called *Virāt*. *Viśva* and *Virāt* together is called the first quarter as it were. Similarly, *ātmā* associated with the dreamer’s body and world is called *Taijasa* and *Hiraṇyagarbha*. *Taijasa* and *Hiraṇyagarbha* put together is called the second facet of *ātmā*. Up to this we saw in the last class. Every single point so far should be remembered to get the total picture.

Mantras 5 and 6 deal with the sleep state.

Mantra 5

यत्र सुप्तो न कञ्चन कामं कामयते न कञ्चन स्वप्नं पश्यति

तत् सुषुप्तम् । सुषुप्तस्थान एकीभूतः प्रज्ञानघन

एवानन्दमयो ह्यानन्दभुक् चेतोमुखः प्राज्ञस्तृतीयः पादः ॥ ५ ॥

yatra supto na kañcana kāmaṃ kāmayate na kañcana svapnaṃ paśyati
tat susuptam | susuptasthāna ekībhūtaḥ prajñānaghana

evānandamayo hyānandabhuk cetomukhaḥ prājñastrīyaḥ pādaḥ || 5||

The sleep-state is that where one is self-ignorant, one does not desire any external object, and does not see any dream. The third quarter is Prājña whose field is the sleep-state, who is undifferentiated, who is a mass of mere consciousness, who is full of ānanda, who is the experiencer of ānanda, and who is the gateway to the experience (of the waking and the dream). (mantra 5)

The Upaniṣad describes what the sleep state is. In the waking state, I experience an external world with the sense organs. In the dream state, I experience an internal world without the sense organs. First it is said that the word sleep refers to a sleep state without dreams. This is dreamless, deep sleep. There is no external or internal world. This is a state in which a person is asleep and in which there is no external object desired, liked or disliked by the person. This is to show that it is different from the waking state. It is a state in which one does not experience an internal projected world also. This is to show that it is different from the dream state. Thus sleep is defined as a state that is different from both the waking and dream states.

We cannot say that the objects are not there during the sleep state. They are in potential form waiting to appear the moment we wake up. *Ātmā* associated with the deep sleep state is called the third quarter in which all the dualities and pluralities have merged into one undifferentiated, potential form. Not only are the objects resolved into one undifferentiated form, their knowledge is also resolved into one undifferentiated form. In the waking state, for example, two objects like clip and watch are present and the knowledge associated with each is also present. Many different objects and the corresponding different cognitions are present in the waking state. In sleep, both objects and the corresponding distinct knowledge are resolved into one undifferentiated mass. When the objects and experiences are resolved, our problems are also resolved. Every object produces a variety of disturbances, like (attachment), dislike (aversion), desire, anger, greed, delusion, and jealousy. These are products of objects and their knowledge present in the dual world. Even fear is born out of the experience of duality. The unmanifest state, which is deep sleep, is called *ānandamaya*, saturated with *ānanda* and the sleeper experiences the *ānanda* also. We love sleep because we love *ānanda*. The basic Vedāntic principle is that we love a source of joy and we dislike a source of pain. Everyone loves deep sleep state because it is a source of joy. We cannot declare that we experience *ānanda* while sleeping but we declare after waking up that we slept well happily.

In sections 6 and 8 of *Taittirīya Upaniṣad*, a comparison is made between the original happiness and the reflected happiness. *Prājña* is the experiencer of the reflected happiness and not the original happiness. There are four differences between the original happiness and the reflected happiness.

1. The reflected happiness belongs to *ānandamayakoṣa*. It is *koṣānanda*. The original happiness belongs to *ātmā* itself. It is *ātmānanda*.
2. The reflected happiness is subject to arrival and departure and is impermanent. The original happiness is permanent.

3. The reflected happiness is subject to gradation. The original happiness is not subject to gradation.
4. The reflected happiness can be experienced. It is available for objectification. The original happiness can never be experienced. The original happiness is not available for experience but is available for claiming as our nature.
5. The fifth difference is that the reflected happiness can be attained by two methods. One is through objects and the other is by practicing detachment and contentment. This happiness obtained through contentment is equal to what is obtained in heaven. The reflected happiness can be obtained through sense objects or by contentment. It only takes a little discrimination, which would produce detachment leading to contentment. However, knowledge alone will allow one to claim the original happiness.

This sleep state or the sleeper is the link between the waking and the dream states. Sleep state is the vestibule between the waking and dream states. According to Vedānta, from the waking state, we never go to dream state directly and similarly, we do not go to waking state from the dream state directly. Through the sleep state alone, we go to the other two states: waking – sleep – dream – sleep – waking. Even when we seem to have woken up suddenly and directly from the dream state, there is a sleep state of very short duration intervening that we are unable to recognize. The Upaniṣad mentions this because to go from one state to another, we have to drop our identification with one body and develop identification with the other body. Switching from the waker's body to the dreamer's body requires a small gap and that gap is called the deep sleep state. The sleeper is the link between the waker and the dreamer. *Prājñā* is the link between *Viśva* and *Taijasa*. *Ātmā* is *Prājñā* when associated with the potential body, causal body, which is saturated with happiness. The sleeper's universe is everything resolved with respect to him and is explained in the 6th mantra.

Mantra 6

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

eṣa sarveśvaraḥ eṣa sarvajña eṣo'ntaryāmyeṣa yoniḥ
sarvasya prabhavāpyayau hi bhūtānām ॥ 6॥

He is the lord of all. He is omniscient. He is the inner controller. He is the source of all, being the ground of origination and dissolution of beings. (mantra 6)

Ātmā associated with the entire universe in potential form is called *Īśvara*. *Prājñā* and *Īśvara* are the *ātmā* associated with the sleeper's body and the sleeper's world respectively. *Ātmā* is the ruler of all because from this *Īśvara* alone, everything in the waking state evolves. When you go to sleep, everything resolves. This *Īśvara* has omniscience, not just knowledge of one body and one mind but the knowledge contained in the total universe, the past, present and even the yet to be discovered future knowledge, all in potential condition. Since we are also *ātmā*, we can claim that we are omniscient also only if we claim our status as *ātmā* and not our body-mind. The problem is when I use the word I, I

invariably mean the body-mind. That is why body identification is an obstacle to the absorption of Vedāntic teaching. In *Taittirīya Upaniṣad*, the *jñāni* claims he is every thing, the all-pervading consciousness. Our notion is that we are in the world, whereas the *jñāni*'s knowledge is that the world is in him, the consciousness. It is tough but possible if we work for it. This *ātmā* is inherent in everyone. The sleeper's world is the cause of the waker's and dreamer's world because both of them resolve into the sleeper's world only. The words 'lord of all and omniscient' mean the intelligent cause. The word 'source' means the material cause. Thus *Īśvara* alone is both the intelligent and material cause of the entire universe. What is meant by material cause? It is the source of origination of all things and beings and is the ground of resolution just as the ocean is the source of all the waves and the ground of the resolution of all the waves. The waker is the source of all the dream world and the waker is the ground for the resolution of the dream world. *Īśvara* is the cause for the origination, sustenance and resolution of the world. In the previous mantra, *ātmā* is called *Prājña*. In this *mantra*, *ātmā* is called *Īśvara*. *Prājña* and *Īśvara* put together is called the third quarter.

Viśva and *Virāt*, *Taijasa* and *Hiraṇyagarbha*, and *Prājña* and *Īśvara* cover the three quarters. The fourth quarter is described in the 7th *mantra*. The first three quarters are *ātmā* associated with *anātmā*, three types of *anātmā*. The *Turīyaṃ* is *ātmā* dissociated from the *anātmā*, just pure *ātmā*. That is explained in the 7th *mantra* and in *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad*, that *mantra* is the main teaching. The Upaniṣad says that liberation is possible only through the knowledge of *Turīyaṃ*. The knowledge of the first three quarters is useful but cannot give liberation.

Gauḍapāda introduces his commentary at this point consolidating the first three quarters.

Kārikā 1

बहिष्प्रज्ञो विभुर्विश्वो ह्यन्तःप्रज्ञस्तु तैजसः ।

घनप्रज्ञस्तथा प्राज्ञ एक एव त्रिधा स्मृतः ॥ १ ॥

bahisprajño vibhurviśvo hyantaḥprajñastu taijasaḥ ।

ghanaprajñastathā prājña eka eva tridhā smṛtaḥ ॥ 1 ॥

Viśva is with outward consciousness and is all-pervading. Taijasa, however, is with inward consciousness. And, Prājña is a mass of consciousness. The same one is thought of in a threefold way. (kārikā 1)

We are going to see nine *kārikās* and the 7th *mantra* will come after these nine *kārikās*. The content of the nine *kārikās* is the consolidation of the first six mantras in which the three quarters of *ātmā* were described. *Kārikā* does not comment upon every word of the *mantra*. That is the difference from a *bhāṣyam*, commentary. *Kārikā* is an analysis, study or an observation. Here, Gauḍapāda compares and contrasts the three quarters in terms of their common and uncommon features. Thereafter, he gives some

additional information about the three quarters taken from the other Upaniṣads viz., *Chāndogya*, *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣads*, etc.

Viśva is the waker who has his awareness turned outwards and that *Viśva* himself is *Virāt* from the total angle (same water known as wave and ocean). Similarly, the *Taijasa*, the dreamer is the same *ātmā* only but turned inward and *Prājñā* is one in whom all the experiences and knowledge are in a mass of undifferentiated form. Gauḍapāda uses the word *ghanaprajñā*. All the three are the one and the same *ātmā*. Bodies are different, sense organs are different, worlds are different but I, the consciousness, am one and the same. Waker-I, dreamer-I, and sleeper-I, are three different names for one and the same consciousness.

MK-7 = Chapter 1, Kārikās 2 to 6

Kārikā 1

बहिष्प्रज्ञो विभुर्विश्वो ह्यन्तःप्रज्ञस्तु तैजसः ।

घनप्रज्ञस्तथा प्राज्ञ एक एव त्रिधा स्मृतः ॥ १ ॥

We have completed the first six mantras of the Upaniṣad in which the Upaniṣad started the *ātma-vicāra* in mantra 3. From the 3rd to the 6th mantras, the Upaniṣad introduced the three quarters of *ātmā*, *Viśva*, *Taijasa* and *Prājña*. All these three names are the names of the *ātmā* itself, which is really the *Turīyaṃ*, and which will be mentioned in the 7th mantra. When consciousness is associated with the three states, the very same *Turīyaṃ* is given the three names, from the standpoint of the three states. *Viśva*, *Taijasa* and *Prājña* are three relational names just as one and the same man can be called son, husband and father with respect to three generations. Once you negate the relations, the names are gone and he is just a person. Similarly one *Turīyaṃ* gets three different relational names with respect to three different states, consciousness turned outward, consciousness turned inward and consciousness neither turned inward nor outward but remaining as a mass of consciousness. That was said in *kārikā* 1. In this *kārikā*, the most important part is that there are no three *ātmās* but only three relational names for one and the same *ātmā*. Including the three names *Virāt*, *Hiranyagarbha*, and *Īśvara* with respect to the three universes, *ātmā* has six relational names.

Kārikā 2

दक्षिणाक्षिमुखे विश्वो मनस्यन्तस्तु तैजसः ।

आकाशे च हृदि प्राज्ञस्त्रिधा देहे व्यवस्थितः ॥ २ ॥

dakṣiṇākṣimukhe viśvo manasyantastu taijasaḥ ।

ākāśe ca hṛdi prājñastridhā dehe vyavasthitaḥ ॥ 2॥

Viśva is in the opening of the right eye. Taijasa, however, is within the mind. And Prājña is in the space within the heart. (The same one) is placed in the body in a threefold way. (kārikā 2)

Here, Gauḍapāda introduces an incidental topic taken from the other Upaniṣads even though it is not very much required for our further study. In the scriptures, before we come to *ātma jñānam* or *Turīyaṃ jñānam*, varieties of *sādhanas* are prescribed for refining the mind. Some of the *sādhanas* are in the form of karma-yoga or karma and some of the *sādhanas* are in the form of *upāsana-yoga* or meditation. Varieties of meditations are talked about. Some of the meditations are found in the *Taittirīya Upaniṣad*. One kind of meditation is meditating upon the essential oneness of the individual, microcosm and the total, macrocosm. In all the levels the essential nature of the microcosm and macrocosm are one and the same. In the example of wave and the ocean, the essence of wave (microcosm) and ocean (macrocosm) is water. This microcosm-macrocosm *upāsana* from the standpoint of the common factor is presented.

Similarly, they talk about *Viśva-Virāt* oneness *upāsana*. *Viśva* consists of the gross body and *Virāt* consists of the gross *prapañca*. What is common to both is their gross nature. Both *Taijasa* and *Hiranyagarbha* are essentially subtle. Since I am the *Viśva*, *Taijasa* and *Prājña*, I invoke *Virāt*, *Hiranyagarbha* and *Īśvara* upon *Viśva*, *Taijasa* and *Prājña* respectively. For the sake of this *upāsana*, the Upaniṣad talks about various locations in the body for this invocation. Even though the entire person is the waker, the Upaniṣad gives a particular location where the waker can be invoked. Eyes are considered the most prominent sense organ of the waker because they have a large range of operation. According to the scripture the right eye is considered more sacred. *Viśva* is thus invoked in the right eye. This *upāsana* is highlighted in *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* (chapter 4, section 2). In this *upāsana*, *Viśva* is invoked for *upāsana*. The mind, being the prominent part of the subtle body, is used for invoking *Taijasa*. *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* states (chapter 2, section 2) that within our heart, there is an inside space into which all our sense powers are resolved when we are in deep sleep. *Prājña* is invoked in this space. In these three different parts of the body the three quarters are invoked for meditation.

Kārikā 3

विश्वो हि स्थूलभुङ्गित्यं तैजसः प्रविविक्तभुक् ।

आनन्दभुक् तथा प्राज्ञस्त्रिधा भोगं निबोधत ॥ ३ ॥

viśvo hi sthūlabhūṅgityaṃ taijasaḥ praviviktabhuk ।

ānandabhuk tathā prājñastridhā bhogaṃ nibodhata ॥ 3॥

Viśva is indeed the constant experiencer of the gross (objects.) Taijasa is the experiencer of the subtle (objects.) And Prājña is the experiencer of ānanda. Know the experience to be threefold. (kārikā 3)

All these three quarters have three types of experiences. *Viśva*, the waker, experiences the gross material objects of the world that are made up of the five elements regularly in every waking state. The dreamer cannot contact the gross material universe because to do so, sense organs must be available. The tangible, material world goes away from the dreamer. The dreamer sees dream mountain, rivers, etc., that are thoughts which were in the subconscious mind in the form of *vāsanās*. The *vāsanās* registered in the mind come out in dream. Thus the dream is subtle *vāsanā*-based universe. The dreamer is the experiencer of the subtle thought world. The waker and the dreamer have pleasurable and painful experiences but the sleeper always experiences happiness. During sleep state all the *kośas* (sheaths) except the vital sheath and the bliss sheath are resolved. The vital sheath is operating keeping the body alive. The mental sheath is resolved with all the emotions resolved. The intellectual sheath is resolved with all types of thoughts resolved. The causal body, the bliss sheath is present where everything is resolved. It is an undisturbed condition. When we are in the causal body in which there are no disturbances, the *ātmānanda*, which is the original nature of *ātmā* gets reflected in the calm mind that is resolved in the causal body. The sleeper is the experiencer of the reflected bliss. In the second chapter of

Taittirīya Upaniṣad, the four important differences between the original and reflected happiness are discussed in the section on the bliss sheath. Thus the experiences are three-fold.

Kārikā 4

स्थूलं तर्पयते विश्वं प्रविविक्तं तु तैजसम् ।

आनन्दश्च तथा प्राज्ञं त्रिधा तृप्तिं निबोधत ॥ ४ ॥

sthūlaṃ tarpayate viśvaṃ praviviktaṃ tu taijasam ।

ānandaśca tathā prājñaṃ tridhā tṛptiṃ nibodhata ॥ 4॥

The gross (object) satisfies Viśva; whereas the subtle (object satisfies) Taijasa. And ānanda (satisfies) Prājña. Know the satisfaction to be threefold. (kārikā 4)

This verse is similar to the previous one in content but presented in a different language. The gross universe entertains the waker. The word “experience” was used in the previous verse. The subtle dream universe entertains the dreamer and the reflected happiness entertains the sleeper.

Kārikā 5

त्रिषु धामसु यद्भोज्यं भोक्ता यश्च प्रकीर्तितः ।

वेदैतदुभयं यस्तु स भुञ्जानो न लिप्यते ॥ ५ ॥

triṣu dhāmasu yadbhojyaṃ bhoktā yaśca prakīrtitaḥ ।

vedaitadubhayaṃ yastu sa bhuñjāno na lipyate ॥ 5॥

One who is said to be the experiencer and that which is (said to be) the experienced in the three states – he who knows both of them is indeed not affected while experiencing (them.) (kārikā 5)

In the following verses, Gauḍapāda gives some extra information, which is not actually in the *mantras*. The one who has the knowledge of these three pairs, waker and the gross universe, dreamer and the subtle universe, sleeper and the reflected happiness, i.e., the experiencer and the experienced, knows. In all the three states, there is a distinct experiencer, *Viśva*, *Taijasa* or *Prājña* and distinct experienced objects. If a person knows all these three pairs very well and the substratum of these three pairs, the *Turīyam*, the original consciousness, he clearly grasps. Such a *Turīya jñāni* is never affected by any *karma* or any *karma* benefit even when the *jñāni* experiences the world. Kṛṣṇa refers to this in the *Bhagavad Gita*.

The ātmā takes neither the pāpam nor the puṇyam of anyone. Discrimination is veiled by ignorance. Hence the beings are deluded. (5:15)

The *jñāni* is never affected because he understands that whatever is experienced is *mithyā* and that he, the original consciousness, is *satyaṃ*. *Mithyā* cannot contaminate *satyaṃ* just like space cannot be wet by water, or burnt by fire.

The foundational principle of *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad* is that the observer is *satyaṃ* and the observed is *mithyā*. This one fundamental principle must be assimilated to get the understanding of the entire *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad*. The observer is *satyaṃ* and the observed cannot prove its existence without the observer. This is the unique principle of *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad*. In all the other Upaniṣads, the principle is different. In all other Upaniṣads, the cause is *satyaṃ* and the effect is *mithyā*. The observer alone is *Turīyaṃ*.

Kārikā 6

प्रभवः सर्वभावानां सतामिति विनिश्चयः ।

सर्वं जनयति प्राणश्चेतोऽशून्युरुषः पृथक् ॥ ६ ॥

prabhavaḥ sarvabhāvānāṃ satāmiti viniścayaḥ ।

sarvaṃ janayati prāṇaścetom'śūnpuruṣaḥ pṛthak ॥ 6॥

It is an established fact that origination (is) only for all those beings which are existent. Prāṇa creates everything. Puruṣa (creates) conscious beings distinctly. (kārikā 6)

In this verse, Gauḍapāda mentions a topic briefly that will be elaborated later in the third chapter. That is the topic of creation. Creation or cosmology is a big topic in philosophy or science. Gauḍapāda is hinting at the topic taken from the sixth *mantra* of *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad*. In that *mantra*, the third quarter was talked about, which is *ātmā* associated with the causal body and the causal universe. In sleep, everything is in resolved condition. During sleep, even though we are experiencing blankness, sleep is not blankness. *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad* says that everything is in potential condition in sleep. From that potential condition alone our experience in dream and waking states arises. **Therefore, we are making an important conclusion that if you have to create anything, that product must exist in potential form. This is an important Vedāntic principle.** If out of a lump of clay, you are able to create a variety of earthenware, all those forms have to be in the clay in potential form. Thus creation always exists, which means that there is no creation of anything new. So there is no creation at all! What is called creation is a misnomer because matter cannot be created nor destroyed. What is in unmanifest form coming into manifestation is wrongly called creation. When butter is made from milk, it is only the unmanifest butter in milk that comes out. Otherwise if butter can be newly created, it can be done so from anything. Butter cannot be created from water because water does not contain butter in potential form. Butter comes out of milk because it is in milk in potential form. **This principle is called *sat-kārya-vāda* (effect pre-existent in the cause). This is a very important Vedāntic doctrine.** It says that you never create anything new. You only convert unmanifest into manifest. In the third quarter, which is

the deep sleep of the individual called *laya* or the deep sleep state of the total cosmos called *pralaya*, everything is in potential condition. The whole five elements are also in potential condition. **That potential form of the material creation is called *māyā*, *prakṛti*, *mūlāvidyā*, *avyaktam*, *avyākṛtam*, or *śakti*. *Māyā* will be used here.** During *laya* and *pralaya*, the whole universe is in *māyā* seed form along with consciousness called *Turīyaṃ*, Brahman or *ātmā*. *Ātmā* plus *māyā* is equal to the third quarter, *Prājña-Īśvara*, in which everything is in seed form. Every state of sleep is followed by a waking-up. When you wake up in the current body, it is called waking up. If you wake up in some other body it is called rebirth. Manifestation follows every dissolution. At the time of manifestation, everything dormant rises back. What happens to consciousness? Consciousness does not and cannot do anything. It cannot undergo any change. When the body-mind complexes are manifested, consciousness lends reflected consciousness to the body-mind complex. Thus, as many minds there are, so many reflected consciousnesses will form. Gauḍapāda says that objects, that exist in potential form in the *Prājña-Īśvara*, referred to in the sixth *mantra*, become the manifest world. Un-manifest world is as good as non-existent because it is not useable.

MK-8 = Chapter 1, Kārikās – 6 to 9, Mantra 7

Kārikā 6

प्रभवः सर्वभावानां सतामिति विनिश्चयः ।

सर्वं जनयति प्राणश्चेतोऽशून्युरुषः पृथक् ॥ ६ ॥

In the first five *kārikās*, Gauḍapāda made a comparative study of the first three quarters of *ātmā*, in the form of *Viśva*, *Taijasa* and *Prājña*, and correspondingly at the total level, in the form of *Virāt*, *Hiranyagarbha* and *Īśvara*. Regarding this *Īśvara*, *mantra 6* pointed out that this *Īśvara* is associated with the causal body and the causal universe at the total level. Since *Īśvara* is associated with the causal universe, *Īśvara* is called the cause of the entire universe. Therefore, both the gross body-gross universe, and the subtle body-subtle universe pairs are born out of the causal universe alone and they rest in the causal universe and resolve in it. This was discussed in the 6th *mantra*. There the phrase “*yonih sarvasya*” is the important phrase, which Gauḍapāda highlights. The word *yonih* means cause. *Īśvara* is therefore the cause of the universe. *Īśvara* is *ātmā* when associated with the causal body and the causal universe. The Upaniṣad pointed out that *Īśvara* is the intelligent and the material cause. In that context, Gauḍapāda wishes to discuss some points about the creation because *Īśvara* is said to be that cause and everything is the effect. Effect coming out of cause is creation. Therefore, in these verses beginning with the 6th verse, Gauḍapāda enters into a brief discussion of creation, which will be very elaborately discussed later in the 3rd and the 4th chapters of *Māṇḍūkya-kārikā*.

The first point that Gauḍapāda highlights in the 6th verse is that the entire creation is not a new creation by *Īśvara* because nothing can be newly created. Matter cannot be created or destroyed. What about *Īśvara*? This rule is applicable to *Īśvara* also even though *Īśvara* is omniscient and omnipotent. What else does *Īśvara* do if not creating? Goldsmith only brings out what is in potential form in a lump of gold in the form of name and form ornaments. Electricity is in potential, dormant and unusable form in atom, coal, waterfall or sunlight. Thus creation is nothing but the conversion of the unmanifest into the manifest. Creation is modification of the unmanifest into manifest. *Īśvara* must have two things in potential form because the universe has two aspects, the inert material component, and the consciousness component. From that *Īśvara*, the inert material component gets converted into the universe and the consciousness remains as is.

Everything that is potentially there, that alone can manifest. This manifestation is wrongly called creation. An important lesson of Vedānta is that creation is a wrong word. Manifestation is the correct term. Either things manifest naturally or work is expended to manifest things.

Which part of *Īśvara* contributes to the inert universe and which part contributes to the sentient universe? In *kārikā 6*, in the phrase, ‘*prāṇa sarvam janayati*’, *prāṇa* refers to the causal universe. *Prāṇa* is a loaded technical word. Elsewhere in the scriptures, causal body is called *prāṇa*. It is a rare contextual word. Why this confusing expression here? The reason is – during our sleep, we are in our

causal body. Everything has resolved in the deep sleep state except *prāṇa-śakti*, which functions despite any effort on the individual's part. In the deep sleep state, we are in the causal body with *prāṇa* functioning, and the word *prāṇa* is used for the causal body. At the total level, *prāṇa* is the causal universe. In this *kārikā*, *prāṇa* is the causal universe, the *māyā* principle. This insentient component of *Īśvara* projects the entire material universe, whereas *puruṣa*, the consciousness principle creates the sentient *jīvas*. The mind of every *jīva* forms the reflection of the original consciousness just like a mirror forming the reflection of the face. Thus the original consciousness generates an innumerable number of reflected consciousnesses, like one sun forming many reflections when there are many reflecting media. The *jīvas* with the reflected consciousness are the living beings and the material universe is the object of experience.

Kārikā 7

विभूतिं प्रसवं त्वन्ये मन्यन्ते सृष्टिचिन्तकाः ।

स्वप्नमायासरूपेति सृष्टिरन्यैर्विकल्पिता ॥ ७ ॥

vibhūtiṃ prasavaṃ tvanye manyante sṛṣṭicintakāḥ ।

svapnamāyāsarūpeti sṛṣṭiranyairvikalpitā ॥ 7॥

Some cosmologists consider the creation to be the glory (of the Lord.) But, the creation is considered to be comparable to dream or magic by some others. (kārikā 7)

This topic of creation is a highly debated topic in all the systems of philosophy, theology, atheistic systems, and science. Gauḍapāda says that varieties of theories are held by varieties of people including in the Veda and *purāṇas* and he enumerates them. Hundreds of questions about creation and life come up in people's lives. Some of the debaters of creation point out that the creation is the glory of the Lord. The 10th chapter of the *Bhagavad Gita* is a description of the creation being the glory of the Lord. Some other creation thinkers visualize that the creation is like the dream of God. The Lord's dream is our waking state. Another version is that the creation is like a magic show of *Bhagavān*. Gauḍapāda only presents all these versions and does not say which one is right and which one is wrong. In Vedānta itself all these versions are presented according to context.

Kārikā 8

इच्छामात्रं प्रभोः सृष्टिरिति सृष्टौ विनिश्चिताः ।

कालात्प्रसूतिं भूतानां मन्यन्ते कालचिन्तकाः ॥ ८ ॥

icchāmātraṃ prabhoḥ sṛṣṭirिति sṛṣṭau viniścitāḥ ।

kālātprasūtiṃ bhūtānāṃ manyante kālacintakāḥ ॥ 8॥

In respect of creation, (some) are convinced that the creation is a mere will of the Lord. Astrologers consider the origination of beings to be from time. (kārikā 8)

Some other debaters point out that the creation is the will of God. *Bhagavān* was alone present in the beginning and he willed for creation and it came out of his will. They are very certain about this and maintain that their version should not be questioned. Some others say that *Bhagavān* is not responsible for creation but it is all because of *kālam* (time). Time is responsible for the arrival of creation. Astrologers who always base everything on time hold this view.

Kārikā 9

भोगार्थं सृष्टिरित्यन्ये क्रीडार्थमिति चापरे ।

देवस्यैष स्वभावोऽयमाप्तकामस्य का स्पृहा ॥ ९ ॥

bhogārthaṃ sṛṣṭirityanye krīḍārthamiti cāpare ।

devasyaiṣa svabhāvo'yamāptakāmasya kā sprhā ॥ 9॥

Some (consider) that the creation is for the enjoyment (of the Lord.) Others (consider) that (the creation is) for the sport (of the Lord.) What desire (is possible) for the ever-fulfilled one? This (creation) is the nature of the Lord. (kārikā 9)

There are those that hold the view that *Bhagavān* created this world out of his will only and when asked the purpose of *Bhagavān* in producing this world, they say that *Bhagavān* created this world and beings for his own entertainment. Some others say that the creation is the sport of the Lord. Vedānta itself gives all these answers at different times.

But all these answers will only work temporarily. When one probes into these versions of creations they will lead to more questions. Any answer regarding creation will lead only to mystery about the creation. Just the level of mystery will shift. Take the Lord dreaming up this universe similar to us dreaming our dreams. But in our case, the dreams are based on the registered impressions of the experiences we have had in the waking state. Every dream presupposes a waking state. That will not apply to *Bhagavān*. Similarly *karma* and *janma* cannot apply to *Bhagavān*. So Gauḍapāda says that any theory of creation will generate a lot of problems and using the word creation regarding the universe will never give an intellectually satisfying answer. **Gauḍapāda's stand is that there was no creation. The world did not arrive.** If it arrived, why did it arrive? The world has always been there in Brahman either in unmanifest or manifest form. The world was never created nor did it arrive but has always been there as name and form in unmanifest or manifest form. *Mithyā* name and form is an integral part of Brahman. Gauḍapāda uses the expression *svabhāva* meaning integral, non-separable part to refer to the universe. This universe, which is *mithyā* name and form was never created by *Bhagavān*. It never arrived at a particular time, but has always existed in Brahman. It has no beginning or end. Referring to this in the 15th chapter

of the *Bhagavad Gita*, Kṛṣṇa says, “Its form as such is not perceived here. It has no beginning, middle, or end.” Drop the word creation and you will get out of confusion.

This may lead to another question even though it is not discussed in the *kārikā*. If *mithyā* name and form universe is an integral part of Brahman, does it not contradict our original assertion that Brahman does not have any parts at all? The answer is that **a *mithyā* part being *mithyā* is as good as not a part**. What is *mithyā* cannot be counted or taken. It is experienced but cannot be counted like the shadow of the body, which is inseparable from the body. Shadow will have all the features of the body but cannot be counted as a second entity.

How can Brahman have a desire to create a world? This cannot be answered but any answer will lead to a lot of further questions. *Bhagavān* does not have a desire to create the world. But in *Taittirīya Upaniṣad*, a temporary description of *Bhagavān* having a desire to create was given but it is not a real description. The real explanation of creation is that there is no creation. With this *kārikā*, Gauḍapāda’s analysis of the first six *mantras* of the *Upaniṣad* is over. Now we enter into the crucial 7th *mantra* of the *Upaniṣad*.

Mantra 7

नान्तःप्रज्ञं न बहिष्प्रज्ञं नोभयतःप्रज्ञं
 न प्रज्ञानघनं न प्रज्ञं नाप्रज्ञं ।
 अदृष्टमव्यवहार्यमग्राह्यमलक्षणं
 अचिन्त्यमव्यपदेश्यमेकात्मप्रत्ययसारं
 प्रपञ्चोपशमं शान्तं शिवमद्वैतं चतुर्थं मन्यन्ते
 स आत्मा स विज्ञेयः ॥ ७ ॥

*nāntaḥprajñam na bahiṣprajñam nobhayataḥprajñam
 na prajñānaghaṇam na prajñam nāprajñam ।*

*adr̥ṣṭam avyavahāryam agrāhyam alakṣaṇam
 acintyam avyapadeśyam ekātmapratyayasāraṁ
 prapañcōpaśamaṁ śāntaṁ śivam advaitaṁ caturthaṁ manyante
 sa ātmā sa vijñeyaḥ ॥ 7॥*

They consider the Tūrīya to be (that which is) not the outward consciousness, not the inward consciousness, not the consciousness turned both sides, not a mass of consciousness, not the all-knowing consciousness, not unconscious, beyond perception, beyond transaction, beyond grasp, beyond inference, beyond thoughts, beyond description, traceable through the unbroken self-awareness, free from the world, tranquil, auspicious, and non-dual. It is the ātmā. It is to be known. (mantra 7)

In the 2nd *mantra*, the Upaniṣad introduced the *ātmā* with four quarters. The three quarters were explained in *mantras* 3 (first quarter, *Viśva* and *Virāt*), 4 (second quarter, *Taijasa* and *Hiraṇyagarbha*), and 5, 6 (third quarter, *Prājña* and *Īśvara*). In each of the *mantras*, the Upaniṣad pointed out that each quarter is the name of I, *ātmā*, the consciousness principle. I am called *Viśva* when associated with the waking state, *Taijasa* when associated with the dream state and *Prājña* when associated with the sleep state. It is my threefold association that makes me *Viśva*, *Taijasa* or *Prājña*.

What then is *Turīyaṃ*? First, it should be noted that *Turīyaṃ* is not associated with a fourth state but dissociation from the previous three states. Consciousness, I, dissociated from the three states and the things obtaining there (the three bodies and the three universes) am *Turīyaṃ*. How do I dissociate myself from the three states? We are always in one state or the other. Suppose one goes to meditation and *samādhi*. Can we call *samādhi* a fourth state in which one is dissociated from all the three states? If you analyze, you cannot say that. Even in *samādhi*, in which one can withdraw from all the sense organs, mind and its functions, they all remain in dormant condition. In *samādhi*, all the functions go into dormant state, and one is in the causal body. Thus physical dissociation from the three states, the three bodies and the three universes is not possible. Consciousness cannot be separated from any one of these conditions. Then, how can I dissociate from the three states? How is it possible? Or is it not possible? If it is not possible, then *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad* will not be relevant. The dissociation has to happen in an ingenious and different way.

MK-9 = Chapter 1, Mantra 7

Mantra 7

नान्तःप्रज्ञं न बहिष्प्रज्ञं नोभयतःप्रज्ञं
न प्रज्ञानघनं न प्रज्ञं नाप्रज्ञं ।

अदृष्टमव्यवहार्यमग्राह्यमलक्षणं
अचिन्त्यमव्यपदेश्यमेकात्मप्रत्ययसारं
प्रपञ्चोपशमं शान्तं शिवमद्वैतं चतुर्थं मन्यन्ते
स आत्मा स विज्ञेयः ॥ ७ ॥

Mantra 7 is the definition of *Turīyaṃ*, the *ātmā*. My association with the three states gives rise to the three quarters. *Viśva*, *Taijasa* and *Prājñā* are relational statuses. Consciousness from its own standpoint, dissociated from the three states is called *Turīyaṃ*. It is called the fourth non-relational status compared to the other three relational statuses. How can consciousness disassociate from the worlds of the waker, dreamer and sleeper? Can consciousness dissociate at all? If it can, how can it?

Superficially speaking, consciousness can never physically separate itself from the three worlds. Why? Consciousness being all-pervading can never get away from anything. Two finite entities can have association and dissociation. For an all-pervading entity, dissociation is not possible. Space cannot dissociate from anything. Consciousness cannot physically dissociate from any object.

Can consciousness experientially dissociate from the external world? Superficially speaking, consciousness can experientially dissociate just like we experience in the deep sleep state. In deep sleep, we have withdrawn from the external world, our body, mind, and thoughts. So in the deep sleep state, we are able to experientially dissociate. Similarly, in *nirvikalpa samādhi*, a meditator dissociates from the world and thoughts. But there are two problems. Even though I experientially dissociate, it is not an actual dissociation because everything is potentially present. Actually it only appears to be dissociation because the body, mind, etc., are in potential form and so this dissociation is only temporary. Once the sleep or *samādhi* is over, the association comes back. So experiential dissociation is not possible for *Turīyaṃ* even though seemingly there seems to be a dissociation.

Can consciousness dissociate from the world to become *Turīyaṃ*? It is not possible physically or experientially. Vedānta says that it is possible in some other way. The *jñāni* is accomplishing that alone by separating himself from the world in an ingenious way. That method is pure knowledge or understanding. Dissociation can be brought about through sheer understanding. What type of understanding is it? That understanding is that I am the observer and the world is the observed. In *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad*, the observer and the observed are given special status. I, the observer am *satyaṃ*, and everything that is observed or experienced, namely body and world in all the three states are *mithyā*. I, the consciousness, am *satyaṃ* and the world is *mithyā*. Can *satyaṃ* and *mithyā* get associated? They can be together but can they get associated at all? *Mithyā* can never touch the *satyaṃ* even though it is

vey much on the *satyaṃ*. The movie can never affect the screen. There is only a seeming connection between *satyaṃ* and *mithyā*. Once it is understood that the association is a seeming one and not factual, it becomes clear that I, the *Turīyaṃ*, am only seemingly *Viśva*, *Taijasa* and *Prājñā*, but not associated with any of those quarters. After knowledge, I know that I have always been *Turīyaṃ* but only playing the roles of *Viśva*, *Taijasa* and *Prājñā*. Even while playing the roles, I am *Turīyaṃ* because the roles never touch me at anytime. Sureśvarācārya gives an example in *Naiṣkarmya Siddhi* to illustrate this point. Imagine water in a transparent glass bowl. There is a straight rod partially dipped in water. When the rod comes in association with water, the rod under the water appears to be bent. How do you straighten the rod? Not by taking it out. Actually the rod need not be straightened because it was never bent. Thus experiencing the bent rod, I can declare that the rod is straight by the knowledge that the seeming bend is not a real bend. Similarly, consciousness is *Turīyaṃ* all the time. During the three states, the roles are appearances. Becoming *Turīyaṃ* is by understanding that I am always *Turīyaṃ*. With the knowledge that I am always *Turīyaṃ* not associated with any of my roles in the three states, I can enjoy playing the roles.

What is the nature of that *Turīyaṃ*?

Not an experiencer: Consciousness is seemingly *Viśva* or *Virāt* (*mantra* 3), *Taijasa* or *Hiranyagarbha* (*mantra* 4), *Prājñā* or *Īśvara* (*mantras* 6, 7), but it is actually not any of these. It is not any of the intermediary states. Normally there are only three states, waking, dreaming and sleep. But there are certain extraordinary states of experiences in which the mind cannot be said to be in the waking or the dreaming states but in some intermediary states. It can happen just before you go to sleep or in the early morning during which times, you can experience extraordinary things like premonition. One can experience hallucinations, ESP, or engage in controlled yogic experiences. *Turīyaṃ* is not any of these intermediary states also. It is not simultaneous experience of all the three states. If *Turīyaṃ* is not the experiencer of anything, is it inert? It is not inert but it is consciousness without any association with any object. It is not consciousness of something but it is consciousness by itself, objectless consciousness.

Not an object of experience: *Turīyaṃ* is not an object that you can experience because it is not perceived by the eyes and the other sense organs, organs of knowledge. Hand and other organs of action cannot handle *Turīyaṃ*. Therefore, it is beyond all transaction. It is transcendental reality.

MK-10 = Chapter 1, Mantra 7

Mantra 7

नान्तःप्रज्ञं न बहिष्प्रज्ञं नोभयतःप्रज्ञं
न प्रज्ञानघनं न प्रज्ञं नाप्रज्ञं ।

अदृष्टमव्यवहार्यमग्राह्यमलक्षणं
अचिन्त्यमव्यपदेश्यमेकात्मप्रत्ययसारं
प्रपञ्चोपशमं शान्तं शिवमद्वैतं चतुर्थं मन्यन्ते
स आत्मा स विज्ञेयः ॥ ७ ॥

In the most significant *mantra*, *mantra 7*, the Upaniṣad talks about *Turīyaṃ*, the *ātmā*. The essential message is that *Turīyaṃ* is the name of *ātmā*, I, the consciousness or witness principle and I, the consciousness principle, am called the waker, dreamer, or sleeper when I am associated with waking, dream or sleep. I myself am called *Turīyaṃ*, the fourth, when I am dissociated from waking, dream and sleep. The question is how can I dissociate from the three states. We saw that dissociation from the three states cannot happen physically because consciousness being eternal and all-pervading cannot dissociate from anything. Physical dissociation is not possible. Experiential dissociation is not possible because I am always in one state or another. Other than the three states, there is no fourth state. If there is a fourth state, I can enter the fourth state and bring about disassociation, but the fourth state is not there. How do we know there is no fourth state? The Upaniṣad talks about only three states but the word fourth state does not occur in *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad*. So the *Turīya* state does not exist. Experientially I have to be always in one of the three states and cannot get away from the three states.

We separate *Turīyaṃ* from the three states only by knowledge. This is the essence of *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad*. This has to be understood. Knowledge has to take place in the waking state. How can knowledge help me dissociate from the three states? The knowledge that I gain from the study of the Upaniṣad is that I, the experiencer consciousness principle, am *satyaṃ* and the three states belong to a lower order of reality otherwise called *mithyā*. The moment I get this knowledge, I have dissociated from the three states. *Satyaṃ* and *mithyā* can never get associated. They are in proximity but cannot get associated. Mirage water and sand are together but the mirage water cannot wet the sand. Movie and the screen are in proximity but they are never associated. I am a seeming waker, dreamer, and sleeper but factually I am *Turīyaṃ* all the time. I only appear as the waker, dreamer or sleeper but not actually become a waker, dreamer or sleeper. I only play these roles. Therefore, when *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad* says that *Turīyaṃ* is said to be the fourth quarter of *ātmā* it is not really the fourth quarter but it is the *ātmā*. *Turīyaṃ* is considered to be the fourth. However, it is not the fourth but it is only *ātmā*. I should know the *Turīyaṃ* only by claiming that I am *Turīyaṃ*, which is a thought that should happen in the waking state.

The nature of that *Turīyaṃ ātmā* is described in *mantra 7*. Each description is profound worth meditating on for weeks. Gauḍapāda will extensively elaborate on this *mantra* in the later chapters. I am

not the waker, dreamer and sleeper even when I appear as all of these. I have three appearances but I am always *Turīyaṃ*. I am different from the waker, dreamer and sleeper. I am the consciousness principle that seems to have the statuses of the waker, dreamer or sleeper. This is the first part of the description.

The second part of the description is that *Turīyaṃ* is not any object available in any one of the three states. So don't search for *Turīyaṃ* in any one of the three states as an object. It is not an object of knowledge. Neither can you see it outside or inside. It is not available for organs of action. It is not available for *jñāna* or *karma* transaction.

Beyond inference: There is nothing else other than *Turīyaṃ* and so it cannot be inferred.

Beyond thoughts: It is not available for sensory objectification or mental objectification. No one can claim the he or she has experienced *Turīyaṃ*. It does not have any color or form.

Beyond description: It cannot be described by words. It is indescribable. Words can function in only five areas of description. Those five areas are: specific substance (mango tree), any generic substance (a tree), property (color, form), varieties of activities, and relationships (father). Any word in any language functions in only these five areas. *Turīyaṃ* does not fall into any of these five areas. Specifically, there is no second thing of the same order of reality as *Turīyaṃ* and so it cannot have any relationship. *Turīyaṃ* cannot be described in words.

Free from the world: *Turīyaṃ* is free from all the three universes and the three bodies. The Upaniṣad is negating this world itself. How can the Upaniṣad negate this world when we are experiencing this world solidly? It can negate this world only under one condition. What is experienced can be negated only if what is experienced is not factual. Blue sky and blue waters of the ocean are examples. *Turīyaṃ* is free from the world because the world is *mithyā*.

Therefore, *Turīyaṃ* is **advaitam**. When there is no second real thing other than *Turīyaṃ*, every second thing is *mithyā* and therefore is as good as not there. So *Turīyaṃ* is non-dual.

Turīyaṃ is called the fourth quarter **only figuratively** but really it is not the fourth quarter but the only quarter available. *Viśva*, *Taijasa* and *Prājña* are simply names and *Turīyaṃ* only really is. It is like saying gold, ring, bangle, and chain. Even though you count four, on enquiry you find one gold and three names for the same gold. Only one *Turīyaṃ* is present and three names for that *Turīyaṃ* are given.

Therefore, *Turīyaṃ* is **tranquil**, ever undisturbed because *mithyā* universe cannot disturb the *satya* *Turīyaṃ*. One *mithyā* object can disturb another *mithyā* object. A dog can bite the human body in the waking state. A dream dog can bite the dream body in the dream state. Pain will be felt in both situations. My body, being of the same order of reality as the universe, will be disturbed by it. However,

the entire universe can never disturb me, the *Turīyaṃ*. So *Turīyaṃ* is ever *śāntam*, tranquil. Therefore, *Turīyaṃ* is ***śivam***, **free from sorrow**.

This *Turīyaṃ* alone is the real I, and the other three are roles that I play in life. Life is a play but it can get serious if I forget that it is only a play. This fact should be remembered. If life appears to be a meaningless, burdensome, boring struggle, life has become *saṃsāra*. Life becomes *saṃsāra* when I do not understand my higher nature and if I do not remember the fifth capsule of Vedānta: *by forgetting my real nature, I convert life into a burden, by remembering my real nature I convert life into a blessing wherein I can claim my higher glory*. Make your life beautiful by knowing that you are *Turīyaṃ*.

MK-11 = Mantra 7, Kārikās 10, 11

Mantra 7

नान्तःप्रज्ञं न बहिष्प्रज्ञं नोभयतःप्रज्ञं
न प्रज्ञानघनं न प्रज्ञं नाप्रज्ञं ।

अदृष्टमव्यवहार्यमग्राह्यमलक्षणं
अचिन्त्यमव्यपदेश्यमेकात्मप्रत्ययसारं
प्रपञ्चोपशमं शान्तं शिवमद्वैतं चतुर्थं मन्यन्ते
स आत्मा स विज्ञेयः ॥ ७ ॥

This 7th *mantra*, which we completed in the last class is the essence of the entire *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad* as well as the entire *Māṇḍūkyakārikā*. This *mantra* gives the definition of *Turīyaṃ*. Every description of *Turīyaṃ* is extremely important in this *mantra* but three words are to be specially noted.

advaitam indicating that *Turīyaṃ* alone is worth counting and *Turīyaṃ* alone is *satyaṃ*, one without a second. One full chapter, chapter 3, *Advaitaprakaraṇam* with 48 verses is dedicated to the commentary on *advaitam*.

prapañcopasamam indirectly reveals the *mithyā* nature of this universe. *Mithyā* is whatever is experientially existent but factually non-existent. Examples are mirage water, blue sky, blue waters of the ocean, sunrise and bent rod in a glass of water. Gauḍapāda dedicates one full chapter, the 2nd chapter consisting of 38 verses as a commentary on this one word, *prapañcopasamam*. In the second chapter, Gauḍapāda establishes the *mithyā* nature of this universe by taking the example of the dream. The dream is experientially existent but is factually not there. In comparison with the dream, Gauḍapāda establishes that this world is also like another type of dream only.

ekātma-pratyaya-sāram is significant because it gives us the methodology to comprehend *Turīyaṃ*. *Turīyaṃ* will have to be comprehended in a unique manner because it is not available for regular means of knowledge. *Turīyaṃ* is not an object of knowledge but it is the very “you” who wants to know. So it cannot be observed externally or internally in deep meditation. To understand *Turīyaṃ*, a clue, *eka-ātma-pratyaya-sāram*, is given. *ātma-pratyaya* means Self-Knowledge or “I” awareness. Whenever you say, “I am”, you are aware of yourself. This self-awareness, whenever you say, “I am” is called *ātma-pratyaya* (*pratyaya* = awareness). *eka* means continuous. *ekātma-pratyaya* means continuous self-awareness. This continuous self-awareness is the *sāram*, an indicator or a pointer. We have to capture the *Turīyaṃ* by holding on to self-awareness. Normally when I say, “I am” in the waking state, I am available as a waker. Imagine in the waking state, I say, ‘I slept well last night and I dreamt in between and now I am a waker’. I say, “I slept, I dreamt, I am now awake” indicating that the sleeper, dreamer and waker are not separate entities but all these three are one and the same. I do not say that somebody slept, someone else dreamt. I say, “I slept, I dreamt, and I am awake”. This is called *pratyabhijñā*, meaning the recognition of all the three as one and the same. This *pratyabhijñā* is a very important clue

for Self-Knowledge. In the sixth verse of the *Dakṣiṇāmūrtistotram* also, the phrase ‘*pratyabhijñāyate*’ occurs. When I equate waker to dreamer and sleeper, superficially seeing, this statement is wrong because waker can never be dreamer, and dreamer can never be sleeper. These three are mutually exclusive and they have contradictory adjectives. In spite of the superficial contradiction, we are deliberately, clearly and instinctively equating them, which is possible only under one condition. When I am equating an elderly person with grey hair with my classmate sixty years ago and say that this man is that man, I am temporarily forgetting the contradictory features and understanding that behind the contradictory features, the person is one and the same. The features are widely different, but my understanding is that behind those features the person is essentially one and the same. At the time of equation, I am dropping the adjectives. At the time of *pratyabhijñā*, the contradictory features are renounced intellectually. Similarly when I say, “I slept, I dreamt and I am awake”, I am equating all the three ‘I’ with ‘I myself’ (*soham*). In that recognition, all the contradictory features, waker status, dreamer status, and sleeper status are unknowingly, instinctively dropped. Since I am instinctively dropping the three statuses, I am neither *Viśva* nor *Taijasa* nor *Prājña*. During that fleeting moment I am remaining as awareness principle without these three statuses. During that fleeting moment, unknowingly and instinctively I am referring to myself as the consciousness principle without these three statuses. Thus, I am *Turīyaṃ* at that time without knowing that I am *Turīyaṃ*. At that time I am very close to the teaching of the Upaniṣad. Once I understand that I am the consciousness principle and that these three statuses are not mine, then the teaching of the Upaniṣad will help me reinforce. How does the Upaniṣad do that? Really speaking, the waker, dreamer and sleeper are not the statuses of me, the consciousness principle. These three statuses belong to the mind alone and not I, the consciousness principle. How? When the mind is extrovert, that condition of the extrovert mind is called the waking state. When the mind is not extrovert, but is turned inward towards its own memories, *vāsanās*, it is called the dreamer mind. It can happen in the night or daytime. The resolved mind, when it is neither extrovert nor introvert, is in the sleeper status. The Upaniṣad says that these three statuses belong to the mind. But who am I? I am the witness who reveals the extrovert mind and the introvert mind. I am also aware of the passive mind in sleep because after waking up, I say that I did not know anything. I reveal that non-knowing status of the mind. I am ever free from the waker status, dreamer status and sleeper status. Therefore, I am *Viśva-Taijasa-Prājña-vilakṣaṇa*. I am *Turīyaṃ* always. I need not go to *nirvikalpa samādhi* to know this. I should learn to claim here and now that the three statuses belong to the mind and I am *Turīyaṃ*. For that *eka-ātma-pratyaya* is useful. This is the 7th *mantra*. Gauḍapāda will say more about this *mantra* later. With the 7th *mantra*, the Upaniṣad completes the description of the fourth quarter of *ātmā* and the *ātma-vicāra*. Now Gauḍapāda begins his commentary on the fourth quarter.

Review

ekātmapratyayasāram (traceable through the unbroken self-awareness): this is a technical and profound word. What is the method that I should use to understand that I am Turīyaṃ? I am always associated with one of the three states. I am either Waker-I, the dreamer-I, or the sleeper-I. Even though I continuously shift through these three, I do not look upon these three as three different entities. I never say that there was a dreamer-I and now there is a Waker-I, etc. I say that I was sleeping, I had a good dream or bad dream and now I am awake. This means that I am seeing the Waker-I, the dreamer-I, and the sleeper-I as one constantly continuing I. Not that the Waker-I comes and goes and that the dreamer-I comes and goes. It is one constant non-variable I. That means that in our vision the Waker-I = dreamer-I = sleeper-I because we understand that the 'I' is continuous. This is technically called pratyabhijñā, recognizing all the three "I" as one and the same. That is why I say that I slept, I dreamt and I am awake. The question is when I equate Waker-I, and dreamer-I, what is happening in my understanding? This is a very subtle point. Superficially seeing, the equation is wrong because the dreamer can never be the waker and the waker can never be the dreamer. Waker and dreamer being mutually exclusive adjectives, they can never be equal. But we are still seeing them as one and the same. How are we doing this? Whenever we are equating the Waker-I, and the dreamer-I, we are temporarily keeping aside the different adjectives (bhāga-tyāga-lakṣaṇa). We are keeping aside the two different statuses. If the statuses are retained, the two states cannot be equated. The fact that we are equating indicates that we are temporarily separating the different statuses and referring to consciousness, which is free from the waker and the dreamer statuses. When you are equating a younger person who had black hair with the person who has become older now with white hair, you are temporarily giving up the different hair colors. Whenever we are equating the dreamer, the sleeper, and the waker we are giving up the different statuses and referring to the Turīyaṃ. When I say that I dreamt and now I am awake, the dreamer-I, am now the Waker-I, and the word "I" is referring to the Turīyaṃ without the opposite statuses. The pratyabhijñā, i.e., the recognition of the Waker-I, the dreamer-I, and the sleeper-I, as one and the same is an indication for the Turīyaṃ persisting in all the three states. The Upaniṣad uses the word ekātma pratyaya, 'one common self-awareness', equating the waker, the dreamer and the sleeper. This self-awareness reveals the Turīyaṃ, which is free from all the three statuses. Therefore through that sāram, the trail of the common I, the Turīyaṃ can be recognized. This Turīyaṃ has to be known for liberation.

Kārikā 10

निवृत्तेः सर्वदुःखानामीशानः प्रभुरव्ययः ।

अद्वैतः सर्वभावानां देवस्तुर्यो विभुः स्मृतः ॥ १० ॥

nivṛtteḥ sarvaduḥkḥānāmīśānaḥ prabhuravyayaḥ ।

advaitaḥ sarvabhāvānāṃ devasturyo vibhuḥ smṛtaḥ ॥ 10 ॥

Being free from all miseries, Turīya is considered to be the Lord, capable (of freeing one from misery.) It is immutable, effulgent, all-pervading, and the non-dual (truth) of all beings. (kārikā 10)

In the 10th *kārikā*, Gauḍapāda describes the essential nature of *Turīyaṃ* as revealed by the 7th *mantra*. Gauḍapāda concentrates on the pure consciousness aspect of *Turīyaṃ*. *Turīyaṃ* is revealed in the 7th *mantra* in the following manner. It is of the nature of pure consciousness, not the knowing-consciousness. Consciousness takes up the role of knowing only when the mind joins the consciousness. Consciousness by itself is not a knower, not an experiencer and cannot do any action. *Turīyaṃ* is of the nature of pure consciousness. Can consciousness say, ‘I am consciousness?’ It cannot do that. Consciousness requires the mind because claiming requires a relevant thought. Claiming, knowing, and experiencing require relevant thoughts and thoughts require a mind. In the presence of mind alone, the process of knowing is possible. ***Turīyaṃ is the non-knowing consciousness principle.*** Consciousness does not require mind to be consciousness but it requires mind to claim that I am consciousness.

Consciousness is not affected by space and is all-pervading and in fact, space is contained in consciousness. It is non-dual and a non-variable factor. The mind is variable. The mind is extrovert (waker), introvert (dreamer) or passive (sleeper). Experiences are variable. The world is also variable. *Turīyaṃ* reveals all the variable factors by its mere presence, but in itself it is non-variable, *advaita*. It is *advaita* amidst all variable things. It is not affected by time. Body and mind will fade but I, *Turīyaṃ*, do not fade.

Turīyaṃ is the powerful master of *saṃsāra* because it is free from afflictions of sorrow. In fact, the intrinsic nature of *Turīyaṃ* is *ānanda*. Even *Bhagavān* as *Bhagavān* will be afflicted. These afflictions will affect body and mind but not *Turīyaṃ*. *Jīva*’s *ahaṅkāra* and *Īśvara*’s cosmic *ahaṅkāra* will never be free from afflictions of pain and sorrow. To get free from *saṃsāra* we have to hold on to *Turīyaṃ*.

Kārikā 11

कार्यकारणबद्धौ ताविष्येते विश्वतैजसौ ।

प्राज्ञः कारणबद्धस्तु द्वौ तौ तुर्ये न सिध्यतः ॥ ११ ॥

kāryakāraṇabaddhau tāviṣyete viśvataijasau ।

prājñaḥ kāraṇabaddhastu dvau tau turye na sidhyataḥ ॥ 11 ॥

Viśva and Taijasa are both considered to be conditioned by cause and effect. But Prājña is conditioned by cause (alone.) Both of them do not exist in Turīya. (kārikā 11)

With the 7th *mantra*, the *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad* has completed the presentation of the four quarters of the *ātmā*: *Viśva*, *Taijasa*, *Prājña* and *Turīyaṃ*. The *Upaniṣad* defines these four quarters as follows: I, the

consciousness principle, when associated with the waking, dream, and sleep states are called *Viśva*, *Taijasa*, and *Prāñña* respectively; when dissociated from all the three states, and looked at from my own standpoint I am called *Turīyaṃ*. The method of dissociation is neither physical nor experiential in nature but in the form of understanding that my association with these three states is only a seeming one similar to the movie screen and the movie. That understanding helps me claim my *Turīyaṃ* nature. Thus the three quarters are due to association.

In these verses beginning from 11th to 15th, Gauḍapāda is making an interesting enquiry. Now all the four quarters have been revealed. To make sure that we have clearly understood all the quarters, Gauḍapāda is making a ‘compare and contrast’ study of the four quarters taking any two quarters at a time. It is an analysis of the common features and the uncommon features among these four quarters. Gauḍapāda uses certain terminology to communicate this idea. In this analysis, Gauḍapāda defines *Viśva*, *Taijasa*, *Prāñña* and *Turīyaṃ* slightly differently. This definition is only superficially different but it needs to be noted to understand these verses.

The common person does not know that he is the *Turīyaṃ*. This ignorance is common to all the people. This is self-ignorance. Because I don’t know that I am *Turīyaṃ* all the time, this ignorance leads to misunderstanding or misconception. Wherever ignorance is present, there will be misconception. Self-ignorance leads to self-misconception. Self-Ignorance is cause and self-misconception is effect. Self-Ignorance of *Turīyaṃ* leads to misconceptions that I am waker, dreamer or sleeper. Now Gauḍapāda explains who among the three has got the self-ignorance and self-misconception. Both the waker and the dreamer have self-ignorance and self-misconception, and thus cause (ignorance) and effect (misconception). The sleeper is also ignorant but he does not have any misconception. That is why he is blissful. The sleeper cannot say that he is the sleeper in sleep. The sleeper has cause only. *Turīyaṃ* is free from both cause and effect.

MK-12 = Kārikās – 11 to 15

Kārikā 11

कार्यकारणबद्धौ ताविष्येते विश्वतैजसौ ।

प्राज्ञः कारणबद्धस्तु द्वौ तौ तुर्ये न सिध्यतः ॥ ११ ॥

With the 7th mantra, *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad* has completed the presentation of the four *pādas* of the *ātmā*: *Viśva*, *Taijasa*, *Prājña* and *Turīyaṃ*. Now Gauḍapāda is analyzing this portion by making a ‘compare and contrast’ study. He is analyzing the common and the non-common features among the four *pādas*. In this analysis, Gauḍapāda defines *Viśva*, *Taijasa*, *Prājña* and *Turīyaṃ* slightly differently. This definition is only superficially different but it needs to be noted to understand these verses.

The Upaniṣad defines these four *pādas* as follows: I, the consciousness principle, when associated with the waking, dream, and sleep states am called *Viśva*, *Taijasa*, and *Prājña* respectively; when dissociated from all the three states, and looked at from my own standpoint I am called *Turīyaṃ*. The method of dissociation is neither physical nor experiential in nature but in the form of understanding that my association with these three states is only a seeming one similar to the movie screen and the movie. That understanding helps me claim my *Turīyaṃ* nature. Thus the three *pādas* are due to association.

Gauḍapāda makes a small difference in this definition. Every human being has the ignorance of the fact that he is *Turīyaṃ*. This ignorance leads to a self-misconception that makes me identify with the gross, subtle or the causal body resulting in the notion that I am a finite limited individual called *ahaṅkāra*. Self-ignorance is the cause for self-misconception. Four pairs of words are used for the pair self-ignorance and self-misconception: *ajñānam* (ignorance) and *ahaṅkāra*, *agrahanam* (non-perception) and *anyathāgrahaṇam* (non-apprehension), *nidrā* (spiritual ignorance) and *svapna* (dream), cause and effect.

Gauḍapāda then describes which of the four quarters are associated with ignorance and misconception. *Viśva*, the waker has ignorance and misconception. *Taijasa*, the dreamer has ignorance and misconception. *Prājña* has ignorance but does not have misconception because it requires an active mind. Ignorance without misconception is bliss. *Turīyaṃ* does not have both because everything other than *Turīyaṃ* is *mithyā*. *Mithyā* cannot touch *satyaṃ*. Ignorance does not contaminate *Turīyaṃ* and it is free from both ignorance and misconception. Gauḍapāda gives this message in the following verses but he keeps changing the words of definition constantly.

Viśva and *Taijasa* are linked with cause and effect, ignorance and misconception. *Prājña* is linked with only ignorance. In *Turīyaṃ*, both ignorance and misconception are not there.

Kārikā 12

नऽऽत्मानं न परांश्चैव न सत्यं नापि चानृतम् ।

प्राज्ञः किञ्चन संवेत्ति तुर्यं तत्सर्वदृक्सदा ॥ १२ ॥

na'atmānaṃ na parāṃścaiva na satyaṃ nāpi cānṛtam ।

prājñāḥ kiñcana saṃvetti turyaṃ tatsarvadṛksadā ॥ 12॥

Prājña knows nothing – neither himself (nor) others, neither the truth nor the untruth. That Turīya is ever the all-seeing (consciousness.) (kārikā 12)

This verse is a commentary on the 2nd line of the previous verse. *Prājña* is associated with ignorance and therefore does not know anything. Neither *Prājña* does not know other things but does not know himself as a sleeper. Neither does *Prājña* know what is *satyaṃ* nor does he know what is *mithyā*. *Prājña* is totally and blissfully ignorant. But *Turīyaṃ*, the consciousness, is always the witness of everything but not associated with anything. It is the witness of ignorance also even though it is not associated with ignorance. Witness consciousness reveals both knowledge and ignorance and is untouched by both.

Kārikā 13

द्वैतस्याग्रहणं तुल्यमुभयोः प्राज्ञतुर्ययोः ।

बीजनिद्रायुतः प्राज्ञः सा च तुर्ये न विद्यते ॥ १३ ॥

dvaitasyāgrahaṇaṃ tulyamubhayoḥ prājñaturyayoḥ ।

bījanidrāyutaḥ prājñāḥ sā ca turye na vidyate ॥ 13॥

Non-perception of duality is common to both Prājña and Turīya. Prājña is associated with causal ignorance. And that does not exist in Turīya. (kārikā 13)

Here Gauḍapāda is comparing *Prājña* with *Turīyaṃ* and contrasting them also. He uses different terms. *Prājña* is associated with ignorance and *Turīyaṃ* is not associated with ignorance. This is the contrast. The common feature is that misconception, duality, is absent for both. *Prājña* is associated with causal ignorance. In *Turīyaṃ*, this causal ignorance is not present.

Kārikā 14

स्वप्ननिद्रायुतावाद्यौ प्राज्ञस्त्वस्वप्ननिद्रया ।

न निद्रां नैव च स्वप्नं तुर्ये पश्यन्ति निश्चिताः ॥ १४ ॥

svapnanidrāyutāvādyau prājñastvasvapnanidrayā ।

na nidrāṃ naiva ca svapnaṃ turye paśyanti niścitāḥ ॥ 14॥

The first two are associated with dream and sleep. But Prājña (is associated with) dreamless sleep. Wise (people) see neither sleep nor dream in Turīya. (kārikā 14)

The same idea is presented again with different terms, dream and sleep. The first two quarters, *Viśva* and *Taijasa*, are associated with misconception and ignorance. The ignorant waker is spiritually a dreamer. Only a *jñāni* alone is truly a waker. *Prājña* is associated with mere ignorance (sleep) without misconception (dream). Wise people will see neither ignorance (sleep) nor misconception (dream) in *Turīyaṃ* and will claim that they are that *Turīyaṃ*.

Kṛṣṇa describes the *jñāni* who knows that he is not a doer or an enjoyer in the 5th chapter of the *Bhagavad Gita*.

Even while seeing, hearing, touching, smelling, eating, moving, reclining, breathing, talking, evacuating, receiving, opening the eye, and closing the eye, the disciplined knower of the Truth understands “I do not do anything at all” bearing in mind that sense organs remain in sense-objects. (5:8,9)

Further Kṛṣṇa refers to himself as seemingly a *Viśva* but actually the non-doer and non-enjoyer *Turīyaṃ* in the 4th chapter of the *Bhagavad Gita*.

The fourfold division (of society) has been created by Me based upon guṇa and karma. Know me to be its author. Also (know me) to be a non-doer (and) changeless. (4:13)

Kārikā 15

अन्यथा गृह्णतः स्वप्नो निद्रा तत्त्वमजानतः ।

विपर्यासे तयोः क्षीणे तुरीयं पदमश्नुते ॥ १५ ॥

anyathā grhṇataḥ svapno nidrā tattvamajānataḥ ।

viparyāse tayoh kṣīṇe turīyaṃ padamaśnute ॥ 15॥

Dream belongs to one who takes (the ātmā) differently. Sleep belongs to one who does not know the ātmā. When the flaw in these two is gone, one attains the goal of Turīya. (kārikā 15)

In the previous verse, Gauḍapāda has used the words *nidrā* and *svapna*, sleep and dream. They are not regular expressions but loaded with special meaning. Gauḍapāda has not explained the special meaning so far. In this verse he does so. Dream in Vedāntic parlance refers to self-misconception. Even a waker is a dreamer as long as he has self-misconception. Sleep, in Vedānta is the ignorance of the *tattvam*, the real nature, which is *Turīyaṃ*. As long as these two are present, *samsāra* will never end. When one of them, the self-misconception, is absent, we get a temporary respite from *samsāra* in deep sleep, death,

and dissolution of the world, but *saṃsāra* continues afterwards. When both ignorance and misconception are eliminated, one 'attains' *Turīyaṃ*, which is nothing but claiming one's own glory.

MK-13 = Kārikās – 15 to 18

Kārikā 15

अन्यथा गृह्यतः स्वप्नो निद्रा तत्त्वमजानतः ।

विपर्यासे तयोः क्षीणे तुरीयं पदमश्नुते ॥ १५ ॥

Commenting upon the 7th mantra of *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad*, Gauḍapāda first gave the definition of *Turīyaṃ* and thereafter makes a ‘compare-contrast’ study of the fourth quarter. He pointed out that the first two quarters, waker and dreamer are associated with two problems, self-ignorance and self-misconception or error. Waker and dreamer identities are misconceptions arising out of the ignorance of *Turīyaṃ*. The *Prājña* has got only one problem, ignorance and does not have misconception. *Turīyaṃ* is free from both ignorance and misconception. Ignorance was referred to by four words, ignorance, non-perception, sleep and cause. Error was also referred to by four words, *ahaṅkāra*, non-apprehension, dream and effect. *Turīyaṃ* is free from both the problems. Ignorance of *Turīya* is a problem for the entire humanity because that is the cause of *saṃsāra*. Ignorance by itself does not cause the problem but mixed with error it causes the problem of *saṃsāra*. During deep sleep, only ignorance is present and there is no *saṃsāra*. But *saṃsāra* comes back upon waking. Both ignorance and error have to be eliminated. Error alone cannot be eliminated for good without the removal of ignorance. Error needs to be removed for the elimination of *saṃsāra* and ignorance has to be removed to prevent error from coming back. A *jñāni* who has eliminated both attains *Turīyaṃ* as it were. *Turīya jñāni* does not know *Turīyaṃ* as an object. He claims *Turīyaṃ* as himself and ‘attains’ *Turīyaṃ*, which is ever free from *saṃsāra*.

Kārikā 16

अनादिमायया सुप्तो यदा जीवः प्रबुध्यते ।

अजमनिद्रमस्वप्नमद्वैतं बुध्यते तदा ॥ १६ ॥

anādimāyayā supto yadā jīvaḥ prabudhyate ।

ajamanidramasvapnamadvaitaṃ budhyate tadā ॥ 16॥

Having been ignorant of (Turīya) due to beginning-less māyā, when the jīva awakens, then, he knows the non-dual (Turīya), which is unborn, dreamless, and sleepless. (kārikā 16)

Gauḍapāda says this spiritual awakening, which is claiming that I am *Turīyaṃ* all the time and not just at a particular time called *samādhi*, is a very sacred moment in the life of every *jīva* because the spiritual sleep in the form of self-ignorance has been there from beginning-less time. The opportunity for awakening can come only in human birth. Only a very few people diagnose the problem of *saṃsāra*. Even if diagnosed, few know that knowledge alone is the solution and that knowledge requires Vedānta *śravaṇa mananam*. Many people are trying to get enlightenment by various methods including raising *kuṇḍalinī*. Varieties of spiritual exercises are practiced by varieties of people not knowing that those

practices cannot give that knowledge. Knowledge can come from a means of knowledge only. If I have to know the color, I have to use the right instrument of knowledge. For *Turīyaṃ* knowledge, Vedānta alone is the instrument. All the other instruments are turned outward. To come to knowledge, a competent *ācārya* is needed. Very few will get the desire to study Vedānta. Very few will get the opportunity to study Vedānta. Even among those, very few will grasp the message and claim, “I am the consciousness principle who am dissociated from waking, dream and sleep all the time.”

My association with the three states is only a seeming one. Once I understand the association to be a seeming one, I am free. The stick under water only seems to be bent. If I take the bend to be real, I have to do something to straighten the stick. When I know the bend to be only a seeming one, I do not need to do any *sādhana* to straighten the stick. Let the stick be in water and appear to be bent. But it is straight all the time. Similarly, I appear to be a waker, dreamer or a sleeper. Even when I appear as all these three, they are only appearances. I am always *Turīyaṃ* and this I have to know in the waking state.

This ignorant waker is spiritually asleep by the power of *māyā* from beginning-less time. *Māyā* has *āvaraṇa-śakti*, the power to conceal the truth that I am *Turīyaṃ* all the time. Once the truth is concealed, falsehood is projected. *Māyā*'s projection power is called *vikṣepa-śakti*. With the operation of this *śakti*, I associate with the waker, dreamer and sleeper and all the rest. Because of some blessing there is desire for knowledge, opportunity to know, and grasping the knowledge. When this happens, the *jīva* awakens from both sleep (ignorance) and dream (error). At the time of awakening, the world is understood as *mithyā* but the world will not disappear like the dream world disappearing upon waking from sleep. Plurality will appear but it is known to be the non-dual *Turīyaṃ* only. That *Turīyaṃ* is understood to be ‘I am’, the ‘I’ referring to the consciousness principle. Gauḍapāda keeps *mantra 7* in focus all throughout the entire *Māṇḍūkya-kārikā*. That *Turīyaṃ* is free from association with the deep sleep, dream, and waking states. All these states belong to the mind. The extrovert mind is in the waking state, the introvert mind is in the dream state and the passive mind is in the deep sleep state. These three states are states of the mind only but we superimpose these onto ourselves, the consciousness. This is false transference. A clear crystal in the proximity of a red flower appears red. When I mistake the crystal to be red, I am falsely transferring the color of the flower onto the crystal. The crystal is not red at anytime. Mind has got different states and when I transfer the mental attributes of the waking, dream or deep sleep states upon myself, I think that I am the waker, dreamer or sleeper. After this wisdom, I transfer the attributes back to the mind itself and know that I am *Turīyaṃ* all the time.

Kārikā 17

प्रपञ्चो यदि विद्येत निवर्तेत न संशयः ।

मायामात्रमिदं द्वैतमद्वैतं परमार्थतः ॥ १७ ॥

prapañco yadi vidyeta nivarteta na saṁśayaḥ |

māyāmātramidaṁ dvaitamadvaitaṁ paramārthataḥ || 17||

The world can go away if it (really) exists. There is no doubt. This duality is mere māyā. In reality there is non-duality. (kārikā 17)

This is another powerful and important verse along with 15, 16 and 18. A doubt may arise, which Gauḍapāda tries to clarify. After gaining the knowledge, the *jñāni* understands that he is the *Turīyaṁ*, the consciousness principle, which is the observer, and free from all the attributes of the body-mind and world. There is a world with varieties of attributes. The world can be objectified, has materiality, has attributes, has a changing nature and is subject to arrival and departure. I am the opposite of all these five attributes and free from waking, dream and sleep as attributes. I am the consciousness principle and everything else is matter, and I am the observer and the world including the attributes of the body-mind is the observed.

I know that I am *Turīyaṁ*. But how can I say that I am *advaitam*? *Advaitam* means non-dual, one only. In addition to the *Turīyaṁ*, there is the observed world. So we should count minimum two things, the observer *Turīyaṁ* and the observed universe. There should be only duality. How does Gauḍapāda say *Turīyaṁ* is known to be *advaitam*? There is a world other than me the observer. How can there be non-duality? The clue to the answer has already been given in the introduction. In all the other Upaniṣads, cause is *satyaṁ* and effect is *mithyā* because effect is only name and form. In *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad*, I, the observer, am *satyaṁ*, and the observed cannot exist without the blessing of the observer. One cannot say that the dream world continues even after waking up. The observer is required to prove the existence of the dream world. Similarly, this world can be proved only when there is an observer. This topic is discussed more in the next chapter. The main idea is that the observer is *satyaṁ* and the observed is *mithyā*. This is the foundation of *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad*. I experience the world but the world is *mithyā* because it does not have an independent existence of its own. What is *mithyā* cannot be counted along with *satyaṁ*. The dream world is experienced but is never counted. Similarly the waking world is experienced but it cannot be counted. Only one worth counting is I, the observer.

Therefore, if there is a dualistic universe separately existent, it has to be eliminated for *advaitam*. To become *advaitam*, you will have to eliminate the dualistic universe, if it is there. But really speaking the dualistic universe is only an appearance without having a reality of its own. The entire dual world is *māyā*, an appearance, and *mithyā*. But I am not able to see the world as *mithyā*, unreal. How can I accept this world to be unreal? For that Gauḍapāda will say in the second chapter that the dream world is not accepted as unreal in dream. For a dreamer, dream is not a dream in dream. The dreamer will see the dream in dream as the waking state and that the dream events as taking place outside him. This is because in dream, the dream world is real only. Similarly this world will be real in the waking state. It is conditional reality. Each one is real in its respective state but each one turns unreal in the other state.

Therefore it is called *māyā*. In reality from the standpoint of the absolute, *Turīyaṃ*, there is only *advaitam*.

Kārikā 18

विकल्पो विनिवर्तेत कल्पितो यदि केनचित् ।

उपदेशादयं वादो ज्ञाते द्वैतं न विद्यते ॥ १८ ॥

vikalpo vinivarteta kalpito yadi kenacit ।

upadesādayaṃ vādo jñāte dvaitaṃ na vidyate ॥ 18॥

Division can go away if it has been created by somebody. This talk (of division) is for the sake of teaching. There is no duality after knowledge. (kārikā 18)

In the previous verse, Gauḍapāda pointed out that after knowledge the world will continue to appear. There will be no difference in the appearance, but the *jñāni* will not count the appearance as number two because he sees the difference in the order of reality. In a movie we experience the screen as well as the movie characters. We experience both of them in close proximity but for an informed person even though both of them are experienced together, one is *satyaṃ* and the other is *mithyā*. Similarly the world and I are always together. But one is *satyaṃ* that is I, and everything else like the characters in the movie are moving in me, the screen. I, like the screen, am never affected. This is with regard to the appearance of the world.

In this verse, Gauḍapāda says that this analysis can be extended to the *guru*-scripture-disciple duality also. They all belong to *mithyā* category also. If the division of the *guru*, scripture and disciple is actually created, it has to be eliminated by effort but it need not be eliminated by action because that division is an appearance only. That division is eliminated by knowledge, not from our perception, but from the reality status. By mere knowledge we eliminate duality.

There are two methods of destroying a pot. One is to break it. The other method is by the knowledge that there is no substance called pot, but pot is a word given to a form of clay for transaction. Once I understand this, in my vision the substance called pot does not exist. The word ‘pot’ alone exists. For a Vedānta *jñāni*, the world is nothing but a word, the substance called world does not exist. The only existing thing is *Turīyaṃ* and everything else is name and form. I am that *Turīyaṃ*. This is the teaching.

MK-14 = Chapter 1, Kārikā – 18, Mantras – 8, 9

Kārikā 18

विकल्पो विनिवर्तेत कल्पितो यदि केनचित् ।

उपदेशादयं वादो ज्ञाते द्वैतं न विद्यते ॥ १८ ॥

These four *kārikās*, 15 to 18 are important *kārikās* wherein Gauḍapāda gives the essence of *Turīyaṃ* as given in the 7th *mantra*. These four verses will be elaborately expanded in the next two chapters, *Vaitathyaprakaraṇam* and *Advaitaprakaraṇam*. In these four verses, Gauḍapāda pointed out that when a person knows the *Turīyaṃ*, he discovers that he is the *Turīyaṃ* and that it is not an object. The Upaniṣad has pointed out that *Turīyaṃ* is *advaitam*, non-dual without a second. The *jñāni* discovers that he is *advaitam*. If he is *advaitam*, then what about everything else like world, etc.? Gauḍapāda said that if there is only *advaitam*, then there is no *dvaitam*, duality. In the wake of knowledge, there is no duality and there is no world. This statement will naturally raise a question. *Jñāni* declares, “ I am non-dual”, and that there is no duality. What about the world? Does it mean that the world goes away after gaining knowledge? This question is difficult to answer for an *advaitin*. Saying either that the world goes away in the wake of knowledge or does not go away presents problems for establishing *advaitam*. An *advaitin* says that he cannot answer the question. That may be seen to be inadequate teaching. Gauḍapāda says that he cannot answer the question not because he does not know the answer but because the question itself is wrong. The question is based on the assumption that there is a world before knowledge. Gauḍapāda says that that assumption is wrong. Since there is no world, the question of whether it continues or not after knowledge need not be answered. After knowing the clay, does the pot go or not? The question is wrong because the pot is not present in all three periods of time. Only clay was, is and will be. Pot is a word introduced by you. There is no object called pot, there is only clay. So after clay knowledge, pot remaining or not is not a relevant question. There is no pot to disappear or continue. Pot is only a word and not a thing. Brahman is like clay, world is like pot. There is no such thing called world other than Brahman. World is a word. After knowledge, you understand that the world is only a word. There is no second thing at all. There is only one thing, Brahman. That *Turīyaṃ* Brahman I am. If a world exists, you can talk about a world disappearing. The same explanation is extended to other pluralities like *guru*, scripture and disciple. They were never there to begin with and they are only words used for transaction. If you consider there is a world, it is due to your ignorance.

Gauḍapāda hints at a technical but profound point in the first part of the second line of *kārikā* 18 that he will elaborate in the 2nd and 3rd chapters. There is no world and that there is a world is an assumption and that assumption is based on ignorance. Therefore, people see duality because of ignorance and in the wake of knowledge, non-duality is seen. A technical question is asked. The student may see duality because of ignorance. One may say that the student projects duality. How do you account for the Veda itself accepting duality? Veda talks about duality in the early section. Veda talks about rituals, offering things into fire, different paths that a *jīva* takes after death to higher worlds and heaven, which are all duality. Veda comes from the Lord himself. If Veda accepts duality, it means that God accepts duality.

Therefore, duality must be real and not born out of ignorance. It can be said that *dvaitam* is *satyaṃ* and there is no *advaitam* because *dvaitam* is talked about in the Veda. *Bhagavān* cannot be ignorant. What is the answer?

Bhagavān and the Veda temporarily accept duality in the action-section not because it is real but because duality is required for preparing the mind. Even though duality is *mithyā*, that *mithyā* duality is required for practicing *karma-yoga*, *upāsana-yoga*, listening, reflection, etc. Duality is required as a stepping-stone even though it is *mithyā*. That does not mean that duality is *satyaṃ*. If duality is *satyaṃ*, Veda will not negate duality later because what is *satyaṃ* cannot be negated. Hundreds of statements in the Upaniṣads negate duality. Veda accepts duality temporarily as a stepping-stone. After coming to *advaitam*, we should negate *dvaitam*. Scaffolding used to build a building is discarded after the building is built. *Dvaitam* is *mithyā* and it is really not there. It is temporarily accepted. Later it is negated as name and form. For the sake of teaching purposes, duality is temporarily accepted by the Veda. This point will be elaborated in the 2nd and 3rd chapters.

With this 18th *kārikā*, the commentary on the 7th *mantra* is over. The *ātma-vicāra* part is also over. In the first two mantras of *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad*, two enquiries were introduced, *oṅkāra-vicāra* and *ātma-vicāra*. The *ātma-vicāra* was done from the 3rd to the 7th *mantra*. We now enter the *oṅkāra-vicāra*, which was introduced in *mantra* 1.

Mantra 8

सोऽयमात्माऽध्यक्षरमोङ्करोऽधिमात्रं पादा

मात्रा मात्राश्च पादा अकार उकारो मकार इति ॥ ८ ॥

*so'yamātmā'dhyakṣaramoṅkaro'dhimātraṃ pādā
mātrā mātrāśca pādā a-kāra ukāroma-kāra iti ॥ 8॥*

The same ātmā is Oṅkāra from the standpoint of the total syllable. From the standpoint of the individual letters, the quarters are the letters and the letters are the quarters. The letters are 'a', 'u', and 'm'. (mantra 8)

This *catuspāt* (four-quartered) *ātmā*, consisting of *Viśva*, *Taijasa*, *Prājña* and *Turīyaṃ* and which was analyzed in the previous five *mantras*, can be equated to the sacred Vedic *mantra* OM in its totality as the total syllable. Total *ātmā* is equal to total *Oṅkāra*. Having equated them in totality, the Upaniṣad says that the total *ātmā* and total *Oṅkāra* has got four components. The four components of *ātmā* are *Viśva*, *Taijasa*, *Prājña* and *Turīyaṃ*. What are the four components of *Oṅkāra*? They are *a-kāra*, *u-kāra*, *m-a-kāra*. They are the letters a, u, m. For the sake of pronunciation “*kāra*” is added after each letter. ‘*kāra*’ is equivalent to using the inverted commas; “a”, “u”, and “m”. According to the Sanskrit grammar rules, a+u = o, the last letter is m. So a+u+m becomes OM. It is to be noted that the spelling of *Oṅkāra* is not AUM but OM. After the utterance of *Oṅkāra*, it is followed by silence and silence also precedes the

utterance of the next *Oṅkāra*. That silence is the fourth component. The Upaniṣad calls that silence *amātrā*. Thus both *Oṅkāra* and *ātmā* have four components. The Upaniṣad says that each component of *ātmā* can be equated to each component of *Oṅkāra* in the same order sequentially. Thus *Viśva* is equal to ‘a’, *Taijasa* is equal to ‘u’, *Prājña* is equal to ‘m’, *Turīyaṃ* is equal to silence. *Turīyaṃ* cannot be talked about. Silence is the best representation of *Turīyaṃ*. Then, the Upaniṣad talks about meditating upon ‘a’, ‘u’ and ‘m’ as *Viśva-Vaiśvānara*, *Taijasa- Hiranyagarbha*, and *Prājña-Īśvara* respectively. Practicing this meditation will get one ready for identity with *Turīyaṃ*. The *mātrās* are equal to quarters and vice versa. The *upāsana* will be introduced.

Mantra 9

जागरितस्थानो वैश्वानरोऽकारः प्रथमा
मात्राऽऽप्तेरादिमत्त्वाद् वाऽऽप्नोति ह वै सर्वान्
कामानादिश्च भवति य एवं वेद ॥ ९ ॥

*jāgaritasthāno vaiśvānaro'kāraḥ prathamā
mātrā'pterādimattvād vā'pnoti ha vai sarvān
kāmanādiśca bhavati ya evaṃ veda ॥ 9॥*

Vaiśvānara, whose field is the waking state, is the first letter ‘a’ due to (the similarity of) all-pervasiveness and primacy. One who meditates thus attains all desires and becomes the foremost. (mantra 9)

The three equations are the subject matter for *upāsana*. The first meditation is *a-kāra*. The first letter ‘a’ of *Oṅkāra* is equated to *Vaiśvānara*, the first quarter of *ātmā*, which is experienced in the waking state. Two explanations for this equation are given. Equating two things is normally based on some common features. Between the letter ‘a’ and *Vaiśvānara*, two common features are pointed out: all-pervasiveness and primacy. This is based on the phonetic principle. According to Sanskrit grammar, the first, original, natural alphabetic letter is ‘a’, when you open the mouth. The letter ‘a’ is the cause for all the other letters. ‘a’ alone becomes ‘u’, ‘i’, etc. ‘a’ alone becomes all the other alphabetic letters. Cause must pervade all the effects. The letter ‘a’ pervades all the letters. *Vaiśvānara* or *Viśvarūpa* also pervades everything. All-pervasiveness is the common feature of the letter ‘a’ and *Vaiśvānara*. Thus ‘a’ becomes the symbol for the entire waking universe. The second common feature is that both of them are the first one in the list. In the alphabetic list of the Indian languages, the sound ‘ah’ is the first symbolized with the letter ‘a’. Because of the two common features, pervasion and primacy, we have to meditate on ‘a’ as *Vaiśvānara*. What happens when you do that meditation?

MK-15 = Chapter 1, Mantras – 9 to 11, Kārikās – 19 to 21

Mantra 9

जागरितस्थानो वैश्वानरोऽकारः प्रथमा
मात्राऽऽमेरादिमत्त्वाद् वाऽऽप्नोति ह वै सर्वान्
कामानादिश्च भवति य एवं वेद ॥ ९ ॥

After completing the four-quartered *ātma-vicāra* with the 7th *mantra*, now from the 8th *mantra* onwards, the Upaniṣad has started the *oṅkāra-vicāra*. An introduction was given in the 8th *mantra* in which the total *ātmā* was equated with the total *Oṅkāra*, and by the word total what is meant is all the four components, *Viśva*, *Taijasa*, *Prājña*, *Turīyaṃ* and a, u, m, silence. After equating both of them generally, the Upaniṣad is equating each component, *Viśva* with *a-kāra*, *Taijasa* with *u-kāra*, *Prājña* with *ma-kāra*, and *Turīyaṃ* with silence.

Of these four equations, the first equation is presented in the 9th *mantra*. This *mantra* talks about *a-kāra-Vaiśvānara* identity. This needs to be practiced in the form of *upāsana*. This *upāsana* will help in two different ways. One way is that it can be used as *upāsana* for worldly benefit and the other is for expanding and purifying the mind. Later it will help in arriving at *Turīyaṃ*. Meditating upon the letters of OM and the corresponding universes will help in arriving at *Turīyaṃ*. As the letters get resolved into silence, the three universes will get resolved into *Turīyaṃ* in Vedāntic meditation. This *pravilāpana dhyānam* is mentally resolving the entire universe into me, the consciousness. Chanting OM helps in visualizing the universe arising out of me. The silence following the chanting helps in visualizing the universe resolving into me. OM chanting is creation, its duration is sustenance, and the following silence is dissolution. Having chanted OM a few times, I remain silent with the knowledge that everything arises out of me and everything resolves into me. *Pravilāpana dhyānam* is meditation on the substratum of all. The cause is one, substantial, permanent and real. Effects are many, non-substantial, temporary, and *mithyā*. For this *pravilāpana dhyānam*, *Oṅkāra* serves as a symbol.

Now the *a-kāra* meditation involving equating it to *Virāt* is described in *mantra 9* as a rehearsal *upāsana*. *a-kāra* is the first letter in the alphabet and contains all the other letters. *Virāt* is the first quarter of *ātmā*. *Upāsana* benefit is talked about in the second line of the *mantra*. *Niṣkāma upāsana* benefit is expansion and refinement of the mind. *Sakāma upāsana* benefit is the fulfillment of all the desires in terms of position, possession and becoming foremost in life.

Mantra 10

स्वप्नस्थानस्तैजस उकारो द्वितीया मात्रोत्कर्षाद्
उभयत्याद्वोत्कर्षति ह वै ज्ञानसन्ततिं समानश्च भवति
नास्याब्रह्मवित्कुले भवति य एवं वेद ॥ १० ॥

*svapnasthānastaijasa ukāro dvitīyā mātrotkarṣād
ubhayatvādvotkarṣati ha vai jñānasantatiṃ samānaśca bhavati
nāsyābrahmavitkule bhavati ya evaṃ veda ॥ 10॥*

Taijasa, whose field is the dream state, is the second letter ‘u’ due to (the similarity of) superiority and middle-ness. One who meditates thus extends the range of knowledge and becomes equal (to all.) In his family there will be no one who is ignorant of Brahman. (mantra 10)

The second equation is presented. ‘u’ is the second letter of *Oṅkāra* and *Taijasa* is the dream state. We have to include the *Hiranyagarbha* at the total level. Two common features of u-kāra and *Taijasa* are noted. The first is that both are superior to the previous pair. u-kāra is superior to *a-kāra* because u-kāra is closer to silence compared to *a-kāra*. Similarly, *Hiranyagarbha* is closer to *Turīyaṃ* Brahman. *Hiranyagarbha* is the cause for *Virāt* and so superior. The second is that u-kāra is intermediary between *a-kāra* and ma-kāra. Similarly, *Hiranyagarbha* is intermediary between *Virāt* and *Īśvara*.

A person has to practice u-kāra meditation. The *niṣkāma* benefit is expansion of the mind. *Sakāma* benefit: One who meditates on u-kāra will have increased knowledge because *Hiranyagarbha* is the total intellect. This meditator will not be disliked by anyone. He will be chosen as the intermediary in resolving disputes. This meditator will later become a *jñāni* also and in his family there will be no self-ignorant people.

Mantra 11

**सुषुप्तस्थानः प्राज्ञो मकारस्तृतीया मात्रा मितेरपीतेर्वा
मिनोति ह वा इदं सर्वमपीतिश्च भवति य एवं वेद ॥ ११ ॥**

*suṣuptasthānaḥ prājño makārastrītyā mātrā miterapītervā
minoti ha vā idam sarvamapītiśca bhavati ya evaṃ veda ॥ 11॥*

Prājña, whose field is the sleep-state, is the third letter ‘m’ due to (the similarity of) being a measure and being the ground of dissolution. One who meditates thus knows (the truth) of all this and becomes the ground of dissolution. (mantra 11)

The third equation is presented. The third letter ma-kāra is equated to *Prājña* and *Īśvara*. *Prājña* is associated with deep sleep state. The common features of ma-kāra and *Īśvara* are: Both are like a measuring vessel. Just as the measure holds the grain (invisible) and pours out the grain (visible), *Īśvara* holds the creation in the unmanifest form and creation comes out of *Īśvara*. When the speaker closes his mouth after speaking many words, the sound made is ma-kāra. Into ma-kāra all the words resolve and from ma-kāra all words arise again. The second common feature is that both are the resolution ground. Both are swallows of everything. For *niṣkāma upāsana* the benefit is the purification of the mind. For

sakāma upāsana, the benefit is increased capacity to discriminate and assess everything. This meditator finally makes the assessment that this world is *mithyā* and that the truth of the world is Brahman.

If a person practices the three meditations, he will be ready for the final meditation that Brahman is silence. *Oṅkāra* meditation should be practiced on *Virāt*, *Hiraṇyagarbha* and *Īśvara* and this would give mental refinement. The Upaniṣad gives the identity between *Oṅkāra* and *ātmā* in *mantra* 12. Before that Gauḍapāda comments on the three equations in several *kārikās*.

Kārikā 19

विश्वस्यात्वविवक्षायामादिसामान्यमुत्कटम् ।

मात्रासम्प्रतिपत्तौ स्यादाप्तिसामान्यमेव च ॥ १९ ॥

viśvasyātvavivakṣāyāmādisāmānyamutkaṭam ।

mātrāsampratipattau syādāptisāmānyameva ca ॥ 19॥

While relating to the letters, when Viśva is to be identified with ‘a’, the similarity of primacy as well as the similarity of all-pervasiveness becomes evident. (kārikā 19)

In these three *kārikās* 19 to 21, Gauḍapāda is paraphrasing the three equations given in *mantras* 9, 10 and 11. No analysis is done. This *kārikā* is paraphrasing *mantra* 9. When *a-kāra* is equated to *Viśva* and *Virāt* in the *upāsana*, the common features of primacy and pervading should be kept in focus.

Kārikā 20

तैजसस्योत्वविज्ञान उत्कर्षो दृश्यते स्फुटम् ।

मात्रासम्प्रतिपत्तौ स्यादुभयत्वं तथाविधम् ॥ २० ॥

taijasasyotvavijñāna utkarṣo drśyate sphuṭam ।

mātrāsampratipattau syādubhayatvaṃ tathāvidham ॥ 20॥

While relating to the letters, when Taijasa is to be identified with ‘u’, their superiority is seen clearly; so also is (their) middle-ness. (kārikā 20)

This *kārikā* is paraphrasing *mantra* 10. While equating letters and quarters in general, when *u-kāra* is equated to *Taijasa* and *Hiraṇyagarbha*, the two common features of superiority and their middle-ness should be kept in focus.

Kārikā 21

मकारभावे प्राज्ञस्य मानसामान्यमुत्कटम् ।

मात्रासम्प्रतिपत्तौ तु लयसामान्यमेव च ॥ २१ ॥

makārabhāve prājñasya mānasāmānyamutkaṭam ।

mātrāsampratipattau tu layasāmānyameva ca ॥ 21॥

While relating to the letters, when Prājña becomes ‘m’, the similarity of being a measure and the similarity of being the ground of dissolution become evident. (kārikā 21)

Similarly, when ma-kāra is equated with *Īśvara*, the two common features of measure and resolution ground should be kept in focus. One should practice these three meditations as stepping-stones to the 12th mantra.

MK-16 = Chapter 1, Mantra – 12, Kārikās – 22 to 24

Kārikā 21

मकारभावे प्राज्ञस्य मानसामान्यमुत्कटम् ।

मात्रासम्प्रतिपत्तौ तु लयसामान्यमेव च ॥ २१ ॥

After completing the four-quartered *ātma-vicāra*, now the Upaniṣad has entered into *Oṅkāra* analysis, equating the four letters of *Oṅkāra* with the four quarters of *ātmā*. Of them, the Upaniṣad has already equated the first three letters of *Oṅkāra*, ‘a’ with *Virāt*, ‘u’ with *Hiraṇyagarbha* and ‘m’ with *Īśvara*. The Upaniṣad has recommended *upāsana* on these three equations and has also pointed out the benefit of the *upāsana*. If the *upāsana* is *sakāma upāsana*, the worldly benefits will come, and if the *upāsana* is *niṣkāma*, the spiritual benefits will come. Those equations were given in *mantras* 8, 9, 10 and 11. The general and total equation was given in *mantra* 8 and the letter-wise equations were given in *mantras* 9, 10 and 11. Before going to the fourth and main equation, which is silence equated to the *Turīyaṃ* quarter, Gauḍapāda summarizes the teaching. *Kārikās* 19 to 21 summarized the equations for the three quarters. Then Gauḍapāda gives some general conclusions.

Kārikā 22

त्रिषु धामसु यत्तुल्यं सामान्यं वेत्ति निश्चितः ।

स पूज्यः सर्वभूतानां वन्द्यश्चैव महामुनिः ॥ २२ ॥

triṣu dhāmasu yattulyaṃ sāmānyaṃ vetti niścitaḥ ।

sa pūjyaḥ sarvabhūtānāṃ vandyaschaiva mahāmuniḥ ॥ 22॥

He who clearly knows the common similarities (between the quarters and the letters) in all the three states is a great sage. (He is) respectable and adorable to all beings. (kārikā 22)

In the previous *mantras* the Upaniṣad talked about *sakāma upāsana* benefit but did not talk about the *niṣkāma* benefit. Gauḍapāda is supplying that benefit. *Niṣkāma upāsana* will give the desire for getting the knowledge of *nirguṇam* Brahman, *Turīyaṃ*. The seeker will get the opportunity to get this knowledge and after knowledge will get *jīvanmukti* and *videhamukti*.

The meditator who has got the clear knowledge of these three equations and the pairs of the common features of the *Oṅkāra* letters and *ātmā* quarters, and who practices *upāsana* with the motive of attainment of *jñānam*, will become a great wise person. He will understand the identity of silence with Brahman. He becomes adorable to all the people and will be worshipped by everyone. Worshipping a *jñāni* gives both material and spiritual benefits. *Upāsana* will not directly give knowledge but one has to go through *śravaṇaṃ*, *mananaṃ* and *nididhyāsanam* for knowledge.

Kārikā 23

अकारो नयते विश्वमुकारश्चापि तैजसम् ।

मकारश्च पुनः प्राज्ञं नामात्रे विद्यते गतिः ॥ २३ ॥

akāro nayate viśvamukāraścāpi taijasam ।

makāraśca punaḥ prājñaṃ nāmātre vidyate gatiḥ ॥ 23॥

The letter ‘a’ leads (the meditator) to Virat. The letter ‘u’ (leads to) Hiranyagarbha and the letter ‘m’ (leads to) Antaryāmi. There is no travel in the case of amātrā. (kārikā 23)

After talking about *niṣkāma upāsana* benefit, Gauḍapāda comes to *sakāma* benefit. Why should Gauḍapāda repeat this benefit when the Upaniṣad has already talked about it? For all *sakāma karma* and *upāsana*, the benefits are two-fold. One is what is obtained in the current birth. The other is the benefit obtained after death. The Upaniṣad has talked about only the benefit in the current birth. Gauḍapāda describes the benefit after death. *a-kāra-Virāt* meditation will take the meditator to *Virāt Īśvara*, i.e., he will temporarily lose his individuality and *saṃsāra* after death. Doing *u-kāra-Hiranyagarbha sakāma* meditation, the meditator will temporarily merge into *Hiranyagarbha* after death until the *puṇyam* lasts. Doing *ma-kāra-Īśvara sakāma* meditation, the meditator will temporarily merge into *Īśvara* after death and not experience *saṃsāra* until the *puṇyam* lasts. **We all merge into Īśvara every time we are in dreamless sleep.** *Chāndogya*, *Bṛhadāranyaka*, and *Praśna* Upaniṣads describe this. What about the fourth one? If a person practices the *nididhyāsanam* of silence-*Turīyaṃ* identity, he will not go anywhere after death. *saṃsāra* and rebirth are permanently over for him. Whatever is infinite cannot travel from one place to another. The infinite is one in which everything travels but it itself does not travel. With this, Gauḍapāda’s commentary on the three equations is over.

Mantra 12

अमात्रश्चतुर्थोऽव्यवहार्यः प्रपञ्चोपशमः शिवोऽद्वैत

एवमोङ्कार आत्मैव संविशत्यात्मनाऽऽत्मानं य एवं वेद ॥ १२ ॥

amātraścaturtho'vyavahāryaḥ prapañcōpaśamaḥ śivo'dvaita

evamoṅkāra ātmaiva saṃviśatyātmanā"tmānaṃ ya evaṃ veda ॥ 12॥

Turīya is the Silence, which is beyond transactions, free from the world, auspicious, and non-dual. Thus Oṅkāra is the very ātmā. One who knows thus enters the ātmā by himself. (mantra 12)

Now the Upaniṣad comes to the silence, the mental silence. This is the fourth component of *Oṅkāra*, which is the same as the fourth quarter of *ātmā*, *Turīyaṃ*. The silence that we experience is the *Turīyaṃ*, which is beyond all transactions. Silence cannot be handled by the organs of action or knowledge. Silence cannot be handled by physical, mental or verbal means. The moment you describe silence, the silence goes! It is silence in which the world of all forms of sounds has resolved. *Turīyaṃ* is the

substratum wherein all the objects (*pada*, form) have resolved. Silence is the substratum wherein all sounds (*padārtha*, name) have resolved. Śiva: silence is *Turīyaṃ*, which is *ānanda* (*maṅgalaṃ*). Languages are different but silence is one. In silence and *Turīyaṃ*, division and plurality are not present. They are both *advaitam*. In this manner, *Oṅkāra* and *ātmā* are equal in all the four levels.

When we talk about the equation of silence and *Turīyaṃ*, the word silence has a special connotation. It is not the conventional silence. Silence here has a special meaning. The conventional silence, absence of sound, should not be taken as *Turīyaṃ*. This should not be equated to *Turīyaṃ* for two reasons. The first reason is that the conventional silence is taken to mean a mere absence of sound or noise and thus it is a negative entity. Absence is not a positive entity. If this negative description is applied to *Turīyaṃ*, one will end up with the Buddhist *śūnyavāda* teaching that the ultimate truth is emptiness. The second reason is that the conventional silence is experienced only when the sound has disappeared. In the arrival of sound, conventional silence goes away and vice-versa. Conventional silence is a relative entity subject to arrival and departure. Comparison with conventional silence will make *Turīyaṃ* a relative entity. Thus *amātrā*, Silence should not be taken as the relative silence. When you experience silence externally, it is the absence of sound and when thoughts and disturbances are absent in the mind, you experience internal silence, blankness. When you experience internal silence and there is internal blankness, is there only blankness? Other than that blankness, there is something else, because of which you are aware of the blankness. If the silence is experienced and known by me, it means that there is a knowing consciousness principle that pervades the silence. That consciousness principle I cannot see, hear or objectify because that consciousness principle is ‘I am’, that pervades and illumines the silence. The meaning of “Silence” is the consciousness principle that reveals the silence. That consciousness is *amātrā*. **Silence is equal to consciousness principle that reveals the absence of sound. It is not absent in itself but it reveals the absence.** In *Pañcadaśī*, Vidyaranya gives a beautiful example of *nāṭaka dīpam*. *Nāṭaka dīpam* reveals the play on the stage and also the empty stage after the play is over. A non-dancing lamp continues to be on the stage illumining the absence of all the actors and dancers after the play is over. The mind is the stage, and thoughts are the dancers. When the thoughts are gone, you say that the mind is blank. But the blankness is revealed by the consciousness principle. That consciousness is not subject to arrival and departure, but it is absolute silence. It illumines the relative sound and the relative silence. That is *Turīyaṃ*. Whoever understands that he is the *Turīyaṃ* all the time, he ‘merges’ into *Turīyaṃ ātmā* as one with the *Turīyaṃ ātmā*. This is total merger. It is like water merging into water and not like salt merging into water. This is *mokṣa*. With this *mokṣa* benefit, *oṅkāra-vicāra* is over and *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad* is also over. But Gauḍapāda has not finished his commentary.

Kārikā 24

ओङ्कारं पादशो विद्यात्पादा मात्रा न संशयः ।

ओङ्कारं पादशो ज्ञात्वा न किञ्चिदपि चिन्तयेत् ॥ २४ ॥

oṅkāraṃ pādaśo vidyātpādā mātrā na saṃśayaḥ |

oṅkāraṃ pādaśo jñātvā na kiñcidapi cintayet || 24||

One should know Oṅkāra in terms of the quarters (of the ātmā.) The four quarters are the four letters; there is no doubt. Having known Oṅkāra in terms of the four quarters, one should not think of anything else. (kārikā 24)

Gauḍapāda instructs the student to carefully note the four equations between *Oṅkāra* and *ātmā*. The equations should be understood in totality and also in their four components. The total equation is that *Oṅkāra* is *ātmā*. The individual ones are ‘a’ is *Viśva*, ‘u’ is *Taijasa* and ‘m’ is *Prājña*, and silence is *Turīyaṃ*.

After understanding the four equations clearly, one should practice *nididhyāsanam* with the *Oṅkāra mantra*. *Oṅkāra* can be used as a support for *nididhyāsanam*. How do you meditate? Chant OM and when you come to silence, you have to dwell upon the knowledge that there are two components in that silence, one is silence and the other is consciousness. Then turn your attention from silence to consciousness and claim that you are that *Turīyaṃ*, consciousness. This is called silence meditation.

In fact, any mantra can be used for *nididhyāsanam*. There are many swamis who use *mantras* for *nididhyāsanam*. *Mantras* can be used for *upāsana* and *nididhyāsanam*. Swami Dayananda describes how this is done: When you repeat a *mantra* like “*Om namo Nārāyaṇāya*”, you think of your chosen deity and surrender to the Lord. There you focus on the *mantra*. This is the meditation in which you give emphasis to the sound of the *mantra*. When you use the very same *mantra* for *nididhyāsanam* after completing *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad*, you chant the *mantra* initially, and focus on the silence between two chantings of the *mantra*. You gradually come from the *mantra* to the silence. Thereafter, you expand the silence between two chantings of the *mantra*. Thus from *mantra* you come to silence. From silence you come to consciousness. From consciousness you come to *Turīyaṃ*. Thus one and the same *mantra* can be used for *upāsana* or *nididhyāsanam*. Here OM is used. In this meditation, one comes to silence awareness. I am never affected by silence and sound also. May I abide in *Turīyaṃ*.

MK-17 = Chapter 1, Kārikās 24 to 29

Kārikā 24

ओङ्कारं पादशो विद्यात्पादा मात्रा न संशयः ।

ओङ्कारं पादशो ज्ञात्वा न किञ्चिदपि चिन्तयेत् ॥ २४ ॥

The Upaniṣad has concluded the *oṅkāra-vicāra* with the 12th *mantra* in which *amātrā*, the silence was talked about as identical with the fourth quarter of the *ātmā*, namely *Turīyaṃ*. Silence followed by *Oṅkāra* is not just the mere absence of sound but the consciousness that pervades and reveals the silence. This consciousness is indicated by the silence of *Oṅkāra*. This silence of the *Oṅkāra*, which is consciousness, must be understood as the *Turīyaṃ* as described in the 7th *mantra*. That *Turīyaṃ* is the substratum for *Viśva*, *Taijasa* and *Prājña* and also the substratum for *Virāt*, *Hiraṇyagarbha*, and even *Īśvara*. For all these three pairs, the *Turīyaṃ* is the substratum. That *Turīyaṃ* is the silence, which is the consciousness principle. Thus we have to equate the four *mātrās* of *Oṅkāra* and the four quarters of *ātmā*. The Upaniṣad says that whoever does this four-fold equation ‘becomes’ the *ātmā*, the *Turīyaṃ*. With this benefit, the Upaniṣad is completed. From the 24th *kārikā* up to the end of the chapter, Gauḍapāda concludes the *oṅkāra-vicāra* highlighting the *Turīyaṃ mātrā*. He focuses on using *Oṅkāra* for *nididhyāsanam*. This is highlighted in all the seven verses.

Oṅkāra must be seen as identical with *ātmā*. Having seen the general equation, the individual equations of the *mātrās* and quarters should also be clearly understood. While practicing the *Oṅkāra nididhyāsanam*, one should utter the *Oṅkāra*, and thereafter lapse into silence. From sound you come to silence and from silence you come to the consciousness principle. This consciousness is not the reflected consciousness, which is only when you are associating with the first three *mātrās* and quarters but once you are dissociated from the first three *mātrās*, the consciousness that is referred to, is the *cit* (original consciousness), which is always there. Therefore, sound to silence, from silence to *cit*, from *cit* to the *Turīyaṃ* as substratum of all. If you don’t go to *Turīyaṃ*, you will think that consciousness is multiple being confined to different bodies. We should meditate upon the consciousness as singular, all-pervading, etc. Every word of the 7th *mantra* should be meditated upon. *Nididhyāsanam* is going from sound to silence to consciousness to meditation upon every word of the 7th *mantra*, *śāntam*, *śivam*, *advaitam*, etc., as ‘I’. Consciousness should not be viewed as an object but “I am that consciousness” should be focused upon. While doing this, one should not get distracted.

Kārikā 25

युञ्जीत प्रणवे चेतः प्रणवो ब्रह्म निर्भयम् ।

प्रणवे नित्ययुक्तस्य न भयं विद्यते क्वचित् ॥ २५ ॥

*yuñjīta praṇave cetaḥ praṇavo brahma nirbhayam |
praṇave nityayuktasya na bhayaṃ vidyate kvacit || 25||*

One should fix the mind on Oṅkāra. Oṅkāra is fearless Brahman. For one who is ever established in Oṅkāra there is no fear anywhere. (kārikā 25)

Gauḍapāda says that we should practice *Oṅkāra* meditation regularly because *Oṅkāra* is Brahman. The sound part of *Oṅkāra* represents *saguṇa* Brahman and the silence part is *nirguṇa* Brahman. Brahman is the only source of security. Anything else you hold onto will be either *Viśva* or *Taijasa*, which are time bound and there is no security in them. Time will affect everything but will not reach *Turīyaṃ* Brahman. For a person who is ever abiding in the *praṇava*, OM, who is ever remembering the knowledge of OM even during the most provoking transaction in life, he does not feel insecurity in any place, at any time or in any situation. **Non-forgetting this knowledge is abiding in Brahman. Fear is *saṃsāra* and fearlessness is *mokṣa*.**

Kārikā 26

प्रणवो ह्यपरं ब्रह्म प्रणवश्च परः स्मृतः ।

अपूर्वोऽनन्तरोऽबाह्योऽनपरः प्रणवोऽव्ययः ॥ २६ ॥

*praṇavo hyaparaṃ brahma praṇavaśca paraḥ smṛtaḥ |
apūrvo'nantaro'bāhyo'naparaḥ praṇavo'vyayaḥ || 26||*

Indeed Oṅkāra is the lower Brahman and Oṅkāra is known to be the higher (Brahman also.) Oṅkāra is without cause, without effect, without inside, without outside, and without decay. (kārikā 26)

The Upaniṣad uses the word *Oṅkāra*. Gauḍapāda also started the discussion with *Oṅkāra* in the 24th *kārikā*. From the 25th *kārikā*, he replaced the word *Oṅkāra* by the word *praṇava*. This word is not used in the Upaniṣad. *Praṇava* is a synonym for *Oṅkāra* that is used in the other Upaniṣads. The meaning of *praṇava* is perfect name, ideal name, or suitable name. For Brahman or God the ideal name is *Oṅkāra*. That is why *Oṅkāra* is called *praṇava*. God is one and OM is one syllable.

Brahman is *saguṇa* and *nirguṇa* and *Oṅkāra* also is *saguṇa* and *nirguṇa*. The sound part of *Oṅkāra* is *saguṇa* and the silent part is *nirguṇa*. In all respects *Oṅkāra* and Brahman are identical. Thus OM is the ideal name, *praṇava* for Brahman.

The *Oṅkāra* represents *saguṇa* Brahman. The silent part represents the *nirguṇa* Brahman. *Nirguṇa* Brahman is without a cause and an effect, without any second thing internally or externally, and without degeneration or declension. *Oṅkāra* can be used for *saguṇa* or *nirguṇa dhyānam*.

Kārikā 27

सर्वस्य प्रणवो ह्यादिर्मध्यमन्तस्तथैव च ।

एवं हि प्रणवं ज्ञात्वा व्यश्रुते तदनन्तरम् ॥ २७ ॥

sarvasya praṇavo hyādirmadhyamantastathaiva ca ।

evaṃ hi praṇavaṃ jñātvā vyaśrute tadanantaram ॥ 27॥

Oṅkāra is indeed the beginning, the middle, and the end of all. Having known Oṅkāra thus, one certainly attains that immediately. (kārikā 27)

This *nirguṇa* Oṅkāra is without cause and effect. But when *māyā* is associated with this *nirguṇa* Brahman, it is called *saguṇa* Brahman. Brahman then becomes cause. Once you accept *māyā*, do we not have duality? Remember that *advaitam* means that there is no second absolute reality. Brahman is the only absolute reality and when *māyā* is accommodated it is not accommodated as absolute reality, but as empirical reality. *Māyā* cannot thus be counted as the second. So even with *māyā*, Brahman continues to be *advaitam*. Due to the association with *māyā*, Brahman becomes the cause of the creation, sustenance and dissolution of everything. Thus the meditation should be: I am that *nirguṇa* consciousness. I myself become *Īśvara* when associated with the *māyā* principle. As *Īśvara*, I alone am the cause for creation, sustenance and dissolution. With *māyā-śakti*, I create this world, the waking universe and with *nidrā-śakti*, I create the dream universe. Understanding the *praṇava* in this manner, a person ‘attains’ that Brahman, Oṅkāra immediately. Knowing Oṅkāra one knows that he is Brahman. How does the dreamer know the waker? Only upon waking, he knows the waker by realizing that he is the waker. One wakes up as the waker.

Kārikā 28

प्रणवं हीश्वरं विद्यात्सर्वस्य हृदि संस्थितम् ।

सर्वव्यापिनमोङ्कारं मत्वा धीरो न शोचति ॥ २८ ॥

praṇavaṃ hīśvaraṃ vidyātsarvasya hṛdi samsthitam ।

sarvavyāpinamoṅkāraṃ matvā dhīro na śocati ॥ 28॥

One should know Oṅkāra to be indeed the Lord who is present in the hearts of all. Having known Oṅkāra, which is all-pervading, a discriminative (person) does not grieve. (kārikā 28)

The silent part of Oṅkāra is *Īśvara* or Brahman. That Brahman resides in the heart (mind) of everyone witnessing the presence and absence of thoughts. The non-arriving and non-departing consciousness that witnesses the arrivals and departures of all thoughts in the mind is *Turīyaṃ* Brahman. Saying that Brahman is in the heart presents a problem that Brahman is finite. The *kārikā* says that Brahman is in the

heart of everyone and everywhere else also. It is present as the witness consciousness in the minds of all. Knowing Brahman as myself is liberating knowledge.

People generally say that they have knowledge and understanding but they do not have realization. That means that they are not able to accept the knowledge as realization. There is no realization other than this knowledge. An unqualified student is not able to accept the knowledge as realization. Whether one accepts knowledge as realization or not, will depend on one's qualifications. The person who understands that this knowledge is liberating knowledge has no more grief in life.

Kārikā 29

अमात्रोऽनन्तमात्रश्च द्वैतस्योपशमः शिवः ।

ओङ्कारो विदितो येन स मुनिर्नेतरो जनः ॥ २९ ॥

amātro'nantamātraśca dvaitasyopaśamaḥ śivaḥ ।

oṅkāro vidito yena sa munirnetaro janaḥ ॥ 29॥

Oṅkāra is without sound and with infinite sounds. It is the ground of dissolution of duality. It is auspicious. A sage is one by whom Oṅkāra is known; not any other person. (kārikā 29)

All these *kārikās* (24 to 29) are commentary on the 12th *mantra* dealing with *amātrā*. In this *kārikā*, Gauḍapāda specifically comments on *amātrā* and concludes. *Amātrā* is the silence at the end of the *Oṅkāra*, which is nothing but the consciousness principle. It is without any limit for its boundary. For a sound, there is spatial and time-wise boundary but for silence there is no boundary. The silence is infinite in its measurement. It is the ultimate reality where all the dualities are absent, viz., *Viśva* and *Virāt*, *Taijasa* and *Hiraṇyagarbha*, *Prājña* and *Īśvara*. These pairs are resolved in *Turīyaṃ*. It is *maṅgalaṃ* or of the nature of bliss. Whoever knows *Oṅkāra* completely, he alone is the real *muni* not necessarily the ones that may have only the outward signs of a *muni*. With this, the 29th *kārikā* and Gauḍapāda's commentary on the *Māṅḍūkya Upaniṣad* are over. The rest of the *kārikās* are Gauḍapāda's further analysis of the teaching which are found in chapters 2, 3 and 4.

MK-18 = Chapter 1 Summary

Māṇḍūkya-kārikā has four chapters. The first chapter is titled *Āgamaprakaraṇam*. This chapter consists of the entire *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad* consisting of the twelve *mantras* and also the analysis of the Upaniṣad done in 29 *kārikās* by Ācārya Gauḍapāda. Of these two portions, the Upaniṣad is important and *kārikā* is only a commentary on the Upaniṣad. Due to the importance of the Upaniṣad in this chapter, the title of the chapter is, *Āgamaprakaraṇam*, *āgama* meaning Veda or Upaniṣad. The rest of the chapters do not contain any Upaniṣad. First, the Upaniṣad will be summarized and later the *kārikās* will be summarized.

1. Introduction of the Subject Matter - oṅkāra-vicāra and ātma-vicāra(1, 2)

Of the 12 *mantras* of the Upaniṣad, the first two *mantras* introduce the subject matter. The first *mantra* introduces *oṅkāra-vicāra* as the means to the knowledge of the truth. The second *mantra* introduces *ātma-vicāra* as the means of the knowledge of the truth. *Vicāra* means enquiry or analysis. Having introduced the two enquiries, the Upaniṣad takes up *ātma-vicāra* first from the 3rd to the 7th *mantra*. *oṅkāra-vicāra* is conducted from the 8th to the 12th *mantra*.

2. The First Three Quarters of the Ātmā (3 – 6)

In the *ātma-vicāra*, the Upaniṣad points out that *ātmā* has four portions or versions. *Ātmā* means the self, I, the experiencer of everything, the conscious principle. Whatever I experience will come under *anātmā*. The entire world is *anātmā*. The body and mind also come under the experienced *anātmā*. There is a very important principle applied in *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad* uniquely. This principle should be kept in mind throughout the study of this Upaniṣad. **That fundamental principle is that the experiencer exists independently and does not depend on any other thing, whereas the experienced object can prove its existence only through the experiencer.** The entire *anātmā* does not exist independently and comes under *mithyā* category. The observer is *satyaṃ* and the observed is *mithyā*. Thus *ātmā*, the observer is *satyaṃ* and **anātmā**, the observed including body and mind is *mithyā*.

Then the Upaniṣad divides *anātmā* into three: first, experienced in the waking state; second, experienced in the dream state; and third, experienced in the deep sleep state. In the waking state, the *anātmā* experienced is in the form of gross body and gross universe. In the dream state, the *anātmā* is experienced as subtle body and subtle universe. In the deep sleep state, the *anātmā* is causal body and causal universe, both in dormant form. Thus *anātmā* has been divided into gross body and gross universe, subtle body and subtle universe, causal body and causal universe. I, the *ātmā*, am associated with the gross body and the gross universe in the waking state, the subtle body and the subtle universe in the dream state and the causal body and the causal universe in the deep sleep state. *Ātmā* is given three different names based on the three different associations. The names for the *ātmā* are first quarter, second quarter and third quarter in the waking, dream and deep sleep states respectively. These quarters

are then divided in each state according to the microcosmic and macrocosmic entities in each quarter. These divisions of the quarters are given the names *Viśva* and *Virāt* (*mantra* 3), *Taijasa* and *Hiraṇyagarbha* (*mantra* 4), *Prājña* and *Īśvara* (*mantra* 5 and 6) for the first, second and third quarters respectively.

3. Definition of *Turīyaṃ* (7)

If the three associations result in *Viśva*, *Taijasa* and *Prājña*, what is the *Turīyaṃ*? What association does *Turīyaṃ* have? *Turīyaṃ* is the name of the *ātmā* when it is dissociated from all the three states. I myself, as consciousness principle, am *Turīyaṃ*. How do I become *Turīyaṃ*? By dissociating from the three states. How can this dissociation be done? It cannot be done experientially because whatever I do, I will be in one of the three states, and even in sleep or coma. Logically, the separation is not possible because *ātmā* is all-pervasive. Gauḍapāda says that there is a third type of dissociation that is unique to Vedānta. If this is understood, Vedānta is understood. That method of dissociation is by the knowledge that I, the observer *ātmā*, am *satyaṃ* and everything else is *anātmā mithyā*, and that *anātmā mithyā* can never have any connection or association with *satyaṃ* even though it seems to be connected. Example: In the presence of the red flower, a crystal appears to be red in color. How can the red color be removed from the crystal without removing the flower? The normal answer is that it is not possible. Vedānta says that it is possible by understanding that the crystal does not have the red color and the red color is only an appearance. Since the red color is only an appearance, the crystal can continue to appear red, but the colorless nature of the crystal is not affected. Nothing needs to be done to remove the red color from the crystal. This freedom is freedom through knowledge.

Similarly, I, the *ātmā*, am like the crystal. I seem to appear as *Viśva*, *Taijasa* and *Prājña*. Even when these attributes appear in me, I am free from all these three all the time. I am *Turīyaṃ* appearing as *Viśva*, *Taijasa* and *Prājña*. This knowledge is enough to ‘become’ *Turīyaṃ*. I become *Turīyaṃ* by knowing that *Viśva*, *Taijasa* and *Prājña* are only appearances and not factual. I am *Turīyaṃ* all the time. This knowledge is given in the 7th *mantra*. *Mantra* 7, which gives the definition of *Turīyaṃ*, is the most important *mantra* in the Upaniṣad.

Of this definition, two words are most important: *prapañca-upasamam* and *advaitam*. *Prapañca-upasamam* means ‘free from the world’. *Turīyaṃ* is free from the world consisting of the three pairs of the first three quarters. These pairs are absent in *Turīyaṃ*. Therefore, *Turīyaṃ* is *advaitam* without a second entity. We should note that the *Turīyaṃ* is free from the world but not experientially. Experiential world will continue similar to the red color of the crystal. The red color will continue even when I say that the crystal is colorless. Even when I negate the blue sky, the appearance and the experience of the blue sky continues. Similarly, I, the *Turīyaṃ*, am without a second thing even when I experience the world because the world is *mithyā*. *Mithyā* is as good as not there. Then the Upaniṣad said that this is the *Turīya ātmā* to be known for liberation. Without knowledge, liberation is never possible. As *Viśva* and

Taijasa, I will be a doer and an experiencer. *Sañcita-karma* will be there, *prārabdha-karma* will exhaust. In the process, I will accumulate *āgāmi-karma* and at the time of death, *āgāmi* will add to the *sañcita* and another portion of *sañcita* will give rise to another birth. Thus the *karma* flow will keep going. As *Viśva* and *Taijasa*, no freedom is possible. Only as *Turīyaṃ*, I can claim that I am free all the time. Therefore, the Upaniṣad says that I have to know *Turīyaṃ*. No other method will give liberation. With this *ātma-vicāra* is over.

4. oṅkāra-vicāra(8 – 12)

From the 8th *mantra* to the 12th *mantra*, *oṅkāra-vicāra* is done. *Oṅkāra* has four *mātrās*, “a”, “u”, “m” and silence. The Upaniṣad introduces the total *Oṅkāra* and equates the total *Oṅkāra* with total *ātmā*. Thereafter, the components are equated. The first three *mātrās* of *Oṅkāra* are equated to the three quarters of *ātmā* respectively and the silence is equated to *Turīyaṃ*. Interestingly, the Upaniṣad introduces three forms of meditation as a side topic. Meditation on *Virāt* as “a”, on *Hiraṇyagarbha* as “u”, and on *Īśvara* as “m” is prescribed. The *mātrās* are taken as symbols for meditation. The Upaniṣad gives the logic for the equations in the form of two common features for each. *a-kāra* equation with *Virāt* is based on pervasiveness and primacy. *u-kāra* equation is based on superiority and middle-ness. *ma-kāra* and *Īśvara* equation is based on being similar to a measure and the ground of dissolution. Thus three *mātrās* are representatives of the three quarters.

Now silence that comes after the three *mātrās* is discussed. In silence, there is not nothing, but consciousness is present revealing the silence. Silence represents the witness consciousness by implication and therefore that silence must be equated to *Turīyaṃ*, which is none other than Brahman. It should be noted that ‘a’, ‘u’, and ‘m’ represent *Virāt*, *Hiraṇyagarbha* and *Īśvara* respectively **but silence does not represent Brahman, but silence is Brahman, which is myself, ātmā**. Through these equations, *oṅkāra-vicāra* is completed.

5. Important Topics Covered in the Kārikās

Some of the important topics discussed by Gauḍapāda in the *kārikās* will be taken up now. Gauḍapādācārya prominently discusses three *mantras* of the Upaniṣad.

I. The 6th mantra defining Īśvara or Prājña (kārikās 6 – 9, 17, 18)

In this *mantra*, *Īśvara* is defined as the cause of the creation, both the intelligent and the material causes. *sarveśvaraḥ* and *sarvajña* mean the intelligent cause; *yeṣa yoniḥ sarvasya prabhavāpyayau* refers to the material cause. Gauḍapāda makes a brief analysis of the creation. Whenever we talk about the creation of the world, the question of why *Bhagavān* created this world comes up. How did *Bhagavān* create the world? When did *Bhagavān* create this world? What is the purpose of this creation of the world? The

moment one accepts the creation of the world, many questions will come up and no answer will be satisfactory. In stating the usual answers given like *Bhagavān* creates out of his will, creates for his entertainment, etc., Gauḍapāda says that these questions come up because one thinks that the world has been created at a particular time. He says that the world has not been created because nothing can be created. An existent thing cannot be created because it is existent. A non-existent thing cannot be created because it is non-existent. We can never talk about the arrival of the world. The world is always with Brahman. It has never been created and it has always been there. The world never arrived at a particular time. The world was never created at a particular time. Matter can never be created or destroyed. This world has always existed eternally either in potential form or active form. The active form of creation is called world and the potential form is called *māyā*. *Māyā* is with Brahman all the time. The most important point is that this *māyā* or the world that is always with Brahman is *mithyā* and so it cannot contaminate Brahman. It ever exists in Brahman but it never contaminates Brahman like the movie cannot contaminate the screen. That Brahman I am and the creation is my very nature.

II. A comparative study of the four quarters with reference to the 7th mantra (kārikās 2 - 5, 10 – 16)

Gauḍapāda makes an interesting observation that in the waking state, *Viśva* has two problems. The waker is ignorant of the fact that he is *Turīyaṃ* all the time and because of this ignorance, the waker mistakes himself to be a waker individual who is a doer and an experiencer. Ignorance is followed by misconception. *Ajñānam*, *agrahanam*, *nidrā*, and *kāraṇam* are the four names for ignorance. *Ahaṅkāra*, *anyathāgrahaṇam*, *svapna* and *kāryam* are the four names for misconception. *Viśva* and *Taijasa* both have ignorance and misconception. *Prājñā* has ignorance and the sleeper does not have any misconception. There is no *saṃsāra* for the sleeper. Ignorance followed by mistake is the problem. *Turīyaṃ* is ever free from ignorance and mistake. Therefore, to become *Turīyaṃ* one has to remove ignorance and mistake by gaining knowledge. Then the understanding will be that one is *Turīyaṃ* all the time. Every *jñāni* is equated to *Turīyaṃ*. Every *ajñani* is equated to *Viśva*, *Taijasa* or *Prājñā*. Knowledge is claiming “I am *Turīyaṃ*” and that knowledge is the only solution for *saṃsāra*.

III. Vedāntic meditation with reference to mantra 12 (kārikās 24 – 29)

Gauḍapāda analyzes the 12th mantra and does the *amātrā-vicāra* wherein he talks about *Oṅkāra dhyānam* as a type of *nididhyāsanam*, Vedāntic meditation. For this meditation, *śravaṇam* and *mananam* of the entire Upaniṣad must have been done already. How is the *nididhyāsanam* practiced? I chant the *Oṅkāra*, visualizing the entire universe as arising out of myself. At the time of *Oṅkāra* chanting, the world arises and rests in me and when the chanting is ended with the ‘m’, the world resolves into me. The silence follows. Initially, *Oṅkāra* is longer and silence is shorter and gradually, the silence is made longer and longer. Having come to the silence, I should ask whether this silence is experienced or not. This silence is experienced and so there is consciousness because of which the silence is known. From the silence, I turn my attention to the witness of the silence, which is the consciousness principle. Then I

ask the question how can I see the witness consciousness. The answer is that I cannot see the witness consciousness because I am that witness consciousness. From silence I come to consciousness and from that consciousness I come to I, the witness consciousness. Then I claim that I am that consciousness, *Turīyaṃ*. What type of *Turīyaṃ*? Going back to the 7th *mantra*, it is understood that the rise and fall of the creation continuously happen in me, the *Turīyaṃ*. Even when all these things happen, what happens to me? Just like the colorless crystal is never contaminated by the flower's color even when the flower's color appears in it, I am never contaminated when the rise and fall of creation appear in me. I am the uncontaminated non-dual consciousness, *Turīyaṃ*. I allow everything to happen in me remembering that I am ever free. I should practice *Oṅkāra dhyānam* regularly. How long? The *dhyānam* is a reminder of my true nature and so the *dhyānam* should be practiced until I cannot forget. Once I am established in my nature, I will not forget my true nature in and through all the transactions and will not claim any doer-ship. This is *jīvanmukti*. With this, Gauḍapāda finishes his *Oṅkāra* analysis and the first chapter of *Māṇḍūkya-kārikā*.

Māṇḍūkya-kārikā
Vaitathya-prakaraṇam

Transcript of classes given by
SWAMI PARAMARTHANANDA

MK-19 = Chapter – 2, Verses – 1 to 3

We have completed the first chapter of *Māṇḍūkya-kārikā* titled *Āgamaprakaraṇam*. In the first chapter, we completed the study of *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad* also. We will now concentrate on Gauḍapāda's analysis of *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad* through his *kārikās*.

In the first chapter, Gauḍapāda wrote general notes on the *Upaniṣad* in 29 *kārikās*. In the following three chapters Gauḍapādācārya focuses on the 7th *mantra* of the *Upaniṣad*, which is the main teaching of the *Upaniṣad*. In the 7th *mantra*, Brahman was revealed as the *Turīya ātmā*. In this *mantra* every word is important but two are very profound. One is *prapañcopasamam* (free from the world) and the second is *advaitam* (non-dual). Gauḍapāda aims to bring out the full significance of these two words. The significance that he extracts is '*Brahma satyaṃ jagan mithyā*'. How do we arrive at this conclusion?

The *Upaniṣad* says that Brahman is *advaitam*, non-dual without a second thing. If Brahman is non-dual without a second thing, how does one explain this world? The status of the world will come under question. You cannot say that the world is non-existent because the world is experienced. Can I say that the world is existent? That also I cannot say because if the world is existent, Brahman cannot be *advaitam*. Otherwise there will be two things, Brahman or *Ātmā*, the observer and the world, the observed. If you say that Brahman and the world are both existent, it will lead to *dvaitam*. If you say that the world is non-existent, then the experience of the world cannot be explained. Then you have to say that the world is different from both. The world is neither existent nor non-existent. The world is not non-existent because it is experienced. The world is not existent because Brahman alone exists. So the world has to come under a third category, which is different from both existent and non-existent. This third category is called *mithyā*. The world is seemingly existent but on enquiry, it is factually non-existent. Such a category is called *mithyā*, seemingly existent but factually non-existent.

The teaching, '*Brahma satyaṃ jagan mithyā*' is conveyed by the words *advaitam* and *prapanchopasamam*. *Advaitam* means *Brahma satyaṃ* and *prapanchopasamam* means *jagan mithyā*. To reveal this particular status of the world, Gauḍapādācārya takes the example of dream. During the dream state, we experience the dream world very clearly. For a dreamer, the dream is not a dream in dream. The dream world is existent for him, and the dreamer will never say that the dream world is non-existent. He will never use the word 'seemingly' to describe the existence of the dream world in dream. Upon waking up, he will find the dream world gone and know that it was never separate from him and it was only a thought disturbance in his mind. The dream world is seemingly existent in dream but on waking up, it is non-existent. Similarly this world is seemingly existent for the waker but upon enquiry, from the standpoint of Brahman, this world is also like dream, *mithyā*. '*Jagan mithyā, Brahman satyaṃ*' is the teaching. The second chapter establishes the *mithyā* status of the world and is called *Vaitathyaprakaraṇam*. *Vaitathyam* is another word for *mithyā*. The third chapter is called *Advaitaprakaraṇam* and it establishes *Brahma satyatvam*. That Brahman I am. The fourth chapter

defends this teaching by answering all the questions and objections raised by the proponents of other systems.

We say that the world is seemingly existent and factually non-existent. Both statements are essentially conveying the same meaning. The statement ‘seemingly existent’ is *vivarta vāda*. The statement ‘factually non-existent’ is *ajāti vāda*. *Vivarta vāda* and *ajāti vāda* are two different ways of looking at the *mithyātvam* of the world.

When we repeatedly study this, we may develop a misconception. The chapters 2, 3 and 4 of *Māṇḍūkya-kārikā* are so profound that they may develop certain misconception in our minds. One should be aware of this. These chapters continuously talk about the world, as only seemingly existing and not factually existing much like a dream. This may give rise to a misconception that Vedānta does not give importance or value for the world and worldly life. It may look like Vedānta is discrediting the world and the worldly life. Vedānta never discredits the world and the worldly life. Vedānta first reveals our higher nature, which is *Turīyam* Brahman. That is Vedānta’s first aim. Then it reveals the status of the world from the standpoint of our higher nature. From that standpoint, the world is *mithyā* and it can never disturb me, my higher nature. As *Turīyam ātmā*, which is non-doer and non-experiencer, I cannot enter into or do any transaction. But with the *ahankāra* disguise, as *Viśva*, I enter into worldly transaction in the waking state. Vedānta repeatedly teaches that from the standpoint of *ahankāra*, the disguise and the world are real. From the standpoint of *Turīyam ātmā*, the world is *mithyā* but from the standpoint of *ahankāra*, *Viśva*, the waking state and the world should be understood as real and that the world is important. Therefore, during transaction, the world importance should be recognized. Once I know the importance of the world from the *Viśva*’s standpoint, *dharma śāstra* becomes relevant. Let us not dismiss the world and its relevance in the name of Vedānta. Once transaction is entered into as *Viśva*, the four pillars of *dharma śāstra*, which are family, society, duties and values, are important. All the four should be respected. Vedānta repeatedly warns that the Vedantic student should follow *dharma* as part of the society.

If *dharma śāstra* is important, then what is the purpose of knowing that I am *satyaṃ* and *jagat* is *mithyā*? The purpose of Vedantic teaching must be very clear. When we are living our regular life, especially when problems come repeatedly, spiritual questions will arise. Any human being will have spiritual questions now and then. What is the purpose of life? What is the meaning of life? Why was I born? Why did *Bhagavān* create this world? If *Bhagavān* is omniscient, all-powerful and compassionate, why should there be suffering in the world? Some people are so busy that they never get these questions. But some people do. For some people, these questions will come, stay briefly and then go away. For some people these questions will never come. But for some spiritually sensitive people, these questions will come, stay and get deeper. These questions will disturb them so much that normal life becomes impossible. Swami Vivekananda and Buddha are examples. When this intense spiritual urge comes, Gauḍapāda’s answer alone will quiet the mind. ‘*Brahman satyaṃ jagat mithyā*’ alone and no other

teaching will satisfy the thinking intellect. In the 4th chapter, Gauḍapāda shows how no other teaching will satisfy the spiritual urge or question. Vedānta talks about the *mithyātvam* of the world but it does not say that the world and family are unimportant. All these are important at the transactional level. Family, society, duties and values are important. Following them, you gain this knowledge and then the spiritual questions will not disturb your mind anymore. This Vedantic teaching should be seen in the right perspective. With this background, we will enter into chapter 2.

Verse 1

वैतथ्यं सर्वभावानां स्वप्न आहुर्मनीषिणः ।

अन्तःस्थानात्तु भावानां संवृतत्वेन हेतुना ॥ १ ॥

vaitathyaṃ sarvabhāvānāṃ svapna āhurmanīṣiṇaḥ ।

antaḥsthānāttu bhāvānāṃ samvṛtatvena hetunā ॥ 1 ॥

The wise (people) declare the unreality of all objects in dream because of the objects' location within the body and because of the limitation of space. (verse 1)

Gauḍapāda shows that the world obtaining in the waking state is *mithyā*. It appears real only in the waking state. Its relevance and validity are only in the waking state. Its reality is only conditional reality. What is the condition for the waking world to be real? You must be in the waking state. As an example for this, Gauḍapāda refers to the dream. Dream is also real under one condition. That condition is that you must be in dream. So he shows that dream is conditionally real, *mithyā*. This we can understand relatively easily. Having shown dream to be *mithyā*, Gauḍapāda shows that the waking state also has all the features of the dream world. The dream world is *mithyā*. The waking world has all the features of the dream world. So to show that the waking world is also *mithyā* like the dream world, he logically establishes that dream is *mithyā* or unreal even though we generally know that dream is unreal. For any object to exist, it requires sufficient space. For example, no one will accept the existence of an elephant in a handbag. The required space for the existence of an object is condition number 1. For an event to take place, sufficient time is needed. Suppose someone says that he went to the United States last night and came back to India this morning. The usual reaction to this will be 'you should be dreaming!' For things and events to be real, sufficient space and time are required. All the dream events are happening in my head and not outside my head. How can a world consisting of mountains, rivers, etc., be contained in my head? But still I experience such a world in dream. In dream, the experience is real. Events and objects are experienced in dream. In dream, there is not sufficient time and space for dream events and objects and so the dream is unreal, but the dream events and objects appear real. The objects and events in dream are only projections and not reality.

Verse 2

अदीर्घत्वाच्च कालस्य गत्वा देशान्न पश्यति ।

प्रतिबुद्धश्च वै सर्वस्तस्मिन्देशे न विद्यते ॥ २ ॥

adīrghatvācca kālasya gatvā deśānna paśyati ।

pratibuddhaśca vai sarvastasmindeśe na vidyate ॥ 2॥

Moreover, one does not see the places by going there because of the shortness of time. Again, after waking up, no one indeed continues to be in that place. (verse 2)

Not only the objects in dream are unreal but the events are also unreal. The time in dream is very limited. Dreams last for only 1.5 minutes based on REM sleep study. Within these 1.5 minutes, events lasting for much longer times happen in dream. The dreamer is experiencing the events of the dream, but the dream is unreal because of lack of required time and space. After establishing the *mithyātvam* of dream, Gauḍapāda gives direct experience for support. Suppose I have a doubt whether during dream I am really traveling or not. Let us imagine that someone in dream traveled to *Kāśī* and had *darśanam* of the Lord. While he was coming out of the temple, he woke up. When he wakes up where will he wake up? He wakes up only in his bed and not in *Kāśī*. So the travel is *mithyā* only. Every person, when he wakes up in the middle of his dream does not find himself in the dream location but finds himself in the location where he was sleeping. Thus direct experience and inference reveal that dream is *mithyā*. In the third verse, Gauḍapāda says that even the scriptures say that dream is *mithyā*. Even though scriptures do not have to teach us about dream, they confirm what we know about dream.

Verse 3

अभावश्च स्थादिनां श्रूयते न्यायपूर्वकम् ।

वैतथ्यं तेन वै प्राप्तं स्वप्न आहुः प्रकाशितम् ॥ ३ ॥

abhāvaśca rathādināṃ śrūyate nyāyapūrvakam ।

vaitathyam tena vai prāptam svapna āhuḥ prakāśitam ॥ 3॥

Moreover, the absence of chariot, etc., is heard (in the Upaniṣad) along with supporting logic. Therefore, (they) say that the unreality (of objects) in dream, which is established (by logic,) is revealed (by the Upaniṣad also.) (verse 3)

The Veda also confirms the *mithyātvam* of dream in *Bṛhadāranyaka Upaniṣad*. A person dreams various chariots, horses, roads, charioteer, traveling, etc., but upon waking up he finds that they were all his mental projections. None of those things were really there in dream. It cannot be said that chariot, etc., actually existed because on waking, they are found to be absent. It cannot be said that chariot, etc., were non-existent because non-existent objects cannot be experienced. The dreamer clearly experienced all

the objects and also traveled. Because of that experience those objects cannot be called non-existent. Thus the dream objects and events are neither non-existent nor existent. They come under the category of seemingly existent. That is called *mithyā*. Even though it is *mithyā*, the dreams can disturb the dreamer during the dream and even later. Vedānta says that this world is also seemingly existent and it is capable of giving a lot of problems, but when I wake up to my higher nature, *Turīyam*, from that standpoint, I can say that no world exists independent of me.

MK-20 = Chapter – 2, Verses – 3 to 6

Verse 3

अभावश्च रथादिनां श्रूयते न्यायपूर्वकम् ।

वैतथ्यं तेन वै प्राप्तं स्वप्न आहुः प्रकाशितम् ॥ ३ ॥

The main topic of the second chapter is the establishing the *mithyātvam* of the waking world also by taking the example of the dream world. *Mithyā* is roughly translated as unreal but we should understand unreal here as conditional reality. By conditional reality is meant that each thing that comes under this category is real under certain conditions. As long as the conditions remain, the ‘unreal’ thing has to be considered real. During dream, every object in dream should be treated as real from the standpoint of the dreamer. The dream world is real as long as one continues to be in dream. Dream objects can produce either positive or negative results. Dream poison will kill a dream animal or a dream human being. Dream medicine can cure the dream disease. This is conditional reality.

Conditional reality can be represented as ETU. ‘E’ means clearly experienced. The waking world is clearly experienced. The dream world is also clearly experienced through the dream sense organs. Every object in dream can be clearly transacted. The dream cup is useful for drinking dream coffee. It is tangible and available for transaction. After waking up, we will say that dream is nothing but thought but during dream, they are not experienced as thoughts but are experienced as solidly experience-able and transact-able objects. ‘T’ stands for ‘available for transaction’ and tangible. Dream objects have utility in dream. When I have thirst in dream, dream water alone is useful and not water that is on the nightstand. ‘U’ stands for utility. The dream world is real under dream conditions. The word *mithyā* does not mean unreal in the total sense but only conditionally real. The unreality signified by *mithyā* is not absolute reality. But it is also not absolute unreality. The aim of the second chapter is to show that the waking world is not much different from the dream world. If both of them are *mithyā*, what is *satyam*? *Satyam* is nothing but *Turīya ātmā*, which is none other than myself. This is the topic of the second chapter.

Gauḍapāda first establishes that the dream world is *mithyā*. Thereafter, he extends it to the waking world also. In the first three verses, Gauḍapāda established that the dream world is *mithyā* using three *pramāṇams*. The first *pramāṇam* is *anumāna pramāṇam*. The dream world cannot be real because it is experienced in a constrained space of our own body. Mountains, stars, and planets cannot be accommodated in our bodies but we still experience all of them within the body and so they must be unreal. The example is an elephant reflected upon the mirror. The reflected elephant is not real because it will crush the mirror otherwise. The second *pramāṇam* is *pratyakṣa pramāṇam*. All our travels in dream are *mithyā* because in the middle of the travel, you wake up from the dream and you find yourself not in the place that you are traveling but in the place that you are lying down. Our direct experience about the dream when we wake up is proof for the *mithyā* status of the dream. The third *pramāṇam* is the śruti *pramāṇam* from the *Bṛhadāranyaka Upaniṣad* (4.3.10). *Svayamjyoti Brāhmaṇa* of the *Upaniṣad* says that in dream there are no chariots, horses, roads. Even though none of them is present, the dreamer

experiences all of them. If they are not present in the dream, how are they experienced? The answer is by mental projection, not by actual creation. An actual creation will require a lot more time than available in dream. Therefore, it is *mithyā*. Veda reinforces what is known through logic and experience. Thus using the *pramāṇams* of *śruti*, *yukti* and *anubhava*, the dream world is shown to be *mithyā*. Now the waking world has to be shown to be another form of dream only. Even this class is another form of dream only.

Verse 4

अन्तःस्थानात्तु भेदानां तस्माज्जागरिते स्मृतम् ।

यथा तत्र तथा स्वप्ने संवृतत्वेन भिद्यते ॥ ४ ॥

antahsthānāttu bhedānāṃ tasmājjāgarite smṛtam ।

yathā tatra tathā svapne saṃvṛtatvena bhidyate ॥ 4॥

As it is in the case of the dream so it is in the case of the other. Therefore, (the unreality) of objects in the waking state is accepted. However, (the dream) differs because of its location within (the body) and because of the limitation of space. (verse 4)

From this verse up to the 18th verse, Gauḍapāda establishes that the waking world is also like the dream. For that he gives introduction in this verse. The experience in dream should be extended to the waking world also. Just as we experience things in the dream world, the same *mithyātvam* should be extended to the waking world also. How we prove it to be *mithyā* in the waking world also will come later. After proposing that the waking world is also *mithyā*, Gauḍapāda says that even though both of them are *mithyā*, there is a difference within the *mithyā*. Within the *mithyātvam* of the waking and the dream worlds, there is an internal difference. The dream world is experienced within our physical body whereas the waking world is experienced outside the physical body. In spite of this difference both the worlds are *mithyā*. The dream is inside the body and exists in a confined space but the waking world is outside and not confined.

Verse 5

स्वप्नजागरितस्थाने ह्येकमाहुर्मनीषिणः ।

भेदानां हि समत्वेन प्रसिद्धेनैव हेतुना ॥ ५ ॥

svapnajāgaritasthāne hyekamāhurmanīṣiṇaḥ ।

bhedānāṃ hi samatvena prasiddhenaiva hetunā ॥ 5

The wise (people) say that the dream state and the waking state are indeed identical because of the similarity of objects due to the well-known reason. (verse 5)

Therefore, Gauḍapāda explains his proposition more clearly. The dream world and the waking world are the same from the standpoint of their reality. Both of them are conditionally real and they have ETU (experienced, available for transaction, has utility) in their respective conditions. Wise people declare that both the worlds are equally unreal. Normally, people ascribe gradations in the reality of the dream and the waking states saying that dream is less real than waking. The objects of experience in both states are very similar. Gauḍapāda has not yet given the logic or reasoning for the *mithyātvam* of the waking world. What is the logic? The logic given in the case of the dream world, which is constrained space and time, cannot be given for the waking world. Gauḍapāda says that the waking world is also *mithyā* for a well-known reason. Śaṅkarācārya says that the well-known reason is what we saw in the introductory class, which is the foundation of *Māṇḍūkya-kārikā*. That reason is: Whatever is an object of experience has to be *mithyā* because it cannot exist independent of the observer. Any object can prove its existence only when it is observed or otherwise it cannot prove its existence. Suppose there is an object that can never be experienced by anyone at any time. That object's existence can never be accepted. Imagining it to exist will lead to arbitrary imagining of any object, which is absurd. Existence of an object requires it being experienced by someone at some time. Thus an experiencer is required to prove the existence of an experienced object because the object borrows existence from the subject. That subject is *ātmā* and not the mind and sense organs because those are also objects. Behind the mind and sense organs consciousness is required to prove the existence of anything. There is only one universal consciousness without which the existence of anything cannot be proven. The waking world is observed and so is *mithyā* just as the dream world is. Gauḍapāda now gives his own reason in the next verse.

Verse 6

आदावन्ते च यन्नास्ति वर्तमानेऽपि तत्तथा ॥

वितथैः सदृशाः सन्तोऽवितथा इव लक्षिताः ॥ ६ ॥

ādāvante ca yannāsti vartamāne'pi tattathā ॥

vitathaiḥ sadṛśāḥ santo'vitathā iva lakṣitāḥ ॥ 6 ॥

That which does not exist in the beginning and in the end is so in the middle also. (Even though) they are identical with unreal objects, they are regarded as though real. (verse 6)

This is a very important verse. First, the explanation of the verse is given. That which does not exist in the beginning and at the end or that which did not exist earlier and will not exist later but has only a temporary existence in an intermediary stage is *mithyā*. Whatever is temporarily existent is *mithyā*. If it is only temporarily existent, its existence must be borrowed from somewhere. If it has its own original existence, it will be permanently existent. Water is hot temporarily because it does not have natural heat. Fire is always hot. Even when anything temporarily exists, it has borrowed existence and the borrowed existence is not its own. When a temporarily existent thing appears existent temporarily, really speaking it is non-existent. It does not have its own existence. It has borrowed existence. That is *mithyā*.

Gauḍapāda says that a thing that was not existent in the past and will not exist in the future has only a seeming existence in the present if it exists in the present. This should be extended to the dream and the waking worlds. The dream world is experienced temporarily in the dream state. The waking world is experienced temporarily in the waking state. In the middle of the class if you go out of the waking state, the class is gone for you. Thus the dream world exists temporarily in the dream state. The waking world exists temporarily in the waking state. Both of them are temporary only. Therefore both of them are equally *mithyā*. One more point needs to be made. Even though the waking world is said to be *mithyā* because it is temporary, for the experiencer it is very real, *satyaṃ*. The dream world also appears very real in the dream state. In dream, the objects and events are very real. Dream running is done to save your dream body from the chasing dream dog in the dream. In their respective fields, waking and dream, things are *satyaṃ*. They appear real. The moment you go to dream, waking disappears. The moment you come to waking, dream disappears. Each one is conditionally real. Both of them are not absolutely real. That is *mithyā*. Even though the waking world is *mithyā* like the dream world, it will appear real in the waking state. Just because something appears real, do not conclude that it is real.

MK-21 = Chapter – 2, Verses – 6 to 9

Verse 6

आदावन्ते च यन्नास्ति वर्तमानेऽपि तत्तथा ॥

वितथैः सदृशाः सन्तोऽवितथा इव लक्षिताः ॥ ६ ॥

After establishing that the dream world is *mithyā*, Gauḍapāda extends this to the waking world and establishes that it is also *mithyā*. For that two reasons are given. One reason was an implied one given in verse 5. The second reason given is in verse 6.

The first reason is as follows. Both the waking and the dream worlds are *mithyā* because both of them are objects of experience. Therefore they cannot prove their existence without the subject observer. The observer alone has to prove the existence of the observed object. Since the existence of the observed world depends upon the observer, it does not have an independent existence and therefore is *mithyā*. Thus objectify-ability is the first reason and experience-ability is the criterion for *mithyātvam*.

The second reason was given in verse 6. Both of them have only temporary existence in their own states of experience. The dream world is available only in dream state. The waking world is available only in the waking state. Both of them are mutually exclusive. The presence of the one is automatically the absence of the other. We know that the dream world that is available in only the dream state is *mithyā*. Extending this principle, the waking world that is available only in the waking state must also be *mithyā*.

Experience-ability and impermanence are common to both the dream and the waking worlds, and so *mithyātvam* must be common to both. Further both are subject to arrival and departure. However, waking world appears as *satyaṃ* only even though it is *mithyā*. Gauḍapāda answers that appearance should not be taken as fact because the dream world does not appear as *mithyā* in dream. For a dreamer, dream is not dream in dream. For a dreamer, dream appears as *satyaṃ* in dream. But we do not accept that dream is *satyaṃ*. Appearances are misleading. Never depend upon appearances to know the fact. The dream world appears as real in dream. The waking state world also appears as real in the waking state. But both the worlds are *mithyā*. In *Aparokṣānubhūti*, Śāṅkarācārya gives many examples to show how appearances mislead the human beings: Blue sky, stationary earth, sun appearing to go round the earth, and stars appearing to be little. Going by logic, both waking and dream are objects and temporary and therefore, are *mithyā*.

Verse 7

सप्रयोजनता तेषां स्वप्ने विप्रतिपद्यते ।

तस्मादाद्यन्तवत्त्वेन मिथ्यैव खलु ते स्मृताः ॥ ७ ॥

saprayojanatā teṣāṃ svapne vipratipadyate ।

tasmādādyantavattvena mithyaiva khalu te smṛtāḥ ॥ 7॥

Their utility is contradicted in dream. Therefore, they are indeed considered to be unreal only since they have a beginning and an end. (verse 7)

Hereafter, Gauḍapāda answers some of the objections raised for our conclusion. These objectors point out that Gauḍapāda's conclusion that the waking world is *mithyā* is based on his own definition of *satyaṃ* and *mithyā*. His definition is that whatever is objectified is *mithyā* and the subject *ātmā* is *satyaṃ*. The objection is why anyone should accept this definition. The objectors then give their own definition. The definition is a clever one in that it makes dream *mithyā* but waking *satyaṃ*. Four or five definitions are given which need to be examined.

The first objection is that the waking world must be accepted as real because all the objects in the waking world are useful for life. *Thus utility proves reality*. But in dream for example, one can earn a lot of money but upon waking up, that money cannot be used. In dream, the dream objects have no utility. Thus dream is *mithyā* .

Gauḍapāda refutes this by saying that this definition does not work. Waking objects are useful in the waking state only. Dream objects are useless in the waking state but are useful in the dream state. In fact, dream objects alone are useful in the dream state. Each object is useful in its state and useless in the other state. Utility in the respective state is common to both waking and dream and uselessness in the other state is common to both. Therefore both states should be given the same status of reality. The utility of the waker's objects is falsified in dream. **Thus, utility is not a criterion for reality.** That which is beginning-less and eternal alone is real. *Eternity is the criterion of reality*. So the waking world is *mithyā*.

Verse 8

अपूर्व स्थानिधर्मो हि यथा स्वर्गनिवासिनाम् ।

तान्यं प्रेक्षते गत्वा यथैवेह सुशिक्षितः ॥ ८ ॥

apūrvam sthānidharmo hi yathā svarganivāsinām ।

tānyaṃ prekṣate gatvā yathaveha susikṣitaḥ ॥ 8॥

The uniqueness is indeed the attribute of the observer as in the case of the citizens of heaven. Having gone there, one experiences them just as a well-informed (person experiences) in this world. (verse 8)

The second objection is a peculiar one. It states that dream must also be taken as *satyaṃ* because dream is not a mental projection based on the waking state. Normally, dream is defined as *vāsanā* projection from the mind. It is said to *mithyā* because it is a projection. The objector says that the dream cannot be based on *vāsanās* of the waking state. In dream, we do see unique things that we had not experienced in the waking state. Dream must be another unique different world of experience and so must be taken as *satyaṃ*. Since the waking state is similar to dream, it must also be *satyaṃ*. Some *darśanas* like *viśiṣṭādvaita* hold that dream is not our mental projection but created by God for a particular *jīva*. Thus *uniqueness is the criterion for reality*. Waking and dream are both unique in their own way and both must be taken as *satyaṃ*.

Gauḍapāda's answer is that uniqueness cannot be taken as criterion for reality. We do have several mental projections unique to us. If uniqueness is criterion for reality, whatever we uniquely project can be considered to be real. That is not so and the argument that uniqueness is the criterion of reality is simplistic. No one accepts dream as real. Whether dream is unique or not, dream depends upon the observer for its existence. Since the unique dream object depends on the dream observer, it does not have independent existence of its own and therefore it must be understood as *mithyā*. There is no objective world existing. But the type of world we are experiencing will depend upon the type of instruments that we are using. You can never prove an objective world as it is. The type of world that we experience will depend upon the type of instruments that we use. Suppose we are using eyes, the world will be understood as the world of forms. The moment you remove the eyes and use only the ears, the world will be the world of sounds. Depending upon the instrument, the world will be experienced differently. If instead of a human body we have an animal body, this world experience will be unique to the animal body. Many animals cannot see colors and for them this world will be black and white only. Vedānta says that we do not experience the world objectively but our experience depends on the instrument that we use. The moment a human being gets a celestial body, he will experience a celestial world here and now. For a celestial, this world will be non-existent. Gauḍapāda says that the existence of the world depends on the observer and the nature of the world depends upon the medium of observation. To experience a 3D movie, one needs special 3D glasses. Different animals have different sensory faculties and their experience will be unique to their faculties. Thus uniqueness of experience is not a criterion of reality. In different births, the *jīvātma* experiences different fields of experience (*lokas*) depending upon the *upādhi*, instrument of experience, but all these different *lokas* are dependent upon the observer for their existence and on the instruments of experience for their nature. Gauḍapāda gives the example of experiencing different things in different places but the observer is the same. Just as a well-educated person travels from place to place experiencing different things in this earth itself, similarly, the *jīvātma* travels from *loka* to *loka* experiencing different things in different births. All these

experiences are dependent upon the observer for their existence and dependent upon the instruments of experience for their nature. *Uniqueness cannot be the criterion for reality.*

Verse 9

स्वप्नवृत्तावपि त्वन्तश्चेतसा कल्पितं त्वसत् ।

बहिश्चेतोऽगृहीतं सदृष्टं वैतथ्यमेतयोः ॥ ९ ॥

svapnavṛttāvapi tvantaśchetasā kalpitam tvasat ।

bahiśchetogṛhītam saddṛṣṭam vaitathyametayoḥ ॥ 9॥

In the dream-state itself, anything projected within by the mind is indeed unreal. Anything experienced outside by the mind is real. The unreality of both is experienced (on waking.) (verse 9)

The objector comes up with a new definition of *satyaṃ* and *mithyā* . It is defined in such a way that dream is *mithyā* and waking is *satyaṃ*. It is difficult to accept the Vedantic teaching that this world is *mithyā* and so the objector tries to prove otherwise. We experience the dream only within our body. Since we have closed our sense organs, the dream world is experienced inside us. Therefore, we know that the dream world is a mental projection and so it is *mithyā*. Whereas this world is not within my body but it is experienced outside my body and I am experiencing this world through my sense organs and thus it is external. The dream world is internal and the waking world is external to the body. Whatever is external is real and whatever is internal is *mithyā*. *Externality is the criterion for reality and internality is the criterion for unreality.*

Gauḍapāda says that superficially seeing, this seems to be correct. You say that this world is outside in the waking state. You say that the dream world is inside **only in the waking state**. You are studying the dream world in the waking state, but to be objective, study the waking world in the waking state and the dream world in the dream state. When you are in dream, is the dream world experienced internally or externally? Mentally imagine you are in dream. You realize that you have a dream physical body, dream sense organs and your experiences are external to you. A dreamer never says that he is experiencing the dream in himself. All the experiences in dream are very similar to waking and external to the dream body. **The dream is exactly like the waking state when you are in dream. This is the single important lesson of this second chapter.** The dreamer can also commit mistakes in dream and can also have a dream in dream. Inner and outer are thus relative expressions. Relative expressions should not be used for defining reality. From the waking standpoint, the dream world is inside but from the dreamer's standpoint the dream world is outside and even though it is outside, on waking, we find that even the so-called outside world also is *mithyā*.

Now look at the verse. In the dream state also, what the dreamer projects within his mind he sees as *mithyā* and what the dreamer experiences outside of the dream body, the dreamer takes as real. On

waking up, both the inside and outside of the dream become unreal, *mithyā*. Vedānta says that from the waking body's standpoint, this world is real only. We never say that the world is *mithyā*, when we study the world from the standpoint of the body. The world must be defined as *satyaṃ*. When you wake up and learn to look at the world from the standpoint of your higher nature, *ātmā*, both the body as well as the world are nothing but thoughts in *māyā*, *māyā* disturbances. Like the dream is nothing but thoughts in your mind, this world is nothing but some disturbance in the cosmic mind called *māyā tattvam*. For this you have to shift your attention from the body to *ātmā*.

MK-22 = Chapter – 2, Verses – 9, 10, 14, 15

Verse 9

स्वप्नवृत्तावपि त्वन्तश्चेतसा कल्पितं त्वसत् ।

बहिश्चेतोगृहीतं सदृष्टं वैतथ्यमेतयोः ॥ ९ ॥

Gauḍapāda established that the waking world is *mithyā* by giving two reasons in support. One is the implied reason in the 5th verse, which is that the waking universe is an object of experience. In the 6th verse, another reason was given, which is that the waking universe is temporarily experienced. Any object of experience is *mithyā* because it cannot prove its existence without the support of the subject. Therefore whatever is experienced is *mithyā*. The dream world is experienced and so is *mithyā*. The second argument is that whatever is temporarily experienced is *mithyā*. We find that the dream world is available only in the dream state and the waking world is available only in the waking state. Both of them are available only in their respective states and are not available in the other state, and so both of them are temporary, subject to arrival and departure. Therefore, both of them are *mithyā*.

Thereafter, an objector suggests revised definitions of *mithyā* and Gauḍapāda assesses each of the definitions and proves that the objector's definition will not work.

The first definition is that whatever is useful is real and whatever is useless is unreal. Utility is the criterion for reality. Gauḍapāda refuted this criterion: The waking world is useful in the waking state but not useful in the dream state. The dream world is useful in the dream state and useless in the waking state. Therefore, it is not right to say that based on utility, the waking world is more real than the dream world.

The second criterion for reality suggested is uniqueness. The waking and the dream worlds have their own uniqueness and so both are real. Gauḍapāda countered by saying that uniqueness does not depend on the objective world at all but depends upon the instrument that one is using. In every *loka*, the experience will depend upon the body one has. In fact, one can mentally project a unique world consisting of a human being with a tail, etc., but that world cannot be taken as real. So uniqueness cannot be a criterion for reality.

The third criterion is contained in verses 9 and 10. They should be taken up together. The objector says that the waking world is outside of our body and so we will accept it as reality. The dream world is experienced within our body and within our head. Within our mind alone the dream world is experienced. The objector then says that what is external is real and what is internal is unreal. The waking world is real because it is external and the dream world is unreal because it is internal. Gauḍapāda counters by saying that the objector is making the same mistake. Only in the waking state it is said that the dream world is internal and within the mind. But once you are in dream, you have a dream body and mind and with that when you experience a dream world, you experience it external to

the dream body. For a dreamer when he imagines an imaginary world, it will seem internal to his dream body but the other activities will be external to his dream body. Thus the dreamer also divides the dream world into external and internal, external being real and internal being unreal. That external dream world will be declared to be unreal by the dreamer when he wakes up. If that can happen in the dream world, Gauḍapāda says that it can happen in the waking state also. The waker says that from the waker's standpoint, the external world is real and the internal world is unreal. But for the wise man that has woken up to his *ātmasvarūpam*, from the *ātmā* standpoint, the external world is also exactly like the dreamer's external world. Externality cannot be the criterion for reality and internality cannot be the criterion for unreality. Then what should be the criterion? What was said in verses 5 and 6, *drśyatvam vidyātvam*, and *anityatvam vidyātvam*.

In the waking state, learn to think of the dream as the dreamer. In the dream world, the dreamer says that whatever he is imagining inside is unreal but what is experienced outside from the dreamer's standpoint the dreamer will say is real. The dreamer's conclusion of this reality will continue until he wakes up. The moment he wakes up, the entire the dream world will be deemed to be just a bunch of thoughts in the mind. If this is understood from the standpoint of the dreamer, extend this to the standpoint of the waker also. This is a disturbing message but it is the truth.

Verse 10

जाग्रद्वृत्तावपि त्वन्तश्चेतसा कल्पितं त्वसत् ।

बहिश्चेतोगृहीतं सद्युक्तं वैतथ्यमेतयोः ॥ १० ॥

jāgradvṛttāvapi tvantaśchetasā kalpitaṃ tvasat ।

bahiścetogrḥītaṃ sadyuktaṃ vaitathyametayoḥ ॥ 10॥

In the waking state also, anything projected within by the mind is indeed unreal. Anything experienced outside by the mind is real. The unreality of both is reasonable. (verse 10)

An ordinary human being who has not been taught the *śāstra* will conclude in the waking state that whatever imaginary world that he imagines within his mind to be unreal. But he will say that the external world that he experiences through his mind and sense organs, which is not his imagination, is real. The above will be the normal conclusion of the waker. After the spiritual waking up, i.e., after obtaining *ātmajñānam*, the waker's external world will also be falsified. The unreality of the dream world and the waking world is valid from the standpoint of *ātmā*, the *Turīyam*, the higher reality. So the criterion of internality-externality is not valid.

Two more objections come from the objector. They come later in the 14th and 15th verses. These verses will be examined now. Verses 11, 12 and 13 will be skipped at this time. Three criteria of the objector were looked at so far. To complete all the objections, verses 14 and 15 will be looked at now.

Verse 14

चित्तकाला हि येऽन्तस्तु द्वयकालाश्च ये बहिः ॥

कल्पिता एव ते सर्वे विशेषो नान्यहेतुकः ॥ १४ ॥

cittakālā hi ye'ntastu dvayakālāśca ye bahiḥ ॥

kalpitā eva te sarve viśeṣo nānyahetukaḥ ॥ 14॥

(Things) which are (experienced) within have a subjective existence. Whereas, (things) which are (experienced) outside have an objective existence. All of them are projected only. Their distinction is not due to any other reason. (verse 14)

Among the five suggestions of the objector, this fourth one is the most powerful. It is not very easy to answer this objection. Even if Gauḍapāda answers this, it will take a while to assimilate the answer. The objector says that you should not treat the waking world and the dream world equally. You should admit that there is a difference between the waking and the dream world. This difference is very clearly experienced by us and you cannot ignore that. He says that the waking world has continuous existence and it has permanence. It exists independent of my experience and perception. The same external world has continuous existence in the past and present and so has permanence. Further it exists even when I go to dream and sleep because after waking up, the external world is present. So the waking world has continuity, permanence and independent existence even when I do not experience it in dream and sleep. But the dream world is experienced only in the dream and the moment I wake up from dream, the dream world does not continue. Next day, when I go to dream, I cannot continue from last night's dream. The dream world does not have continuity, permanence and does not exist independent of me. Therefore, the dream world must be inferior to the waking world. The waking world is superior to the dream world and so treating them equally is very unfair. So the objector says that the waking world, which is independent and permanent is *satyaṃ* and the dream world, which is temporary and dependent is *mithyā*. The waking world is *satyaṃ* because it is continuous.

Gauḍapāda uses two special expressions to describe the objector's argument. He indicates the waking world's permanence by '*dvayakālatvam*' (continued existence, objective existence) and the temporary existence of dream by '*cittakāla*' (subjective existence). The waking world continues to exist before our dream and also after the dream when we wake up. This is called *dvayakāla*. When you experience something for the first time, it is called *pratyakṣakāla*, and when you experience the same thing and recognize it as what was there before it is called *pratyabhijñyākāla*. Thus in the past and later, the waking world continues to exist. It can be inferred that it has existed in between also even if I was not there to validate its existence. This is continuity proved by *pratyakṣa* and *pratyabhijñyā*, which is called *dvayakālatvam*. Therefore the waking world has independent existence.

The dream world is called *cittakāla*. Only when the mind is experiencing the dream, the dream world exists and when the mind is withdrawn from the dream, the dream world does not exist. Experience time alone is existence time for the dream world. Thus dream has *ekakālatvam* and waking has *dvikālatvam*. Therefore one is superior and the other is inferior and treating them both equally is very unfair.

Gauḍapāda does not answer this but says that all these things are wrong and will not work. Gauḍapāda says that this line of explanation is wrong but does not say why. Śaṅkarācārya and Ānandagiri explain the fallacy in this approach. The objector says that the waking world has continuity and so is real but the dream world has no continuity and so is unreal.

What is our project now? It is the assessment of the waking world and the dream world. We wish to find out which is superior and which is inferior. We also want to know the merits of these two. Gauḍapāda says that whenever you want to assess two things or two people you require a judge. What should be the criterion for the judge? The judge must not be related to the contestants or competitors. Then alone, the judge will be impartial and neutral. When the contest is between the waking world and the dream world, who can judge the contest, the waker or the dreamer? Neither of them can be the real judge. The waker cannot be a real judge because the waker is related to the waking world and the dreamer cannot be the judge because he is related to the dream world. When both of them are related thus, their judgment will be only partial and colored. When the waker is assessing these two, he will say that the waking world is permanent and the dream world is impermanent and therefore the waking world is superior and the dream world is inferior. The dreamer's assessment will still be worse. He will always feel and say that the dream world always has continuity and the dream world has independent existence. The dreamer will say that the dream world is continuous, independent and permanent. When asked about the waking world, the dreamer will say that the waking world does not even exist. At least the waker says that the dream world exists temporarily. For a dreamer the waking world does not even exist and he will ask, 'Where is the contest?' So the waker and the dreamer give two different verdicts in this contest. Which one is correct? Both cannot be correct because they are partial judgments made by observers that are related to one or the other of the two states. That is why Vedānta says that we can never know what the truth is. Whatever the world we are studying we are studying as an observer that belongs to that world and therefore conclusions will be conditioned and partial. So no one can know the reality. Both the verdicts of the waker and the dreamer should be rejected because they are not neutral judges. Vedānta says that we have to take the scripture's teaching that we should judge from the standpoint of the witness consciousness, the consciousness principle. Never judge the waking world as *Viśva*. Never judge the dream world as *Taijasa*. Never judge the causal world as *Prājña*. They are all not neutral judges. The neutral judge is the consciousness that witnesses the three states. From the standpoint of that consciousness, *ātmā*, both the waking and the dream are equal and existing in their own states and not available in the other states.

The dream world is temporary from the standpoint of the waker and the waking world is permanent from the standpoint of the waker. This judgment of the waker cannot be correct because he is not impartial with respect to the waking world. It is a relative judgment coming from a non-neutral judge called the waker. From *ātmā's* perspective, waking is as *mithyā* as dream. The distinctions that are talked about from the standpoint of the waker cannot be the reason to show that the waking world is *satyam*. With this, fourth objection has been answered.

These are the important messages of Vedānta. Some of the scientists are wondering whether science can arrive at the reality because to study the world totally the scientist cannot be part of the world. You should have a stand outside the world to get the realistic picture objectively. For Science, truth will be out of reach. Remaining as part of the world, we are trying to understand the world. Using our own brain we are trying to understand the brain. Therefore, truth will always be a mystery is the conclusion arrived at by some of the scientists. Veda says that to live in the empirical world for transactional purposes, you can use the instruments that you have but to know the truth of the creation and yourself, your instruments will fail and therefore Veda says that it has an answer to give if you are open to receive it. Veda has an extraordinary vision of the world, which is not vitiated by this particular limitation. It gives an objective presentation and that is what we should try to understand rather than trying to study with our instruments. Gauḍapāda also says that he is not giving his truth but that *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad* has given a unique message. Let us try to understand that message. As a waker you can never arrive at the truth.

Verse 15

अव्यक्ता एव येऽन्तस्तु स्फुटा एव च ये बहिः ।

कल्पिता एव ते सर्वे विशेषस्त्विन्द्रियान्तरे ॥ १५ ॥

avyaktā eva ye'ntastu sphuṭā eva ca ye bahiḥ ।

kalpitā eva te sarve viśeṣastvindriyāntare ॥ 15॥

(Things) which are (experienced) within are not clear. (Things) which are (experienced) outside are clear. All of them are projected only. The distinction is due to a different sense organ. (verse 15)

The fifth criterion of reality given by the objector is based on the same mistake that the waker makes in assessing the waking and the dream world. It will be never neutral. That assessment is that in the waking world one experiences objects very clearly and they continue to be present. In the dream world, objects, persons and situations do not have that clarity because they have only fleeting presence. After waking up, often one is not able to clearly remember the dream because the dream objects are not very clear. The objector's definition is that what is clearly available is real and what is unclear is *mithyā*. Gauḍapāda answers that the objector is making the same mistake of the waker judging both waking and dream states.

MK-23 = Chapter – 2, Verses – 11, 12, 13, 16

Verse 15

अव्यक्ता एव येऽन्तस्तु स्फुटा एव च ये बहिः ।

कल्पिता एव ते सर्वे विशेषस्त्विन्द्रियान्तरे ॥ १५ ॥

In this second chapter, titled *Vaitathyaprakaraṇam*, Gauḍapāda establishes the *mithyātvam* or *vaitathyam* of the waking world. Once this *mithyātvam* is established, he can come to the conclusion that there is only one *satya vastu* and that *satya vastu* is I, the *ātmā*, witness consciousness. The observer, I, alone is *satyaṃ*. Whatever is observed is *mithyā*. To establish the *mithyātvam* of the waking world, Gauḍapāda took the example of the dream world. The dream world is also an object of experience and the waking world is also an object of experience. The dream world appears real in the dream state. The waking world appears real in the waking state. The dream world is useful in dream but not useful in waking. The waking world is useful in waking but not useful in dream. Thus in all respects, the dream world and the waking world are similar. Therefore, the conclusion is that since the dream world is known to be *mithyā*, the waking world should also be concluded to be *mithyā*. This is the central principle of the second chapter.

However, some people raised objections and they suggested various definitions for *mithyā* and through those definitions they strive to prove that the waking world is *satyaṃ* and the dream world is *mithyā*. What do we say? The waking world also is equally *mithyā*. Various definitions were analyzed and Gauḍapāda showed that whatever definition you apply, the final result is that both waking and dream are equal only. In the waking state, this world appears to be outside and in the dream state the dream world appears outside. So just because these worlds appear outside, they cannot be said to be real. That the dream world is useful in dream but not in waking cannot be used to say that it is *mithyā* but the waking world is real; because the waking world is useful in waking but not in dream making it *mithyā* also. Both of them are objects of experience, arriving and departing, and conditionally useful. Therefore, Gauḍapāda's conclusion is right.

The fifth and final objection is analyzed in verse 15. The objector says that the waking world must be real because it is clearly experienced whereas dream is always vague and unclear. The objector claims that whatever is clearly experienced is *satyaṃ* and whatever is vaguely experienced is *mithyā*. Gauḍapāda refutes this. The dream world is said to be vague only in the waking state but in dream, the dream experience is very clear for the dreamer. Thus, clarity and the lack of it cannot be the criterion for reality.

The dream world that is experienced within is vague from the waker's standpoint. The waking world that we experience in the waking state is clear all right but one should note that both the waking and the dream experiences are *mithyā*. The objector further says: The experiences in waking and dream are different in nature. The experiences in waking are normal. In dream, unusual experiences take place.

How does one account for those different experiences in different states unless waking is real and dream is *mithyā*? Gauḍapāda replies that the difference in experiences does not prove that one set is real and the other is *mithyā* because all experiences are *mithyā*. All experiences are subject to arrival and departure and so are *mithyā*. Even though all experiences are *mithyā*, within the *mithyā* experiences themselves, there will be differences depending on the instruments (*upādhis*) that are used. If we have a human body, the experiences will be humanly in nature. The experiences of an animal will be in keeping with the animal's body. These differences have nothing to do with reality but depend on the instruments of experience used. The conclusion is that the waking world is *mithyā* just like the dream world.

All the five objections have been refuted. Gauḍapāda has established the *siddhānta* that the waking world is subject to arrival and departure and is an object of experience, and therefore is *mithyā*. Based on this conclusion, the objector raises a question. Now we have to go back to verse 11.

Verse 11

उभयोरपि वैतथ्यं भेदानां स्थानयोर्यदि ।

क एतान्बुध्यते भेदान् को वै तेषां विकल्पकः ॥ ११ ॥

ubhayorapi vaitathyam bhedānām sthānayoryadi ।

ka etānbudhyate bhedān ko vai teṣāṃ vikalpakaḥ ॥ 11 ॥

If the unreality of the objects in both the states (is accepted,) who experiences these objects? Who is indeed their creator? (verse 11)

This verse contains a very profound question. The answer that is equally profound may be difficult to accept. The objector says that he agrees with Gauḍapāda temporarily that the waking world also is *mithyā* like the dream world. That means questions come up. I know that the dream world is projected by me because we all know that dream is nothing but *vāsanās*, impressions in our minds that we project at the time of dream. Thereafter I myself support the dream world. I am the projector, supporter and later I alone enter the dream world and experience the dream world also. I alone experience my dream using my dream body. I am the projector, supporter, and experiencer of the dream.

If the waking world also is *mithyā* like dream, then who is the projector, supporter and experiencer of the waking world? If I am the projector, supporter and experiencer of the *mithyā* dream world, then for the waking world also, the same rule should apply because both are *mithyā*. If that rule applies, I am the projector, supporter and experiencer of the waking world. If I am the PSE (projector, supporter, experiencer), what is the meaning of the word 'I', physical body or mind? The 'I' is neither of them because the body itself is a part of the waking world, which is projected. The mind is also not the projector because the mind is also a part of the projected waking world. I, the projector must be different from the body and mind. The 'I' is the consciousness principle, *ātmā*. Then the question is how do I do

such a thing? It is unbelievable. But then, how do I create a dream world? It is effortless because I have a special *śakti* called *nidrā-śakti*. With the help of *nidrā-śakti*, I project a dream universe consisting of dream space, time, stars, moon, etc. Similarly to project the waking world also, I, the *ātmā*, have a *śakti* called *māyā-śakti*. In previous *Upaniṣads*, this *māyā-śakti* is referred to as *māyā-śakti* of *Bhagavān*. But in *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad*, it is referred to as *māyā-śakti* of mine. I, as the *ātmā* am capable of doing that. The body is limited, and the mind is limited but I, the *ātmā*, with *māyā-śakti*, project the waking world. With two *śaktis*, I project two different worlds and both of these worlds are *mithyā*. Once I know that they are *mithyā*, the greatest advantage is that *mithyā* cannot harm the *satyaṃ*. This is the fourth capsule of Vedānta: I am never affected by any event that takes place in the material world and in the material body. Then the fifth capsule of Vedānta: By forgetting my real nature, I convert life into a burden and by remembering my real nature I convert life into a blessing because I can claim my glory. This is a profound topic.

Regarding this topic the objector raises a question. Suppose the objects in both the waking and the dream states are *mithyā*, who is the projector of the waking world? Anything *mithyā* has to be projected. I know that I am the projector of the dream world. The next questions are who is the supporter and who is the experiencer of the waking world. Gauḍapāda answers the question of the projector, supporter and experiencer of the waking world in verse 12. In all the other *Upaniṣads* we learnt that there was a *Bhagavān* who created the world. Now Gauḍapāda is changing that stand and revealing disturbing news.

Verse 12

कल्पयत्यात्मनाऽऽत्मानमात्मा देवः स्वमायया
स एव बुध्यते भेदानिति वेदान्तनिश्चयः ॥ १२ ॥

*kalpayatyātmanā"tmānamātmā devaḥ svamāyayā
sa eva budhyate bhedāniti vedāntaniścayaḥ ॥ 12॥*

The effulgent Ātmā projects itself by itself through its own māyā. That (Ātmā) itself experiences the objects – this is the conclusion of the Vedānta. (verse 12)

The answer is whoever is projecting the dream world is the same one that projects the waking world also. Therefore, *ātmā* alone projects out of itself the waking world with the help of *ātmā* itself. Other than *māyā-śakti*, *ātmā* does not need anything else for this projection. The dreamer does not need anything else external to himself other than *nidrā-śakti* for projecting the dream world. In the same way, *ātmā* does not require anything other than *māyā-śakti* to project this world. Where does *māyā* come from? Gauḍapāda says that it is already there in *ātmā* similar to the *nidrā-śakti*. That *ātmā* alone is called *Bhagavān* in the *Bhagavad Gita* and the *purāṇas*. *Bhagavān* creating is only an expression in *purāṇas*, etc. That *Bhagavān* is not outside in some *loka*. *Bhagavān* is nothing other than *ātmā*. That is why the *upanyāsakas* use the word *Kṛṣṇaparamātmā* to indicate that the creator is not outside but the *ātmā* itself. In the *Gita*, Kṛṣṇa says: “ *I am the Self, who resides in the hearts of all beings and I am the cause of the*

creation, sustenance, and resolution of all beings/things”. Thinking that *Bhagavān* is outside, people go in search of *Bhagavān* and do not find him and then they conclude that there is no *Bhagavān*. It is like the wave going in search of water. The wave going in search of water, the cloth going in search of thread, and the *jīva* going in search of Brahman are all foolish efforts. That *Bhagavān* is none other than I, the *ātmā*. Therefore, I am the projector and supporter. I am also the experiencer. I project the dream. To experience the dream world, I need a dream body. Similarly to experience the projected waking world, I use my own physical body. I create the dream and support the dream but my own dream threatens me. This world has become a huge problem for me because of ignorance. To solve the problem, I have to wake up. I am the only truth and I am the essential truth of the creation. This is the final teaching of Vedānta. I have been looking down upon myself as an insignificant creature. Gauḍapāda says that I am the significant creator. Spiritual journey is from creature to creator.

Verse 13

विकरोत्यपरान्भावानन्तश्चित्ते व्यवस्थितान् ।

नियतांश्च बहिश्चित्त एवं कल्पयते प्रभुः ॥ १३ ॥

vikarotyaparānbhāvānantaścittē vyavasthitān ।

niyatāṃśca bahiścitta evaṃ kalpayate prabhuḥ ॥ 13॥

The Ātmā projects the mundane (dream) objects, which are present within the mind. In the same manner, it projects well-defined objects also with an outward mind. (verse 13)

How are the two types of worlds created with the help of two types of *śakti*? I, *ātmā*, myself use two different types of *śakti* to project two different worlds. In dream, using *nidrā-śakti*, *ātmā* projects the dream objects that are inferior in nature. All the dream objects are already in our own minds in the form of *vāsanās*. The entire waking world is registered in the form of karma in potential condition in the *māyā* medium. With an extrovert mind, with the help of *māyā-śakti*, the *ātmā* projects objects in the waking state, which appear to last longer. Thus the creation comes into being. Now what happens?

Verse 16

जीवं कल्पयते पूर्वं ततो भवान्पृथग्विधान् ।

बाह्यानाध्यात्मिकांश्चैव यथाविद्यस्तथास्मृतिः ॥ १६ ॥

jīvaṃ kalpayate pūrvaṃ tato bhavānprthagvidhān ।

bāhyānādhyātmikāṃścaiva yathāvidyastathāsmṛtiḥ ॥ 16॥

(The Ātmā) projects the jīva first. Thereafter, (the Ātmā projects) various objects, which are external as well as internal. As the knowledge is so is the memory. (verse 16)

Ātmā, with the help of *māyā-śakti* projects the waking world. The entire created world should include the experiencer *jīva* and the experienced objects. One is sentient and the other is insentient. Even though we cannot talk about the order of the appearance of the experiencer and the experienced, for our understanding we talk about an order. In that order, first the experiencer *jīva* is created according to the *karma* of the *jīva* and thereafter the experienced world is created based on the *karma* of the *jīva* only. The world does not have *puṇya-pāpam* because it is inert. The creation of the *jīva* and the world are based on the *karma* of the *jīva*. *Jīvas* are created first who have many types of *karmas*. Those *jīvas* with *puṇya karma* require higher worlds and *ātmā* creates these and similarly the lower worlds. The whole drama starts. The only solution is to raise oneself from *Viśva*, *Taijasa* and *Prājña* to *Turīyam*, which was defined in *mantra 7*.

MK-24 = Chapter – 2, Verses – 16 to 18

Verse 16

जीवं कल्पयते पूर्वं ततो भावान्पृथग्विधान् ।

बाह्यानाध्यात्मिकांश्चैव यथाविद्यस्तथास्मृतिः ॥ १६ ॥

Until now by comparing the waking world to the dream world, Gauḍapāda established that both of them are equally *mithyā* only. Therefore, the dream world is also projected by me, supported by me and experienced by me because of my *nidrā-śakti*: PSE (projector, supporter, experiencer). I project, support and experience the dream world because of my *nidrā-śakti*. It is important to note that I do not experience the dream world directly but only through the dream body. Sleep that is taken as casual usually is considered an extraordinary *śakti* in *Māṇḍūkya-kārikā*. Gauḍapāda extends the same principle to the waking world also. I am the PSE with regard to the waking world also through the waking body. I am able to be the PSE of the waking world due to my other special *śakti*, *māyā-śakti*. Thus I am the substratum for both the waking and the dream worlds. The word ‘I’ refers to not the body or mind because they belong to the waking and the dream world, but to something other than the body-mind complex, which is I, the consciousness. The eternal all pervading consciousness is what is meant by ‘I’, the PSE.

Having established that I am the PSE of both worlds, Gauḍapāda now focuses on the waking world details. Those details are given in this verse. The waking world consists of the two components, subject and objects, experiencer and experienced. Between these two, we cannot really talk about the order of their creation. Whether the experiencer (*jīva*) came because of the experienced (world) or the experienced came because of the experiencer cannot be determined. Gauḍapāda says that even though really speaking, the order of *jīva*-world creation cannot be talked about, generally for the sake of understanding we start with *jīva* because the world becomes meaningful only from the standpoint of the *jīva*. The purpose of the creation can be understood only from the standpoint of the *jīva* and so we start with the *jīva* first. All the *jīvas* come into existence first. *Jīvas* require a *loka* for experiencing for exhausting their *karma* (*puṇya-pāpam*). After the creation of the *jīvas*, in keeping with the their *karma* requirements, all varieties of objects in the internal (mind and sense organs) and the external worlds are created in the waking world. Once the *jīvas* and the world have come into existence, every *jīva* goes through every experience that is available. Every experience is classified as favorable or unfavorable by the *jīvas*. Based on this classification *jīvas* develop likes and dislikes. Based on that likes-dislikes memory *jīvas* act in the world. Wherever there is attachment, *jīvas* will go after that. This is *pravṛtti*. Wherever there is aversion, *jīvas* will go away from that. This is *nivṛtti*. This cycle of experience, likes-dislikes, *pravṛtti*, and *nivṛtti* will go on and on. Therefore, Gauḍapāda says that as a person experiences and learns, so his memory of favorable and unfavorable experiences develops that lead to *pravṛtti* and *nivṛtti*. More *karma* is accumulated and rebirth happens.

Verse 17

अनिश्चिता यथा रज्जुरन्धकारे विकल्पिता ।

सर्पधारादिभिर्भावैस्तद्वदात्मा विकल्पितः ॥ १७ ॥

aniścitā yathā rajjurandhakāre vikalpitā ।

sarpadhārādibhirbhāvaistadvadātmā vikalpitaḥ ॥ 17॥

The Ātmā is mistaken just as a rope, which is not clearly known in darkness, is mistaken for various things like a snake, a streak of water, etc. (verse 17)

The waking and the dream world are *mithyā* projections and I, the *ātmā*, am the PSE. Gauḍapāda says that as long as I do not know the *ātmā*, the *mithyā* world will appear as *satyaṃ*. The dream world will be known as *mithyā* only after I wake up and understand that I am the PSE of the dream world. “Waking up” in Vedantic language is knowing that I am the PSE of the dream world. As long as I don’t wake up, I don’t know that I am the PSE. As long as I don’t know that I am the PSE, I will mistake the dream world to be *satyaṃ*. Mistaking the dream world to be *satyaṃ* will create varieties of problems expressing in the form of helplessness because of mistaking oneself to be a limited person. Helplessness leads to anger, frustration and depression. This *saṃsāra* is the result of mistaking the dream world to be *satyaṃ*. Vedānta says that the same is the story of the waking world also. Gauḍapāda diagnoses *saṃsāra* as due to the ignorance of ‘I’ as the PSE of the waking world. Mistaking the waking world as *satyaṃ*, my limitations become *satyaṃ*. Then helplessness, anger, frustration and depression follow. **The *mithyā* waking world is understood as *mithyā* only when I understand myself as the PSE.** Self-ignorance is the cause of *saṃsāra* and Self-knowledge is the solution for *saṃsāra*.

To illustrate this, Gauḍapāda gives a well-known example, which is very often quoted. Imagine there is a rope that is similar in length to a snake and curved. If there is bright light, the rope will be recognized as rope. If there is total darkness, the rope is not seen. But in partial darkness, the rope is not known as rope. However, it is known that there is something. Then any of the various objects can be projected like snake, streak of water, crack on the ground, etc. Supposing a snake is projected on to the rope and the person who is projecting is frightened. Does the snake exist or not? You cannot say that the snake does not exist because for that person who is frightened the snake exists. For the frightened projector, it is not a projection but it is an existent snake. Can you say that the snake is existent? No, because in bright light he will see only the rope. So the snake is non-existent. This unique snake is *mithyā* snake. *Mithyā* is something that does not come under the existent category or the non-existent category. *Mithyā* is seemingly existent but factually non-existent. Even if it is *mithyā*, the snake is capable of disturbing the person. *Ātmā* alone is like the rope. This *ātmā* is not clearly known as *ātmā*. If there is total ignorance there is no problem. I am not totally ignorant because I know that I am. The partial knowledge is “I am”. The total knowledge is that I am the PSE. The total knowledge is not there. The total ignorance is also not there. I have partial self-knowledge and partial self-ignorance. Because there is partial self-

knowledge, there is projection. Thus we have two *mithyā* projections, the waking world and the dream world, which are caused by self-ignorance. When the snake is frightening me, how do I get out of that problem? Similar will be the solution to the *samsāra* problem also. *Samsāra* problem is a rope-snake problem. *Samsāra* solution is rope-snake solution. What is that solution? Gauḍapāda gives the solution in the next verse.

Verse 18

निश्चितायां यथा रज्ज्वां विकल्पो विनिवर्तते ।

रज्जुरेवेति चाद्वैतं तद्वदात्मविनिश्चयः ॥ १८ ॥

niścītāyāṃ yathā rajjvāṃ vikalpo vinivartate ।

rajjureveti cādvaitaṃ tadvadātmaviniścayaḥ ॥ 18॥

When the rope is clearly known as “(this is) rope only”, (every) misperception goes away and the nondual (rope remains.) The knowledge of Ātmā (is also) like that. (verse 18)

Can you drive away the rope-snake? No, it is really not there. Can you beat the rope-snake to death? That is also not possible. You will only be beating the rope. Would chanting the *Garuḍa mantra* drive the rope snake away? No! Our fear and palpitation, etc., will go away by a simple torchlight. Where we require light we use the stick. Where we need *jñānam* we use *karma*. What a mistake? What is required is not a lot of *karma*. What is required is renunciation, renunciation of ignorance. The rope-ignorance is removed only by rope knowledge. Rope knowledge will come by using a light, which will light up the rope. Gauḍapāda says that when you clearly understand that there is only rope, which understanding requires a light, the rope snake is known to be not there in the first place. There was no snake to begin with for it to go anywhere. There was no snake in all three periods of time. If it is asked if the snake will go away after knowing the rope, it is difficult to answer that question. But for teaching it is said that there is ignorance to begin with, and after knowledge the snake will go away. After knowledge, the student understands that there was no snake to begin with. All the projections simultaneously “go away”. Gauḍapāda says that the entire waking world and *samsāra* are like the rope-snake, which is only *mithyā* and does not have an existence of its own, but is born out of ignorance. In the case of the waking world, the ignorance is of *ātmā*, the PSE, the substratum. After knowledge, rope alone remains. After *ātmā jñānam*, it is known that there is only one thing, *ātmā* and *ātmā* alone. Does it mean that *anātmā* is non-existent? We do not say it is non-existent also. It is neither existent nor non-existent. It is *mithyā*. In the same way, the *samsāra* problem will be solved only by Self-knowledge that I am the PSE. For understanding the rope, extra light was needed.

Similarly with the available instruments of knowledge we do not have complete knowledge of ourselves. Someone needs to bring a special light. For Self-knowledge, that special light is the Upaniṣads. The teaching of the Upaniṣads is, “You are not the *jīvātma*, a creature in the waking world but you are the

paramātmā, the projector of the waking world”, which is a revelation and is a *mahāvākya*. If that one *ātmā* is missed, the projections will be endless. The projections will be many if the truth is missed. Gauḍapāda says that other than Vedānta, all the other systems are projections. The other systems like *Sāṃkhya*, *Yoga*, *Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika*, *Buddhism*, and *Jainism*, etc., do not use the Upaniṣads but their own limited resources and create a lot of confusions. Gauḍapāda enumerates these confusions from the next verse onwards.

MK-25 = Chapter – 2, Verses – 19, 20

Verse 18

निश्चितायां यथा रज्ज्वां विकल्पो विनिवर्तते ।

रज्जुरेवेति चाद्वैतं तद्वदात्मविनिश्चयः ॥ १८ ॥

In the two verses, 17 and 18, Gauḍapādācārya gives the well-known example of rope-snake to reveal the nature of this universe, and thereby the essence of Vedānta. The teaching contained in the two verses should be understood and assimilated well.

The nature of the waking world is comparable to the rope-snake, which appears, and appears to be real because of the ignorance of the rope. When there is partial darkness, I see that there is something lying on the road. I have partial knowledge of something but I do not have the total knowledge that it is nothing but rope. This partial knowledge or partial ignorance is responsible for the projections of many false things like a snake, a garland, a streak of water or a crack on the earth. These are all different projections caused by partial ignorance. What is to be understood is what is the nature of this snake. Will it come under the existent category or the non-existent category? On enquiry we find that it does not come under the existent category because when you switch on the flashlight and go near, you see that there is no snake at all. At the same time it does not come under the non-existent category also because the rope-snake is sufficiently existent to cause fear, palpitations, etc. Therefore the snake is neither non-existent nor existent. The rope-snake is seemingly existent and in Vedānta it is called *mithyā*. This *mithyā* snake will cause problems to the observer. This is **point number 1**. The **second point** that is very important is that the *mithyā* snake is understood as *mithyā* snake only after knowing the rope and until the person knows the rope, the *mithyā* snake will never seem like the *mithyā* snake. For the ignorant observer, *mithyā* snake is *satya* snake only. Therefore it will cause all the problems that a *satya* snake causes. This is called suffering from fear, or mini *samsāra* caused by *mithyā* snake, which is for the time being is a *satya* snake. When does the problem go away? **The third point** is that the problem caused by *mithyā* snake will go away only by one method, which is the observer knowing the rope completely. Now he knows the rope partially. He should know the rope completely, which is the knowledge that rope is rope. In the wake of complete knowledge the problem caused by the so-called *satya* snake, which appeared *satya* till now is solved for good. So what is the solution? It is the knowledge of the substratum.

Once we understand the above three points we have to apply those to the *ātmā* also. Here, corresponding to the rope we have *ātmā*, and corresponding to snake, we have the entire *anātmā*, the waking and the dream worlds. Both the waking and the dream worlds are caused by self-ignorance. This self-ignorance is given two names contextually. In the context of the dream world, the self-ignorance is called *nidrā-śakti*. In the context of the waking world, the very same self-ignorance is called *māyā-śakti*. Since both worlds are caused by ignorance, both are *mithyā*. Then the second point that we should apply is that both the waking and the dream world are both *mithyā* all right, but for an ignorant person, the two worlds are

not seen as *mithyā*. He takes both of them as *satyaṃ* only. **For the dreamer, in dream, the dream world is *satyaṃ*. For a waker, in waking, the waking world is *satyaṃ*.** Both “*satya*” worlds are causing havoc for the ignorant person. As long as the self-ignorance is present, both the waking and the dream worlds will appear as *satyaṃ* and both of them will cause *saṃsāra* in their respective states. What is the remedy? Self-knowledge is the remedy. This knowledge is that I, the *ātmā*, should be understood as *Turīya caitanyam*. When I claim that I am *Viśva*, the waker, it is partial knowledge and it will cause problems. When I claim I am *Taijasa*, the dreamer, it is partial knowledge and it will create problems. When I claim that I am *Prāṇa*, the sleeper, it is partial knowledge and it will create problems. When I claim that I am *Turīyam*, it is complete knowledge.

When I gain complete knowledge, the waking and dream will be understood as *mithyā*. The *mithyā* world will not cause any problems like watching a movie. Even though I choose to deliberately identify with the characters in the movie and when the movie becomes overwhelming, I have the facility to invoke the higher knowledge that it is only a movie and what is there is one screen alone. I have the facility to deliberately forget that it is only a movie and identify with the movie and go through the emotions. I can also deliberately invoke the fact that it is only a movie and not be affected. This facility to see the *mithyā* as *mithyā* at will enables me to enjoy the movie. Vedānta says that life also should be converted to something very similar to a movie. I know the fact (truth) but I do not have to invoke the fact all the time. But I can choose to identify with my roles in life and enjoy the varied emotions of life. But when life becomes a meaningless, burdensome, and boring struggle, gets overwhelming, and I feel like praying to God to take me away, I should have the facility to shake off the *Viśva*, *Taijasa* and *Prāṇa* dust particles and claim that I alone was, am and will be. The whole thing is a play. I need not repeatedly tell myself all the time that this life is a play. I should enjoy life as I would a movie and give in to the emotions, but have the facility to shake everything off when I have to. This facility is obtained only through self-knowledge. That self-knowledge is “I am the PSE” knowledge: I am the projector of the waking and the dream world, I alone am the sustainer of the two worlds and I alone experience the waking world through the waking body and sense organs and the dream world through the dream body and dream sense organs.

Then Gauḍapāda says that as long as this truth is not known we will continue to mistake the *anātmā* to be *satyaṃ*. Many people including great philosophers have missed this truth either because they did not come to the Upaniṣads that alone reveal this truth or they come to the Upaniṣads but do not know how to extract the truth from the Upaniṣads. Reality is one but false conclusions can be many. Gauḍapāda lists the false conclusions in verses 19 to 28. Śaṅkarācārya did not comment on these verses but Ānandagiri, the sub-commentator, pointed out the philosophers that are talked about in these verses.

Verse 19

प्राणादिभिरनन्तैश्च भावैरेतैर्विकल्पितः ।

मायैषा तस्य देवस्य यया सम्मोहितः स्वयम् ॥ १९ ॥

prāṇādibhiranantaiśca bhāvairairvikalpitaḥ ।

māyaiṣā tasya devasya yayā sammohitaḥ svayam ॥ 19॥

The Ātmā is mistaken for the following countless things like prāna, etc. All this is the māyā of that Ātmā by which (māyā) the Ātmā itself is deluded. (verse 19)

The misconception is the glory of *māyā*. *Māyā* is so powerful that we will conclude that the truth is something somewhere. We will never think that we are the truth. Kṛṣṇa refers to the *māyā*'s power in the *Bhagavad Gita*. By this *māyā* alone the philosophers are confused. Some of them are religious philosophers believing in God and some others are atheistic.

Prāna in this verse is *Hiraṇyagarbha*, the total *prāna* principle. *Prāna* here refers to any deity of any religion. Considering such a deity as the ultimate reality is the first mistake. When we worship a deity, can we accept this deity as the ultimate truth? Is that deity an object of experience or the subject? *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad*'s fundamental teaching is that any object of experience cannot exist independent of the observer. Anything that is observed is *mithyā*. Is *Viṣṇu satyaṃ* or *mithyā*? Vedānta will not answer but will ask the question whether *Viṣṇu* is an object of experience or the subject, consciousness principle. If you say that you had a *darśanam* of *Viṣṇu*, Vedānta will say that that *Viṣṇu* is *mithyā* name and form. If you say that *Viṣṇu* is like how it is described in *Kaṭhapaniṣad* as *ātmā*, Vedānta will say that that *Viṣṇu* is *satyaṃ*. *Prāna* in this verse is any deity that is deemed as an object of experience. It has been clearly said in *Kenopaniṣad* that any deity that you meditate upon as an object is not the truth. Still many religious people think that the deity is the ultimate reality.

This is misconception number 1. Taking the form of the deities as the truth people commit a mistake. Even if this is a mistake, do not tell out that it is so because it is a useful mistake that will bless a person. During *karma-yoga* and *upāsana-yoga* stages, we do use this way of worship. Behind anything that is false, there must be the truth as the support. Every *mithyā* has *satyaṃ* supporting it. Every false movie has the real screen supporting it. So when you worship *mithyā* you unknowingly worship *satyaṃ* also. All the rituals of worship, though made to a *mithyā* deity, are indirectly directed towards the *satya ātmā*.

Verse 20

प्राण इति प्राणविदः भूतानीति च तद्विदः ।

गुणा इति गुणविदस्तत्त्वानीति च तद्विदः ॥ २० ॥

prāṇa iti prāṇavido bhūtānīti ca tadvidaḥ |

guṇā iti guṇavidastattvānīti ca tadvidaḥ || 20||

The knowers of prāṇa (consider) the prāṇa to be (the Reality) and the knowers of elements (consider) the elements to be (the Reality.) The knowers of guṇas (consider) the guṇas to be (the Reality) and the knowers of categories (consider) the categories to be (the Reality.) (verse 20)

All different types of the religious people claim that their deities are the ultimate reality. There are so many such systems in the Hindu religion itself.

The other group does not believe in God and scriptures and for them matter is ultimate reality. This is the *Cārvāka* system. They look upon the four elements as the ultimate reality. They do not include space because it is not perceptible. The proponents of the three *guṇas* consider the *guṇas* to be the ultimate reality, *prakṛti* or *pradhānam*.

Some others like those of the *śaiva siddhānta* system talk about fundamental categories and consider those categories to be the ultimate reality.

All of these people consider the *anātmā*, the observed, to be real and lose sight of I, the observer. They miss the common factor 'I'.

MK-26 = Chapter – 2, Verses 20 to 25

Verse 20

प्राण इति प्राणविदः भूतानीति च तद्विदः ।

गुणा इति गुणविदस्तत्त्वानीति च तद्विदः ॥ २० ॥

By giving the example of rope-snake, Gauḍapāda pointed out that the ignorance of the *satya vastu*, the reality, would lead to the projection of *mithyā vastu* just as the ignorance of the real rope leads to the projection of the *mithyā* snake. Similarly, the ignorance of the real *vastu*, *ātmā*, leads to the projection of the *mithyā vastu*, *anātmā*. Anātmā was divided into the waking world and the dream world. Both of them are *mithyā*, projected because of self-ignorance. We use only two different words in two different contexts. When we talk about the projection of the dream world, the self-ignorance is called *nidrā-śakti* and in the case of the waking world projection, the same self-ignorance is called *māyā-śakti*. The next point is that *mithyā* will be understood as *mithyā* only after gaining the knowledge. The rope-snake will be understood as *mithyā* only after the knowledge of the rope. During the time of ignorance no one takes the rope-snake to be as *mithyā*. During the time of ignorance *mithyā* is *satyaṃ*. Therefore, as long as self-ignorance continues, *anātmā mithyā* will appear as *satyaṃ* only. With this self-ignorance, many people try to find out the reality. They look for the truth amidst the *anātmā* world. They will never succeed because the entire *anātmā* world is *mithyā*. The truth happens to be the very person who is looking for the truth. He never even remotely imagines that he can be the truth of the creation. Therefore all the other philosophers will never find the truth in the *anātmā* that they are searching in. They take one *anātmā* or the other to be the ultimate truth according to their temperament. If I am a money crazy person, for me money will be the truth. One who is a glutton, food will be his truth. Each one will consider some *anātmā* to be the truth. As many philosophers there are, so many mistakes are there.

The first mistake is the one made by all the religious people. Religion is wonderful if it brings one to Vedānta. Every theology is a mistake because every religion talks about one deity or the other and take the deity as an object of experience. For them, the deity is in a remote place, and if the *bhakta* prays, the deity will come, give *darśanam* and go away. The arriving and departing deity is *anātmā* and that deity is conditional reality. Not knowing this, each religion quarrels with the other. Gauḍapāda says that all of them are mistaken. When you study Vedānta, you get the teaching that that *Viṣṇu* that you worship is the very *ātmā*. Kṛṣṇa says in the *Bhagavad Gita*: “I am the Self, who resides in the hearts of all beings.” The real Kṛṣṇa is not a person outside but is the *ātmā* in everyone. Kṛṣṇa further said, “Seeing my human form many people think that the human Kṛṣṇa is the ultimate reality”. If they consider Kṛṣṇa’s form is the reality, Kṛṣṇa himself says that they are ignorant. But we worship Kṛṣṇa outside to get the qualifications for Self-Knowledge. The outside Kṛṣṇa is only a projection of Kṛṣṇa inside. One will know this when one studies Vedānta. It is similar to the unknown in a mathematical calculation which when solved gives the right answer for the unknown.

The first mistake is *prāna*, which refers to the religious deity seen as an object outside. The warning that Gauḍapāda gives is that this information should not be given out indiscriminately. Vedānta is dangerous if it is not received by a mature mind. Lord Kṛṣṇa said, “Do not confuse the religious people talking about Vedānta without preparing them.” What is the preparation? Start with *Tattvabodha*, and go through *Bhagavad Gita*, *Muṇḍaka*, *Kena*, *Kaṭha*, and *Kaivalya Upaniṣads* and only after that, this particular fact should be taught in *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad*. Any deity outside is not the ultimate reality. The other mistakes are the *anātmā*: elements, *guṇas* and categories.

Verse 21

पादा इति पादविदः विषया इति तद्विदः ।

लोका इति लोकविदः देवा इति च तद्विदः ॥ २१ ॥

pādā iti pādavidō viṣayā iti tadvidah |

lokā iti lokavidō devā iti ca tadvidah || 21||

The knowers of the pādas (consider) the pādas to be (the Reality.) The knowers of sense-objects (consider) the sense-objects to be (the Reality.) The knowers of the worlds (consider) the worlds to be (the Reality) and the knowers of gods (consider) the gods to be (the Reality.) (verse 21)

There are some other philosophers who study the four *pādas* of the *ātmā* in *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad* and conclude that all the four *pādas* are the ultimate reality. People given to sense pleasures think that life is a series of sense enjoyments and consider the sense objects to be the ultimate truth. Whatever gives happiness alone is the truth is the conclusion of the materialistic and consumption-oriented people. The *paurāṇic* people consider the various *lokas* described in the *purāṇas* to be the ultimate truth. Various *devatās* and deities mentioned in the Vedas that are meditated upon by the *upāsakas* are considered to be the truth by them.

Verse 22

वेदा इति वेदविदः यज्ञा इति च तद्विदः ।

भोक्तेति च भोक्त्रविदः भोज्यमिति च तद्विदः ॥ २२ ॥

vedā iti vedavidō yajñā iti ca tadvidah |

bhokteti ca bhoktrvidō bhojyamiti ca tadvidah || 22||

The knowers of the Vedas (consider) the Vedas to be (the Reality) and the knowers of yajnas (consider) the yajnas to be (the Reality.) The knowers of the enjoyer (consider) the enjoyer to be (the Reality) and the knowers of the object of enjoyment (consider) the object of enjoyment to be (the Reality.) (verse 22)

The people who are committed to Vedic learning and chanting and are not even interested in knowing the meaning consider the Vedas to be the ultimate reality. Vedic chanting is for mental purification. Veda itself is *anātmā*. The ultimate truth is beyond the knower, known and the means of knowledge.

Some learn the meaning of the Vedic *mantras*. They love doing rituals and ultimately get obsessed with the ritualistic way of life and are not able to go beyond that life. They consider rituals as the truth.

Some philosophers like the *Sāṃkhya* philosophers are peculiar ones. They say that *ātmā* is a non-doer but *ātman* is the experiencer. How can the non-doer be the experiencer? These people say that the experiencer *ātman* is the reality. Some others think that objects of enjoyment are the ultimate reality.

Verse 23

सूक्ष्म इति सूक्ष्मविदः स्थूल इति च तद्विदः ।

मूर्त इति मूर्तविदोऽमूर्त इति च तद्विदः ॥ २३ ॥

sūkṣma iti sūkṣmavidaḥ sthūla iti ca tadvidaḥ ।

mūrta iti mūrtavido'mūrta iti ca tadvidaḥ ॥ 23॥

The knowers of the subtle (consider the Reality) to be subtle and the knowers of the gross (consider the Reality) to be gross. The knowers of deities with forms (consider) the deity to be (the Reality) and the knowers of the formless (consider the Reality) to be formless. (verse 23)

Some philosophers like *Nyāya-Vaiśeṣikas* view the atoms as the ultimate reality. This is similar to the modern scientific thinking. Some others, the *aṇu-ātmā* proponents say that atoms are the ultimate truth but not the *paramāṇu* (atom), the matter. But *ātmā*, which is of the size of *paramāṇu* is the ultimate truth. The material *paramāṇu* is not the truth but the *ātmā paramāṇu* is the ultimate truth. *Digambara* Jains hold this view. They take some of the Upaniṣad statements that contain the expression ‘*ātmā aṇu*’ for the support of their view. The literal meaning taken by these people is not warranted because the very same Upaniṣad says that *ātmā* is all pervading. In the Upaniṣad the word ‘*aṇu*’ does not refer to the size of *ātmā* but to not being available for sensory perception. Another group of Jain philosophers say that *ātmā* is the truth and is of the size of the body. Some consider various *mūrtis*, idols for worship to be the reality. In *Vaiṣṇavism*, this is called *arcāvatāra*. The inert idols are God, the ultimate reality for them. A finite sculpture cannot be the ultimate truth. Another extreme to this is the Buddhist *Śūnyavādis*. They say that the formless, emptiness called *śūnyam* is called the ultimate reality. The *śūnyavādi* says that he is *śūnyam* also. This Buddhist system will be studied in chapter 4.

Verse 24

काल इति कालविदः दिश इति च तद्विदः ।

वादा इति वादविदः भुवनानीति तद्विदः ॥ २४ ॥

kāla iti kālavido diśa iti ca tadvidah ।

vādā iti vādavido bhuvanānīti tadvidah ॥ 24॥

The knowers of time (consider) the time to be (the Reality) and the knowers of directions (consider) the directions to be (the Reality.) The knowers of theories (consider) the theories to be (the Reality.) The knowers of the worlds (consider) the worlds to be (the Reality.) (verse 24)

Some people who are astrologers consider time to be important to the extent that for them even *mokṣa* is dependent on time. For these people, there is a right time to do everything. They take time to be the reality. For some, direction is the truth. These people choose the right direction for everything. The alchemists take the materials that they use in their profession to be the ultimate truth. Some who know the different spheres of existence take them to be the reality.

Verse 25

मन इति मनोविदः बुद्धिरिति च तद्विदः ।

चित्तमिति चित्तविदः धर्माधर्मौ च तद्विदः ॥ २५ ॥

mana iti manovido buddhiriti ca tadvidah ।

cittamiti cittavido dharmādharmau ca tadvidah ॥ 25॥

The knowers of the mind (consider) the mind to be (the Reality) and the knowers of the intellect (consider) the intellect to be (the Reality.) The knowers of citta (consider) the citta to be (the Reality) and the knowers of dharma and adharmā (consider) dharma and adharmā to be (the Reality.) (verse 25)

Gauḍapāda lists the internal *anātmā*. Some philosophers take the mind to be the ultimate reality. They say that everything is in the mind. Some others, Buddhists, consider that knowledge is important and for them, the intellect is the ultimate truth. Some others, psychologists, consider that the subconscious or the unconscious is the truth. The *mīmāṃsaka* philosophers consider that everything is *karma*. For them, *dharma*, *adharmā*, *punya* and *pāpa* are the ultimate truth.

MK-27 = Chapter – 2, Verses – 25 to 30

Verse 25

मन इति मनोविदः बुद्धिरिति च तद्विदः ।

चित्तमिति चित्तविदः धर्माधर्मौ च तद्विदः ॥ २५ ॥

Gauḍapādācārya continues with the misconceptions held by so many different groups of people because of a fundamental ignorance, the ignorance of I myself as the *Turīya Ātmā*. One truth is missed, and misconceptions are many. The truth of *Turīyam Ātmā* is PSE. I am the projector and sustainer and I am the experiencer of whatever I projected with the help of a relevant body, the dream world through the dream body and the waking world through the waking body. The bodies themselves are projections. Using the projected bodies I experience the projected universe. When this truth is missed, so many *anātmās* are mistaken as *ātmā*, the reality. Until now, various misconceptions with regard to the external world were pointed out.

Now Gauḍapāda comes to some of the misconceptions regarding the internal world. Many people say that the world is only a projection. Who is the projector? Instead of saying that I, the *ātmā*, am the projector they say that the mind is the projector of everything. Buddhism committed the mistake of taking the mind as the projector. They also say that everything is in the mind only. If they make that statement, it is acceptable but they conclude that the mind is the ultimate reality. *Kṣaṇika-vijñāna vāda* takes the mind as the ultimate truth.

Within the mind itself there are three components taken. Different people give importance to different component of the mind.

One group gives importance to the emotional aspect of the mind. All the people who love emotions never like Vedānta. They like only a religion in which love of the Lord is important. They love to love the Lord as a person and the Lord to love them. This is *prema bhakti*. They even pray to the Lord not to take them to Vedānta. But the Lord will bring them to Vedānta eventually.

The rational intellectual people who analyze everything logically consider *buddhi* is the ultimate reality. Another group considers *cittam*, the subconscious or unconscious mind as the reality. They say that everything is governed by *karma* or *vāsanās*. They are *vāsanā-pradhāna* people. Everything is explained by *vāsanā*. Even the dream is analyzed for the *vāsanā* and through the *vāsanā* analysis they arrive at the nature of the individual. For all the psychologists, the inner unconscious mind is important and they say that 90% of a person's life is governed by the unconscious. Some other people who are *mīmāṃsakas* say that things do not depend on your mind, intellect or *cittam* but depend on the past *punya-pāpa karma* only.

Verse 26

पञ्चविंशक इत्येके षड्विंश इति चापरे ।

एकत्रिंशक इत्याहुरनन्त इति चापरे ॥ २६ ॥

pañcaviṁśaka ityeke ṣaḍviṁśa cāpare ।

ekatriṁśaka ityāhurananta iti cāpare ॥ 26॥

Some say that (Reality consists of) twenty five (categories.) Others (say) that (it consists of) twenty six (categories.) (Some others say) that (it consists of) thirty one (categories.) Yet others (say) that (it consists of) countless (categories.) (verse 26)

There are some systems of philosophies that reduce the entire world into principles or categories and they say that these principles alone have joined together in various proportions to evolve as the universe. *Sāṃkhya* system enumerates 25 *tattvams* but does not include *Īśvara*. For them there are many *jīvātmas* but no *paramātma*. Yoga system includes all the 25 *tattvams* of *Sāṃkhya* but adds *Īśvara tattvam* and yoga system has 26 *tattvams*. Another group called *pāśupata*, a *śaiva* system, adds five more and end up with 31 *tattvams*. There are some other systems that say the *tattvas* are infinite in number.

Verse 27

लोकाल्लोकविदः प्राहुराश्रमा इति तद्विदः ।

स्त्रीपुंनपुंसकं लैङ्गः परापरमथापरे ॥ २७ ॥

lokāल्लोकविदाः प्राहुराश्रमा इति तद्विदाः ।

strīpuṅnapuṃsakam laiṅgāḥ parāparamathāpare ॥ 27॥

The knowers of the people declare (the pleasures of) the people to be (the Reality.) The knowers of the stages of life (consider) the stages of life to be (the Reality.) The knowers of genders (consider) the masculine, feminine, and neuter (words to be the Reality) and others (consider) the higher and the lower Brahman (to be the Reality.) (verse 27)

Ordinary people of the world consider the different *lokas* that we experience as the ultimate reality. For a dreamer, the dream world is his reality. There are people that are so much obsessed with the four *āśramas* that are discussed in the *dharma śāstra*. For them, everything in life is governed by one's status, *āśrama* in life, and therefore the *āśramas* are reality for them. They do not realize that *āśramas* are only stepping-stones to liberation and not ends in themselves. For grammarians, words are more important than the objects. They are obsessed with grammar rules and the genders of the words and these become the reality for them. There are some other people who consider that *param-brahma* and *aparam-brahma* together to be ultimate reality. *Saguṇa-nirguṇātmaka* Brahman is the ultimate truth for

these people. For Vedānta, *nirguṇam Brahman* is the ultimate truth. *Saguṇam Brahman* includes *māyā* in it and so *saguṇam Brahman* cannot be the ultimate truth.

Verse 28

सृष्टिरिति सृष्टिविदः लय इति च तद्विदः ।

स्थितिरिति स्थितिविदः सर्वे चेह तु सर्वदा ॥ २८ ॥

sr̥ṣṭirīti sr̥ṣṭivido laya iti ca tadvidah |

sthitirīti sthitividaḥ sarve ceḥa tu sarvadā || 28||

The knowers of creation (consider) the creation to be (the Reality) and the knowers of dissolution (consider) the dissolution to be (the Reality.) The knowers of sustenance (consider) the sustenance to be (the Reality.) All these are ever (projected) on this (Ātmā.) (verse 28)

There are some people who are obsessed with *sr̥ṣṭi*, some with *sthati* and some others with *laya*. Every object is associated with all these three all the time. Life is a series of all these three. None of these can be the ultimate truth. In the momentary fleeting universe, none of these three can be the truth.

Gauḍapāda says in short that every group has one misconception of the truth or the other. The common mistake that is made is that something or the other is the truth but they never imagine that “I am the truth of all”. Upaniṣads alone teach this. Everyone analyzes everything in the world but never analyzes the analyzer. The analyzer can never be analyzed, because the analyzer has to become an object. But the subject can never become an object. Yājñavalkya to Maitreyi in *Bṛhadāranyaka Upaniṣad*: “How will you observe the observer and with what instrument?” Nobody thinks of asking the question, “Who am I?” Because this question is not asked, one *anātmā* or the other is taken as reality. People are all the time running after *anātmā* and that is the glory of *māyā*. But there is a silver lining in all this. Gauḍapāda says that all are not lost but there is hope. That is described in the next important verse.

Verse 29

यं भावं दर्शयेद्यस्य तं भावं स तु पश्यति ।

तं चावति स भूत्वाऽसौ तद्गृहः समुपैति तम् ॥ २९ ॥

yaṃ bhāvaṃ darśayedasya taṃ bhāvaṃ sa tu paśyati |

taṃ cāvati sa bhūtvā'sau tadgṛahaḥ samupaiti tam || 29||

One sees that thing (as the Reality) which thing (a teacher) shows him. Having become one with him, it protects him. Firm conviction in that possesses him. (verse 29)

Gauḍapāda says that every human being is exposed to one view or the other right from early life in the form of *Bhagavān* as one particular deity or the other by the parents or teacher. That deity becomes the only God for a particular person. The human mind gets *bhakti* in the form of strong emotion by constant association with a particular deity. Gauḍapāda respects this *bhakti*. He says that deity will certainly protect that devotee because of his sincere devotion. That devotion will bless the person irrespective of what that deity is. That deity will protect the devotee by becoming one with him because of the devotee's constant devotion. As the person thinks so the person becomes. Great *upāsakas* develop behavior and attitudes of the *upāśya* deity. The devotee's faith in that deity will increase more and more. That intense devotion, passion and obsession will take over the devotee. Kṛṣṇa said in the 7th chapter of the *Bhagavad Gita*: "Let any *bhakta* worship the Lord in any form, I will never disappoint that person in the form of his chosen deity." The devotee will be blessed even though the devotion is based on the mistake of considering the *anātmā* deity as the truth. The ultimate *Bhagavān* is considered as an object. But that *bhakti* will bless him by bringing him to Vedānta. The very liking for Vedānta is the grace of the Lord, which we have mistaken as an object.

Verse 30

एतैरेषोऽपृथग्भावैः पृथगेवेति लक्षितः ।

एवं यो वेद तत्त्वेन कल्पयेत्सोऽविशङ्कितः ॥ ३० ॥

etaireṣo'pṛthagbhāvaiḥ pṛthageveti lakṣitaḥ ।

evaṃ yo veda tattvena kalpayetso'viśaṅkitaḥ ॥ 30॥

This (Ātmā) is considered to be separate from these objects which are (really) not separate (from the Ātmā.) One who really knows thus expounds (the Vedas) with clarity. (verse 30)

This is a profound verse but can be a disturbing verse for an unprepared mind. The entire *anātmā* world is *mithyā* and therefore it cannot exist independent of *ātmā*. *Ātmā* is described in mantra 7 as *Turīya Ātmā*. That *Turīya Ātmā* is I. The *mithyā* world does not exist independent of I, the *Turīya Ātmā*. Included in the *anātmā* world are all the deities that people worship. These deities are *mithyā* as *anātmā*, whatever the form of the deity. None of these deities can ever exist separate from I, the *ātmā*. Those deities actually depend upon I, the *ātmā*. Gauḍapāda says that people do not know this *rāja vidyā rāja guhyam*, the greatest secret. Many people do not know this and many are not prepared to know this because it requires tremendous intellectual courage to accept this fact. Gauḍapāda's teaching is one step higher than the *soham* teaching in which God and I are one. Gauḍapāda says that God as an object *anātmā* is dependent on me, the *ātmā*. This teaching is not for a beginner.

Many people think that *ātmā* and *anātmā* exist separately and independently even though the *anātmā* world does not exist independently. The dreamer in dream looks upon the dream world as existing

independently but when he wakes up, the dream world resolves into him, the observer. The fundamental truth is that the observed does not exist independent of the observer. Anything observed, ordinary or extraordinary, secular or sacred cannot exist independent of the *Turīyam Ātmā*, the observer. One who can comfortably claim the following (*Kaivalyopaniṣad*) is the one who truly understands:

mayyeva sakalaṃ jātaṃ mayi sarvaṃ pratiṣṭhitam ।

mayi sarvaṃ layaṃ yāti tadbrahmādvayamasmyaham ॥ 19॥

Everything is born in me alone; everything is based on me alone; everything resolves into me alone. I am that non-dual Brahman. (19)

I am the *sthiti-laya-kāraṇam*. *Kārya* world does not exist separate from I, the *kāraṇam*. Thus one who understands this alone has understood the scriptures properly. He alone has understood the final message of the entire Vedas. No doubt the Vedas start with *bhakta-Bhagavān* duality but it is only the starting point and not the ending point. One who has understood this truth alone is the one who has understood Vedānta.

MK-28 = Chapter – 2, Verses – 30 to 33

Verse 30

एतैरेषोऽपृथग्भावेः पृथगेवेति लक्षितः ।

एवं यो वेद तत्त्वेन कल्पयेत्सोऽविशङ्कितः ॥ ३० ॥

Gauḍapādācārya established that the waking world is also *mithyā* exactly like the dream world and both of them are my own projections caused by self-ignorance just like there is a snake projection caused by rope-ignorance. In the context of the dream world, the self-ignorance is known as *nidrā-śakti* and in the context of the waking world the self-ignorance is called *māyā-śakti*. In both cases, when I use the word self-ignorance, ‘self’ refers to *Turīya ātmā*. Both the worlds will be known to be *mithyā* when I wake up to my real nature. Awakening from *nidrā* will happen naturally. In the case of *māyā-śakti* and the waking world, the awakening required is spiritual awakening, which will not naturally happen even if one goes through many lifetimes. It requires a deliberate effort.

When we have a general awakening, the dream world is known as *mithyā* and the dream world disappears for me. Whereas when there is spiritual awakening from *māyā-śakti*, the waking world is falsified but it does not disappear. It will continue for the awakened person, he experiences it, but knows that it is *mithyā*. Once the waking world is known to be *mithyā*, the awakened person knows that it does not exist separate from him just like the dream world. The dream world *anātmā*, the waking world *anātmā*, or any *anātmā* does not exist separate from me, the *ātmā*, the PSE. Even different deities we worship are also *anātmā* as long as they are objects of worship. Even they do not exist separate from me, the *ātmā*. Gauḍapāda says that whoever knows the fact that no *anātmā* exists separate from *ātmā* understands Vedānta. Every thing depends on me and I do not depend on anything. A person who understands and assimilates the Vedānta scriptures is alone fit to be the ideal *guru*. The one who knows that he is PSE in reality, he alone can teach the Upaniṣads to other people very clearly without any doubt.

Even after the *advaita jñānam*, the *jñāni* continues to be in the waking world. All the transactions continue for him as before, which he participates in but considers them to be necessary for his roles in life and not for who he is in reality. For such a *jñāni*, is there *Īśvara* worship as before? If a *jñāni* can play various transactional roles with various transactional identities, why can’t he play another role as a transactional *bhakta*? He plays the role with the understanding that it is only a role but does not have the attitude of a *saṃsāri*. It is an appreciation of *māyā* without a sense of *saṃsāra*. If a *jñāni* can enjoy various worldly things, the *jñāni* can enjoy *bhakti* also. There is no denial of *vyāvahārika dvaita bhakti*. There is no threat to *dvaita bhakti* after *advaita jñānam*. It is like watching a movie with the knowledge that it is only a movie. Even though I know that it is only a movie, it does not deny me the enjoyment of the movie. *Advaita satyatvam* and *dvaita mithyātvam* need not be repeated. I can continue *dvaita vyavahāra* and I can invoke the *advaita* knowledge at will. One of the greatest *advaitins*, Madhusūdana

Sarasvatī says that *dvaita bhakti* is tastier after *advaita jñānam* than before that *jñānam*. *Dvaitam* is a cause of *saṃsāra* only before knowledge. After enquiry and the *advaita jñānam*, the *dvaita bhakti* can continue not as for a *saṃsāri* but a *mukta puruṣa*.

Verse 31

स्वप्नमाये यथा दृष्टे गन्धर्वनगरं यथा ।

तथा विश्वमिदं दृष्टं वेदान्तेषु विचक्षणैः ॥ ३१ ॥

svapnamāye yathā dr̥ṣṭe gandharvanagaram yathā ।

tathā viśvamidam dr̥ṣṭam vedānteṣu vicakṣaṇaiḥ ॥ 31॥

In (the light of) the Vedantic statements, this universe is seen by the wise (people) in the same way as dream and magic are seen (or) as the city in the sky (is seen.) (verse 31)

Here, Gauḍapāda shows the difference between awakening from the dream world and awakening from the waking world. An *advaita jñāni* will have *dvaita* experience. *Advaita jñāni's advaitam* is not the absence of *dvaitam* but in spite of *dvaitam*. He will continue to experience *dvaitam* but he will know that the essence is one with different names and forms. How will the *jñāni* remember this fact? Gauḍapāda gives three examples. He has the understanding within. Gauḍapāda says later that the *jñāni* should live like the other people. Do not keep saying to people that they are name and form, the world is *mithyā* and they are PSE. Just as the other people are ignorant, the *jñāni* should act like them. This may require putting on a façade to maintain harmony in the society. This is not hypocrisy because the façade is not for cheating others but for maintaining harmony. The *jñāni* knows *advaitam* but he lives like the *ajñāni dvaitin*.

Like the dream world, the magician's creation, or a seeming city in the sky when there are cloud formations, which are all only appearances, in the same way from the standpoint of *Turīyam*, this entire creation is also seen as a *mithyā* appearance by those people who are experts in Vedantic teaching. For them it is not just a teaching anymore but it has become a fact.

Verse 32

न निरोधो न चोत्पत्तिर्न बद्धो न च साधकः ।

न मुमुक्षुर्न वै मुक्त इत्येषा परमार्थता ॥ ३२ ॥

na nirodho na cotpattirna baddho na ca sādhaḥ ।

na mumukṣurna vai mukta ityeṣā paramārthatā ॥ 32॥

There is no dissolution, no creation, none who is bound, none who strives (for liberation,) none who seeks liberation, and none who is liberated – this is the absolute truth. (verse 32)

This verse is a corollary of the previous verse. It is a profound and often a disturbing verse. For a *jñāni*, the waking world is also exactly like the dream world only. What does it mean? Let us look at the dream world first. When we are in the dream world we see many events happening. They all appear real in dream. From the dreamer's standpoint, all the dream events are really taking place. But when the dreamer wakes up, from the standpoint of the waker, it is realized that all the dream events did not really take place. They all seemingly happened but factually they did not happen. If this is understood with respect to the dream world, Gauḍapāda says that that understanding should be extended to the waking world also.

The creation, sustenance, and dissolution of the waking world only seemingly happen but really they do not happen from the standpoint of *Turīya ātmā*. From the waker's standpoint they are real. *Jīvas* coming into existence, experiencing *saṃsāra*, *jīvas* becoming seekers, following the *sādhanas karma-yoga*, *upāsana-yoga* and *jnana-yoga*, coming to a *guru*, *guru* teaching, and getting liberated only seemingly happen. There is no question of anyone becoming liberated. **From the standpoint of the body-mind complex, all these are really happening but from the standpoint of *Turīyam*, all these are as though happening.**

Are *sādhanas* required to get *mokṣa*? The question is asked from the standpoint of the body-mind complex. So the answer should be that the *sādhanas* are necessary to gain the knowledge of *Turīyam ātmā*. From the body's standpoint, the world is real but from the *Turīyam*'s standpoint it is as good as non-existent. If a dreamer is chased by a dream dog in dream, the advice that should be given to him in dream is to run away from the dog to avoid being bitten. The standpoint should be very clear otherwise Vedānta gets confusing. People get into confusion because they do not remember the standpoint of reference.

Verse 33

भावैरसद्भिरेवायमद्वयेन च कल्पितः ।

भावा अप्यद्वयेनैव तस्मादद्वयता शिवा ॥ ३३ ॥

bhāvairasadbhirevāyamadvayena ca kalpitaḥ ।

bhāvā apyadvayenaiva tasmāadvayatā śivā ॥ 33॥

This (Ātmā) is imagined as the unreal objects and as the non-dual (substratum.) But, the (unreal) objects (exist) because of the non-dual (substratum) only. Therefore, non-duality is auspicious. (verse 33)

This is another profound verse. *Turīyam* is the PSE of the waking world and the dream world. Since the two worlds are *mithyā dvaita* worlds, *Turīyam* is called *advaita adhiṣṭhānam*, the supporter of the *dvaita* world. It is called so only from the standpoint of the *mithyā dvaita* world and once you negate the *dvaita*

mithyā world, *Turīyam* cannot be called *advaita adhiṣṭhānam* also. The word *adhiṣṭhānam* is applicable only from the standpoint of the *mithyā dvaita* world.

The rope is the support of the rope-snake when a person experiences the rope-snake. From the standpoint of the false rope-snake, the rope is called the *adhiṣṭhānam* of the rope-snake because rope alone lends existence to the snake. Whatever borrows existence is called *mithyā* and whatever lends existence is called *adhiṣṭhānam*. Now Gauḍapāda says that the word *adhiṣṭhānam* is used only from the standpoint of the *mithyā* snake. If the snake is negated in better lighting, the snake is known to be non-existent and was only an appearance. Once the snake is negated, can one call the rope the *adhiṣṭhānam*? *Adhiṣṭhānam* is *adhiṣṭhānam* only from the standpoint of the snake when it was borrowing existence. When the snake has been negated, the rope cannot be called *adhiṣṭhānam* also. Even the word *advaita adhiṣṭhānam* is only from the standpoint of the *dvaita* world, the empirical angle. From the absolute angle, *Turīyam* cannot be called *advaita adhiṣṭhānam* also. A *guru* can be called a *guru* as long as there are disciples in front. When the disciples are gone, the *guru* cannot have the status of *guru*. Similarly *Turīyam* can have the status of *adhiṣṭhānam* only as long as you accept a *dvaita* world. When the *dvaita* world itself is negated, *Turīyam* does not have the status of *adhiṣṭhānam* also. Therefore, you cannot call it *adhiṣṭhānam*. Then what do you call it? No name is possible because every name is in relation to something or the other. Since there is no second thing, *Turīyam* does not have any name. That is why it was said in *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad* that *Viśva* is represented by the letter ‘a’, *Taijasa* by the letter ‘u’, *Prājña* by ‘m’ and *Turīyam* is represented by silence. *Therefore Turīyam is neither dvaitam nor advaitam also.*

MK-29 = Chapter – 2, Verses – 33 to 35

Verse 33

भावैरसद्भिरेवायमद्वयेन च कल्पितः ।

भावा अप्यद्वयेनैव तस्मादद्वयता शिवा ॥ ३३ ॥

In verse 32, Gauḍapāda pointed out that from the standpoint of the absolute reality, duality does not exist at all. Therefore, there is no creation, sustenance, dissolution, *saṃsāri*, seeker, *sādhaka*, *sādhana*, *jñānam*, and *mokṣa*. All these are negated from the standpoint of absolute reality. There is no bondage or liberation.

This one absolute reality called *Turīyam* itself is available in two versions or two forms at our experiential plane. Those two versions are: *mithyā dvaita* world that we are experiencing, *mithyā* because it has only borrowed existence; and *satya advaita adhiṣṭhānam* because for the *mithyā dvaita* world to borrow existence, there should be something to lend existence. That lender of existence is called *satya advaita adhiṣṭhānam*. If both these versions of the absolute reality belong to the experiential plane only, why is *advaitam* superior? Both belong to the same status. Gauḍapāda says that both *advaitam* and *dvaitam* belong to the experiential plane, but only *advaita adhiṣṭhānam* is the lender of existence and the *dvaita* world is the borrower of existence and therefore, *advaitam* is superior because it does not borrow existence. Whatever that has non-borrowed original independent existence, which is *satya adhiṣṭhānam*, must be superior. Then, what should one hold on to in the experiential plane? One should hold on to the *advaita adhiṣṭhānam* only, which is the knowledge, “I am Brahman”. The *dvaita* world exists in the experiential plane supported only by *advaita adhiṣṭhānam*. Enjoy the *dvaita* world but do not hold on to it. Relationships will come and go, youth will come and go. Do not hold on to these, but hold on to the *advaita adhiṣṭhānam*. That is *jīvanmukti*.

From the *vyāvahārika dṛṣṭi*, one Brahman is available as *dvaita mithyā* world and *advaita satya adhiṣṭhānam*. Then what about *pāramārthika dṛṣṭi*? From the absolute reality standpoint, both are negated but in a slightly different form. The *mithyā dvaita* world is totally negated. The *advaita satya adhiṣṭhānam* is not totally negated, **but we negate only the status of *adhiṣṭhānam***, the name is negated. Brahman is not negated but we only negate the name *satyaṃ* because the word *satyaṃ* is only with respect to the *mithyā* world. When the *mithyā* world is negated, the descriptor *satyaṃ* is negated. Similarly, when *dvaita* world is negated, *advaitam* will not be negated but only the word *advaitam* is negated because that word is only from the standpoint of *dvaitam*. The word *adhiṣṭhānam* is similarly taken away because it is applicable only from the standpoint of what is supported, the *mithyā* world. When the rope-snake is seen, the rope is called *adhiṣṭhānam*. But when the snake is negated, the rope is not the *adhiṣṭhānam* anymore and so, that name *adhiṣṭhānam* is withdrawn. The word *advaitam* is also removed because *dvaitam* is negated. **The absolute reality cannot have any names.** The words, *satyaṃ*, *caitanyaṃ* (only with respect to the inert universe), *advaitam*, *adhiṣṭhānam* are all gone. What then is there? **Truth is there without even the word truth. That is why we say silence is reality.** Even

that word silence is from the standpoint of sound. Therefore the *dvaita* world is totally negated and the *satya advaita adhiṣṭhānam* is negated from the standpoint of its name but the *adhiṣṭhānam* itself will continue to be there without the name *adhiṣṭhānam*.

Verse 34

नाऽऽत्मभावेन नानेदं न स्वेनापि कथञ्चन ।

न पृथङ्नापृथक्किञ्चिदिति तत्त्वविदो विदुः ॥ ३४ ॥

nā''tmabhāvena nānedam na svenāpi kathañcana ।

na pṛthannāpṛthakkiñciditi tattvavido viduḥ ॥ 34॥

This plurality does not (exist) as identical with the Ātmā: nor (does it exist) on any account by itself. An object is neither different nor non-different (from another.) Thus the knowers of the Reality understand. (verse 34)

This is another profound verse. At the empirical level, this world is called the *mithyā* world. How should we understand *mithyā*? The toughest thing in Vedānta is intellectually grasping the idea of *mithyā*. Vedānta gives several definitions to help us understand *mithyā*. The dream world does not come under the category of either existent or non-existent but comes under the seemingly existent category. The dream world cannot be said to be non-existent because we experience it in dream. The dream world cannot be said to be existent because the moment we wake up we find that the dream world disappears without a trace. If it is existent, it must be available all the time. *Mithyā* is neither existent nor non-existent. (*sad-asad-vilakṣaṇam*)

Gauḍapāda gives another definition for the *mithyā* world, otherwise called *anātmā*. *Anātmā* is called *mithyā* because you cannot say that it is identical with *ātmā* and you cannot say that it is different from *ātmā* also. It is seemingly existent but is not available for any definition. *Mithyā* is not identical or different. You cannot say that *anātmā* is identical with *ātmā* because *anātmā* is inert, subject to modifications whereas *ātmā* is consciousness and free from modifications. They cannot be one and the same. Why not then have two different things consciousness and matter? Gauḍapāda says no. One has to look at the definition of *ātmā*, *sat-cit-ānanda*. The first word is *sat* and thus *ātmā* is defined as existent. If you say *anātmā* is different from *ātmā*, it will mean that *anātmā* is different from 'sat' meaning that it is non-existent. Anything that is different from *ātmā* cannot exist because *ātmā* being *sat* anything other than *ātmā* will be *asat*, non-existent. This would mean that any *anātmā* will be non-existent. Therefore one cannot say that *anātmā* is different from *ātmā* also. ***Anātmā is neither identical nor different from ātmā like the rope-snake is neither identical with rope nor different from the rope.*** Rope-snake is not identical with the rope because the snake is sentient and the rope is insentient. Rope-snake is not different from rope because the snake cannot exist apart from the rope. *Anātmā* is *bhinnatva-abhinnatva vilakṣaṇam*. This is the second definition of *mithyā*. Śaṅkarācārya says in *Vivekacūḍāmaṇi*:

“*Anātmā (māyā) cannot be said as real or non-existent or combination of real and non-existent; is not separate or non-separate from Brahman nor combined in nature of separate and non-separate; does not have parts nor is part-less nor combined in nature. She is a great wonder and cannot be categorically explained.*” (111)

The pluralistic universe does not exist identical with *ātmā* nor does it exist by itself separate from *ātmā*. It is indefinable and inexplicable like the rope-snake or the dream world.

Thereafter, Gauḍapāda makes another more profound statement. One needs to meditate on this statement to fully grasp the meaning. We are experiencing so many objects in front of us. Each object is different from each other. We are experiencing plurality and we see everything different from everything else. Therefore, we are experiencing difference everywhere in life. Vedānta asks what is the nature of difference? Upon enquiry, **difference is also *mithyā***. Why? **We experience difference but we cannot prove difference as a fact.** Blue sky is experientially available but it is factually not there. Difference is experientially available but it cannot be factually proved. If you have to prove something, you have to show a relevant *pramāṇam* or evidence. What cannot be proved by *pramāṇam* cannot be accepted as fact. What *pramāṇam* is there to prove difference? The tradition says that no *pramāṇam* is present to prove difference. We are experiencing difference everywhere but there is no *pramāṇam* to prove it. All our sense organs are meant to see sound, touch, form, taste or smell. Difference or *bheda* does not come under any of these five categories. Difference does not have sound, touch, form, taste or smell. Difference is a concept we have. Since difference does not have any attributes, *pratyakṣa* does not prove difference. Eyes see orange color and blue color. The difference between the colors orange and blue is not perceived by the eyes but conceived by the mind. Therefore difference is never perceived but it is only conceived. If the difference is not perceived, why can it not be said that it is inferred like smoke and fire? Inference will not help because whatever you are inferring has to have been perceived by you before. You are able to infer the fire because you have experienced fire and smoke together. You can only infer what you have perceived before. Because difference has never been perceived, you cannot make an inference also. Therefore no *pramāṇam* can prove difference. Difference is experienced but cannot be proved. What is experienced but cannot be proved is *mithyā*.

All the objects cannot be said to be identical with or different from each other. You can never prove objects as identical or different among themselves. You cannot prove them to be identical because you experience difference. Difference cannot be proved because there is no *pramāṇam* to do the proof. In short, the world is a mystery. It is experienced but you cannot prove anything logically. The more you go deeper, the more mysterious it gets. The *adhiṣṭhānam* for this mysterious world is I, the *Turīya ātmā*. Experience life without asking too many questions. Every question will produce an answer that will lead to more questions. It leads to riddles. That is why it is called *māyā*. Enjoy the world as it is. Whenever favorable conditions come, thoroughly enjoy. Whenever unfavorable conditions come thoroughly put up with them. Move on. Do not talk too much. “*aham satyaṃ jagan mithyā*” is the knowledge.

Verse 35

वीतरागभयक्रोधैर्मुनिभिर्वेदपारगैः ।

निर्विकल्पो ह्ययं दृष्टः प्रपञ्चोपशमोऽद्वयः ॥ ३५ ॥

vītarāgabhayakrodhairmunibhirvedapāragaiḥ ।

nirvikalpo hyayaṃ dr̥ṣṭaḥ prapañcopaśamo'dvayaḥ ॥ 35॥

The non-dual Ātmā which is division-less and which is free from the world is indeed seen by the sages who are free from attachment, fear, and anger and who are well versed in the Vedas. (verse 35)

Gauḍapāda himself says that this teaching is so extremely profound that receiving this teaching, grasping it, assimilating it and using it in our life requires a lot of mental maturity and preparation. That is why the Vedas did not teach *advaitam* initially. *Veda-pūrva* is all *dvaitam*. Very few people understand this teaching. Only rare qualified people can grasp this non-dual *Turīyam* that is division-less, in which even *satya-mithyā* difference cannot be talked about and in which there is no universe at all. *Satya-mithyā* difference applies only from the empirical angle. The qualifications are a mind that is not preoccupied with the worldly involvement. When worldly preoccupations are there, the mind will not have the required depth, and it will be a shallow mind. Only a mind that does not have attachment, anxiety, and anger will be available for intense absorption in this subject matter and be able to analyze the teaching of Vedānta. Pure logic will not take one to the truth. Both logic and *veda pramāṇam* have to be used for grasping the teaching that is contained in the five capsules of Vedānta.

1. I am of the nature of eternal and all-pervading consciousness.
2. I am the only source of permanent peace, security and happiness.
3. By my mere presence, I give life to the material body and through the material body I experience the material universe.
4. I am never affected by any event that happens in the material world or in the material body-mind complex.
5. By forgetting my real nature, I convert life into a burden and by remembering my real nature, I convert life into a blessing.

MK-30 = Chapter – 2, Verses – 35 to 38

Verse 35

वीतरागभयक्रोधैर्मुनिभिर्वेदपारगैः ।

निर्विकल्पो ह्ययं दृष्टः प्रपञ्चोपशमोऽद्वयः ॥ ३५ ॥

With the 34th verse, Gauḍapādācārya has concluded the main teaching of the second chapter, the teaching being that *ātmā*, the *Turīyam* alone is *satyaṃ* and other than *ātmā* whatever is experienced is *mithyā*. By the word *Turīyam* is meant, I, the observer consciousness principle. This particular message that everything experienced is *mithyā* was highlighted in the second chapter. ‘*ātmā* is the *satyaṃ*’ will be highlighted in the third chapter. ‘*anātmā* is *mithyā*’ is highlighted in the second chapter. *Dvaita mithyātvam* is the second chapter and *advaita satyatvam* is the third chapter. Gauḍapāda used the dream world as the main example to show that the waking world is *mithyā*. Therefore whenever there is a doubt about *mithyātvam* of the waking world it should be compared to the dream world. The dream world is experienced, can be transacted, and has utility in dream. In spite of all these, dream is real only from the standpoint of the dreamer. So it is *mithyā*. Similarly the waking world is real only from the standpoint of *Viśva*. The dream world is real only from the standpoint of *Taijasa*. In the waking world, the dream world is unreal and in the dream world the waking world is not even available. This is called conditional reality, *mithyā*. *Satyaṃ* is observer, I, the *ātmā*. All this has been established up to verse 34. Now Gauḍapāda winds up the chapter by talking about *sādhana*.

The entire range of *sādhana* is presented in the following four verses. The first *sādhana* described is *karma-yoga* for the preparation of the mind to accept the results of actions. This will give equanimity of mind. Such a mind will become free from likes and dislikes, anxiety or fear, and anger. We experience *samsāra* in four stages. Because of limitation, we experience helplessness in most of the situations. Helplessness leads to anger. Anger leads to frustration, which leads to depression. All these are the natural tendencies of the mind. *Karma-yoga* helps one to get out of these tendencies to a great extent by accepting the situations as *Īśvara prasada*. *Karma-yoga* is the first level of *sādhana* through which a person becomes *vīta-rāga-bhaya-krodha*.

The next stage is *upāsana*, *Īśvara upāsana*. By *viśvarūpa upāsana*, by seeing everything as sacred a person does not resist or hate anything. The mind gets refined through this *upāsana*. *Karma-yoga* gives purification of the mind and *upāsana-yoga* gives one-pointedness of the mind and expansion of the mind. After *karma-yoga* (*vīta-rāga-bhaya-krodha*) and *upāsana-yoga* (*munibhi*), the seeker goes to *jñāna-yoga* (*vedapāragaiḥ*) and gets the Vedantic knowledge. Without religious life, spirituality is impossible. Without spirituality, religious life is incomplete. Thus with *śravaṇaṃ* and *mananam*, the knowledge will be received and conviction will be attained. *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad* is *śravaṇaṃ* and *Māṇḍūkyakārikā* is *mananam*. The knowledge is “I am the *Turīyam Ātmā*”. The knowledge consists in claiming that I am *ātmā*. *Turīya Ātmā*, not being an object, is ultimately available only for claiming. Knowing is claiming I am the *Turīyam*. It is an intellectual process only. I require the convincing

thought that I am *Turīyam*. This *aparokṣa jñānam* is called *darśanam*. This *Turīyam* is without any division of *pramātā-pramāṇam-prameyam*, and *Viśva-Virāt*, *Taijasa-Hiraṇyagarbha*, *Prājña-Īśvara*. Even the microcosm-macrocosm duality is not present in *Turīyam*. Those divisions belong to the transactional plane. The *Turīyam* is totally free from the *mithyā* world and is non-dual. This *aparokṣa jñānam* is the result of *śravaṇam* and *mananam*. The *sādhana* is not yet over. *Nididhyasanam* still needs to be done.

Verse 36

तस्मादेवं विदित्वैनमद्वैते योजयेत्स्मृतिम् ।

अद्वैतं समनुप्राप्य जडवल्लोकमाचरेत् ॥ ३६ ॥

tasmādevaṃ viditvainamadvaite yojayetsmṛtim ।

advaitam samanuprāpya jaḍavallokaṃ mācaret ॥ 36॥

Therefore, having thus known this (Ātmā,) one should fix the mind on the non-dual (Ātmā.) Having attained the non-dual Ātmā, one should behave in the world like an ignorant one. (verse 36)

Having received the knowledge convincingly and doubtlessly, the knowledge must be internalized. The format should be changed from triangular to binary. Looking at myself as a finite *jīva* and looking at the world as too big giving continuous problem, I get the notion that I am a victimized *jīva* and the world is the victimizer. Since I am not able to handle the big huge world, I have to regularly rush towards *Īśvara*. This is the triangular format: *jīva-jagat-Īśvara*. But I need to come to the binary format. I am not the victimized and the world is not the victimizer. I do not require a savior from outside. I am the reality, Brahman and everything else is nothing but name and form. Instead of drawing strength from an external God, I learn to draw strength from my own higher nature. When I am shifting from the triangular to the binary format, what is happening is the external God becomes my own higher nature. Therefore I learn to draw strength from my own higher nature or my own knowledge. That is why the word used in the 7th *mantra* is *śivam*. *Turīyam* is called *śivam* and by this the Upaniṣad asks not to think of the Lord Śiva as a person sitting remotely. That is only a symbolic representation of the formless Śiva, which is your own higher nature. Formed external Śiva is nothing but my own formless internal higher nature. Therefore, the *jñāni* draws strength not from outside but from his higher nature or the knowledge. **This knowledge is the greatest support. This we will get only by practice.** Unless the binary format is practiced at least now and then, this drawing of strength will not take place. Every now and then one will go to the triangular format but gradually one has to be in binary format and walk on one's own feet as it were.

Therefore, one should understand in the manner as taught in the previous 35 verses that *Turīyam* is not an object, not outside me, not inside me but it is me. One should recollect the teaching regularly and thoroughly, and then completely and spontaneously be in the binary format at least within oneself. We

need not tell this outside. We need not even show this outside but internally, our conviction must be ‘ I am ever liberated’. *Mokṣa* is not a goal or an event that will take place. *Mokṣa* is not the nature of the body or mind. It is my own real nature. This is *ātmaniṣṭha*, *brahmaniṣṭha*, *jñānaniṣṭha*, *brāhmisthiti* or *sthitaprajña*. This is total internal transformation.

When I am transacting with the world what format should I use? The whole society is in the triangular format. I should not utter a word or even whisper a word about the binary format and should behave exactly like other people. Be a *jīva* with a *jīva* disguise and act as a worldly *jīva* only. This is Gauḍapāda’s teaching. It is like following the traffic rules of the country you are in. As a *Viśva* in the society, follow the triangular format but inside, remember that the world is a stage and we are only playing roles like actors. It is not hypocrisy because it is not done with an ulterior motive but with good intention. Conformity is required and the *jñāni* should not become a rebel in society.

Gauḍapāda refers to the *samādhi-abhyāsa-rūpa nididhyasanam* in the first line of the verse. This was described in the 6th chapter of the *Bhagavad Gita*. Some exclusive time should be given for dwelling on the teaching. In the second line, *Brahma-abhyāsa-rūpa nididhyasanam* is described. This refers to remembering the teaching at the back of the mind while transacting in the world. In the 5th chapter of *Bhagavad Gita* this is talked about. One is closed-eye meditation and the other is open-eye meditation.

Verse 37

निस्तुतिर्निर्मस्कारः निःस्वधाकार एव च ।

चलाचलनिकेतश्च यतिर्यादृच्छिको भवेत् ॥ ३७ ॥

nistutirnirnamaskāro niḥsvadhākāra eva ca ।

calācalaniketaśca yatiryādṛcchiko bhavet ॥ 37॥

A saṁnyāsi is without praise, without salutation, without rituals, and with the body and the Ātmā as the abode. He is spontaneous. (verse 37)

This is an advice *śāstra* will give now and then. If the householder finds life too busy for *nididhyasanam*, *śāstra* says that another option is available in the form of a *saṁnyāsi*’s lifestyle in which the person has no responsibilities and no rights. He accepts whatever comes and his life is devoted entirely to *nididhyasanam*. This is *vidvat-saṁnyāsa*. The example is given of Yājñavalkya wishing to enter into this lifestyle in *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad*. However, Kṛṣṇa says in the *Bhagavad Gita* that as a householder also, one can manage to do *nididhyasanam* if there is sufficient will.

If required, one can become a *vidvat-saṁnyāsi*. This person needs only assimilation because he already has the *jñānam*. This *saṁnyāsi* is free from all the duties including religious duties. For all the basic needs of life, this *saṁnyāsi* depends upon *bhikṣā* (alms) and eats whatever he gets. If he does not get

food he will fast on that day. After *bhikṣā*, he does *nididhyasanam*. He treats his body as his house when he eats and the very *ātmā* as his other house when he does *nididhyasanam*. He accepts whatever happens in his life considering them as means of *prārabdha-karma* exhaustion of the body. Whether you are a *saṁnyāsi* or a householder, find time for *nididhyasanam*. Lifestyle is not important but *sādhana* is.

Verse 38

तत्त्वमाध्यात्मिकं दृष्ट्वा तत्त्वं दृष्ट्वा तु बाह्यतः ।

तत्त्वीभूतस्तदारामस्तत्त्वादप्रच्युतो भवेत् ॥ ३८ ॥

tattvamādhyātmikam dṛṣṭvā tattvam dṛṣṭvā tu bāhyataḥ ।

tattvībhūtastadārāmastattvādapracyuto bhavet ॥ 38॥

Seeing the Reality within the body and seeing the Reality outside, he becomes one with the Reality. Reveling in that (Reality,) he does not deviate from the Reality. (38)

Nididhyasanam is being aware of the changeless *ātmā* in and through the changing *anātmā nama-rūpa*. That changeless *ātmā* is both inside and outside. Enjoy the movie but be aware of the screen and the movie as movie. When the screen is forgotten, the movie becomes more real and overwhelming and the entertainment that the movie gives is not entertainment anymore. Similarly the changeless *ātmā* is available inside as the consciousness principle in and through every changing thought. Outside, in and through the changing *nama-rūpa*, the changeless principle is available as the *sat*, the existence principle. *Sat* is the external changeless entity. *Cit* is the internal changeless entity. *sateva cit citeva sat*. One should never forget this. This alone is called *tattvam*, reality.

Gauḍapāda says that one should see the inner truth as the changeless consciousness principle within and see the same truth externally in the form of changeless existence (isness). When you are aware of the changeless *tattvam*, you may remind yourself that that changeless *tattvam* is yourself. Claiming the *tattvam* as oneself, a person should not objectify it. Learning to relax in this knowledge, may you dilute the stress of life by abiding in your higher nature. Kṛṣṇa refers to this in the *Bhagavad Gita*:

Oh Arjuna! Sense organs and objects, which cause cold, heat, pleasure, and pain, are subject to arrival and departure. They are impermanent. (2:14)

Make sure you do not slip from this teaching and if you slip, *saṁsāra* will swallow you. Do not allow that to happen. With this verse, the second chapter is over.

MK-31 = Chapter 2 Summary

The 7th *mantra* of the *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad* gives the definition of the real nature of *ātmā*, the *Turīyam* and in that important definition of *ātmā*, two words are extremely important. One is *prapañcopasamam* and the second word is *advaitam*. The word ‘*prapañcopasamam*’ means the *prapañca mithyātvam*. *Prapañca* refers to the waking world, the universe. *Upasama* literally means absent. ‘*prapañcopasama*’ means that even though we experience the world, factually it is not there. It is experientially available, factually non-existent. It is otherwise called *mithyātvam*, or *vaitathyam*. *Prapañcopasamam*, *prapañca mithyātvam* and *prapañca vaitathyam* all mean that the world is *mithyā*. Gauḍapāda dedicates one full chapter consisting of 38 verses to show the *mithyātvam* of the universe. Therefore, the chapter is called *Vaitathyaprakaraṇam*. The word *advaitam* will be taken up in the third chapter and in 48 verses Gauḍapāda will explain *advaitam* there. *Vaitathyam* is the topic here. With this background, we will see the important topics here.

To understand the *mithyātvam* of the waking world, Gauḍapāda uses the dream world as the ideal example because it is also *mithyā*. This is the main approach of the second chapter.

1. The Mithyātvam of the Dream World (1 – 3)

In the first three verses, Gauḍapāda first shows that the dream world is *mithyā* so that it can be used as the example for the waking world. He gives two reasons to show that the dream world is *mithyā* : *ucita deśa abhāvāt*, *ucita kāla abhāvāt*. Any object to exist requires time and space as coordinates. Further, sufficient time and space are required for an object’s existence. If both sufficient time and space are not present, the object does not really exist. ‘An elephant in a suitcase’ is a *mithyā* statement because there is no sufficient space in the suitcase for the elephant to exist. The whole dream world exists within my body, within my head and within that space, all these objects like mountains, rivers, sun, moon and stars are seen. All these cannot exist in my head because of *ucita deśa kāla abhāvāt*, insufficient space and therefore are *mithyā*. They are experienced but not factual. Similarly the events in the dream world are *mithyā* because events requiring several days happen in a few minutes of dream. These events cannot factually happen because of *ucita kāla abhāvāt*, insufficient time. Therefore both things and events in the dream world must be admitted to be *mithyā*. When we are in dream, they will appear as *satyaṃ*. We can say that they are *mithyā* in the waking state but in dream, *mithyā* appears as *satyaṃ*. Even though it appears as *satyaṃ*, it is not *satyaṃ*. This much can be said about the dream world with certainty.

2. aham satyaṃ jagan mithyā (4 – 18)

From the 4th verse up to the 18th verse, the second and the most important topic is covered, which is that the waking world is also *mithyā* exactly like the dream world. Just as the dream world appears as *satyaṃ* in dream, the waking world appears as *satyaṃ* in the waking state. Even though the waking world

appears as *satyam* in the waking state, still it is *mithyā* only. What is the reason for this? Gauḍapāda says that here the reason is different. Insufficient space as the reason does not apply here but a different reason applies here. Śāṅkarācārya gives one reason and Gauḍapādācārya gives another reason. Śāṅkarācārya's reason is tougher to accept than Gauḍapādācārya's reason. Śāṅkarācārya says that the waking world is *mithyā* because it is experienced like the dream world. The experienced dream world is known to be *mithyā* and so the experienced waking world must also be *mithyā*. Gauḍapāda in the very powerful verse 6 says that the dream world is *mithyā* because it is subject to arrival and departure. The waking world is available in the waking state but the entire waking world disappears when you switch over from waking to dream or deep sleep. The moment you change the state, the entire waking world disappears and the dream world appears, and in dream it does not appear as dream, but like the waking world only. The waking world comes in the waking state, it goes in the dream state, the dream world comes in the dream state and it goes in the waking state. Each one appears in its own respective state and disappears in the other state. So both the worlds must have equal status. Therefore, since the dream world is known to be *mithyā*, then the waking world also must be given the same *mithyā* status. Thus Gauḍapāda says that the waking world is *mithyā* because it is subject to arrival and departure just like the dream world is. Thereafter, several objections are raised and all these objections are with an intention to show that dream is *mithyā* and waking is *satyam*. To prove this, various definitions of reality are given. Four definitions given were refuted.

The first is that utility is the criterion of reality. Gauḍapāda refutes this by pointing out that each world is useful in the respective state and each one is useless in the other state. Dream water is useful in dream but not in waking. Similarly, waker's water is useful in the waking state but not useful in the dream. So if utility is the criterion, both should be accepted as the same and it cannot be said that one is *satyam* and the other is *mithyā*.

The second criterion suggested for reality was externality. The waking world is outside and the dream world is inside. What is outside is real and what is inside is unreal, *mithyā*. Gauḍapāda refutes this by saying that the dream world is said to be internal and unreal only when you are in the waking state, but in dream the dream world is experienced as external. Internality and externality logic will thus not work to show that the dream world is *mithyā* and the waking world is real.

The third criterion suggested for reality is continuity. The waking world continues day after day whereas the last night's dream does not continue today. Gauḍapāda says that the dream world is known to be not continuous only in the waking state but when you are in dream the dream world will appear to be continuous. In short, the mistake we commit is that we look at the waking world as the waker and the dream world also as the waker. This way we cannot arrive at reality. Each world has to be looked at from its own corresponding state. Both will be real in its state and both will be absent in the other state.

The fourth criterion suggested for reality is that whatever is clearly available is real. Dream is very vague and so unreal. Gauḍapāda's answer is that the dream world is unreal only from the standpoint of the waking state and when you are in dream, every event is very clear just as everything in the waking world is clear in the waking state. Clarity cannot be used to differentiate between dream and the waking world.

Thus utility, externality, continuity and clarity cannot be the criteria for reality to show that dream is *mithyā* but waking is *satyaṃ*. The criterion therefore, is whatever is subject to arrival and departure is *mithyā* and whatever is not subject to arrival and departure alone can be *satyaṃ*. Therefore, both the waking state and the dream state are *mithyā*.

Then comes the crucial question. Both the waking and the dream worlds are *mithyā* and if the dream world is *mithyā*, I know that it does not have an independent reality of its own and if the dream world is projected by me, supported by me and experienced by me (PSE) through the dream body, then the waking world must be projected, supported and experienced by someone. I know that I am the PSE of the dream world, but what about the waking world? Who is the PSE of the waking world? Gauḍapāda gives a mind-boggling, unbelievable, and unacceptable answer. He says that I am the PSE of the dream world and I alone am the PSE of the waking world also. When I am in dream, if someone tells me that I am the projector of the dream world, I will not accept it but will accept it only after waking up. In dream, the dream will not be accepted as a projection. Similarly in the waking state, I will not accept this world as my projection. Gauḍapāda says in verse 12 that as *ātmā*, I am the projector, sustainer and experiencer of the waking world also. I use two *śaktis* for this purpose, *nidrā-śakti* for being the PSE of the dream world and *māyā-śakti* to be the PSE of the waking world. The meaning of the word 'I' is the consciousness principle, which is *satyaṃ* and not subject to arrival and departure. The waking *deśa-kāla* comes, I am there, the waking *deśa-kāla* goes, I am there. The dream *deśa-kāla* comes, I am there, the dream *deśa-kāla* goes, I am there. Even time and space appear and disappear in me the observer, the witness-consciousness principle: *aham satyaṃ prapañca mithyā*.

Gauḍapāda says that as long as I don't know the *satyaṃ*, *mithyā* will appear as though *satyaṃ*. When the rope is not known, the rope-snake which is *mithyā* will appear as *satyaṃ*. Ignorance of *satyaṃ* converts *mithyā* into *satyaṃ*, which is a major mistake. There are certain mistakes that can create problems. When rope is mistaken for snake, it becomes a serious problem. The waking world will create serious problems when it is mistaken as *satyaṃ*. *Mithyā* mistaken as *satyaṃ* will create problems because *mithyā* is unstable. *Satyaṃ* alone is stable. When we take the *mithyā* world as *satyaṃ*, we will seek support and security from the unstable *mithyā* objects, name, fame, power, position, and even relationships. *Mithyā* never remains the same. Because of the ignorance of 'I am *satyaṃ* and *jagat* is *mithyā*', we are facing problems. 'I am *satyaṃ*, the world is *mithyā*' is not an academic knowledge but it makes a big change in our life itself, the way we look at us, the way we look at the world. There is a huge perspective change, which is the cause of *mokṣa* itself.

3. Mistakes Concerning Reality (19 – 29)

From verses 19 to 29, Gauḍapāda talks about several mistakes committed by several people because of the ignorance of the one truth. I am the only one truth and when I miss myself, I mistake one object or the other as the truth. Science considers matter as reality. Various systems of philosophy, like *Sāṃkhya* thinks *prakṛti* is real, and *nyāya-vaiśeṣika* thinks that *paramāṇu* is real. Various religions think that various *anātmā* deities conceived as sitting in remote *lokas* as real. All these are mistaking *anātmā* as *satyaṃ* because ‘I’, the *ātmā* is missed as *satyaṃ*. How many confusions are there? Gauḍapāda says that truth is one but confusions are many. He gives a long list of them.

At the end, Gauḍapāda makes a positive note, which is very important because of which we respect all religions and all deities. He says that even though *anātmā* is *mithyā*, *anātmā* is pervaded by the *ātmā*, because the ‘isness’ of *anātmā* comes from *ātmā* like the ‘isness’ of the snake comes from the rope, the ‘isness’ of the farthest dream star comes from the waker. Therefore, *ātmā* pervades the *anātmā*, and so *mithyā* has got *satyaṃ* underlying it. Even our prayers to the *anātmā* deities will bless us because there is the underlying *ātmā*. In verse 29, Gauḍapāda says that the pursuit of any deity will bless one. *Dvaita bhakti* will bring a person to *jnana-yoga*. So do not criticize *dvaita bhakti*. At the right time everyone will transcend *duality* and come to *advaita* knowledge.

4. Summary of the Teaching Given in Verses 4 to 18 (30 – 34)

From verses 30 to 34, Gauḍapāda summarizes the teaching he gave in verses 4 to 18. That teaching is that the waking world and the dream world are *mithyā* only. In short, *dvaitam* is *mithyā* whether it is waking or dream *dvaitam*. *Advaitam* is the substratum. *Turīyam Ātmā* alone is *satyaṃ*. *Dvaitam* is *mithyā* can be explained in another way: When you talk of two things, you are counting them as two because each one is different from the other spatially, time-wise, or attribute-wise. *Dvaitam* is concluded because we see difference always. If *dvaitam* is *mithyā*, difference is also *mithyā*. This is unique to *Māṇḍūkya-kārikā* and in the other Vedānta texts, this is not dealt with this deeply. Difference is *mithyā* meaning all differences are experienced but when you try to prove the difference logically, you will not be able to prove it. Just to take one example, clay and pot. Are these two one and the same? It is difficult to prove either way. Suppose you say that they are different. If they are different, you can give away one and keep the other. That is not possible. So it cannot be said that clay and pot are different. Then, can you say that pot and clay are one and the same? That cannot be said because what function that pot has, the clay by itself does not have. Clay cannot hold water but a pot can. From the standpoint of function, they seem to be different because one has utility and the other does not. So they seem to be different. Are they identical or different? Their status is indeterminable.

Gauḍapāda says that similarly any type of difference between *ātmā* and *anātmā* is experienced but not explainable. Between one *anātmā* and another *anātmā*, the differences are experienced but not

explainable. Finally, even *advaitam* and *dvaitam* cannot be treated as two separate things. Both are experienced in the waking world, *advaitam* as the *adhiṣṭhānam*, and *dvaitam* as the *adhyāsam*. We do talk about *advaita-dvaita bheda* from the empirical angle but from the *pāramārthika dr̥ṣṭi*, Brahman cannot be said to be either *advaitam* or *dvaitam*. So *ātmā-anātmā bheda*, *anātmā-anātmā bheda*, *advaita-dvaita bheda* are differences that are experienced but not logically provable. Therefore, *dvaitam* is *mithyā*. *Bheda* is *mithyā*. I am *satyaṃ*.

Once you have understood *mithyā* as *mithyā*, you respect the ETU (experience, transactions, utility) of *mithyā*. As a *jñāni*, respect all the three that are available in *mithyā*, but remember that *mithyā* not being *satyaṃ* does not have stability. *Mithyā* is unpredictable, uncontrollable and unsustainable. Therefore, experience the things of the world as they appear and disappear, but do not hold on to anything. Holding on to *mithyā* is like a drowning man holding on to the floating straw. Experience the world but do not depend on it for peace, security and happiness. For that you have to rely upon *Ātmā* or Brahman, and until you know Brahman, depend upon *Īśvara*. Things will arrive and depart but their arrival and departure will not affect you. This is the practical advantage of the '*aham advaitam satyaṃ jagat dvaitam mithyā*' knowledge. Kṛṣṇa teaches this in the *Bhagavad Gita*. Gauḍapāda says that only a person who has this knowledge can teach the Upaniṣad properly.

5. Sādhana and Phalam (35 – 38)

From verses 35 to 38, Gauḍapāda talks about *sādhana* and benefits. The series of *sādhanas* described in the scriptures must be followed. *Māṇḍūkya-kārikā* will work only when you have gone through the stages of *sādhana*: *karma-yoga*, *upāsana-yoga*, *śravaṇam* and *mananam*. '*vīta-rāga-bhaya-krodhiḥ*' is *karma-yoga*, '*munibhiḥ*' is *upāsana-yoga*, '*vedapāragaiḥ*' is *śravaṇam* and *mananam*, which is consistent and systematic study. At this stage, even if you do not want this knowledge, you will understand and gain the knowledge. Understanding alone is not enough. Simply adding sugar to milk will not make it sweet but it needs to be mixed. In the class, knowledge will come and sit in one corner of the mind. We have to practice *nididhyasanam*. *Nididhyasanam* is of two types: *samādhi-abhyāsa-rūpa* and *brahma-abhyāsa-rūpa nididhyasanam*. The former is spending some regular time dwelling on the teaching. The latter is trying to be alert during worldly transactions, remembering the teaching in the background. These two *nididhyasanams* are the final stage of *sādhana*. If a person goes through all these five stages, he will be soaked in reality with eyes open or eyes closed, and will not miss the *advaita satyaṃ*. Outside, *ātmā* is available as the changeless existence, and inside, *ātmā* is available as the changeless consciousness. This *sat-cit ātmā* is not lost sight of. It is like not losing sight of the screen when you watch the movie. The moment the screen is forgotten, the movie becomes a problem. This abidance in *advaita ātmā*, which is called *ātmaniṣṭha*, *jñānaniṣṭha*, *turīyaniṣṭha*, *sthitaprajña*, or *brāhmisthiti*, is *jīvanmukti*. Therefore, may you follow the *sādhana* and assimilate the *Vaitathya-prakaraṇam*.

Māṇḍūkya-kārikā
Advaitaprakaraṇam

Transcript of classes given by
SWAMI PARAMARTHANANDA

MK-32 = Chapter – 3, Verses – 1 to 2

The third chapter of the *Māṇḍūkya-kārikā* is titled *Advaitaprakaraṇam*. The entire *Māṇḍūkya-kārikā* is a teaching extracted from the *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad* and in the Upaniṣad, the most important *mantra* is the 7th *mantra* in which the definition of the real *ātmā*, is given and is named *Turīya ātmā*, *Viśva*, *Taijasa* and *Prājña* are pseudo *ātmās*. In the definition of *ātmā* two words are extremely important which Gauḍapāda takes up for analysis.

One of the words is *prapañcopasamam*, which means world-*mithyātvam*. This *mithyātvam* was analyzed in the second chapter. Instead of using the word *prapañcopasamam*, Gauḍapāda used the word *vaitathyam*. *Vaitathyam* and *mithyā* are synonymous. *Mithyā* means that the waking world we experience now is only a conditional reality like the dream world. The waking world is real only in the waking state just as the dream world is real only in the dream state. Since both of them are real only in their respective states, they are not absolutely real. This conditional reality is called *mithyātvam*. If the waking world and the dream world are both *mithyā*, conditionally real, what is absolutely real? It is ‘I’ the observing consciousness principle alone. I, the *Turīya ātmā* alone is the *satyaṃ*. I am the PSE, the projector, sustainer and the experiencer of the waking world. This was established in *Vaitathyaprakaraṇam*.

Now in the third chapter, Gauḍapāda takes up another profound word for analysis and that word occurring in the seventh *mantra* is *advaitam*. This word *advaitam* is elaborately analyzed in the third chapter and so the chapter is called *Advaitaprakaraṇam*, which consists of 48 verses. The Upaniṣad points out that *ātmā* is *advaitam* and that everyone should compulsorily know the *advaita ātmā*: *sa ātmā sa vijñeyah*. Why does the Upaniṣad say this? Gauḍapāda answers that *dvaitam* is the cause of several problems called *saṃsāra* and so *advaita-jñānam* is the only solution for this *saṃsāra*. All the Upaniṣads have repeatedly said the same thing. *Kaṭhopanīṣad* says: whoever is in *dvaitam* will go from mortality to mortality. In *Taittirīya Upaniṣad*, it is said: even if the slightest duality is perceived, you will feel insecurity (limitation, helplessness, fear, anger and depression). In *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad*, it is said: *dvaitam* is the cause of insecurity, fear, etc. This is everyone’s problem and for that problem *advaita-jñānam* is the only remedy. The problem is not the absence of *advaitam* but it is the absence of *advaita-jñānam*. When it is said that *dvaitam* is the problem, we should carefully note the following: Experience of duality is not a problem. In fact, it is enjoyment. Variety is enjoyment. *Dvaita* transaction is also not a problem. *Dvaita* experience and transaction are not problems. Then what is problem? Taking *dvaitam* as *satyaṃ* alone is the problem because *dvaitam* is not *satyaṃ* but it is only *mithyā*. When *mithyā dvaitam* is mistaken as *satyaṃ*, one expects stability that leads to emotional leaning or dependence on the *mithyā dvaitam*. Being *nama-rūpa*, *mithyā dvaitam* is not stable, and it is always changing. Relying on unstable things for stability creates a lot of problems. Relying on the unreliable things is the definition of *saṃsāra*. The reliance happens because of mistaking *mithyā* to be *satyaṃ*. Therefore, we should stop emotionally relying upon *mithyā dvaitam* and start relying on *satya advaitam*. That *satya advaitam* is

Turīya ātmā. This *advaita-jñānam* is important for everyone. With this introduction, Gauḍapādācārya starts the third chapter.

Verse 1

उपासानाश्रितो धर्मो जाते ब्रह्मणि वर्तते ।

प्रागुत्पत्तेरजं सर्वं तेनासौ कृपणः स्मृतः ॥ १ ॥

upāsānāśrito dharmo jāte brahmaṇi vartate ।

prāgutpatterajam sarvaṁ tenāsau kṛpaṇaḥ smṛtaḥ ॥ 1 ॥

The jīva who is committed to upāsana remains in (that) Brahman, which is subject to birth. (He thinks -) “all this was unborn (Brahman) before creation.” Hence he is considered miserable. (verse 1)

Gauḍapāda says that the third chapter is very important because it deals with *advaita-jñānam*. Any type of *dvaitam* is a cause of *saṃsāra*. There are two types of *dvaitam*. One is called secular *dvaitam* and the other is sacred *dvaitam*. Secular *dvaitam* consists of I, (the *jīvātma*) and the observed world (the *anātmā*). This *jīvātma-anātmā dvaitam* is secular *dvaitam* because everyone knows this as ‘I am here and the world is there’. In addition to the secular *dvaitam*, *śāstra* also introduces another type of *dvaitam* in the context of *karma-yoga* and *upāsana-yoga*. *Veda-pūrva* section consists of *karma*-section that deals with *karma-yoga* and *upāsana*-section that deals with *upāsana-yoga*, which also involves duality. In the *karma*-section, I, the *jīvātma*, am the worshipper of the Lord and the *paramātma* is *Īśvara* introduced as someone to be worshipped. This is worshipper-worshipped *dvaitam*, which is sacred *dvaitam*. In the *upāsana*-section, even when we drop the rituals and take up meditation, there also we have *dvaitam*: I am the meditator and *Īśvara* is the meditated called meditator-meditated *dvaitam*. Gauḍapāda says that even though the sacred *dvaitam* is considered very sacred and auspicious, that sacred *dvaitam* also will be a cause of *saṃsāra* only. Any *dvaitam* is cause of *saṃsāra*, secular or sacred. Therefore, everyone will have to transcend the secular and the sacred *dvaitam* and come to *advaitam*.

Gauḍapāda starts the third chapter with the disturbing news that even sacred duality is a cause of *saṃsāra*. *Bhagavān-bhakta* is duality. It may look like Gauḍapāda is destroying *bhakti*, which requires deity-devotee duality. But this message is directed towards the advanced students of Vedānta who has studied *Bhagavad Gita* and the five Upaniṣads, *Muṇḍaka*, *Kaṭha*, *Kena*, *Kaivalya*, and *Taittirīya*.

If sacred *dvaitam* itself is *saṃsāra*, why should Veda introduce this *dvaitam*? The reason is that only through *dvaita-bhakti* one can come to *advaita-jñānam*. *Dvaita-bhakti* is a temporary solution for *saṃsāra* but *advaita-jñānam* is the permanent solution. It is like first aid and main treatment. We should engage in *dvaita-bhakti* initially, but soon realize the limitations of that *bhakti* and come to *advaita-jñānam*. Therefore Gauḍapāda says that someone who is a permanent *dvaita bhakta* is an unfortunate

person. One who is a *dvaita bhakta* and wants to come to *advaita-jñānam* is a discriminating person but a *dvaita bhakta* who permanently remains in *dvaita-bhakti* is an unfortunate person to be pitied. Without *dvaita-bhakti*, *advaita-jñānam* is impossible and without *advaita-jñānam*, *dvaita-bhakti* is incomplete. *Dvaita-bhakti* is not an end in itself. Being a *dvaita bhakta* is not harmful but dying a *dvaita bhakta* is unfortunate. Gauḍapāda strongly criticizes those who wish to remain permanently in *dvaita-bhakti*. They are religious *samsāris* with different religious marks.

Gauḍapāda further says that when these people engage in *dvaita-bhakti*, they look upon themselves as *jīvātma* and *Īśvara* as *paramātma*. They create a division in *ātmā*, which is indivisible, and have created a relationship. In this relationship there is a notion that *Īśvara*, the *paramātma* is the creator, the cause and I, the *jīvātma*, am the created, the effect. This cause-effect relationship between the *paramātma* and *jīvātma* is the biggest mistake the *bhaktas* commit. Therefore, Gauḍapāda wishes to show that between *paramātma* and *jīvātma* there is no cause-effect relationship. Created-creator relationship is not there because there is no *paramātma-jīvātma* duality. Then what is there? *Advaita ātmā* alone is there. *Paramātma* is not the *kāraṇam* for the *jīvātma*. This is the main teaching of the third chapter.

Gauḍapāda uses several Sanskrit words in special meaning here. The *jīvātma* who is a devotee in permanent *dvaita-bhakti* has the notion that Brahman is the cause, the creator and mistakes himself to be the effect, the created. The devotee falsely thinks that he was with *Bhagavān* originally and at the time of creation, he was forcibly separated from the Lord and trapped in the world. Then the goal of this devotee is to go back and reach *Bhagavān* to never come back. This is the wrong concept of *mokṣa* according to *dvaita bhakta*. This is all right at the *karma-yoga* and *upāsana-yoga* level. *Paramātma* is not the cause and *jīvātma* is not the effect. There is no such relationship because they are not two separate entities. *Eka-ātmā* alone appears as dual. As long as the *dvaita bhakta* does not know this fact, he is an unfortunate miserable *samsāri*. Gauḍapāda says that there is a way out for this *jīva*.

Verse 2

अतो वक्ष्याम्यकार्पण्यमजाति समतां गतम् ।

यथा न जायते किञ्चिज्जायमानं समन्ततः ॥ २ ॥

ato vaksyāmyakārpanyamajāti samatāṃ gatam ।

yathā na jāyate kiñcijjāyamānaṃ samantataḥ ॥ 2॥

Therefore I shall teach (that Brahman) which is uniform, unborn, (and) free from misery. (I shall also teach) how anything which is born anywhere around is not (really) born. (verse 2)

Gauḍapāda says that he will teach that Brahman, which is not a cause at all and does not create anything. The non-causal Brahman is called *advaitam* Brahman. The technical meaning of *advaitam* is ‘that which does not produce any second thing other than itself.’ The non-causal Brahman is that which never

produces anything, does not multiply into many things or never divides into many things, but remains *advaitam* all the time. Brahman does not produce the world, the *jīvātma*, and any duality also. They all appear all right but are not produced.

That non-causal Brahman, which remains *advaitam* all the time, can never multiply itself, or divide itself or produce anything. Brahman is free from modifications. What is changeless cannot multiply, divide, or produce. Gauḍapāda says that he will teach that non-dual, uniform Brahman because it is the only thing that is free from misery. As long as one remains in *dvaitam*, he will be subject to limitation, anger, frustration and depression. Even though experientially many things seem to be born continuously out of Brahman, that creation is only a seeming creation but not a factual one. Gauḍapāda does not negate the seeming creation. The creation seems to come out of Brahman. Gauḍapāda will show that the creation does not really come out of Brahman. Gauḍapāda will teach how nothing is created even though the world seems to be created out of Brahman. Experiential creation is present but factual creation is not present. In *Puruṣasūkta*, we find the statement, *ajāyamāno bahudhā vijāyate*; ‘without creating the world, *Bhagavān* seemingly creates the world.’ We will ask how is it possible? Vedānta says that all of us are creating the dream world during dream without really creating anything. The dream world is only a seeming creation but not a factual one because it is negated upon waking up.

MK-33 = Chapter – 3, Verses – 3, 4

Verse 2

अतो वक्ष्याम्यकार्पण्यमजाति समतां गतम् ।

यथा न जायते किञ्चिज्जायमानं समन्ततः ॥ २ ॥

Gauḍapādācārya has entered into the third chapter, *Advaitaparakaraṇam*, which is meant to explain the word *advaitam* occurring in the 7th mantra of the *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad*. He points out that the word *advaitam* finally means that which is not a cause. The word *advaitam* finally means that it is not a cause, which cannot produce any *dvaitam*, cannot divide into *dvaitam* and cannot multiply into *dvaitam*. *Advaitam* cannot produce a second thing, cannot multiply to become another thing, and cannot divide itself into duality. *Advaitam* is that which will remain *advaitam* all the time. If that is so, no *dvaitam* can be created out of it and so *advaitam* can never be a cause because a thing is a cause when it can produce an effect by one method or another, producing, multiplying or division. *Advaitam*, which is *Turīyam* or Brahman is not a cause. The world has never been created out of Brahman. This is the message of the third chapter. Since the world has not come out of Brahman, there is no such thing called world even though the world seems to be existent. Thus the entire creation is an appearance and is not a fact. Just like the dream world is an appearance in the mind, the entire world is an appearance only. Brahman is not a cause and world is not an effect. Between Brahman and the world, cause-effect relationship is not there.

But the Upaniṣads, in the beginning stage of the teaching, said that Brahman is the cause and the world is the effect. Now in *Māṇḍūkyakārikā*, we are withdrawing that teaching and in the end we are saying that Brahman is not a cause and the world is not an effect. Thus this unique method of Vedāntic teaching is to introduce an idea and withdraw the idea later. The introduction is called *adhyāropa* (false attribution) and the withdrawal is called *apavāda* (subsequent retraction). In the process, pure consciousness as Brahman has to be revealed. It is exactly like a person asking for water. Water cannot be given by itself. A cup is introduced to contain the water and after drinking the water, the cup is withdrawn. The cup introduction is *adhyāropa* and its withdrawal after the water consumption is *apavāda*. Similarly, in Vedānta, several concepts are introduced to reveal the pure consciousness and once we have known the pure changeless consciousness all the ideas introduced before are withdrawn. Every single idea that Vedānta introduces, Vedānta withdraws, and among such ideas, one idea is the cause-effect *prakriyā*. Brahman is introduced as the cause and later the cause idea is removed. If Brahman is really not a cause, why is it introduced initially as a cause? If you are going to withdraw it later, why do you introduce it at all? The Upaniṣad wants to say that Brahman is as though a cause and from this example, you should take the message and drop the word cause. Do not hold on to the word cause, which is introduced to convey an idea and so extract the idea, like drinking the water, and thereafter drop the word cause.

Now the question is ‘what is the message to be extracted?’ If you look at the worldly experiences, we have got causes producing effects, like the gold producing ornaments. What is the job of the cause? Cause lends existence to the effect. This is the primary message. How do you prove gold gives existence to the ornaments? If you remove the gold, ornaments do not exist. Once you say Brahman is cause, and the world is effect, exactly like the cause gold lending existence to the ornaments, *Brahman lends existence to the world alone is the message*. Once you have understood that the world does not have an existence of its own and that it only gets existence from Brahman, the word cause should be withdrawn. Understand that Brahman lends existence to the world (‘the water to be drunk’ by the student in the example). The message is that the world does not have an existence of its own and it seems to be existent by borrowing existence from Brahman, *Turīyam*. What is that *Turīyam*? That *Turīyam* is ‘I’. I lend existence to the world. Once that idea is grasped, you should not retain the word cause.

If you hold on to the word cause, there will be so many other problems because generally the cause undergoes change. If you hold on to the word cause, you will think that Brahman also undergoes change. Do not hold on to the word cause too much. Similarly, saying Brahman is the intelligent cause is a problem. An intelligent cause produces something with a purpose. If Brahman is an intelligent cause for the creation, the question ‘what is the purpose of the creation’ cannot be answered. So intelligent and material causes are only temporarily introduced. Brahman is neither an intelligent nor a material cause. *These words are used to convey one idea that Brahman lends existence to the world*. The words should not be taken literally. This is like saying that someone is a pillar of the organization. Here the word pillar is never taken literally. With the Upaniṣadic statements, we should take the meaning that the Upaniṣads wish to convey and not our meaning that we want. Once the intended meaning of pillar is understood in that statement, the word pillar can be dropped. Similarly when it is said that Brahman is the creator, the word creator should not be taken literally. When Brahman is said to be the material cause, it should not be taken literally because the material cause undergoes change. Neither is Brahman the creator, nor is it a material cause. In fact, it is neither an intelligent cause nor a material cause. Then what does it do? **Extract the central message that it lends existence to the world without any change whatsoever.** No desire is involved, no will is involved, no plan is involved, and no change is involved. By its mere presence, Brahman lends existence to the world. The world seems to exist because of the borrowed existence. Thus Brahman is not a cause. This introduction of the idea that Brahman is the cause is called *adhyāropa prakaraṇam* and negation of Brahman as the cause is called *apavāda prakaraṇam*.

The entire Māṇḍūkya-kārikā is apavāda-pradhāna Vedānta, which is the toughest part in Vedānta. The teacher takes away all the ideas introduced as if he is contradicting himself. All the other Upaniṣads that we study are *adhyāropa-pradhāna Vedānta* wherein *apavāda* is very brief. *Māṇḍūkya-kārikā* is *apavāda-pradhāna Vedānta* wherein *adhyāropa* is very brief. Therefore it is extremely tough because Gauḍapāda will consistently say that there is no existent world. What is there then? There is an appearing world but there is no existent world. A non-existent world but an appearing world is called *mithyā*. This has to be

grasped. *This mithyā world is supported by Brahman, which is Turīyam, you yourself. This is the message of the third and the fourth chapters.*

Gauḍapāda is going to present this message in four stages. First he says that no *jīva* is born out of Brahman by giving an appropriate example. This is the logical negation of the experiencing individual, *jīva*. The next topic is negation of the world creation. By giving another example, he will logically show that there is no creation of the world. The third topic is that even by scriptural analysis the same conclusion about *jīva*'s birth can be reached. The fourth is that by scriptural analysis, the world creation is negated. Thus Gauḍapāda negates the existence of the world, but not the experience of the world. This point is missed by a lot of people. Gauḍapāda never says that you will not experience the world. The world experience will continue before and after *Māṇḍūkya-kārikā* study. The experience will continue but you will never assign existence to the world. Now we will take up the first stage.

Verse 3

आत्मा ह्याकाशवज्जीवैर्घटाकाशैरिवोदितः ।

घटादिवच्च सङ्घातैर्जातावेतन्निदर्शनम् ॥ ३ ॥

ātmā hyākāśavajjīvairghaṭākāśairivoditaḥ ।

ghaṭādivacca saṅghātairjātāvetannidarśanam ॥ 3॥

Ātmā is indeed like the space. It is born in the form of jīvas, which are like the pot-spaces. (It is born) in the form of the bodies also which are like the pots. This is the illustration with regard to the birth (of the jīvas.) (verse 3)

The first part is the logical negation of *jīva sṛṣṭi*. The example Gauḍapāda uses here is that of space, which is an important one. Brahman, *ātmā* or *Turīyam* is often compared to space, because consciousness principle is very similar to space. What are the similarities? Both are intangible and invisible. You understand space but you don't see it because it does not have any color or form. Both are formless, all-pervading, indivisible, accommodate everything, and uncontaminated. Space is indivisible. Consider an open space. A potter creates many pots from the clay of the earth. Once the pots are created, the all over open space is available in the pot also. Now we have space within and without. Therefore we use the expression outside space and inside space, unenclosed space and enclosed space. Even though we use two phrases open space and enclosed space, really speaking space has not been divided, it is only seemingly divided. This is the first seeming division. Once you introduce inside space, the enclosed space has become many as it were, since there are several pots. Then we start using adjectives to indicate the seemingly different sizes of the enclosed space in the pots. The words are many, the adjectives are many, but how many spaces are there: Only one space with a seeming division. Open space is not available for any function. Space becomes useful only when it becomes enclosed. Open land is useless for living but a building that encloses the space gives the land utility. The building is not the

main concern but the space within is. Transactional utility belongs to the enclosed space. The useless space has now become useful space. *Advaitam* space has now become pluralistic space. This plurality looks as though factual plurality. It looks as though space has become many but all the time space continues to be *advaitam*. If space can be seemingly divided and the seemingly divided space can become useful for transaction, the same thing is happening for consciousness also. Consciousness by itself is not available for any transaction. Just as many pots are produced, many bodies are produced out of *māyā* or *prakṛti*. When many bodies and minds are created, the all-pervading one consciousness is available within the body also. Now there are two consciousnesses as it were. One is external consciousness, which is not available for any transaction and the other is an internal consciousness, enclosed consciousness obtaining within the body-mind complex. The enclosed consciousness is available for all the transactions. The first and foremost transaction that happens when the consciousness is enclosed within the body-mind is “I am”. The first consciousness is called self-awareness. The open consciousness without body-mind complex does not have self-awareness, but the very same consciousness enclosed in the body-mind develops self-awareness, “I am”. *This enclosed consciousness with self-awareness is called jīvātma*. This self-awareness, “I am” does not refer to the body, mind, thoughts, or even the reflected consciousness (RC is only a by-product) but it refers to the original consciousness. This enclosed consciousness is called *jīvātma*. The unenclosed all-pervading consciousness is called *paramātma*. External consciousness is *paramātma* and internal consciousness is *jīvātma*. Is there a division between them? Is there a division between pot-space and total space? Don’t say that division is there. Don’t say that division is not there. The answer should be that there is a seeming division between total space and pot-space. Similarly, *Jīvātma* and *Paramātma* are seemingly divided but really speaking there is no division at all. When the pot is born, the pot-space is enclosed within the pot, which is called pot-space. Can it be said that the potter created pot-space? The potter creates only the pot but does not create a pot-space. Total space has not undergone a change to produce a pot-space. Total space has not been divided to produce pot-space. Pot-space has not been produced at anytime. When the pot is created, the enclosed pot-space seems to be created. Before the creation of the pot, the enclosed space was not available. After the creation of the pot, the enclosed space is available. Therefore we tend to say that the enclosed space is created but the potter does not create it. Similarly when the body-mind complex is born, the total consciousness is available in the body-mind complex, which is named *jīvātma*. *Jīvātma* is not born. Then what is born? The name pot-space is born. We have introduced the name ‘pot-space’ for the sake of transaction. *Jīvātma* is never born in all the three periods of time and only the name *jīvātma* is used for the sake of transaction. *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* talks about the procedure of the naming of a baby that is born. It says that the parents should name the child as Brahman. Why? The child is Brahman. If every child is named Brahman, there will be confusion. So the Upaniṣad says that even though every child is *jīvātma* which is none other than the all-pervading consciousness Brahman, let the name Brahman remain the secret name, and let the parents give the baby another name. Similarly the word ‘*jīvātma*’ is born but we are *paramātma* all the time. Thus Gauḍapāda says that your name is *jīvātma* for transaction purposes but you are *paramātma*.

One total space is as though born in the form of many pot-spaces. Only the word pot-space is born even though the pot-space is not born. There is no difference in space now inside the pot and that same space that was there before the pot. In the same way, one consciousness, *paramātmā* Brahman, is seemingly born in the form of the *jīvātmas*. Then the next question is what is pot born out of? Pot-space is seemingly born out of total space. What is pot born out of? You will say pot is born out of earth. Gauḍapāda says that pot is born out of space only. Modern quantum physics will support this. In *Taittirīya Upaniṣad*, it is said that from space, air, fire, water, and earth are born, from earth the pot is born. So pot is born out of space. Just as pots are born out of space, all the body-mind complexes are born out of *paramātmā* only. Space is the cause of pot and the seeming cause of pot-space. *Paramātmā* is the cause of *jīvātma* and *paramātmā* is the cause of the body also. This example of pot and pot-space should be used to understand the creation. Then Gauḍapāda analyzes the example.

Verse 4

घटादिषु प्रलीनेषु घटाकाशादयो यथा ।

आकाशे सम्प्रलीयन्ते तद्वज्जीवा इहाऽऽत्मनि ॥ ४ ॥

ghaṭādiṣu pralīneṣu ghaṭākāśādayo yathā ।

ākāśe sampralīyante tadvajjīvā ihā''tmani ॥ 4॥

Jīvas (merge) into this Ātmā just as pot-space etc. merge into (the total) space when the pot etc., are resolved. (verse 4)

When the pots are created, the pot-spaces are seemingly created. When the pots are broken, what happens to the pot-space? Generally it will be said that pot-space merges into total space when the pot is broken. Gauḍapāda asks what is the meaning of the word ‘merges’? The word ‘merges’ is a verb indicating some action. Does the pot-space travel after the pot is broken to merge with total space? No! Can you then say that pot-space undergoes a change to become total space? No, because space cannot undergo change. Therefore there is no travel, no change. Then why is the verb ‘merges’ used? Is it not a false verb? The word ‘merges’ conveys only one thing. Pot-space merging into total space means that nothing happens outside but we just withdraw the word pot-space. Previously we introduce the word pot-space and later we withdraw the word pot-space. Both are phenomena only in our speech but as far as the space is concerned nothing has happened. We introduce a word and call it *sṛṣṭi* and get trapped. We introduce another word called merged into total space and call it dissolution. From the viewpoint of space, there is no creation or dissolution. Similarly *ātmā* is always *ātmā*. In the presence of the bodies we introduce a word *jīvātma* and thereafter we decide that we want to merge into *paramātmā*. This is our struggle for *mokṣa*, all born out of our introduction of a word called *jīvātma*. There is no such thing called *jīvātma* other than the word *jīvātma*.

MK-34 = Chapter – 3, Verses – 5 to 8

Verse 4

घटादिषु प्रलीनेषु घटाकाशादयो यथा ।

आकाशे सम्प्रलीयन्ते तद्वज्जीवा इहाऽऽत्मनि ॥ ४ ॥

In this chapter, Gauḍapāda is analyzing the word *advaitam*, which is used in *mantra 7* of the *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad*, while defining *Turīya ātmā*. He wishes to bring out the significance of the word *advaitam*. *Advaitam* is that which cannot multiply into many things and so remains one. If Brahman is always one, a creation can never be born out of Brahman. Therefore the creation of the universe out of Brahman is not possible. If at all we experience the arrival of the universe, it is an experience of only an appearance. It is not factual. So Gauḍapāda says that our experience is not wrong, but the conclusion based on the experience alone is wrong. He does not challenge the experience but challenges only the conclusion. The experience of the sun going round the earth can never be questioned because we experience the sun rising, moving across the sky and setting. This experience is not questioned but the conclusion based on the experience is revised with the knowledge that the earth rotates on its own axis. Even after the conclusion is revised the experience continues.

Similarly, we experience the world, birth of living beings, and death of living beings. Gauḍapāda does not challenge this experience but only the conclusion we draw from it. Our experience is the birth of sentient beings and the inert objects, *anātmā*. The sentient beings are *jīvātma* and the inert universe is *prapañca*. Gauḍapāda challenges the conclusion that we make from this experience that *jīvātma* and world are born out of Brahman. The revised conclusion is that *jīvātma* is not born out of Brahman because *jīvātma* is not born at all. The world also is not born out of Brahman because the world is not born at all.

Gauḍapāda negates the creation of the *jīva* using logic through the example of space. Space is only one. It cannot multiply into many or divide itself into many. But we experience the seeming multiplication of space. How does it take place? When several enclosures are made the all-pervading space is available in every enclosure. Thus we have seemingly several enclosed spaces. The seemingly many spaces have different names, forms and functions. Each space seems to have a date of birth and date of death. We experience all these but the experience does not warrant our conclusion that these happenings are factual. In and through all these phenomena, nothing has happened to the space itself.

Similarly consciousness remains one always and in that consciousness, many bodies arrive and depart but it looks like consciousness is arriving and going. The enclosed consciousness is called *jīvātma*. The *jīvātma* is not born and it is only the enclosure body-mind that arrives and goes. The misconceptions of birth and death of *jīvātma* are described in verses 3 and 4 respectively. Only the word *jīvātma* is born and dies but no *jīva* is born at anytime. That is what Kṛṣṇa said in the *Bhagavad Gita*:

This (ātmā) is neither born at any time nor does it die. It will neither come to existence nor will it disappear again. It is unborn, deathless, decay-less, and growth-less. (It) is not affected when the body is affected. (2:20)

Now Gauḍapāda explains with an example.

Verse 5

यथैकस्मिन्घटाकाशे रजोधूमादिभिर्युते ।

न सर्वे सम्प्रयुज्यन्ते तद्वज्जीवाः सुखादिभिः ॥ ५ ॥

yathaikasminghaṭākāśe rajodhūmādibhiryute ।

na sarve samprayujyante tadvajjīvāḥ sukhādibhiḥ ॥ 5॥

(All) jīvas (are not associated) with pleasure etc. just as all (pot-spaces) are not associated (with dust, smoke etc.) when one pot-space is associated with dust, smoke etc. (verse 5)

When the enclosures are many, the enclosed spaces seem to be varied and many. They seem to have many different attributes also. Different objects contained in the varied spaces seem to make those spaces assume the properties of the objects. In the same way, the many seeming *jīvātmas* have different attributes. Thus *ātmā* seems to be many with different attributes. Gauḍapāda warns against coming to the conclusion that *ātmā* is many.

When one enclosed space is contaminated by dust, smoke, etc., other enclosed spaces are not contaminated. This makes us count space as many. This is our experience but the fact is that space is not many, not born and not divided. In the same way, some *jīvas* are endowed with happiness and some other *jīvas* are unhappy but that is only a seeming experience. Even though space may be foul smelling but that smell is in the air contained in the space but the space is not contaminated by it. Even when the sorrow is in the mind, it cannot contaminate the all-pervading consciousness *ātmā*.

Verse 6

रूपकार्यसमाख्याश्च भिद्यन्ते तत्र तत्र वै ।

आकाशस्य न भेदोऽस्ति तद्वज्जीवेषु निर्णयः ॥ ६ ॥

rūpakāryasamākhyāśca bhidyante tatra tatra vai ।

ākāśasya na bhedo'sti tadvajjīveṣu nirṇayaḥ ॥ 6॥

Forms, functions, and name differ in each case. (But) there is no difference in space. Same is the conclusion with regard to the jīvas. (verse 6)

Each enclosed space has a limited function that varies indicating they are different experientially. But factually, there are no differences in the space at all. It is usually said that the space inside a room is small and the space outside that room is big. Gauḍapāda says that this statement is wrong. There is no question of space inside the room and space outside the room. There is only one space in which all the rooms exist. Space is not in the rooms but the rooms are in one indivisible space. The first mistake is that we say that space is within the room. The second mistake is that we say that that space in the room is small compared to the space outside. Similarly there are not many *ātmā* in different bodies but there is only one *ātmā* in which all the bodies exist.

Verse 7

नाऽऽकाशस्य घटाकाशो विकारावयवौ यथा ।

नैवाऽऽत्मनः सदा जीवो विकारावयवौ तथा ॥ ७ ॥

nā"kāśasya ghaṭākāśo vikārāvayavau yathā ।

naivā"tmanah sadā jīvo vikārāvayavau tathā ॥ 7॥

Jīva is not at all a product or a part of the Ātmā at anytime just as the pot-space is not a product or a part of the (total) space. (verse 7)

This is a very important verse useful for *nididhyāsanam*. Consider the pot-space and the open space. What is the relationship between the enclosed space and the open space? Gauḍapāda suggests two possibilities. Can it be said that the enclosed space is the product of total space? This would mean that total space and the enclosed space would have a cause-effect relationship. If the previous possibility is not viable, can it be said that the enclosed space is a part of the total space? The first one is cause-effect relationship and the second one is part-whole relationship. If either of the above two possibilities is established, extending that to the *jīvātma* and *paramātma*, it can be said that *jīvātma* is the product of *paramātma* (*dvaitam*) or *jīvātma* is a part of *paramātma* (*viśiṣṭādvaitam*). Gauḍapāda rejects both. The enclosed space is neither a product nor a part of the total space. Pot-space is not a product because the pot-space was present even before the pot was created. The potter never creates the pot-space. There is no difference in space before and after the creation of the pot. The enclosed space is not a part of the total space because space cannot be divided or separated by any object. The wall does not separate the inner space and outer space. If it can separate, you can take the two ‘spaces’ away. The wall cannot separate because there is space wherever the wall is standing. When you cut butter with a knife, as the cut is made, there is butter on one side and on the other, but no butter where the knife is. This is separation. However, the wall has not displaced the space where it is standing and so there is no separation of space due to the wall. Therefore, the space is not inside the room but the room is inside the space. Space is an indivisible whole.

Similarly *jīvātma* is not a product of *paramātma* or a part of *paramātma*. *Jīvātma* is another name for *paramātma* just like pot-space is another name for one indivisible total space. The name *jīvātma* is useful for transaction. *Jīvātma* described as a spark of *paramātma* likening it to sparks from a fire is a wrong description.

Verse 8

यथा भवति बालानां गगनं मलिनं मलैः ।

तथा भवत्यबुद्धानामात्माऽपि मलिनो मलैः ॥ ८ ॥

yathā bhavati bālānāṃ gaganam malinaṃ malaiḥ ।

tathā bhavatyabuddhānāmātmā'pi malino malaiḥ ॥ 8॥

Just as the space appears sullied with dirt for children, in the same way, the Ātmā also appears sullied with impurities for the ignorant ones. (verse 8)

If a pot is contaminated with foul smelling substance, the milk contained in the pot will get contaminated with that smell and the space inside the pot would seem to be contaminated also because it is in association with the pot. The enclosed space has never been impure, it is ever pure and it need not merge into the 'pure' total space because there was no separation at all. Similarly the body is the contaminated pot. The milk is the subtle body with impurities. The body and mind need to be purified. But based on the body and mind, I conclude that I, who am neither the body nor the mind but the enclosed consciousness, am impure. That notion has to be dropped by studying the scriptures. For that the mind is required. The mind has to be purified for studying the scriptures and not for purifying the *ātmā*. When the mind is reasonably *sāttvika*, and the scriptures are studied, I understand that I have always been pure and have been one with *paramātma* all the time. Gauḍapāda says that not knowing this everyone says, "I am impure". The enclosed space within an impure pot appears impure, but even when it appears impure the space is always pure. Only childish people say that the space is impure. Gauḍapāda says that we are all doing the same thing with respect to us. The enclosed *jīvātma* within the body-mind complex also appears impure based on the impurity of the mind. Because of this the *jīva* says, "I am impure". This causes problems because *ātmā* has been mixed up with the *anātmā*. What needs to be done is to purify the mind, study the scriptures and understand that "I am not the mind, I am ever the *ātmā*".

MK-35 = Chapter – 3, Verses – 9 to 11

Verse 8

यथा भवति बालानां गगनं मलिनं मलैः ।

तथा भवत्यबुद्धानामात्माऽपि मलिनो मलैः ॥ ८ ॥

In this chapter, Gauḍapāda's main aim is to establish that Brahman is *advaitam* and the significance of the word *advaitam* is that it cannot create a world or be a cause of anything. What cannot become two or many is *a-dvaitam*. Since Brahman cannot be a creator of a world, producer of anything or cause of anything, we can never talk about creation at all. Creation is an intellectual conclusion we have arrived at based on our experience of the world.

Gauḍapāda says that the experience and the appearance of the world are not questioned but the intellectual conclusion arrived at about the world based on that appearance and experience is questioned. The conclusion is two-fold. The two conclusions we have made are: 1. The world exists. 2. The world originated. The second conclusion is a consequence of the first one. If something exists, it must have originated. Gauḍapāda negates the existence of the world and its origination from Brahman. Though he negates both of them, he accepts both the appearance and the experience of the world.

Then the question can be asked as to what the cause of the appearance or experience of the world is. Gauḍapāda says that the cause is *ātma-avidyā*, *mūlā-avidyā* or *māyā*. To explain this, the example given in the second chapter is rope-snake. The existence and the origination of the rope-snake are negated. The experience and appearance of the rope-snake are accepted. The cause for the appearance and experience of the rope-snake is ignorance. Whenever we talk about these four things of something it is called *mithyā*, *adhyāsa*. *Mithyā* or *adhyāsa* should fulfill four conditions: that whose existence is negated, that whose origination is negated, that whose experience and appearance are accepted and the cause of the appearance and existence is the ignorance of the *adhiṣṭhānam*. The *adhiṣṭhānam* of the rope-snake is rope.

Similarly, Gauḍapāda says that the world also comes under *mithyā* or *adhyāsa* and he will establish all these four conditions: negation of the existence of the world, negation of the origination of the world, acceptance of the appearance and experience of the world and the cause of the appearance and experience of the world is the ignorance of the *adhiṣṭhānam*. In the case of the world, the *adhiṣṭhānam* is Brahman, which is *Turīyam*, myself. Of these four conditions for *adhyāsa*, Gauḍapāda is presenting the second condition, negation of the origination. That negation is done in four stages. We are seeing that one by one. First, the negation of *jīva sṛṣṭi* through an example, second is the negation of *jagat sṛṣṭi* through an example, third is the negation of *jīva sṛṣṭi* with the help of scriptures and fourth is the negation of *jagat sṛṣṭi* with the help of scriptures.

We are at the end of the first stage, logical negation of *jīva sṛṣṭi* through an example from verses 3 to 9. Gauḍapāda uses the example of space. Through all these verses up to 8, Gauḍapāda has shown the following. When you talk about creation normally, say a car, the car is actually created, it is used and then later it is destroyed. The car with use gets dirty and so requires cleaning. All these are actually happening. *Gauḍapāda says that all these things can happen in a seeming manner also, seeming origination, seeming movement, seeming destruction, seeming impurity, and seeming cleansing but actual utility.* The example is pot-space. In the case of pot-space, the creation of the pot-space, its movement, getting impure, getting cleaned and destruction happen only seemingly but its utility is factual. Utility is possible because of actual creation and seeming creation also. **Based on utility, the creation should not be concluded to be an actual one.** Gauḍapāda is only questioning our conclusion. When the body enclosures are created, the body enclosed consciousness called *jīvātma* also is seemingly created, living, moving, gets impure, gets cleaned and dying but actually available for transaction. In verse 8 we saw that only childish people will say that the pot-space gets impure. Similarly, out of ignorance, *jīvātma* is mistaken to be impure. Gauḍapāda is aiming for change in our self-perspective. This change should make us understand that we were never born and that we never die. The mindset that leads one to pray for this birth to be the last one, etc., should be displaced with the right perspective of our true nature. At the same time, people who are still in that frame of mind should not be criticized.

Verse 9

मरणे सम्भवे चैव गत्यागमनयोरपि ।

स्थितौ सर्वशरीरेषु आकाशेनाविलक्षणः ॥ ९ ॥

maraṇe sambhave caiva gatyāgamanayorapi ।

sthitau sarvaśarīreṣu ākāśēnāvilakṣaṇaḥ ॥ 9॥

(Jīva) is similar to the pot-space in the case of death, birth, departure, arrival, and existence in various bodies. (verse 9)

Gauḍapāda has analyzed the pot-space example sufficiently and this can be extended further also but he has given some indication based on which we can extend this further. Gauḍapāda concludes by establishing that pot-space is only seemingly created and similarly *jīvātma* is only seemingly created. Thus the negation of the origination of the *jīvātma* is established. With regard to birth, death, going, and arrival, the enclosure has been mistaken for the enclosed one. *Jīvātma* is very similar to pot-space with respect to the seeming birth, death, arrival, departure and plurality. The pot-space has utility even though it is not at all born. The appearance and experience of the *jīvātma* are not negated but only its existence and origination are negated. With this the first stage is over.

Verse 10

सङ्घाताः स्वप्नवत्सर्वे आत्ममायाविसर्जिताः ।

आधिक्ये सर्वसाम्ये वा नोपपत्तिर्हि विद्यते ॥ १० ॥

saṅghātāḥ svapnavatsarve ātmamāyāvisarjitāḥ ।

ādhikye sarvasāmye vā nopapattirhi vidyate ॥ 10॥

All bodies are projected by the māyā of the Ātmā like dream. There is no reason (to establish their reality) whether there is superiority or total equality (among them.) (verse 10)

Gauḍapāda is now entering into the **second topic of the logical negation of the origination of the world**. For this Gauḍapāda takes only one verse. The potter does not create the pot-space but the potter creates the pot. The origination of the pot is clearly seen. Similarly the *jīvātma*, the enclosed consciousness may not be created, but what about the enclosure body? Should not the creation of the body be accepted just like the potter creating the pot? Therefore the origination of the body, thereby many bodies should be accepted. Then the origination of the five elements and the entire world should be accepted. Consciousness may not be created but should the creation of the body and the world not be accepted?

*Gauḍapāda explains the non-origination of the world logically by giving a different example. The purpose of the previous example of space was to show that *jīvātma* is not created just as pot-space is not created. **Once that is understood, that example should be discarded. Every example serves only a limited purpose.** Even though the body is appearing and is experienced, it should not be concluded that the body exists and originated. Gauḍapāda uses the *dream world as the example* to explain the non-existence and non-origination of the *jīva* bodies and the world (the waking world). The dream world is appearing and experienced but one can never talk about the existence and origination of the dream world. This was dealt with elaborately in chapter 2. The waking world including the *jīva* bodies and the world should be understood in a similar manner. All the bodies and objects of the world do not exist or originate but they appear because of self-ignorance in the form of *māyā-śakti*. Irrespective of whatever differences are seemingly there between the waking and the dream worlds, they are *mithyā* only. There is no logic to establish that the waking world is actually created out of Brahman. With this the negation of *jagat sṛṣṭi* through example is over.*

To understand *mithyā*, the following four conditions for *mithyā* should be understood: Existence is negated. Origination is negated. Appearance and experience are accepted. The cause for the appearance and experience is *avidyā*. Two examples are given: 1. ‘Space’ to show that *jīvātma* is not created. 2. ‘Dream’ to show that the world is not created. The above is good for *nididhyāsanam*.

Verse 11

रसादयो हि ये कोशा व्याख्यातास्तैत्तिरीयके ।

तेषामात्मा परो जीवः खं यथा सम्प्रकाशितः ॥ ११ ॥

rasādayo hi ye kośā vyākhyātāstaittirīyake ।

teṣāmātmā paro jīvaḥ khaṁ yathā samprakāśitaḥ ॥ 11 ॥

The (five) kośas beginning with annamaya are mentioned in Taittirīyopaniṣad. The supreme Ātmā is revealed as the content of them like the space. (verse 11)

Now Gauḍapāda enters **the third topic, which is negation of *jīva sṛṣṭi* through scriptures**. Logic and science have limitations. *Kāṭhōpaniṣad*: Logic can never reveal the truth. There is *śāstra pramāṇam* for the negation of *jīva sṛṣṭi*. Verses 11 to 14 describe the negation of the creation of the *jīva* through the scriptures. Gauḍapāda shows that in all the Upaniṣads, the central teaching is *jīvātma-paramātma aikyam* (identity). Each Upaniṣad is centered around a *mahāvākyam* that reveals the identity between the *jīvātma* and the *paramātma*. The most famous *mahāvākyam* is *tat tvam asi. aham brahmāsmi*, and *ātmā brahma* are some of the other *mahāvākyams*. There are many such statements in the Upaniṣads. All the traditional people, whatever may be their *darśanam*, accept that *paramātma* is unborn. Even other religions accept an unborn uncreated entity, God, etc. Because of the identity between *paramātma* and *jīvātma*, if *paramātma* is unborn, then *jīvātma* must be unborn also. Gauḍapāda does not quote the most powerful verse from the *Bhagavad Gita*, verse 2.20, but quotes the *Taittirīya upaniṣad*. That Upaniṣad talks about the five *kośas* in the 2nd chapter, sections 1 - 5. Each section is for each *kośa*. Each *kośa* is an enclosure, one within another starting from *annamaya kośa*. After talking about each *kośa*, the Upaniṣad talks about *ātmā*, the consciousness principle experiencing all the five *kośas*. I experience the five *kośas* so I must be the inner content different from the *kośas*. That is *ātmā*, the witness consciousness. This inner *ātmā* is equated to Brahman. Later this equation is made even clearer. Thus *jīvatama-paramātma* identity is revealed in the *Taittirīya Upaniṣad*. Thus *jīvātma* is never born just as the *paramātma* is never born. This was made clear earlier with the example of space given in verses 3 to 9. This does not mean that birthdays of *jīvas* should not be celebrated. Within the play that the waking world is, all the rules and protocols should be followed with the understanding that all of this is *mithyā*.

MK-36 = Chapter – 3, Verses – 11 to 15

Verse 11

रसादयो हि ये कोशा व्याख्यातास्तैत्तिरीयके ।

तेषामात्मा परो जीवः खं यथा सम्प्रकाशितः ॥ ११ ॥

Gauḍapāda wishes to establish four main ideas with regard to the universe. Those points are: 1. Vedānta negates the existence of the world. 2. Vedānta negates the origination of the world. 3. The appearance and experience of the world is acceptable to Vedānta. 4. The cause for the appearance and experience is *ātma-avidyā*, *mūlā-avidyā*, *māyā* or self-ignorance.

Of these four points, the second point is taken up here, i.e., the origination of the world is to be negated while accepting the appearance of the world. The negation of the origination of the world is divided into two parts. One is the origination of the *jīva*, the experiencer of the world, and the other is the experienced inert world. One is *jīva* and the other is *jagat*. Both the *jīva sṛṣṭi* and the *jagat sṛṣṭi* are negated in these portions. Gauḍapāda takes two examples. *Jīva sṛṣṭi* was negated in verses 3 to 9 using the example of pot-space and total space. Pot-space is seemingly created but not really created. Similarly, the *jīva*, the consciousness principle is not created. Enclosure is there around the pot-space. Similarly, around the *jīva* enclosure alone is there, *jīva*, the consciousness, is not created. Thereafter, Gauḍapāda pointed out that not only *jīvas* are not created, the *jagat* is also not created even though it appears to be created. To convey this seeming creation, he took the second example, the dream world. The dream world is really not created but is seemingly created because it appears in front of us. Similarly this universe is also really not created but it appears like dream. Therefore *jagat sṛṣṭi* is negated with the help of the dream example, which was given in the 10th verse. In that verse, Gauḍapāda does not use the expression *jagat sṛṣṭi*, does not mention the world, but takes a representative of the world, i.e., the physical body. In the 10th verse, he says that the body whether a superior one or inferior one is a projection of *māyā* only. The word *saṅghātāḥ* in the verse means body-mind complex, which represents the entire *jagat*. From the 11th verse to the 14th verse, Gauḍapāda says that the Upaniṣads also convey the same meaning. *Jīvātma* is not created out of *paramātma* even though we feel that *jīvātmas* are created, take rebirth and pray that this *janma* should be our last one. Gauḍapāda says that we assume birth and then try to get out of being born again. *Jīva* will not have rebirth because the *jīva* is never born. How does one know that this is the message of the Upaniṣads? All the Upaniṣads directly point out the *jīvātma-paramātma* identity. If these two are one and the same, how can it be said that one is born out of the other? When both of them are only two words referring to one, how can you talk about *jīvātma sṛṣṭi* from *paramātma*? That is a misconception. All of our *sādhana*s are not for removing rebirth but for removing our misconception regarding birth and rebirth. This is a very important point. I get freedom not from rebirth but from the misconception that I am born again and again. Verse 11 referred to *Taittirīya Upaniṣad* in support of the negation of the *jīva sṛṣṭi*.

Verse 12

द्वयोर्द्वयोर्मधुज्ञाने परं ब्रह्म प्रकाशितम् ।

पृथिव्यामुदरे चैव यथाऽऽकाशः प्रकाशितः ॥ १२ ॥

dvayordvayormadhujñāne paraṃ brahma prakāśitam ।

pṛthivyāmudare caiva yathā"kāśaḥ prakāśitaḥ ॥ 12॥

In the Madhubrāhmaṇam (of Bṛhadāranyakopaniṣad,) the supreme Brahman is revealed in pairs (of locations) just as the (same) space is shown in the earth and in the stomach. (verse 12)

In this verse, Gauḍapāda is taking a quotation from the *Bṛhadāranyaka Upaniṣad*, second chapter, 5th section. *Bṛhadāranyaka Upaniṣad* has six chapters. Each chapter has several sections and each section is called *Brāhmaṇam*. In the second chapter, the fifth section is called *Madhubrāhmaṇam* because the word *madhu* is repeatedly used. In that *Madhubrāhmaṇam*, the Upaniṣad divides the world into several pairs belonging to the individual planes, microcosm and the corresponding macrocosm. The macrocosm is called *devatā* and the microcosm is called *adhyātmaṃ*, the individual. For example the eyes are *vyaṣṭi* (microcosm) and *surya devatā* is the *samaṣṭi* (macrocosm) (*adhyātmaṃ* and *adhidaivam*). Taking these *vyaṣṭi-samaṣṭi* pairs, the Upaniṣad says that even though superficially they are different, the essence of both of them is only one *ātmā*. Normally, wave and ocean example is given. Wave is *vyaṣṭi* and ocean is *samaṣṭi*. Water is the essence of both the wave and the ocean. Taking several pairs, the Upaniṣad says that the same *ātmā*, as the essence of the total is called *paramātmā* and as the essence of the individual is called *jīvātma*.

In the *Madhubrāhmaṇam*, the *eka-ātmā* is revealed as the essence of both the *vyaṣṭi* and the *samaṣṭi* at various levels. This reveals the identity between the *jīvātma* and the *paramātmā*. So *jīvātma* is not born out of *paramātmā*. Therefore, the *jīva sṛṣṭi* does not happen. To illustrate the essential identity between the *vyaṣṭi* and *samaṣṭi*, Gauḍapāda points out that the space in our own stomachs is not different from the space all over on the earth.

Verse 13

जीवात्मनोरनन्यत्वमभेदेन प्रशस्यते ।

नानात्वं निन्द्यते यच्च तदेवं हि समञ्जसम् ॥ १३ ॥

jīvātmanorananyatvamabhedena praśasyate ।

nānātvam nindyate yacca tadevaṃ hi samañjasam ॥ 13॥

The non-difference between the jīva and the Ātmā is praised through (the statements of) identity and plurality is condemned. Such (a teaching) which is (mentioned above becomes) consistent in this way only. (verse 13)

Here Gauḍapāda says that the *jīvātma-paramātma* identity is repeatedly stated throughout all the Upaniṣads in the form of *mahāvākyams*. *Ṛg-veda mahāvākyam* is *prajñānam brahma*. *Yajur-Veda mahāvākyam* is *aham brahmāsmi*. *Sāma-veda mahāvākyam* is *tat tvam asi*. *Atharvana-veda mahāvākyam* is *ayamātma brahma*, which appears in *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad*. All the four Vedas repeatedly say that *jīvātma* and *paramātma* are one and the same through *mahāvākyams*. After revealing the identity, the Upaniṣads glorify that knowledge by saying that this knowledge alone liberates a person. The life would become meaningful only if this knowledge is gained. If you miss this knowledge, this human life becomes meaningless because all the other things that you acquire in this *janma* cannot be carried with you. *Jīvātma* is not born out of *paramātma*. On the other hand, *jīvātma* is *paramātma*. After glorifying this identity, the Upaniṣad strongly criticizes those who see the *jīvātma-paramātma* difference saying that they will continue to be *saṃsāris*. In *Kaṭhopaniṣad*, this statement is made:

That which is here alone is there. That which is there alone is here. One who sees here plurality, as it were, goes from death to death. (2.1.10)

Thus the identity is glorified and the difference is criticized and identity is the teaching. The oneness of *jīvātma* and *paramātma* is revealed through the *mahāvākyams* and it is glorified as the only meaningful knowledge. Not only that, the difference is criticized. From this, Gauḍapāda concludes that the Upaniṣads also support his earlier statement that the *jīvātma* is never born.

Verse 14

जीवात्मनोः पृथक्त्वं यत्प्रागुत्पत्तेः प्रकीर्तितम् ।

भविष्यद्भूत्या गौणं तन्मुख्यत्वं हि न युज्यते ॥ १४ ॥

jīvātmanoḥ pṛthaktvaṃ yatprāgutpatteḥ prakīrtitam ।

bhaviṣyadbhūtyā gauṇaṃ tanmukhyatvaṃ hi na yujyate ॥ 14॥

The separateness of the jīva and the Ātmā which is declared (in the scriptures) before (the statements of) creation is only secondary with regard to the future teaching (of identity.) It is not at all proper (to attribute) primary importance (to that separateness.) (verse 14)

Here Gauḍapāda is answering a possible doubt. The *jīvātma-paramātma* identity is glorified in all the Upaniṣads and the difference is criticized. The Upaniṣads are only the final and smaller part of the Vedas. There is a huge voluminous portion of the Vedas, which is much bigger in size than the Upaniṣads and in that portion Vedas talk about the *jīvātma-paramātma* difference. The entire *karma-section* describes the *jīvātma* worshipping the *paramātma* and the difference is stressed. The *upāsana-section* of the Vedas also maintains the difference. Gauḍapāda can be said to be unfair and selective in quoting the Vedas to support his conclusions. Gauḍapāda addresses this. The entire Vedas wish to talk about only identity. That alone is the aim of the Vedas. Even though the difference causes *saṃsāra*,

Vedas do not want to negate the difference right in the beginning itself. The difference has an advantage. Vedas use this advantage first. By using the *karma-section* and the *upāsana-section* we get the necessary mental maturity for *jñāna-yoga*. Vedas do not negate the difference first but encourage us to keep the difference for the ripening of the mind. When the mind is ripened, the difference is removed. It is like removing the skin of a banana only after the fruit ripens. Then the removed skin is discarded.

Dvaitam is a required provisional teaching but not the prominent teaching. The difference between the *jīvātma* and the *paramātma* are talked about before the Vedāntic teaching in the former part of the Vedas and is temporarily accepted. From the standpoint of the ultimate teaching, which is *advaitam*, this *dvaita* difference is only temporary. Ultimately this has to be dropped. Vedas do not prescribe a time limit for when one comes to the *advaita* teaching. One can continue in *karma-yoga* in which the seeker is a *jīva* and *Īśvara* is different from him, the *jīva* does *karma* and accepts *karma phalam* from *Īśvara* and prays to *Īśvara* to give him the strength to accept them. At that time even exposure to Vedānta can only result in academic knowledge, which is fine until that time when the seeker is ready to start assimilating the knowledge. *Dvaitam* should never be given ultimate importance. Tertiary format should give way to binary format. *Advaitam* should be received and if it is too much to accept keep it as information and continue in *karma-yoga* and *upāsana-yoga*. There is no harm in doing that.

Verse 15

मृल्लोहविस्फुलिङ्गाद्यै सृष्टिर्या चोदिताऽन्यथा ।

उपायः सोऽवताराय नास्ति भेदः कथञ्चन ॥ १५ ॥

mṛllohavisphuliṅgādyai sṛṣṭiryā coditā'nyathā ।

upāyaḥ so'vatārāya nāsti bhedaḥ kathañcana ॥ 15॥

Creation has been taught in many ways through (the examples of) clay, gold, spark, etc. It is a method for the understanding (of non-duality.) There is no duality anyhow. (verse 15)

With this the third topic of the negation of *jīva sṛṣṭi* with the *śruti pramāṇam* is over. Gauḍapāda now enters **the fourth topic of *jagat sṛṣṭi* from the viewpoint of *śruti pramāṇam*** in verses 15 to 26. Gauḍapāda's conclusion is that the world has not originated from Brahman. He starts by answering a possible question from the student. It is said that nothing is originated and the world has not originated from Brahman but the Upaniṣads talk about the origination of the world. Gauḍapāda seems to contradict the Upaniṣads. This is the toughest part of Vedānta, difficult to explain and understand. How can one say that the world has not originated when the Upaniṣads clearly talk about its origination? Any number of examples of this can be given. The *Muṇḍaka* and *Taittirīya Upaniṣads* talk about *sṛṣṭi* elaborately. The *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* in the 6th chapter, section 1 talks about the origination of the world by giving examples of earthenware and clay; various iron materials out of one substance iron; ornaments from

gold. *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* clearly says that similar to the examples cited, the objects in the world come out of Brahman. How can Gauḍapāda contradict all these descriptions?

Gauḍapāda says that the Upaniṣads do talk about creation but do not mean it. He says that the Upaniṣads only temporarily present the creation as though it has come. He says that this will become clear if the Upaniṣads are studied thoroughly to the end. *Mananam* and *nididhyāsanam* should be done back and forth. The very Upaniṣad that talks about creation negates it at the end. If the Upaniṣads really meant to say that the world has come out of Brahman, it should say at the end that there is a world in front of us. From this it is clear that the Upaniṣads introduce creation temporarily for the purpose of teaching Brahman and once Brahman is understood the idea of the creation must be dropped. Then the world should be understood as an appearance and not an originated one.

MK-37 = Chapter – 3, Verses – 15 to 17

Verse 15

मृल्लोहविस्फुलिङ्गद्यै सृष्टिर्या चोदिताऽन्यथा ।

उपायः सोऽवताराय नास्ति भेदः कथञ्चन ॥ १५ ॥

In this portion, Gauḍapāda has taken up the toughest project of establishing the nature of the world. With regard to the world, he conveys four lessons. The existence of the world is to be negated. The origination of the world is to be negated. The appearance and experience of the world are to be accepted. The cause for the appearance and experience of the world is to be understood to be due to *māyā* or *mūlā-avidyā*.

Based on this, a question may come. If the existence of the world is to be negated and the appearance of the world is to be accepted, how come the world is appearing as existent? The world is appearing to be existent. The world appears as existent only because we say that the wall exists, the fan exists, the carpet exists, etc. Gauḍapāda says that even though the world appears as existent, one should not accept its existence. **The existence, which is appearing in the world, does not belong to the world.** The appearance of the existence in the world is not questioned but what is asked is whether the existence in the world is of the world. Gauḍapāda says that there is existence in the world, but it does not belong to the world but borrowed from me, the *ātmā*, the observer. Moonlight is on the moon but moonlight is not of the moon. Similarly Gauḍapāda says that existence is along with the world but it does not belong to the world. It appears borrowing existence from Brahman and had not originated from Brahman.

Then comes the next question. In negating the origination but accepting the appearance of the world, what advantage does Gauḍapāda get? He only seems to have changed the words of description. It looks like saying underdeveloped country or developing country. Both mean the same thing in this example. *Gauḍapāda is particular because once you say that the world has originated from Brahman it becomes real, satyaṃ. When it is said that the world is an appearance then it means that it is mithyā.* Gauḍapāda does not accept the *satyatvam* of the world and he negates the word origination. He converts the word to appearance to show that the world is *mithyā*. The dream world appears for the waker but it does not originate from the waker. Origination means *satyatvam* and appearance means *mithyātvam*. *Sṛṣṭi* means *satyatvam* and *adhyāsa* means *mithyātvam*. Therefore, Gauḍapāda is very particular in using the word appearance. Gauḍapāda says that, “the world does not originate from Brahman but appears in Brahman” is the ultimate message of Vedānta. Vedānta also recognizes that a student cannot accept and assimilate this easily. Vedānta does not give this message in the beginning and it does not tell the truth initially. The initial teaching is that the world has originated from Brahman. Then the student will take the world to be *satyaṃ*. Vedāntic teaching does not disturb that idea initially and does not straightaway say that the world is *mithyā*. The student takes the *jīva*, *jagat* and *Īśvara* to be *satyaṃ*. Vedānta uses this duality for preparing our minds. *Mithyā dvaitam* is useful for refining the mind similar to our reflection in the mirror. Even though the reflection is *mithyā* it is very useful. Vedānta uses the *dvaita* world without telling it is *mithyā*. The way the teaching uses *dvaita* is *karma-yoga* for the development of the

proper attitude of offering all actions to *Īśvara* and accepting all results as gifts from *Īśvara*. Thereafter the Upaniṣad introduces *upāsana-yoga* in which the *jīva-Īśvara* duality is maintained in meditation. Practice of these two yogas for a long time refines the mind. Then the Upaniṣad teaches that this *dvaitam* that you have been experiencing as though *satyaṃ* is really speaking not *satyaṃ*. This *dvaita* was not originated from Brahman but it is only an appearance. Thus origination is introduced first and origination is taken away later and in the place of origination, the word appearance is used. The reflection in the mirror is dismissed after its utility is over. Use the world, qualify yourself, dismiss the world and understand it as appearance. This is the Vedāntic development.

The scriptures temporarily accept the origination of the world by giving various examples like clay-earthenware, gold-ornaments, and iron-iron materials. Based on this acceptance you should not conclude that the world has originated. It is only a temporary stepping-stone or method for driving home the Vedāntic teaching later. A dualistic world is really not there, and it is only an appearance. It is unbelievable but true. Several examples can be considered for this method of teaching: reflected face, pole vault jumping, and scaffolding for the building. Accept *sṛṣṭi*, go to *advaitam* and discard *sṛṣṭi*.

Verse 16

आश्रमास्त्रिविधा हीनमध्यमोत्कृष्टदृष्टयः ।

उपासनोपदिष्टेयं तदर्थमनुकम्पया ॥ १६ ॥

āśramāstrividhā hīnamadhyamotkrṣṭadrṣṭayah ।

upāsanopadiṣṭeyam tadarthamanukampayā ॥ 16॥

There are three types of seekers with inferior, intermediate, and superior vision. Upāsana has been taught for them out of compassion (verse 16)

Why does the Upaniṣad temporarily accept the creation and why can it not teach the appearance in the beginning itself? Gauḍapāda says that all the students are not *uttamaḥ adhikārīs*. These are rare people who can straightaway understand *aham satyaṃ jagan mithyā* merely by the example of dream. In two days Vedānta can be completed if we can compare this world to dream. Even though Vedānta gives this example of dream, in other places Vedānta keeps aside the dream example and elaborately talks about space is born, air is born, etc., thereafter five organs of knowledge, five organs of action, five-fold *prāṇa*, etc. Thereafter *pañcīkaraṇam* involving the subtle and gross elements is taught. All this is taught because it tallies with our idea of the gradual evolution of the universe. That teaching is so convincing even though that is not the message of Vedānta.

Gauḍapāda says that students are of three types. They can be broadly classified into three types, the lowest ones, the intermediary ones, and the superior, most qualified ones. The lowest one is who has neither practiced *karma-yoga* nor *upāsana-yoga*, the one who does not have purity or focus of the mind.

Their minds are riddled with bundles of likes-dislikes and thereby pre-occupied most of the time. In the case of the lowest ones, no reception of the teaching takes place in a Vedāntic class. The intermediary one is who has practiced *karma-yoga* but not *upāsana-yoga*. This person has purity of mind, but no focus of the mind. When this person comes to the class, reception takes place but he does not have any retention of the teaching. This person understands everything in the class but forgets the teaching after the class. Arjuna had this problem in the 6th chapter of the *Bhagavad Gita* and said: “Kṛṣṇa! You are teaching well and I am receiving the message but it just disappears.” The intermediary one has reception but no retention of the teaching. The superior one has gone through *karma-yoga* and *upāsana-yoga*, has purity and focus of the mind and when he listens to the teaching his mind easily absorbs it. Janaka’s detachment and mental preparation made him an exceptional student.

These highly qualified ones are very rare. *Karma-yoga* and *upāsana-yoga* are prescribed for the ones who have the lowest and intermediary qualifications. It is stressed that even though one is attending Vedānta classes the students should revise the *Bhagavad Gita* and practice the proper attitude of offering all actions to *Īśvara* and accepting all results as gifts from *Īśvara*. The *Gita* is very relevant in one’s life when attending Vedānta classes. Then the two will be mutually complimentary.

Verse 17

स्वसिद्धान्तव्यवस्थासु द्वैतिनो निश्चिता दृढम् ।

परस्परं विरुद्ध्यन्ते तैरयं न विरुद्ध्यते ॥ १७ ॥

svasiddhāntavyavasthāsu dvaitino niścitā dr̥ṭham ।

parasparam virudhyante tairayaṃ na virudhyate ॥ 17॥

The dualists are firmly settled on their own set of conclusions. They contradict one another. This (teaching) is not in conflict with them. (verse 17)

Because of the Veda’s temporary acceptance of the origination, people think that the world has really originated from Brahman. Therefore they look upon *dvaitam* as *satyaṃ*. This is a widely held misconception because they do not know the ultimate teaching of the Veda. Gauḍapāda says that not only ordinary people have this misconception but many philosophers also have it and they are dualistic philosophers. There are many *dvaita* proponents. They vehemently argue that *dvaitam* is *satyaṃ*. Based on that misconception they have their own philosophical systems. Each one will hold on to their system as the correct one and that all the other systems are wrong. Each system has its own concept of God. *Vaiṣṇavas* will say Viṣṇu is the ultimate God and only by going to Viṣṇu one will get *mokṣa*. *Śaivaites* will argue similarly. The dualistic philosophers say that their system alone is the ultimate truth. The truth is that there is no truth in *dvaitam*. Wherever there is duality, it can be looked at from different angles. A camera can be used to take pictures of a particular object from different angles. Each picture is true from the angle from which the picture was taken. Thus there is only relative reality in *dvaitam*. Seven blind

persons feeling an elephant give different accounts of the elephant and this shows that the different versions are true with respect to the standpoint of a given perception. Thus there is only relative reality in *dvaitam*. The truth behind *dvaitam* is *advaitam*. A non-dualist will see that each dualist is correct from his standpoint. None of them is correct from the other standpoint. The dualists will quarrel all the time but non-dualists will not quarrel with anyone. That is why Śaṅkarācārya established the worship of Śiva, Viṣṇu and Devī.

The dualists firmly adhere to their own theories. Some say that creation is many things assembled into one, a journey from many to one. Another argues that creation is from one to many. Both are right from their own angles. They fight with each other and refuse to listen to one another. For a non-dualist, the different systems and deities are not ends in themselves but only means to *advaita*. The non-dualist does not have a quarrel with anyone.

MK-38 = Chapter – 3, Verses – 18 to 21

Verse 17

स्वसिद्धान्तव्यवस्थासु द्वैतिनो निश्चिता दृढम् ।

परस्परं विरुध्यन्ते तैरयं न विरुध्यते ॥ १७ ॥

Gauḍapāda pointed out that the Veda talks about creation in the beginning even though the very same Veda negates the creation later. Negating the creation and looking at the creation as a mere appearance requires a lot of intellectual and emotional maturity. Veda wishes to prepare the minds of the people and so suppresses the truth temporarily. Veda talks about the creation of the five elements, the world, the gross body, the subtle body, etc. It also talks about the worshipper-worshipped duality in the *karma-section* and the meditator-meditated duality in the *upāsana-section*. They are only stepping-stones. We have to use them to refine the mind and once that happens, the Upaniṣads say that there is no duality at all. Neither the meditator-meditated nor the worshipper-worshipped duality is really created but it is all an appearance caused by *māyā*. Whatever appears because of *māyā* does not have an existence of its own. It has only a borrowed existence like the dream world. The dream world is really not created and it does not exist by itself but it appears because I give reality to it by remaining in dream. The moment I wake up, the whole dream world is reduced to a bunch of thoughts and objects. That I will never know as long as I remain in the dream and give reality to the dream world. Similarly this *dvaitam* is an appearance only, it does not have an existence of its own and this is the final teaching. Veda does not teach this right away in the beginning but waits until the student is mature. Until maturity comes, the student is allowed to continue in *dvaitam*.

The problem is that most people remain in *dvaitam* permanently. Several philosophers remain in duality like *śaivism* and *vaiṣṇavism*. They remain in duality and according to them *mokṣa* is that after death, the devotees go to the abode of Śiva or the abode of Viṣṇu where Śiva or Viṣṇu is present with eternal bodies and the devotees with eternal bodies will be doing permanent *pūjā*. Thus for them, *saṃsāra* and *mokṣa* are both *dvaitam*. For the non-dualists, the start is *advaitam*, the end is *advaitam* and the middle where *dvaitam* appears, *advaitam* is the truth. This truth is not understood. As long as this is not understood, Gauḍapāda says that everything appears to be true according to one's standpoint. Everything can be looked at from different angles. The waking world and the dream world are both true from the standpoints of the waker and dreamer respectively and untrue from the other standpoint and so quarreling about which one of these is true is meaningless. By quarreling one does not reach anywhere and therefore a non-dualist never quarrels with the dualists. The non-dualist is practical. What is absolute truth is *advaitam*, which is the *adhiṣṭhānam* of all duality.

Gauḍapāda says that all philosophers quarrel with one another but the non-dualists do not quarrel with anyone. The reality of duality is conditional reality. *Advaitam* is absolute reality because there are no standpoints in *advaitam*.

Verse 18

अद्वैतं परमार्थो हि द्वैतं तद्भेद उच्यते ।

तेषामुभयथा द्वैतं तेनायं न विरुध्यते ॥ १८ ॥

advaitam paramārtho hi dvaitam tadbheda ucyate ।

teṣāmubhayathā dvaitam tenāyam na virudhyate ॥ 18॥

Non-duality is indeed the absolute Reality. Duality is said to be its manifestation (only.) For dualists, duality (exists) both (empirically and absolutely.) Hence this (teaching) is not in conflict (with them.) (verse 18)

The absolute reality is only one, non-dual principle. It is known as *Turīyam*. All the duality is all appearances of one Brahman through *māyā* just as through *nidrā-śakti* the dream world appears. *Advaitam* appears as *dvaitam*. As long as I am ignorant, I will take the *dvaitam* to be real. The *advaita* teaching starts from *dvaitam*, the natural experience of people and ends with *advaitam*. From the dualist standpoint, it is always *dvaitam*, whether during *saṃsāra* (ignorance) or *mokṣa* (knowledge). For them, *dvaitam* is the ultimate reality. The non-dualist does not want to contradict them because they are always correct from their standpoint. The non-dualist only tries to reveal the teaching and unless they cooperate the teaching cannot be done. All the dualists are rigidly holding on to their standpoint and even discourage their followers from going to *advaita ācāryas*. The non-dualist is not afraid of *dvaitam* because a non-dualist can understand both levels of truth. *Advaita* does not contradict any other teaching.

Verse 19

मायया भिद्यते ह्येतन्नान्यथाऽजं कथञ्चन ।

तत्त्वतो भिद्यमाने हि मर्त्यताममृतं व्रजेत् ॥ १९ ॥

māyayā bhidyate hyetannānyathā'jam kathañcana ।

tattvato bhidyamāne hi martyatāmamṛtam vrajet ॥ 19॥

This unborn (Ātmā) becomes differentiated through māyā only; not in any other manner. For, if it is really differentiated, the immortal (Ātmā) will undergo mortality. (verse 19)

Many systems of duality believe that there was originally only one *paramātma* and for some reason, the *paramātma* has now become the *jīvātma* and a *saṃsāri*. Thus the *jīvātma* came from the *paramātma*, the *jīvātma* got separated from the *paramātma* and therefore the *jīvātma* is now a *saṃsāri*. What should the *jīvātma* do now? The *jīvātma* has to gradually go towards the *paramātma* and join the *paramātma*. Gaudapāda says that if the *paramātma* can undergo a change and create a *jīvātma* and the *jīvātma* can come away from the *paramātma*, then the *paramātma* is subject to change and division. If the

paramātma has changed and divided and the *jīvātma* has come, and when the *jīvātma* goes and joins the *paramātma* and attains *mokṣa*, the following question comes up. If the *jīvātma* can come away from the *paramātma* once, then even after joining the *paramātma*, the *jīvātma* can come away again. Thus this *mokṣa* cannot be permanent. Vedānta says that the *jīvātma* has never come away from the *paramātma*, has never become separated from the *paramātma* because the *paramātma* cannot undergo any change to create a division. Therefore the separation is only a sense of seeming separation but actually the separation has not happened. If the separation is not factual, the *jīvātma* need not have to join the *paramātma*. Therefore, *mokṣa* is dropping the notion that I am separate from the *paramātma*.

The *paramātma-jīvātma* separation or division takes place only seemingly, not actually, because of *māyā-śakti*, as in the case of dream, the separation from home and being deserted in some place for example. Other than that, the actual separation and division can never take place because Brahman is defined in the scriptures as indivisible just as space does not get divided into inside space and outside space.

Suppose the *jīvātma* and the *paramātma* get separated at *sṛṣṭi* and then doing *sādhana* the *jīvātma* joins the *paramātma* at some time. This can happen again and again. In time everything can happen cyclically. Thus the separation-union of the *jīvātma* and the *paramātma* will go on happening and there will be no permanent *mokṣa*. Further this would imply that the *paramātma* itself would be subject to time, mortality, etc.

Verse 20

अजातस्यैव भावस्य जातिमिच्छन्ति वादिनः ।

अजातो ह्यमृतो भावो मर्त्यतां कथमेष्यति ॥ २० ॥

ajātasyaiva bhāvasya jātimicchanti vādinah ।

ajāto hyamṛto bhāvo martyatām kathameṣyati ॥ 20॥

The disputants wish (to ascertain) the birth of the unborn Reality itself. How can the unborn, immortal Reality indeed undergo mortality? (verse 20)

The problem with all the dualistic systems is that they treat Brahman as one of the objects in the creation. Because we are experiencing various things in the creation, and when the Upaniṣads introduce Brahman, we try to imagine Brahman as another thing or being. In the *śāstra* itself, initially the infinite formless Brahman is given a form for meditation and this leads to the misconception that Brahman is a person in a remote place according to the description given by the *śāstra*. There are descriptions that the *jīvātma* has come away from Brahman like sparks from one fire. This is not factual. Once it is taken as factual that the *paramātma* is subject to division, separation, etc., the *paramātma* is reduced to a finite being.

Various theological and philosophical systems, which look upon *paramātmā* as a person in some other *loka*, talk about the division of *paramātmā* into *paramātmā* and *jīvātma*, and *jīvātma* coming away at the time of *śrṣṭi*. How can one undivided *paramātmā* get divided into the form of many *jīvātmas* and *jagat*? Pot-space is not an actual division but only a seeming division because space is indivisible. *Paramātmā* can never become *jīvātma*. Then *paramātmā* can appear as *jīvātma*. We are none other than *paramātmā* itself appearing as *jīvātma* but we refuse to accept that fact. How can an unborn, deathless and divisionless *paramātmā* get divided into several *jīvātmas*? It can never get divided.

Verse 21

न भवत्यमृतं मर्त्यं न मर्त्यममृतं तथा ।

प्रकृतेरन्यथाभावो न कथञ्चिद्भविष्यति ॥ २१ ॥

na bhavatyamṛtaṃ martyaṃ na martyamamṛtaṃ tathā ।

prakṛteranyathābhāvo na kathañcidbhaviṣyati ॥ 21 ॥

The immortal does not become mortal. In the same way, the mortal does not become immortal. Transformation of the intrinsic nature does not take place anyhow. (verse 21)

This is a very important and profound verse. It has so many corollaries. The essential nature of a thing will never be lost. It will never go away from that thing. Why? What nature does not go away is called essential nature. The essential nature of fire is heat. Wherever there is fire, there will be heat. There can be hot fire or no fire but there can never be cold fire. In the case of hot water, the heat is an incidental nature and is borrowed from fire.

Thus every thing has both incidental nature and intrinsic nature. What is the nature of *ātmā*, whether it is called *paramātmā* or *jīvātma*? The Upaniṣads teach that the intrinsic nature of *ātmā* is immortality. The intrinsic nature of *anātmā* is mortality. Body is mortal. Mortal cannot become immortal. Immortal cannot become mortal. *Mokṣa* is defined as immortality. Now I want to attain *mokṣa*. I ask the question, how can I become immortal.

Gauḍapāda asks whether I want the body to become immortal or I want *ātmā* to become immortal. Either way I will be in trouble. The body can never become immortal because mortality is body's essential nature. *Ātmā* need not become immortal. Body cannot become immortal and *ātmā* need not become immortal.

Then what are we working for and why are we studying the scriptures? We are not working to become immortal because neither *anātmā* nor *ātmā* can become immortal. Even if they become immortal, they will again become mortal. What is our aim then? It is not to become immortal but to understand that mortality belongs to the body and that it should be accepted without complaining. Let me understand

that I am not the body but I am the *ātmā*. Once I claim that I am the *ātmā* I can also claim that I am immortal. Therefore becoming immortal is not our goal but claiming immortality is our goal. While claiming immortality we should accept the mortality of the body. In the *Bhagavad Gita*, Kṛṣṇa says:

Oh Arjuna! Sense organs and objects, which cause cold, heat, pleasure, and pain are subject to arrival and departure. They are impermanent. Oh Arjuna! Endure them. (2:14)

Anātmā will be appearing and disappearing, some *anātmās* will be comfortable, some will not be so comfortable, so one should learn to accept growing old and also respect elders. Old age is respected in our culture.

What is *mokṣa*? Claiming the immortality of myself, the *ātmā*, and gracefully accepting the mortality of the *anātmā* is *mokṣa*. *Anātmā*'s mortality is essential and even *Bhagavān* cannot make *anātmā* immortal. Kṛṣṇa's body is also an incarnated body, which was not immortal.

MK-39= Chapter – 3, Verses – 21 to 24

Verse 21

न भवत्यमृतं मर्त्यं न मर्त्यममृतं तथा ।

प्रकृतेरन्यथाभावो न कथञ्चिद्भविष्यति ॥ २१ ॥

In this third chapter of the *Māṇḍūkya-kārikā*, Gauḍapāda is explaining the *Turīyam*, which is revealed in the 7th *mantra* of the Upaniṣad. For that *Turīyam*, several descriptors are given and in that list, the profound word *advaitam* is explained here. That non-duality of *Turīyam* is explained and established in this entire chapter of 48 verses. Gauḍapāda points out that there are two types of *advaitam* that we should clearly learn to differentiate. One is pseudo seeming *advaitam*, which is really not the *advaitam*. **Pseudo seeming *advaitam* is a state of experience in which all dualities are temporarily dissolved.** In the deep sleep state I am in *advaita anubhava*. In the waking and the dream states, I am in *dvaitam*. In the deep sleep state, I am in *advaitam* because I do not experience the world, body or mind, and I do not even claim that I am sleeping. That self-reference is not experienced and so it is *advaita anubhava*. Gauḍapāda says that this *advaitam* is not the real *advaitam* because in deep sleep, dualities are not gone but they are in potential, dormant and latent unmanifest condition. It is only a seeming *advaitam*. That is why I can remain in the deep sleep state only for some time, and when I wake up, I am in *dvaitam*, which was there in deep sleep also. In the yogic *samādhi*, yogis experience seeming *advaitam*. In death, dissolution, *samādhi*, and deep sleep there is only temporary seeming *advaitam*, which is subject to arrival and departure.

Therefore it is important to understand the real *advaitam* for which the intellect has to assimilate four points. They are:

1. The origination of the world has to be negated.
2. The factuality of the existence of the world has to be negated.
3. The appearance and the experience of the world have to be expected.
4. The appearance and the experience are caused by *māyā* or *mūlā-avidyā*.

Gauḍapāda is discussing these four principles in these verses. These four principles have to be understood and assimilated. To establish this, Gauḍapāda is revealing a fundamental principle in the three verses, 20, 21 and 22, especially in the 21st verse, which is a very important verse. A very important message is pointed out. These are all cardinal principles uniquely discussed in *Māṇḍūkya-kārikā*. Without an understanding of these profound principles, *Māṇḍūkya-kārikā* will be extremely difficult.

The important point that Gauḍapāda is discussing in verse 21 is that the essential nature of a thing will never undergo any change and will never be lost. The fire and its heat is an example. Heat is the

essential nature of fire and can never be lost. Based on the changelessness of the essential nature of a thing two important conclusions can be arrived at.

The *jīvātma* has to be essentially mortal or immortal. These two are the only possibilities. If the *jīvātma* is essentially mortal, there is no use in doing any *sādhana*. By doing *sādhana* the mortal cannot become immortal because the essential nature can never be dropped. If the *jīvātma* is essentially mortal, it can never get *mokṣa* because *mokṣa* is immortality. On the other hand, the Upaniṣads declare that the essential nature of *jīvātma* is immortality. In the *Bhagavad Gita*, we find the following verse about the immortality of *ātmā*:

This (ātmā) is neither born at anytime nor does it die. It will neither come to existence nor will it disappear again. It is unborn, deathless, decay-less and growth-less. (It) is not affected when the body is affected. (2:20)

If the essential nature of *jīvātma* is immortality, what should a *jīvātma* do to become immortal? Gauḍapāda says that doing cannot make you immortal. You have to only drop the misconception that you are mortal. There is only one thing to do, which is not an action. It is dropping the misconception that I am mortal. The question of whether one would become immortal if the notion of mortality is dropped is an absurd one. You do not have to become mortal. It is a matter of claiming the immortality and not a question of becoming or accomplishing. *Mokṣa* is dropping the notion that I am mortal. This is one corollary of that basic principle: essential nature cannot undergo a change. This is at the level of the *jīvātma*. Dropping the misconception that I am mortal is *mokṣa*.

Gauḍapāda now applies this principle at the level of Brahman, *Īśvara* or *paramātmā*. The essential nature of Brahman is immortality. The essential nature of Brahman cannot undergo change. What is meant by immortality in the case of Brahman? We have to make a slight modification in the language. Brahman is immortal means that Brahman is not subject to change. In *Tattvabodha*, six types of change are described, out of which the last one mentioned is death or mortality. Mortality is a form of change. To say that Brahman is immortal is to say that Brahman is changeless. Thus the essential nature of Brahman is changelessness. What is the meaning of ‘cause’? If anything has to be a cause of anything, intelligent or material cause, it has to undergo change. Gauḍapāda stresses the point that cause and change are one and the same. Brahman, being changeless, can never become the intelligent or material cause of anything. Since Brahman cannot be the cause, the world can never originate from Brahman. Thus the origination of the world has to be negated. The real existence of the world has to be negated and thus the origination of the world has to be negated. If the world does not originate and does not factually exist, it must be an appearance caused by *māyā-śakti* exactly like the dream world caused by *nidrā-śakti*.

Verse 22

स्वभावेनामृतो यस्य भावो गच्छति मर्त्यताम् ।

कृतकेनामृतस्तस्य कथं स्थास्यति निश्चलः ॥ २२ ॥

svabhāvenāmṛto yasya bhāvo gacchati martyatām ।

kṛtakenāmṛtastasya katham sthāsyati niścalaḥ ॥ 22॥

(If) the intrinsically immortal Reality undergoes mortality for a person, how can that immortality remain the same for him, since it is a product? (verse 22)

This verse is an important verse for *nididhyāsanam*. This verse poses a hypothetical argument involving an assumption. Essential nature cannot undergo change. Mortal *jīvas* cannot become immortal. Finite cannot become infinite. If finite becomes infinite at a particular time, it can become finite at a later time. Gauḍapāda says the law is that the mortal cannot become immortal. In this verse, Gauḍapāda says that for argument's sake let us assume that the mortal becomes immortal. Then the immortal can again become mortal. What value is there in such immortality? There is no corridor connecting mortality and immortality. If Brahman is changeless, it is always changeless and it cannot become a cause.

Suppose we assume that *jīva* who is immortal now becomes mortal at the time of *śṛṣṭi* and the mortal *jīva* again becomes immortal due to spiritual *sādhana*, the immortality that is accomplished in time will also be lost. So the artificially generated immortality cannot remain permanent. So the aim is not to become immortal but to claim that immortality is my very nature. In the famous prayer, *asato mā sad gamaya / tamaso mā jyotir gamaya / mṛtyor mā amṛtaṁ gamaya //*, 'going from mortality to immortality' is only going from ignorance to knowledge. When I go from ignorance (*tama*) to knowledge (*jyoti*), I do not get immortality but I drop the notion that I am mortal. That alone is required.

Verse 23

भूततोऽभूततो वाऽपि सृज्यमाने समा श्रुतिः ।

निश्चितं युक्तियुक्तिं च यत्तद्भवति नेतरत् ॥ २३ ॥

bhūtato'bhūtato vā'pi sṛjyamāne samā śrutih ।

niścitam yuktivyuktīm ca yattadbhavati netarat ॥ 23॥

Vedic statement is the same whether (duality) is created really or apparently. That which is ascertained (by analysis) and is supported by reason is (the proper meaning;) not the other. (verse 23)

An objection may be raised which must be answered and the answer should be assimilated. Gauḍapāda says that the origination of the world should not be accepted. The world has not originated from Brahman. Does Gauḍapāda accept the Vedas as a source of knowledge? There is a dispute in the

academic circles as to whether Gauḍapāda accepts the Veda or he is really a Buddhist. Gauḍapāda accepts the Veda because he quotes several *śruti pramāṇa vakyam* and this *kārikā* itself is a commentary on an Upaniṣad. Upaniṣads clearly discuss the origination of the world from Brahman. But Gauḍapāda says otherwise. Is Gauḍapāda contradicting the Veda *pramāṇam*? This is the objection.

Gauḍapāda answers not by saying that the Veda is wrong but by saying that the Veda should be read in its entirety. Taking only selective statements will always create problems. If Veda is read in its entirety, it will be found that the Veda does not talk about the actual creation of the world but only a seeming origination of the world. Even if Veda talks about the origination of the world, it cannot talk about the actual origination of the world from the changeless Brahman because it goes against logic. **If the Veda says that changeless Brahman produces the world, it is an illogical statement. An illogical statement should not be accepted even if Veda says it, but instead that statement should be properly interpreted.** An illogical idea should not be accepted. If Veda makes an illogical statement what are we supposed to do? We should not say that Veda is wrong because Vedas are accepted as valid *pramāṇam*. The statement should not be blindly accepted. The statement should be interpreted in such a way that it is not logically contradictory. Then the intellect can accept the statement. In several places Vedas say that *svarga* is finite in nature. Whatever is created is temporary. But in some places, Vedas say that the celestials in *svarga* are immortal which seems contradictory and illogical. The interpretation is that “immortal” refers to a very long life. It is like saying, ‘a permanent job’ meaning that the job is relatively permanent. Gauḍapāda says that Brahman creating a world is illogical and so even if Veda says that, it should be interpreted properly. The interpretation is that Brahman seemingly created the world just like the waker seemingly creates the dream world.

Therefore, Gauḍapāda says that the Upaniṣadic statements of creation are the same whether the creation is actual or seeming. There is no doubt that there is a statement of origination but the *śruti* does not clarify whether the creation is actual or seeming. The Upaniṣad leaves this for us to interpret. We talk about sunrise but we do not say whether it is actual or seeming in our normal reference to the sunrise even though it is only a seeming sunrise.

Which one is the final message of the Vedas, actual or seeming creation? We should take only the seeming creation because the other one is contradictory to logic. We should come to this conclusion by thoroughly analyzing the Upaniṣad by the use of *mīmāṃsa* and *tarka*. *Mīmāṃsa* is analysis of the Vedas or any text to know the intention of the author. *Tarka* is logical analysis. After such analysis what is logically possible alone should be accepted.

Verse 24

नेह नानेति चाऽऽम्नायादिन्द्रो मायाभिरित्यपि ॥

अजायमानो बहुधा मायया जायते तु सः ॥ २४ ॥

neha nāneti cā"mnāyāndro māyābhirityapi ॥

ajāyamāno bahudhā māyayā jāyate tu saḥ ॥ 24॥

That (Ātmā) is indeed born apparently as revealed by the following vedic statements – “In this (Ātmā) there is no plurality at all.” “The Ātmā (is seen as many) due to māyā.” “Remaining unborn, (it is apparently born) as many.” (verse 24)

In these following verses, Gauḍapāda gives several *śruti* statements in which the Veda makes it clear that the creation is only a seeming creation and not an actual creation. Several quotations are given. One of them that we will take up now is the well-known *Puruṣasūkta* mantra. People who study the Veda generally study *Rudram*, *Camakam* and *Puruṣasūkta*. *Puruṣasūkta* is very important because both *Śaivas* and *Vaiṣṇavas* study it. There is a very powerful statement in *Puruṣasūkta*: “*ajāyamāno bahudhā vijāyate*”. *Bhagavān* becomes many things without becoming. *Bhagavān* creates this world without creating or becoming. How is this possible? This can only mean that the creation is not factual. Similarly, there are so many statements, when studied in isolation, will only create confusion.

MK-40 = Chapter – 3, Verses – 24 to 27

Verse 24

नेह नानेति चाऽऽम्नायादिन्द्रो मायाभिरित्यपि ॥

अजायमानो बहुधा मायया जायते तु सः ॥ २४ ॥

In the third chapter of *Māṇḍūkya-kārikā*, Gauḍapādācārya extracts four important and profound messages about the status of the waking world, the world experienced by all of us. The messages are:

1. The existence of the waking world is to be negated.
2. The origination of the waking world from Brahman is to be negated.
3. The appearance and the experience of the waking world are to be accepted.
4. The cause for the appearance and experience of the waking world is to be understood as self-ignorance or *māyā*.

Self-ignorance in *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad* means the *Turīya ajñānam*. Gauḍapāda is stressing these four points by addressing and analyzing them from various angles. He points out that this is a message found in not only *Māṇḍūkya* but the other Upaniṣads also. *Māṇḍūkya* is not different and unique but there is consensus among all the Upaniṣads with regard to the message. Some challenge this four-fold message and they quote the *sṛṣṭi vakyams* of the Upaniṣads. Gauḍapāda analyzes the *sṛṣṭi vakyams*.

How are we to understand the statements of the Upaniṣads that say that the world originated from Brahman? In verse 23, Gauḍapāda makes a general observation. This is a profound and technical topic of Vedānta. The Upaniṣads repeatedly say that the world originated from Brahman. Gauḍapāda says that the Upaniṣads do not say what type of origination it is, seeming or actual. It only talks about the origination but does not say whether the creation is a seeming one or an actual one. Gauḍapāda says that in the creation we see that everything has two versions, seeming or actual. The creation can be actual or seeming and the Upaniṣads do not say which. **The Upaniṣadic statement about creation does not support the objectors or Gauḍapāda.** Merely by *sṛṣṭi vakyam*, one cannot come to a conclusion. That is what Gauḍapāda said in verse 22 that the creation may be actual or seeming and the Upaniṣads do not comment either way. Therefore one cannot go strictly by *sṛṣṭi vakyam* but has to go and look for some more clues. This is called *mīmāṃsa*, Vedic analysis. Whenever a Vedic idea is vague, you look around for some clues from the other areas of the Veda to get clarification about a particular vague idea. If the idea is clear, the analysis is not necessary. Gauḍapāda says that *mīmāṃsa* supports him in that the origination is not an actual one but is only apparent. Later Gauḍapāda says that not only *mīmāṃsa* supports him but logical analysis also supports him. Both *mīmāṃsa* and *tarka* establish the conclusion that creation is not an actual creation. When we talk about sunrise, we never refer to it as a seeming sunrise. But when enquired into it is known to be an apparent one.

The following verses 24, 25, etc., are all clues for an apparent creation. Gauḍapāda takes *mantras* from other Upaniṣads to support his conclusion.

First he takes a *mantra* from the *Kāṭhōpaniṣad* (2.1.11). The *mantra* says that a pluralistic universe is not at all there. It does not say it was not there nor it will not be there. It says that even now the pluralistic universe is not there. If a world has really originated from Brahman, the Upaniṣad should have said that a real universe is there originating from Brahman. It does not say that. Therefore the origination is ‘as though’ origination. If the creation is real, Veda will not have negated it. Veda negates the pluralistic universe and so the creation must be apparent. Instead of quoting the entire *mantra*, Gauḍapāda is quoting only two words *neha nānā*. This is clue number 1 for the apparent origination.

The 2nd clue is from *Brhadāranyaka Upaniṣad* (*madhubrāhmaṇam*, 2.5.19):

"So, let it be understood," says the great Ṛṣi, "that the Master magician who can be called great Māyāvi, the Supreme Being who is designated here as Indra, the Lord of all beings, appears in such manifold forms that it is impossible for the physical eyes to connect the forms with the circumstances in which they are really placed."

Brahman multiplies into many through its *māyā-śakti* or produces this universe through its *māyā-śakti*. *Māyā* is generally used in the meaning of magic. Whatever magically happens does not really happen.

In *Dakṣiṇāmūrtistotram*, we see the line in verse 2, “ *To Him, who, like a magician or even like a great Yogin, displays, by his own will, this universe.....* ” This is clue number 2.

The third clue is taken from *Puruṣasūkta*. “*ajāyamāno bahudhā vijāyate*” (verse 21) is the line from *Puruṣasūkta*. This means that *Bhagavān* produces the world without actually producing. Without multiplying into plurality, *Bhagavān* multiplies. This is possible only by seeming multiplication through *māyā-śakti* like the dream by *nidrā-śakti*. By using the word *māyayā*, Gauḍapāda reminds us of a verse in the *Bhagavad Gita* which conveys a similar idea:

Even though, being one who is unborn, one whose knowledge does not wane, and also being the Lord of all living beings, still, wielding My own prakṛti, I, ‘as though,’ come into being by My own māyā. (4:6)

Kṛṣṇa says, ‘Even though I am unborn, I am born.’ This is not logically possible. The only way of explaining is that even though ‘I am not born, I am seemingly born through *māyā-śakti*.’ **This is clue number 3.**

Verse 25

सम्भूतेरपवादाच्च सम्भवः प्रतिषिध्यते ।

को न्वेनं जनयेदिति कारणं प्रतिषिध्यते ॥ २५ ॥

sambhūterapavādācca sambhavaḥ pratiṣidhyate ।

ko nvenam janayediti kāraṇam pratiṣidhyate ॥ 25॥

Moreover, origination is negated by the negation of Hiranyagarbha. The cause is negated by the statement, “ who indeed will create this (jīva)?” (verse 25)

Another clue is taken from the *Īśāvāsya Upaniṣad*. The Upaniṣad talks about *Hiranyagarbha upāsana*. *Sambhūti* is a word used in *Īśāvāsya Upaniṣad* to refer to *Hiranyagarbha*. What is *Hiranyagarbha*? *Hiranyagarbha* is the first one born out of *Īśvara*, called *Brahmā* in the *purāṇas*. In the *purāṇas*, Viṣṇu is depicted as *Īśvara* and from him comes a lotus and then *Brahmā*. *Brahmā* is called the first-born. The Upaniṣad talks about *Hiranyagarbha* and after introducing *Hiranyagarbha upāsana*, it says that it will not lead one to *mokṣa*. This *upāsana* has its limitations. *Karma* and *upāsana* will not give *mokṣa*. In that light, the *Hiranyagarbha upāsana* criticism is done. From this criticism, it is clear that *Hiranyagarbha* is not the ultimate reality, for otherwise the Upaniṣad would have glorified *Hiranyagarbha*. The birth of *Hiranyagarbha* has to be apparent and thus the origination of the world, which supposedly happens from *Hiranyagarbha*, is only an apparent one. **This is clue 4.**

The next clue, clue number 5, is from *Bṛhadāranyaka Upaniṣad (Śākalya Brāhmaṇam 3.9.28g)*. This 28th *mantra* in the Upaniṣad is itself a group of seven verses. The seventh *mantra* is quoted here. The Upaniṣad is questioning, “Who can create this world?” By raising this question the Upaniṣad says that the cause for the origination of the world cannot be talked about. So Brahman can never become the cause of the universe. Other than Brahman, there is nothing else that can be the cause of the universe. Then, what is this world? **That is called *māyā*. It is an appearance without any logical explanation.** The more you probe into the creation, the more mysterious it becomes and our final answer will be, ‘I do not know’. That is called *māyā*, *mūlā-avidyā*.

Verse 26

स एष नेति नेतीति व्याख्यातं निहृते यतः ।

सर्वमग्राह्यभावेन हेतुनाऽजं प्रकाशते ॥ २६ ॥

sa eṣa neti netīti vyākhyātaṁ nihnute yataḥ ।

sarvamagrāhyabhāvena hetunā'jam prakāśate ॥ 26॥

Because of the un-graspability (of the *Ātmā*, the *Veda*) negates everything that was described before by the statement, “ It is not this, not this.” Therefore, the unborn (*Ātmā* alone) shines. (verse 26)

The sixth clue is from *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* (3.9.26). [This is not referred to in the verse, but from *Kaivalya Upaniṣad* we have “*na bhūmirāpo*”: The five elements you are experiencing so solidly and clearly are only appearances and they do not exist at all like mirage water.] Even quantum physics and cosmology find the origin of the universe mysterious. Even the ‘God particle’ is experienced but not there actually. In the *mantra*, the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* divides the entire universe into concrete (*mūrta*) and abstract (*amūrta*) both at the micro and macro level. The physical body is *mūrta* universe and the subtle body, mind, and thoughts, etc., are *amūrta* universe. Matter is *mūrta* universe and energy is *amūrta* universe. The entire universe is classified into *mūrta* and *amūrta*. What is the truth? While revealing the truth, the Upaniṣad negates both the *mūrta* and *amūrta* through the statement, *neti, neti*. Any *anātmā* universe is not the reality. One *neti* is to negate the *mūrta* universe and another *neti* is to negate the *amūrta* universe. Any *anātmā* grasped by you is not the truth. If everything is negated, what is the truth? The Upaniṣad does not reveal the truth. It just negates and leaves the truth for our imagination. After negating everything, whatever is left behind must be the truth. What is left behind is the one that is doing the negating similar to the witness in the deep sleep state that is witnessing the absence of everything. Therefore, the one who is doing the negation, the subject, the *Turīyam Ātmā*, is the reality.

The *mūrta* and *amūrta* universe is *mithyā*. So what? If the universe is *mithyā*, its origination is *mithyā* also. After the negation of everything, the non-negatable *ātmā* is evident as ‘I am’ because I, the *ātmā*, am not an object of negation. The world is negated as *mithyā* and so the origination of the world is not factual but seeming.

Verse 27

सतो हि मायया जन्म युज्यते न तु तत्त्वतः ।

तत्त्वतो जायते यस्य जातं तस्य हि जायते ॥ २७ ॥

sato hi māyayā janma yujyate na tu tattvataḥ ।

tattvato jāyate yasya jātaṁ tasya hi jāyate ॥ 27॥

For an ever-existent one birth is possible only apparently and not really. Whatever is born is born (again) for that (person) who holds that (it) is really born. (verse 27)

With the previous verse, the *mīmāṃsa* analysis is over. The *mīmāṃsa* analysis of the Vedic statements shows that the origination of the world is apparent and not factual. Gauḍapāda gave six clues from the Upaniṣads that establish the seeming creation of the universe.

Hereafter, Gauḍapāda logically shows that the creation is not factual. When different systems of Vedic tradition talk about the actual creation of the world from Brahman, *paramātmā* or God, they cite the Vedic descriptions of creation. If the scriptures say that the world came from God, Gauḍapāda asks what

the description of God is that is given in the scriptures. If one is a serious seeker, the question of who is God and what is God's nature should be asked. In all the scriptures God or Brahman has been described as unborn and deathless. Gauḍapāda asks if God is unborn, deathless and eternal, is that God subject to change or not. That God should be changeless because birth and death are two types of change only.

This is point number 1.

If anything has to be a cause of something, that cause should undergo change. The very idea of cause denotes change. Cause means change. Being a cause and changelessness are mutually exclusive like light and darkness. So the changeless God or Brahman cannot be the cause of the creation. Rope cannot be the cause of the snake. If rope is really the cause of the snake, that snake creation must only be a seeming one. Similarly, Brahman cannot be the cause for the creation but if it is said that Brahman is the cause then it must be a seeming one.

MK-41 = Chapter – 3, Verses – 27 to 31

Verse 27

सतो हि मायया जन्म युज्यते न तु तत्त्वतः ।

तत्त्वतो जायते यस्य जातं तस्य हि जायते ॥ २७ ॥

Gauḍapādācārya is engaged in a difficult project. He gives four important messages about the nature of the world, the waking world. The four-fold message: the existence of the world should be negated. The origination of the world should be negated. The appearance and experience of the world are to be accepted. The cause of the appearance and experience is to be understood to be *māyā*, self-ignorance, which is ignorance of the *Turīyam*. He has been establishing this message throughout the third chapter. Gauḍapāda, in presenting the four-fold message, wishes to show that this is the message of all the Upaniṣads and not just only the *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad*. He does not want to create an impression that this message is his invention. A human intellect through speculative thinking cannot arrive at the truth. When Gauḍapāda presents this as the Upaniṣadic message, he faces a serious problem. He is confronting that problem now. Gauḍapāda says that the message of the Upaniṣad is the negation of the world's existence and origination whereas the Upaniṣads talk about how the world originated and exists. There seems to be a contradiction between Gauḍapāda's message and the message of the Upaniṣads. Gauḍapāda asserts that there is no such contradiction. He says that the Upaniṣads do talk about the origination of the world and that cannot be denied. But the Upaniṣads do not clearly say whether the origination is an actual one or 'as though' origination. It is our homework to find out using the *mīmāṃsā* method of analysis and logic. Illogical statements should not be accepted whether they come from *guru*, scriptures or even *Bhagavān*. Śāṅkarācārya repeatedly declares that we respect the Vedas but the respect should not suppress our rational intellect. One means of knowledge cannot contradict another means of knowledge. So if there is an illogical statement in the Vedas it is not outrightly rejected but one should look for the hidden meaning of the statement. Gauḍapāda looks for the hidden meaning of the Upaniṣadic statements about the world origination in verses 24, 25 and 26 and brought out six clues. Thus *mīmāṃsā* established that there is no actual origination of the world.

Having gone through *mīmāṃsā*, Gauḍapāda has come to the logical analysis from verse 27. If the world originated, the question of its cause will come up. In all the scriptures Brahman is said to be the cause. The famous *mantra* in the *Taittirīya Upaniṣad* defines Brahman as the cause of the world.

“Seek to know that from which indeed these beings are born, by which (the beings) that are born live, and unto which they go back while resolving. That is Brahman.” (3.1)

Gauḍapāda says that we should not accept Brahman to be the cause just because the Upaniṣads say so. We should independently use our intellect and find out. Anything to be a cause must undergo change whether it is the intelligent cause or the material cause. A cause to be a cause should undergo change. In

the Upaniṣads, Brahman is said to be without birth and death and that means Brahman is not subject to any change at all. In the *Bhagavad Gita* also, we have the following verse about the changelessness of Brahman.

This (ātmā) is said to be un-manifest, not an object of thought, and not subject to change. Therefore, knowing this, you ought not to grieve. (2:25)

Cause is subject to change. Brahman is by nature free from change and thus cannot undergo change. So Brahman cannot be a cause at all. If still the Upaniṣads say that Brahman is the cause, it is possible in only one way. It is ‘as though’ a cause but really not a cause.

The origination of the world from the changeless Brahman is not at all possible actually but apparently possible like the mirage water from the dry sand. In the second line of the verse, Gauḍapāda gives a suppositional argument. Let us assume that Brahman is the actual cause of the world. If the origination is actual, Brahman’s status as a cause will also become actual. Then Brahman will actually become subject to actual change. Thus Brahman will be deemed as changing Brahman. Any changing cause must be itself a product of another cause. So it would mean that Brahman itself is produced out of something and can only be a relative cause and not the original cause. But the Upaniṣad says that Brahman is *satyaṃ jñānam anantaṃ*. Thus if Brahman is the actual cause, several logical problems will come. Therefore Brahman is not the actual cause but it is an apparent cause. The 2nd line of the verse: If Brahman is the actual cause several logical problems arise and so that view should be rejected.

Verse 28

असतो मायया जन्म तत्त्वतो नैव युज्यते ।

वन्ध्यापुत्रो न तत्त्वेन मायया वाऽपि जायते ॥ २८ ॥

asato māyayā janma tattvato naiva yujyate ।

vandhyāputro na tattvena māyayā vā'pi jāyate ॥ 28॥

For a non-existent one, birth is not at all possible (either) apparently (or) really. The son of a barren woman is not born (either) apparently or really. (verse 28)

If Brahman cannot be the cause of the universe, why can it not be said that something else is the cause? That cannot be said because the Upaniṣads say that before creation Brahman alone was there. There was nothing else other than Brahman. Assuming ‘nothing’ is something, why can it not be said that the world has come out of nothing? Out of nothing only nothing can come. The world cannot originate from Brahman, something other than Brahman or nothing. The conclusion is that the world has not originated at all. There can never be a satisfactory explanation for the origination theory because any explanation

will suffer from logical problems. Gauḍapāda's contention is that the origination theory is temporarily accepted until the intellect is prepared and once that happens, the origination theory should be discarded.

From the non-existent cause nothing can originate either actually or apparently. From Brahman, the world can seemingly originate but from nothing even that is not possible. The son of a woman who is incapable of giving birth can never be born either seemingly or actually. Therefore, *sat* is not a cause and *asat* is not a cause. No other cause is there. The world has not originated. But what is seen? An appearance caused by *māyā* is seen. Is it possible? Gauḍapāda says it is possible for something to appear without actual origination. There are many examples to support this. The dream world is the most powerful example and it is given in the next verse.

Verse 29

यथा स्वप्ने द्वयाभासं स्पन्दते मायया मनः ।

तथा जाग्रद्द्वयाभासं स्पन्दते मायया मनः ॥ २९ ॥

yathā svapne dvayābhāsaṃ spandate māyayā manaḥ ।

tathā jāgraddvayābhāsaṃ spandate māyayā manaḥ ॥ 29॥

The mind spins a seeming duality in the waking state through māyā just as the mind spins a seeming duality in dream through māyā. (verse 29)

In the dream state, an apparent dual world is reported by the mind. When the mind perceives the dream objects, the mind takes them to be real with actual origination. If we can create a dream world seemingly, why can Brahman not create a waking world seemingly? In the same way, in the waking state also, the dualistic world is reported by the mind to be a real one. *Turīyam* through our minds gives reality to the waking world. The mind, through its obsession born out of ignorance, reports that the waking world is *satyaṃ*. The waking state has a conditional reality and has ETU. The dream world also has ETU in the dream state. ETU is the characteristic of *mithyā* and not the characteristic of *satyaṃ*. *Satyaṃ* can never be experienced because I am the *satyaṃ* and I am never an object of experience.

Verse 30

अद्वयं च द्वयाभासं मनः स्वप्ने न संशयः ।

अद्वयं च द्वयाभासं तथा जाग्रन्न संशयः ॥ ३० ॥

advayaṃ ca dvayābhāsaṃ manaḥ svapne na saṃśayaḥ ।

advayaṃ ca dvayābhāsaṃ tathā jāgranna saṃśayaḥ ॥ 30॥

The advaitam mind alone is the seeming duality in the dream; there is no doubt. In the same way, the advaitam mind alone is the seeming duality in the waking state; there is no doubt. (verse 30)

The seeming duality we experience in dream is only the *advaitam* mind. The *advaitam* mind alone is appearing as the dualistic world in dream. Similarly in the waking state the seeming world does not exist separate from the *advaitam* observer. This world is available for everyone but the dream world is available for only one mind. How can they be treated equally? Again the mistake is thinking of dream from the standpoint of the waking state. The dream should be looked at from the standpoint of the dream state. Both the worlds are available for many minds in the respective worlds. There is no doubt about this at all.

Verse 31

मनोदृश्यमिदं द्वैतं यत्किञ्चित्सचराचरम् ।

मनसो ह्यमनीभावे द्वैतं नैवोपलभ्यते ॥ ३१ ॥

manodṛśyamidaṃ dvaitaṃ yatkiñcitsacarācaram ।

manaso hyamanībhāve dvaitaṃ naivopalabhyate ॥ 31 ॥

This duality, (consisting of) all things and beings, is a projection of the mind. For, on the cessation of the mind, duality is not at all perceived. (verse 31)

With the 30th verse, Gauḍapāda concludes the main discussion that the world origination is not factual but it is apparent only whether from the scripture angle or the logic angle. He has finished the topics of the origination of the *jīva* and the origination of the world : logical negation of the *jīva* origination, scriptural negation of the *jīva* origination, logical negation of the world origination and scriptural negation of the world origination. Neither the *jīva* nor the world has been created. They are only appearances caused by *māyā*. This is known as *ajāti vāda*, the teaching of non-origination.

Hereafter, Gauḍapāda gets into *sādhana* and *phalam* for this teaching. In verse 29, he said that mind alone reports a real duality in the dream world and mind alone reports a real duality in the waking world. Real duality is presented to us by the mind. This real duality reported by the mind is the cause of *saṃsāra*. That is why we face problems in the dream and the waking states. In deep sleep, there is no duality, no attachment, no aversion and no *saṃsāra*. Gauḍapāda says that the ultimate culprit for *saṃsāra* is our own mind. Do not blame anyone. No one is the cause of any problem. The problem is you and the solution is you. Even if you run to God and gets the problem solved, it will be only temporary. Unless we learn to tackle the mind, we can never solve the problem of *saṃsāra*. The entire Vedānta is how to tackle the mind. When the mind is active, duality and *saṃsāra* are there. When the mind is resolved, duality and *saṃsāra* are gone. This is *anvaya-vyatireka* logic. The entire dualistic universe consisting of the moving and the non-moving is reported by the mind alone. As long as the mind continues, the problem will continue. Therefore, learn to handle the mind. This is referred to here by the technical word, *amanībhāvaḥ*. How? That will be discussed in the next class.

MK-42 = Chapter – 3, Verses – 31 to 34

Verse 31

मनोदृश्यमिदं द्वैतं यत्किञ्चित्सचराचरम् ।

मनसो ह्यमनीभावे द्वैतं नैवोपलभ्यते ॥ ३१ ॥

According to Vedānta, duality is the cause of *saṃsāra* and non-duality is the cause of *mokṣa*. This is clearly said in the Upaniṣads. As long as there is duality, there is fear and insecurity. In duality alone, time and space are present. In time, change is inevitable. Whenever there is change, birth, death and loss are inevitable. This is also experientially proved. In the waking state there is duality and there are issues of attachment, aversion, etc. In the dream state there is duality and similar issues persist. In deep sleep state, duality is not there and there is no *saṃsāra*. The first step in Vedānta is to understand that duality is the cause of *saṃsāra* and so duality has to be tackled one way or the other. Duality cannot be physically destroyed and so we have to learn to tackle duality in some other ingenious method. One cannot take the easy method of remaining in sleep all the time. *Karma* will not allow one to sleep permanently.

Gauḍapāda suggests a method to tackle duality. Ultimately, the method is only one but the route taken is different. In waking and dream, we are experiencing duality reported by the mind alone. The active mind is reporting duality in waking and the semi-active mind is reporting duality in dream whereas in deep sleep the resolved mind is not reporting duality. **The mind that reports duality is the problem.** Now we have refined the problem. First it was said that duality is the cause of *saṃsāra*. The refined statement is that the mind that reports duality is the cause of *saṃsāra*. Therefore one should learn to tackle the duality-reporting mind. This tackling of the mind is what Gauḍapāda called *amanībhāvaḥ*. Converting the problematic mind into a non-problematic mind is called *amanībhāvaḥ*.

The entire dual world of moving and non-moving objects is reported by the mind in both the waking and the dream states. When the mind becomes the non-mind, that is when the mind is tackled, there is no reporting of duality. This is what that needs to be done. How will we do that?

Verse 32

आत्मसत्यानुबोधेन न सङ्कल्पयते यदा ।

अमनस्तां तदा याति ग्राह्याभावे तदग्रहम् ॥ ३२ ॥

ātmastatyānubodhena na saṅkalpayate yadā ।

amanastāṃ tadā yāti grāhyābhāve tadagraham ॥ 32॥

By the knowledge of the Ātmā, which is the Reality, when the mind does not perceive (duality,) then, (it) ceases to be the mind. In the absence of objects to be perceived, it becomes a non-perceiver. (verse 32)

Here Gauḍapāda is presenting a very subtle Vedāntic message. That message is that because of the mind we are experiencing the world of duality. The mind is functioning as the mind because the mind is experiencing the world of duality. When you analyze whether the mind is because of the world or the world is because of the mind, you discover a peculiar truth that **the mind and the world are interdependent**. Both of them do not have an existence of their own and both depend on each other. The mind is because of the world and the world is because of the mind and they are mutually dependent and so both of them are *mithyā*. Both of them borrow existence from something else other than the mind and the world. How to know this? The mind consists of thoughts. For every thought, there is a corresponding object in the external world. At the individual level, the mind is nothing but a thought and the world is nothing but an object. Take a pot-thought and there is a pot-object, etc. There is a series of thoughts and the corresponding objects. Therefore, thoughts and objects are there. *All the possible thoughts put together is the mind and all the possible objects put together is the world*. The mind and the world can be understood as thought and object alone. Gauḍapāda says that when you reduce the mind and the world to thought and object, and analyze whether the thought is dependent on the object or the object is dependent on the thought, it is found that each of them cannot exist independent of the other. Without an object there is no thought and without a thought there is no proof for the existence of an object. If there is an object corresponding to which there is no thought anywhere, the existence of that object cannot be talked about. The existence of one cannot be proved without the existence of the other. Since both are mutually dependent, they cannot be independent.

The mind and the world are reduced to thought and object. Thought and object are mutually dependent. Therefore both of them are not independently existent. So both of them are *mithyā*, borrowing existence from something other than either of them. That something is *Turīyam*, the *ātmā* alone that lends existence simultaneously to both thought and object. Therefore from *ātmā*, thought and object borrow existence and rise together in the waking state and in dream, the dream thought and the dream object exist simultaneously in *ātmā*. In deep sleep both the thoughts and the objects resolve simultaneously. You cannot have one existing with the other resolving. You cannot have resolution of one only. When people meditate, they try to resolve all the objects. When all the objects are removed all the thoughts also resolve. When all the thoughts are resolved there is no mind and then the meditator dozes off. The mind cannot survive if some object or the other, either external or internal, is not visualized.

The message is that thought and object rise simultaneously and they resolve simultaneously. The mind and the world rise simultaneously and they resolve simultaneously. Both of them are *mithyā*. Both of them borrow existence from something else. It is important to understand the *adhiṣṭhānam* of both of them. Trying to tackle the world alone will not work and tackling the mind alone will also not work. It

will end up in some other problem. Swami Dayananda: In psychology there is no solution, in Vedānta there is no problem. Trying to understand the root of both the world and mind alone will help. That root is *ātmā* the *satyaṃ*. When the truth *ātmā* is known as *satyaṃ*, the world and the mind are understood as *mithyā*. The world and the mind will continue to be experienced. It will be like a movie on a screen. The screen is *ātmā*. They will continue to be experienced. You do not try to handle them independently. You do not negate them also. You only deflate the mind and the world of their reality. You allow them to be and continue to experience them but they cannot cause any *samsāra* because *mithyā* cannot touch the *satyaṃ*. The mind and the world are not tackled directly but only by understanding the truth of the world and the mind. The mind and the world are two and the *adhiṣṭhānam* is one. The dream-object and the dream-thought are two but the *adhiṣṭhānam* is one, the waker. The waker alone is getting divided into dream thoughts and dream objects.

One *ātmā* alone is appearing both as the experiencer and the experienced. Understand the *ātmā*, then both the mind and the world become like a movie similar to the dream thoughts and objects.

By gaining the knowledge of the truth of the mind and the world with the help of *guru* and *śāstra*, that truth is known to be *ātmā*, the *Turīyam*. Never look for that *ātmā* because the seeker is the sought itself. When the mind does not report duality anymore because of the knowledge, thereafter the world will not be world but it will be *ātmā* with the world disguise and the mind will not be mind but it is *ātmā* with the mind disguise. *The mind becomes non-mind or the mind is falsified. Both the mind and the world are falsified simultaneously.* In the absence of objects, there is the absence of thought. In my understanding there is no such thing called world other than *ātmā*. A pot can be negated by two methods. One is breaking the pot. The other method is to look at the pot carefully and know that there is no pot but only clay. Holding the pot and proclaiming that there is no pot is wisdom. There is nothing but clay alone and only the name pot is used for that particular form for transaction. Similarly a Vedāntin looking at the world loudly proclaims that there is no world. It is only *ātmā* with different names and forms. Just because there are many names there are not many things. There is no mind or world but there is only *ātmā*.

Verse 33

अकल्पकमजं ज्ञानं ज्ञेयाभिन्नं प्रचक्षते ।

ब्रह्मज्ञेयमजं नित्यमजेनाजं विबुध्यते ॥ ३३ ॥

akalpakamajaṃ jñānaṃ jñeyābhinnaṃ pracakṣate ।

brahmajñeyamajaṃ nityamajenājaṃ vibudhyate ॥ 33॥

The unborn, eternal (Ātmā) has Brahman as the object of knowledge. They declare that (the Ātmā) is not different from (Brahman,) the object of knowledge. (Hence) the unborn consciousness is without division. One knows the unborn Ātmā by the unborn (Ātmā). (verse 33)

Another very profound and technical concept is presented in this verse. Because of the complexity in the construction of the verse, only its essence will be given. We have said that the mind and the world are interdependent. The mind and the world are *mithyā*. *Satyam* is *ātmā* which is the *adhiṣṭhānam* of both. If *ātmā* is not an object of the mind, how can one know that *ātmā*? With the mind alone we are gathering all types of knowledge. If both the mind and the world are negated as *mithyā*, how can one know the *ātmā*? For that *Gauḍapāda* says that *ātmā* is never recognized as an object with the help of the mind. If *ātmā* is an object, it will come under object-thought duality. The mind can never know the *ātmā* by objectification as it does in the case of the other objects in the world. [*Ātmabodha*] The mind need not objectify the *ātmā* because the mind itself is illumined by 'I', the *ātmā* only. The mind itself is known by and objectified by I, the *ātmā*. What is required is that once the mind and the world are negated as *mithyā*, what is *satyam* is whatever is left out. Whatever is left out is I, the *ātmā*, who is the witness of the arrival of the mind and the world in the waking state and also the witness of the departure, the resolution of the mind and the world in the deep sleep state.

Therefore, I am the *satyam*. It has to be claimed and not objectified. 'I am the *satyam*' is a matter to be claimed and not to be objectified by the mind. To claim 'I am *satyam*', the mind has to be used without objectification of the *satyam*. I am always present before the arrival of the mind in the waking state and during the departure of the mind in the deep sleep state. Therefore *Gauḍapāda* says that *ātmā* is not known by the mind. *Ātmā* reveals itself by itself because *ātmā* is self-evident. That 'I am' need not be known with the help of the mind because even before I start operating the mind, I know that I am. Mental operation is required to prove other things and mental operation is not required to prove myself. Therefore I say that I am the consciousness, which is self-evident. Therefore I am *satyam* and the mind and the world are *mithyā*. How do you tackle the world? By knowing that it is *mithyā*. How do you tackle the mind? By knowing that it is *mithyā*. How do you tackle the *ātmā*? The *ātmā* need not be tackled because it does not create any problem.

Verse 34

निगृहीतस्य मनसो निर्विकल्पस्य धीमतः ।

प्रचारः स तु विज्ञेयः सुषुप्तेऽन्यो न तत्समः ॥ ३४ ॥

nigrhītasya manaso nirvikalpasya dhīmataḥ ।

pracāraḥ sa tu vijñeyaḥ susupte'nyo na tatsamaḥ ॥ 34॥

The behavior of the enlightened, disciplined mind, which is a non-perceiver should be known. (The behavior) in sleep is different. It is not similar to that. (verse 34)

We said that the *jñāni* tackles the mind and the world not by destroying them but by knowing that both of them are *ātmā* only. There is no such thing called the mind and the world. **For such a *jñāni* who has this wisdom, his mind will not report duality even though it experiences duality.** His mind knows

that the experienced duality is nothing but one *ātmā* alone. **An enlightened mind has resolved duality by understanding that everything is *ātmā*.** Gauḍapāda gives that enlightened mind a title, *nigrhītam manaḥ*. It is a mind that knows that there is no mind and world other than *ātmā*. An enlightened mind has ‘dissolved’ the world and the mind by wisdom. During the deep sleep state also, the mind and the world are dissolved. For both the mind in deep sleep and the enlightened mind, there is no duality. Gauḍapāda asks what the difference is between these two. What is common is that duality is negated. If both are same, one can opt for sleep. The difference will have to be understood. For a sleeper the problem is only temporarily solved. In fact it is potentially still there in sleep. In enlightenment the problem is solved on a permanent basis. The mind and the world are wonderful for interaction but they cannot touch me the screen that allows the play to go on. A *jñāni* will allow the play to go on but not be affected by it.

MK-43 = Chapter – 3, Verses – 34 to 36

Verse 34

निगृहीतस्य मनसो निर्विकल्पस्य धीमतः ।

प्रचारः स तु विज्ञेयः सुषुप्तेऽन्यो न तत्समः ॥ ३४ ॥

Gauḍapādācārya pointed out that both the mind and the world are mutually dependent on each other. You cannot prove the existence of the one without the support of the other. How do you prove a functioning ear? The ears are proved by the sound and the sound is proved by the ears. You can never prove that you can hear in a place that does not have any sound at all. It is difficult to say whose existence is dependent on which. Thought and object are mutually dependent. All the thoughts put together is the mind and all the objects put together is the world. The mind and the world are interdependent and so both are *mithyā*. Our entire life is one of adjusting the world so that a peaceful mind can be had. When the world cannot be adjusted anymore, one starts adjusting the mind. When that does not work in the long term we start adjusting the world again. This goes on and on without any solution. Beyond all this is a third factor called *karma*. *Karma* also influences both the *anātmā* mind and the world. This creates even more problems. Gauḍapāda says that this approach will not work.

Therefore one needs to go to the root of both the mind and world. Tampering with the *mithyā* mind and world will never solve the problem. The solution is to go to *satyaṃ* and make the *mithyā* non-significant. You can never directly tamper with the rope-snake. You handle the rope-snake by knowing the rope and putting the rope-snake in its place. Then it will become harmless. In the most important verse of the third chapter, verse 32, (32 is the most important verse of the 2nd chapter also) it is said not to tamper with the world and mind directly. The *anātmā* mind and world are very fragile depending on *deśa*, *kāla* and *prārabdha*. Tampering with them will produce only temporary solutions at best. It is like a water drop on a lotus leaf. Never tamper with *anātmā* for a permanent solution. The ultimate solution is in verse 32.

When *ātmā*, the *adhiṣṭhānam* is known, the mind is made into non-mind and the world is made into non-world. If the snake is non-snake it is rope alone. When the mind is non-mind it is *ātmā* plus *nama-rūpa*. The world is *ātmā* plus *nama-rūpa*. In dream, one and the same waker divides himself into the experiencing individual and the experienced world. Similarly I, the *ātmā*, with *māyā-śakti* bifurcate into the experiencing mind and the experienced world; the experiencing thought and the experienced object. After understanding, I let the *nama-rūpa* play to continue. **We cannot stop the play but we can know its nature.** Once its nature is known, we will respect it sufficiently to do our duties but we will not give it more reality than it deserves. To watch a movie we make the required preparations but do not consider the movie as real. The world should not be underestimated but it should not be overestimated also. The conditional reality should be treated as such but it should not be given absolute status because it is always changing *nama-rūpa* flow. *This is called dissolving the world into ātmā and dissolving the mind*

into *ātmā*. Dissolving the mind into *ātmā* is called *amanībhāvaḥ*. Dissolving the world can be called *aprapañcībhāvaḥ* (Gauḍapāda does not give this name). This dissolution is through understanding only even when the experience of the dissolved object continues. The pot-clay example can be given to illustrate this. The truth of the pot is clay. The pot can be handled with the knowledge that it is only a name given to a particular form of clay. An enlightened mind is that which has dissolved the mind through wisdom. In the dissolution through wisdom, the experience of the dissolved object continues and the dissolution continues in spite of the experience. The mind is physically dissolved in sleep but the physical dissolution of the mind is temporary. Physical dissolution through sleep, and yogic dissolution of the mind in *samādhi* are temporary. *Jñānam* dissolution of the mind alone is permanent and therein lies the difference. That is said in this verse.

For a wise person who has understood the mind as nothing but *ātmā* or Brahman his mindset is different. The condition and the state of the enlightened mind are different. He will be very much like other people. There is no external and transactional difference. His mind has the additional wisdom and he knows the nature of the reality of the world. Everyone experiences the moonlight in the same way. But only an informed person knows that moonlight is really not moonlight but it is reflected sunlight. The difference in knowledge will not make a difference in experience. Similarly a *jñāni* will experience everything as before but there is an internal transformation. It is not like the state of deep sleep. The state of the dissolved mind in sleep or *yogic nirvikalpa samādhi* is different because in both of these cases the mind will go into unmanifest condition. Sleep and *samādhi* are not different conditions because the mind goes into potential state in both states. The difference between a sleeping mind and the *jñāni*'s mind is described in the next verse.

Verse 35

लीयते हि सुषुप्ते तन्निगृहीतं न लीयते ।

तदेव निर्भयं ब्रह्म ज्ञानालोकं समन्ततः ॥ ३५ ॥

līyate hi suṣupte tannigṛhītaṃ na līyate ।

tadeva nirbhayaṃ brahma jñānālokaṃ samantataḥ ॥ 35॥

Indeed that (mind) becomes dormant in sleep. The disciplined (mind) does not become dormant. That (mind) is Brahman itself which is fearless and which consists of the light of consciousness all around. (verse 35)

In the case of a sleeper and a *yogi* in *samādhi*, the mind is physically dissolved but in the case of a *jñāni*, the mind is not physically dissolved but it is awake and functioning. When the mind is physically dissolved either by sleep, *samādhi*, taking a drug or anesthesia it will go into potential condition. The problem never gets solved. The *jñāni* never tries to physically eliminate the thoughts but he educates the mind about the nature of the mind. Holding the mind the *jñāni* understands that there is no such thing as

the mind. What you are calling the mind, it is nothing but Brahman. The mind is experienced but it does not exist. The four lessons of the *Māṇḍūkya-kārikā* apply to the mind also. The existence of the mind is to be negated. The origination of the mind is to be negated. The appearance and the experience of the mind should be accepted. The appearance and experience of the mind are due to the *māyā-śakti* of *ātmā*. These lessons have to be understood. If these are not understood, adjusting the mind and the world will go on throughout life and this is *saṃsāra*. The mind is not the mind and is nothing but Brahman, which is free from fear and insecurity. *Ātmā* is ever secure. If you want security, never hold on to the mind or the world but hold on to *ātmā*, which is the light of consciousness that is all around. It is what appears as the mind and the world.

Verse 36

अजमनिद्रमस्वप्ननामकमरूपकम् ।

सकृद्धिभातं सर्वज्ञं नोपचारः कथञ्चन ॥ ३६ ॥

ajamanidramasvapnāmanāmakamarūpakam ।

sakṛdvibhātaṃ sarvajñaṃ nopacāraḥ kathañcana ॥ 36॥

It is unborn, dreamless, sleepless, nameless, formless, and ever-effulgent awareness which is all. There is no ceremony at all (with regard to this Ātmā.) (verse 36)

At regular intervals Gauḍapāda will connect his teaching to the *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad* to remind us that his teaching is extracted from the Upaniṣad. In *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad*, Brahman is called *Turīyam*. *Turīyam* is the fourth *pāda* of *ātmā*, the individual. The other three *pādas* are *Viśva*, *Taijasa* and *Prājña*. Consciousness associated with the waking state is called *Viśva*. Consciousness associated with the dream state is called *Taijasa*. Consciousness associated with the deep sleep state is called *Prājña*. Consciousness from its own standpoint is called *Turīyam*. In the 7th *mantra* of the Upaniṣad, the statements “*na bahiṣprajñam, nāntahprajñam, na prajñānaghanam*” refer to *Turīyam* not being *Viśva*, *Taijasa* or *Prājña* respectively. *Turīyam* is not *Viśva* (*ajam*), not *Taijasa* (*asvapnam*), and not *Prājña* (*anidram*). Brahman mentioned in the previous *mantra* is *Turīyam Ātmā*, which is nameless and formless. *Turīyam* is referred to by silence. It is ever self-revealing. It is ever evident in the form of ‘I’ and does not need any proof. The very attempt of proving the ‘I’ indicates that the ‘I’ exists. The prover of everything need not be proved. It is the revealer of everything. It is the consciousness principle that is in the form of everything in the universe with name and form. It is beyond all transactions of the organs of action, organs of knowledge and the mind. It is not an object of worship or meditation. Inviting the Lord for *pūjā* is limiting the Lord. Śaṅkarācārya’s *parāpūjā* describes how to worship *ātmā*, the real Lord. This *pūjā* involves acknowledging every act of *pūjā* to be non-applicable to *ātmā*. This is the *pūjā* that is done by a *jñāni*. *Pūjā* is prescribed for mental preparation. *Pūjā* is invoking the *ātmā* on an *anātmā* form. This needs to be done until the mind is ready to understand that there is no mind or world other than *ātmā*.

MK-44 = Chapter – 3, Verses – 37 to 39

Verse 36

अजमनिद्रमस्वप्ननामकमरूपकम् ।

सकृद्विभातं सर्वज्ञं नोपचारः कथञ्चन ॥ ३६ ॥

In this third chapter of *Māṇḍūkya-kārikā*, Gauḍapādācārya is explaining *advaitam* that occurs in the 7th *mantra* of the Upaniṣad. According to Gauḍapādācārya, the significance of *advaitam* is that which cannot multiply into many. It cannot become a *kāraṇam* for anything because to be a *kāraṇam*, a thing has to produce something. Therefore the *advaitam* Brahma is not a cause of anything. Thus the world has not originated from that Brahman. The message of this chapter is the four-fold principle: *The existence of the world has to be negated. The origination of the world has to be negated. The appearance and the experience of the world are to be accepted like the dream. The appearance and experience of the world is due to self-ignorance, mūlā-avidyā or māyā.* This world that does not have an existence of its own, which has not originated from Brahman is appearing for us. How does it appear? It appears borrowing existence from Brahman, the *advaitam*, just as the dream world appears borrowing existence from the waker. The world that has borrowed existence is called *mithyā*. I, who lend existence to the world, am called *satyaṃ*. *Aham satyaṃ jagat mithyā* is the fact. The *jagat* includes three things, the world outside that we experience, the body and the mind. The world, the body and the mind all have borrowed existence and so are *mithyā* and I am *satyaṃ*. Who is that I? The *satyaṃ* ‘I’ must be different from the *mithyā* world, body and mind. Gauḍapāda says that the answer is given in the 7th *mantra* of *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad*. The *Turīyam caitanyam*, the consciousness principle alone is the *satyaṃ*. As long as *mithyā* is not known as *mithyā*, it will be misunderstood as *satyaṃ* and *mithyā* misunderstood as *satyaṃ* can create a lot of problems. The dream while in dream is looked upon as *satyaṃ*. For a dreamer, the dream is not a dream in dream. The dream is capable of creating problems in dream. So the knowledge that I am *satyaṃ* and the world, body and mind are *mithyā* is important. Appearance of the world and experiencing the world are not problems but attributing absolute reality to the world is the problem. By knowledge, we do not remove the world or the experience of it but only remove the misunderstanding that it is *satyaṃ*.

Gauḍapāda is explaining the important verse 32 now. By understanding who I am really, when the mind does not entertain misconception, the mind is no more the problematic mind. That wise mind becomes a blessing and no more a burden. Therefore *ātmasatya jñānam* is important. Then the nature of *ātmā* was described in verse 36. Gauḍapāda closely follows the 7th *mantra* in this verse. It is not *Viśva*, *Taijasa* or *Prājña* and it is the *Turīyam*, which is beyond name and form, always self-revealing, being of the nature of consciousness, in the sense of ‘I exist’, and the illuminator of all the states. No transaction is possible in that *advaitam* Brahma. All the *pūjās* and meditation are not applicable to *ātmā*. This is explained in the next verse.

Verse 37

सर्वाभिलापविगतः सर्वचिन्तासमुत्थितः ।

सुप्रशान्तः सकृज्ज्योतिः समाधिश्चलोऽभयः ॥ ३७ ॥

sarvābhilāpavigataḥ sarvacintāsamutthitaḥ ।

suprasāntaḥ sakṛjjyotiḥ samādhiraśalo'bhayaḥ ॥ 37॥

It is free from all external organs, free from all internal organs, totally tranquil, ever effulgent, knowable through samādhi, changeless, and fearless. (verse 37)

The nature of *ātmā*, the *Turīyam*, is explained following closely the 7th *mantra* definition. The word *avyavahāryam*, meaning beyond all transaction is taken up here. Transaction always requires duality. In the waking state, there are many things and therefore there is lot of transaction in the waking state. In the dream state, there is duality and there is a lot of dream transaction. In the deep sleep state, there is no duality and there is no transaction possible. So *ātmā*, being *advaitam*, is beyond all transactions. In the scriptures all transactions are divided into two. All transactions come under either giving or taking. In *advaitam* both of these transactions are not present.

It is free from all verbal transactions and the instruments of verbal transactions. It is free from all mental transactions and the instruments of such transactions. Both these transactions are present in *Viśva* and *Taijasa* but not present in *Prājña* and especially *Turīyam*. So *Turīyam* is absolutely tranquil (*śāntam*, *śivam*, *advaitam*). The calmness of the waker is temporary but in *Turīyam* calmness is permanent. Being of the nature of consciousness it is self-revealing and ever revealing. Śāṅkarācārya gives two meanings for the word *samādhi* that appears in the verse: 1. It is that which can be grasped only by a mind that is not preoccupied. A shallow preoccupied mind cannot grasp the teaching because it is not available for deep discussion. 2. *Samādhi* = *sarvaadhiṣṭhānam*. It is that in which *Viśva*, *Taijasa*, *Prājña*, *Virāt*, *Hiraṇyagarbha* and *Īśvara* rest. Therefore, it is non-moving. It is the only source of security. The world has beauty, variety, and novelty and thus attractive, but it does not have stability. Therefore it does not have reliability and cannot give security. Enjoy the world but never hold on to the world for security. The second capsule of Vedānta says that I am the only source of permanent peace, security and happiness. Therefore Gauḍapāda says that we should not hold on to anyone. Even relationships cannot give security because the people involved in relationships are unstable. In the *Bhagavad Gīta*, Kṛṣṇa says, “*ahamātmā guḍākeśa sarvabhūtāśayasthitaḥ*” - “Hold on to Me who is *ātmā* in everyone for security.”

Verse 38

ग्रहो न तत्र नोत्सर्गश्चिन्ता यत्र न विद्यते ।

आत्मसंस्थं तदा ज्ञानमजाति समतां गतम् ॥ ३८ ॥

graho na tatra notsargaścintā yatra na vidyate ।

ātmasaṁsthaṁ tadā jñānamajāti samatām gatam ॥ 38॥

Neither acceptance nor rejection takes place in the Ātmā where thought does not (exist.) Then, knowledge (becomes) established in the Ātmā. It is uniform and unborn. (verse 38)

Again the description of the nature of *Turīyam* based on the 7th *mantra* is continued. All transactions are in the form of giving and taking. Since *Turīyam* is above all transaction, there is no giving involved or taking involved. There is no taking and therefore no giving because there is no thought in *Turīyam*. Gauḍapāda says that the *jñāni* is one who abides in this *Turīyam* all the time. Gaining the knowledge is relatively easy but that knowledge should be available for me. During worldly and family transactions especially during unfavorable *prārabdha* events, I should know that the experiences belong to the *Viśva* role and I, the one who is behind this role is not affected by them. A knowledge that is well preserved in the book will give liberation to the book. If I should enjoy the benefit, I should remember that I am playing a role in and through all the transactions. It is not that I remember this deliberately all the time. This is similar to a Carnatic musician keeping track of the base note during performing. *In all the transactions, I should remember that waking is like dream and that all the life is a stage and we are all playing roles.* By remembering my higher nature, I convert life into a blessing and by forgetting my higher nature, I convert my life into a burden. *Jñāni* is one who abides in *ātmā*, which is eternal and ever the same. In the *Bhagavad Gita*, Kṛṣṇa refers to this in the 2nd chapter, “*eṣā brāhmī sthitiḥ pārtha naināṁ prāpya vimuhyati*”.

Verse 39

अस्पर्शयोगो वै नाम दुर्दर्शः सर्वयोगिभिः ।

योगिनो बिभ्यति ह्यस्मादभये भयदर्शिनः ॥ ३९ ॥

asparśayogo vai nāma durdarśaḥ sarvayogibhiḥ ।

yogino bibhyati hyasmādabhaye bhayadarśinaḥ ॥ 39॥

The yoga of detachment is indeed difficult to be comprehended by all yogis. Yogis are afraid of this (yoga,) for they see fear in the fearless (Brahman.) (verse 39)

Gauḍapādācārya acknowledges the fact that this knowledge is extremely difficult and not easily acceptable to all the people. It requires tremendous qualification and maturity to say that I am my own

security and that I do not need any external help at all. To drop all the external support and to stand all by myself and say, ‘I can confront life by myself, I do not require any emotional support from anyone, any moral support from anyone, and I am secure by myself’ is not possible for many people. Even after 25 years of Vedānta it is not that easy. Therefore Gauḍapāda says that he does not wish to force *advaitam* on all. If you are ready and willing to take the challenge to drop all support, *advaitam* is for you, otherwise if you need external support, use the walking stick. The walking stick is called God. What we do is, the *Turīyam*, which is our own higher nature, we represent as *Īśvara* outside. Even though the real *Īśvara* is not an outside object, the real *Īśvara* is *ātmā* the *Turīyam*, which is myself, people cannot grasp the *Turīyam*. Until we grasp the *Turīyam*, we use an idol or symbol as representations of *Turīyam*. We pray to this symbol saying that we cannot face life by ourselves, we do not know which *prārabdha* will strike us when and how, we do not have the strength to face and therefore may you give support. Until *ātmajñānam* one should be a *karma-yogi*. *Karma-yogi* is in triangular format and *jñāna-yogi* is in binary format. Gauḍapāda says that as long as you need external support may you take the support of God. A majority of the people require the support, they are afraid of binary format, they are afraid of *advaitam*, and they do not want to drop the walking stick called God.

Ātmajñānam is called *asparśa-yoga*, a *jñānam* by which I cut off all the relationships that I hold on to for emotional support. All the relationships and all the contacts are for having some shoulder to lean on and a lap to rest the head. Every mind requires support and when *advaitam* is talked about, people will generally say that they do not want *advaitam*. Gauḍapāda says that *ātmajñānam* is a yoga of no relationships, which transcends all relationships including the relationship with God. Relationship with God is *dvaitam*. In *advaitam*, relationship with God as a second entity is not there because a *jñāni* discovers God as his own higher nature that is himself. This is very difficult to comprehend for all the seekers. For this reason, Vedas do not give this teaching in the beginning. Have *dvaitam* and *dāsoham bhāvanā* in the *karma*-section, and the *upāsana*-section but one day come to *soham bhāvanā*. All the seekers are afraid of *soham bhāvanā* and they want *dāsoham bhāvanā* for security. The real security is in *advaitam* only but people do not understand this. In *advaitam*, which is the source of fearlessness they are seeing fear. They see fear in the fearless *advaitam*.

MK-45 = Chapter – 3, Verses – 39, 40

Verse 39

अस्पर्शयोगो वै नाम दुर्दर्शः सर्वयोगिभिः ।

योगिनो बिभ्यति ह्यस्मादभये भयदर्शिनः ॥ ३९ ॥

Gauḍapāda has pointed out that the mind that perceives duality is the cause of *samsāra* because as long as duality is present, the sense of limitation and the sense of insecurity will be present. This alone is the expression of *samsāra*. Therefore the mind that perceives the duality should be handled which he called as *amanībhāvaḥ*. He pointed out that that method is through *ātmā-satya-anubodhena*. Handling the mind through the knowledge of the *ātmā* is the only solution. The mind can be handled only through *ātmajñānam*. This is the topic that Gauḍapāda started from verse 32 and concluded in verse 39. When *ātmā* the *satyaṃ* is known, then the duality will not be dismissed but the duality or the world will be understood as an appearance. Remembering the four-fold message, *the existence of the world of duality is to be negated; the origination of the world of duality is to be negated; the appearance and experience of the duality are to be accepted; and that duality is only appearing borrowing existence from ātmā myself*, I should understand that just like the dream duality is existing only by borrowing existence from me the waker and will collapse once I wake up and do not give it support, similarly the waking duality is also only *mithyā* duality.

Thereafter Gauḍapādācārya pointed out that when you say, ‘the world of duality’, you should include the mind also because always when we experience duality there are two parallel things coming, object and the relevant thought, which are responsible for the experience. The entire world is a mixture of thought and object. Without the thought you cannot experience the object and without the object the corresponding thought cannot be there. Therefore both the mind and the world are nothing but *mithyā dvaitam* borrowing support from me. That *adhiṣṭhānam* of the duality is *ātmāsatyaṃ*, which is free from duality. That *advaita ātmā*, in which there is no duality, has no relationships with anything. That *ātmā* is *asaṅga ātmā* or *asparśa ātmā*. This doubtless knowledge should be gained through *śravaṇam* and *mananam* of *jñāna-yoga*. Gauḍapāda calls this *jñāna-yoga*, *asparśa-yoga* here. All people cannot come to this *yoga* and even if they come, many cannot survive this *yoga*. Very few people will comprehend this teaching. In *Kaṭha Upaniṣad*, it is said that many people listen to Vedānta and among them many do not understand but there are some people who understand. The Upaniṣad says that the teacher is wonderful and the student is wonderful if the communication is successful. Gauḍapāda asks why many are not able to stick to *advaita*.

What is the obstacle to come to *advaita*? He says that there is a powerful reason. All the ignorant people do not know that they are *Turīyam*. Therefore they are going to mistake that they are *Viśva*, *Taijasa* or *Prājñā*. Once they are identified with the body-mind complex, and since both of them are limited and perishable, they definitely will feel insecure. When they are insecure, they want to hold on to something

or the other for security. They strike many relationships for a sense of security. All ignorant people feel insecure and want relationships for security. They want *saṅgam*, contact, relationship and security whereas in *advaitam*, there is no *saṅga* possible, no relationship is possible because relationship requires *dvaitam*. When *advaitam* is offered, the *asaṅga* in *advaitam* makes one reject it. Who will come to *advaitam*? Only people with a lot of maturity and understanding.

How does one get maturity and understanding? Through life's experiences I should understand that relationships that I think will give me security would not give me security. This has to be arrived at by experience and logical analysis. When an insecure person is holding on to someone that is also finite by nature, the situation does not improve but it gets worse. *Dvaitam*, *sambandha* and *saṅga* cannot give security. One will have to understand this. Long-term *karma-yoga* is required and one has to go through a lot of painful experiences. How does one handle insecurity? Not by holding on to external support but by enquiring into the cause of insecurity as suggested by Vedānta. The cause of insecurity is ignorance, the thought that I am a *Viśva*, a *jīvātma*. Therefore if I raise the question of who am I, Vedānta will answer that I am not *Viśva*, *Taijasa* or *Prājña* but the *Turīyam* without a second thing. Then what will I hold on to, if there is no second thing? I cannot hold on to anything but then I need not hold on to anything. As *Turīyam*, which is secure by nature, I do not require anything to hold on to. Not knowing this, many people are afraid of *advaitam*. I do not need any support because I am the support of *Viśva*, *Taijasa*, and *Prājña*. To understand this, a lot of maturity is required. For a majority of the people, *advaitam*, which is a source of security, appears as a source of insecurity.

Immature seekers are afraid of *advaitam* because they see insecurity in *advaitam*. The seeker should go from world-dependence to God-dependence to Self-dependence through *karma-yoga* and *jñāna-yoga*. For a *karma-yogi*, God is the support and not the family. Family life is for serving and purifying the mind by growing spiritually. In the *Bhagavad Gita*, Kṛṣṇa says:

Those people who (see themselves as) non-separate from Me, recognizing Me, gain Me. For those who are always one with Me, I take care of what they want to acquire and protect. (9:22)

In *jñāna-yoga*, one learns that the real God is not the name and form outside but is the *Turīya Ātmā*. The *jñāna-yogi* knows that God is none other than the Self. Thus the *jñāna-yogi* goes from God-dependence to Self-dependence. Self-dependence is independence. But most people find world dependence or God-dependence comfortable and are afraid of *jñāna-yoga*.

Verse 40

मनसो निग्रहायत्तमभयं सर्वयोगिनाम् ।

दुःखक्षयः प्रबोधश्चाप्यक्षया शान्तिरेव च ॥ ४० ॥

manaso nigrāhāyattamābhayaṃ sarvayoginām |

duḥkhakṣayaḥ prabodhaścāpyakṣayā śāntireva ca || 40||

Fearlessness, cessation of grief, Self-Knowledge, and ever-lasting peace - all this is dependent on the discipline of the mind for all (these) yogis. (verse 40)

With the previous verse, Gauḍapāda completed the *ātmā-satyā-anubodha* topic, which is Self-Knowledge. The pursuit of Self-Knowledge was called *asparśa-yoga*, which is *jñāna-yoga*. Through *jñāna-yoga*, one comes to Self-dependence, which is independence. This is *mokṣa*. *Jñāna-yoga* is *śravaṇam* and *mananam*. *Śravaṇam* and *mananam* are important but are not complete by itself. *Śravaṇam* and *mananam* will give doubtless knowledge. There is one more step called *nididhyāsanam*, which is an integral part of *jñāna-yoga*. *Nididhyāsanam* is the process by which we derive practical benefit out of this knowledge so that knowledge does not remain isolated without bringing any benefit in daily life. Knowledge should not remain mere information but should result in transformation. This is transformation of our mental state. Knowledge should bring about a transformation of the state of mind to derive practical benefit. How does this take place? The quality of our life depends upon our predominant mental state. If you are worried and anxious and feel bitter about the way people treat you most of the time, then the bitterness, worry and fear will be the predominant mental state, and the quality of life will be poor. If that is the case, the knowledge will be of no benefit. So the mental state has to be transformed. This is called *jīvanmukti* as Kṛṣṇa described in the 2nd chapter of the *Gīta*, verses 54 – 72, in the 12th chapter, verses 13 – 20, and in the 14th chapter, verses 21 – 27.

How does one transform the mental state? It is done by *manonigraha*, which is changing the mental state in keeping with the Vedāntic teaching. This is knowledge-inspired mental state. Transforming the mind is not that easy. What determines the mental state? The mental state is determined is by the thoughts that the mind is entertaining. Thoughts are running all the time. If thoughts of complaints, bitterness, worry, hatred, and persecution occupy the mind predominantly, the mind cannot benefit from the knowledge. Handling the thoughts is called *citta vṛtti nirodha*. *Nirodha* is usually translated as stopping thoughts. But in Vedānta, *nirodha* refers to disciplining or directing the thoughts. Thoughts are of two types, voluntary thoughts and involuntary thoughts. Involuntary thoughts are based on your *vāsanās*. They arrive on their own, choose to stay, decide whether they should allow you to do what you intend to do. *Vāsanās* are past thoughts registered in the *cittam*. These *vāsanās* alone come in the form of involuntary thoughts. I am not entertaining deliberate thoughts all the time and so involuntary thoughts will come. The question is whether they continue with my permission or whether they continue without my permission. When I do not have discipline, the involuntary thoughts take over and if I ask them to stop, they will not stop. The mind is no more my instrument. The mind is under the grip of involuntary thoughts. When those involuntary thoughts are in the form of habitual worry, habitual bitterness, and habitual complaints, most of the time my mind is in a *samsāri* state. When I study Vedānta, if I have a reasonably good intellect, I will understand the teaching but my problem is that my involuntary thoughts are not my under my control. For Vedānta to be beneficial I should learn to manage the involuntary

thoughts. Let them rise but for their continuation, they should have my permission. Many involuntary thoughts are not disturbing but the disturbing ones will interfere with the assimilation of Vedānta. Management of involuntary thoughts is a very important *sādhana*. *Aṣṭāṅga-yoga* is designed for this management. During *pratyāhāra* trying to keep the mind focused and away from the disturbing involuntary thoughts is an important spiritual discipline. At the time of *upāsana-yoga*, this discipline should be practiced. Vedānta minus this yogic discipline would give only academic information. Most of us try to get *jñānam* before *yoga* and even if we become *jñānis* we do not derive the full benefit. In that case, one should learn to manage the involuntary thoughts. Start monitoring the mind. Anytime an inappropriate thought comes, let it come. Once it comes, notice it and decide if you should allow it to continue or not. If you tell the mind that that thought should go away, it should go away. This topic of *manonigraha*, *nididhyāsanam*, *yoga abhyāsa* or *samādhi-abhyāsa-rūpa-nididhyāsanam* is introduced from verses 40 to 48. Gauḍapāda says that all the spiritual seekers should practice this *yoga* of learning to handle involuntary thoughts. It is called *mānasa nigraha*. Only when the mind is disciplined (*śama*) the following practical benefits of *jīvanmukti* will be obtained: *abhayam*, being fearless and less anxious regarding future, *duḥkha kṣaya*, end of complaints, varieties of grief and despondency, *akṣaya śānti*, lasting peace of mind, and *prabodha*, unobstructed knowledge. After *jñānam*, *jīvanmukti* depends on *yoga*, *manonigraha*, which is handling involuntary thoughts.

MK-46 = Chapter – 3, Verses – 40 to 44

Verse 40

मनसो निग्रहायत्तमभयं सर्वयोगिनाम् ।

दुःखक्षयः प्रबोधश्चाप्यक्षया शान्तिरेव च ॥ ४० ॥

In this final part of the third chapter, Gauḍapādācārya is dealing with a very important discipline, which is called *manonigraha*, also known as *śama* in *Tattvabodha*. This mental discipline or thought discipline is extremely important at all the levels of spiritual *sādhana*. At *karma-yoga* level it is required and at the *upāsana-yoga* level it is needed, otherwise *upāsana* itself will not be possible. *Śravaṇam* and *mananam* can take place only when the mind of the student is available for the teacher. Ultimately even after gaining knowledge, if the knowledge is to be available for our benefit, which is *jīvanmukti*, mental discipline is important. *Manonigraha* is learning to handle involuntary thoughts that the mind is generating continuously and constantly. In fact, when you go to sleep the mind is generating involuntary thoughts, which get converted into dream. Except during the short time of deep sleep, the mind is continuously generating involuntary thoughts both in the waking as well as the dream states. These involuntary thoughts are of two types. One is harmful and the other is harmless. Harmful involuntary thoughts are in the form of fear, worry, anxiety, anger, hatred, jealousy, bitterness, and complexes. They harm the mind initially and later the body also. Harmful involuntary thoughts are going to directly affect my life. Even the harmless involuntary thoughts will affect one indirectly because they make the mind preoccupied all the time. That way the mind is not available for one's work. Even for remembering Vedānta, the mind will not be available. Thus involuntary thoughts can harm all people including a spiritual person. Learning to handle the involuntary thoughts is required for a fit person whether one is a spiritual, religious or worldly person and thus is important for leading a meaningful life. For this, *aṣṭāṅga yoga* is prescribed: *yama*, *niyama*, *āsana*, *prāṇāyāma*, *pratyāhāra*, *dhāraṇā*, *dhyāna*, *samādhi*. *Pratyāhāra* is the capacity to withdraw the sense organs and also the mind from its field at will to focus it on *upāsana*, studying Vedānta, or *nididhyāsanam*. Ideally this should have been practiced before Vedāntic studies. But it is never late to start this practice. Learn to watch the involuntary thoughts, investigate their quality. If they are harmful they should be handled right away. If they are harmless slowly bring the mind back to the task at hand. This is very difficult but compulsory if the time spent on Vedāntic study should prove to be worthwhile. Otherwise it becomes another academic pursuit. The four benefits of Vedāntic study can be derived if the mental blocks are eliminated. The benefits are: *abhayam*, freedom from a sense of insecurity. The mind generates insecurity even if one has a lot of material things; *duḥkha kṣaya*, freedom from mental disturbance; *akṣaya śānti*, lasting peace of mind; *prabodha*, unobstructed knowledge that is useful. All these are possible only if one learns to handle thoughts. Thought discipline is to be practiced during the entire waking time. If the mind is wandering all over during the course of the day, it will do the same thing in meditation also and meditation would be impossible. This verse is the introductory verse for this spiritual discipline.

Verse 41

उत्सेक उदधेर्यद्वत्कुशाग्रेणैकबिन्दुना ।

मनसो निग्रहस्तद्वद्भवेदपरिखेदतः ॥ ४१ ॥

utseka udadheryadvatkuśāgreṇaikabindunā ।

manaso nigrāhastadvadbhavedaparikhedataḥ ॥ 41॥

Just as the emptying of an ocean, drop by drop, with the tip of a blade of grass is possible only with perseverance, so also, the discipline of the mind (is attainable only with perseverance.) (verse 41)

Here Gauḍapāda openly acknowledges that thought discipline is very difficult but not totally impossible. It requires long effort. Gauḍapāda gives the example of emptying the ocean with the tip of a blade of grass. This is almost impossible. The mind generates so many thoughts and the task is to weed out useless thoughts.

Emptying the ocean drop by drop using a blade of grass requires a lot of perseverance. In the same way, handling the mind should also be practiced relentlessly without getting frustrated. One should be ready for failures again and again. The commentators write a story relating to this. A bird wished to empty the ocean to retrieve its eggs that went under the waters of the ocean. The bird did this by dipping its beak into water and throwing out the water. The bird was doing this continuously and seeing this sincerity, *Garuḍa Bhagavān* came and dried the ocean by flapping his huge wings. From this story it is learnt that if a person is sincere, there will be help from *Bhagavān* also in the practice of disciplining the thoughts. Kṛṣṇa says this in the 6th chapter: *sa niścayena yoktavyo yogo'nirviṇṇacetasā* ; a mind that does not become defeatist and negative is needed.

Verse 42

उपायेन निगृह्णीयाद्विक्लिप्तं कामभोगयोः ।

सुप्रसन्नं लये चैव यथा कामो लयस्तथा ॥ ४२ ॥

upāyena nigrhṇīyādvikṣiptaṃ kāmabhogayoḥ ।

suprasannaṃ laye caiva yathā kāmo layastathā ॥ 42॥

By proper means, one should discipline (the mind) which is lost in the objects of desire and enjoyment and (which is) pleased in slumber. Slumber (is) as (undesirable) as desire. (verse 42)

Gauḍapāda assumes that some students will be interested in doing meditation. Meditation is an exercise in which I do not allow the mind to do what it wants but make it do what I want. I give a particular task and ask the mind to do that to find out whether the mind is my instrument or I am the mind's instrument.

This meditation can be of two types. If disciplining the mind is done before Vedāntic study, it is called *saguṇa Īśvara dhyānam*, or *upāsana* in the form of mental worship, mental recitation, or mental repetition. This can be done to find where the mind stands. If a person did not practice this meditation before Vedāntic study, then he should practice the meditation after the study. When it is done after the Vedāntic study, it is not *saguṇa Īśvara dhyānam* because Vedānta has taught me *ātmasvarūpam* and given me *ātmā-anātmā viveka*. Therefore it is *ātmā-anātmā viveka dhyānam*. In both types of meditation, the aim is to keep the mind in its field that I want so that I assert my control over the mind and also get the benefit of meditation. Gauḍapāda assumes that some students are going to do either *saguṇa dhyānam* or *nididhyāsanam (nirguṇa dhyānam)*. He gives instructions for this practice like Kṛṣṇa did in the 6th chapter of the *Gita*. Kṛṣṇa concentrated on the preparation for meditation like proper place of meditation, proper time and proper condition of the body, etc. Gauḍapāda talks about the different obstacles for meditation, which Kṛṣṇa did not deal with elaborately. There are four types of obstacles called *dhyāna pratibandha*. The first one is *laya*, mind getting into sleep because of the rise of *tamo guṇa*. The next one is *vikṣepa*, the wandering of the mind, a highly active mind because of the rise of *rajo guṇa*. The third one is *kaṣāyam*, unmanifest or hidden disturbances because of hidden *rāga* and *dveṣa* in the sub-conscious mind resulting in stagnation of the mind and so not available for the task at hand. The fourth one is *rasa svāda*, getting lost in the experiential *ānanda* that may come in meditation. When the mind is tranquil, the experiential *ānanda* that is the reflected bliss comes up and this can make the mind unavailable for Vedāntic meditation.

Gauḍapāda says that one has to transcend these four obstacles. First he takes up *vikṣepa*. When the mind is carried away or lost in sense pleasures and lost in its objects of attachments, withdraw the mind by appropriate method. Gauḍapāda does not say what the appropriate method is. He says that in the next verse. Then he takes up *laya*. He says that when the mind has become passive because of *laya* state, you have to handle the sleeping mind by the appropriate method. Just as distraction caused by desire is an obstacle, a sleeping mind is also an obstacle. So both must be handled.

Verse 43

दुःखं सर्वमनुस्मृत्य कामभोगान्निवर्तयेत् ।

अजं सर्वमनुस्मृत्य जातं नैव तु पश्यति ॥ ४३ ॥

duḥkham sarvamanusmṛtya kāmabhogānnivartayet ।

ajam sarvamanusmṛtya jātam naiva tu paśyati ॥ 43॥

Constantly remembering that everything is a source of sorrow, one should turn away (the mind) from the object of desire. Constantly remembering that everything is unborn (Brahman,) one should never see anything which is (seemingly) born. (verse 43)

Gauḍapādācārya gives two methods to handle the wandering mind. One method is for an *upāsaka* who has not studied Vedānta. The second method is for *nididhyasana kartā* who has studied Vedānta.

The first method: When sense pleasures are distracting you through their temptations, may you meditate upon the problems that can be caused by them. Every rose is wonderful but when you go to pick it, the thorn will hurt you. The pleasure caused by every worldly object has three defects: is mixed with sorrow, does not produce lasting contentment and creates bondage. Let me not hold on to them too much. Let me hand over to *Bhagavān*, *viśvarūpa Īśvara*. I will do my duties towards worldly objects for my spiritual growth but I will never hold on to them for my peace, security or happiness. Anything can disappear at anytime. Let me not emotionally depend upon them. Once I reduce my *rāga*, the attachment, the mind can obey. Repeatedly the mind should be educated to detach from worldly things and worldly beings. Therefore Gauḍapāda says one should remember that every object in the world is mixed with equal amount of pain also. The intensity of pain given by the object is proportional to the intensity of pleasure that it gives. Remembering this defect of the sense objects one should turn the mind away from sensory addiction. In the *Bhagavad Gita*, Arjuna complains about the wandering mind and Lord Kṛṣṇa gives an answer to that:

Arjuna said:

Oh Kṛṣṇa! The mind is indeed fickle, turbulent, powerful (and) firm. I consider its restraint to be very difficult like that of the wind. (verse 6:34)

The Lord answered - Oh Arjuna! Undoubtedly, the mind is fickle and difficult to retrain. Oh Arjuna! However, it can be restrained through detachment and practice. (verse 6:35)

No one should stop the meditation because of failure. Let the meditation continue in spite of failure. This is called *abhyāsa* and *vairāgyam*.

The second method: *Jīva* is not born out of Brahman. The world is not born out of Brahman. What is there in the three periods of time is only Brahman. Everything is Brahman only. There is no such thing called world at all. The entire world is an appearance and we should not hold on to an apparent world and suffer later. One should remember that the world is *mithyā*. For the junior students, the lesson is that the pleasures of the world are mixed with sorrow. For the senior students, the understanding is that the world is not there at all. Why are you falling in love with a shadow? Repeatedly remembering the *mithyātvam* of the world one does not see the created world, but sees only Brahman with different *nama* and *rūpa*. This will help in detaching the mind. Once the mind is detached, the mind will not wander. The principle is *rāga-dveṣa* is the cause of the wandering mind and dilution of *rāga-dveṣa* is the cause of quietening the mind. May you practice that to get out of *vikṣepa*.

Verse 44

लये सम्बोधयेच्चित्तं विक्षिप्तं शमयेत्पुनः ।

सकषायं विजानीयात्समप्राप्तं न चालयेत् ॥ ४४ ॥

laye sambodhayeccittam vikṣiptam śamayetpunaḥ ।

sakaṣāyaṃ vijānīyātsamaprāptaṃ na cālayet ॥ 44॥

One should awaken the mind in drowsiness. One should quieten the disturbed mind repeatedly. One should know (the mind in the intermediary state) to be one with latent desires. One should not disturb (the mind) which has become tranquil. (verse 44)

When the mind wanders due to sense objects, may you bring the mind back either by the remembrance of the world's pleasures being mixed with sorrow or the *mithyā* nature of the world. Even if you withdraw the mind and start the meditation, it will again start wandering. This withdrawal is done repeatedly.

When the mind tends to doze may you wake up the mind. Gauḍapāda does not say how but we have to find whatever works for us. Avoid the causes for drowsiness like deficit of sleep, eating too much, and tiredness. *Tāmasika* and *rājasika* states of mind should be avoided for meditation.

The third obstacle is hidden *rāga-dveṣa* that makes the mind stagnant. When the mind is stagnant, may you understand that it is due to suffering from some pain or problem in the subconscious mind. There is a problem that cannot be expressed externally but comes up during meditation. What to do about that? Remain in that condition, and that suppressed problem will slowly come up. When the mind is quiet and not distracted by external disturbances, whatever is hidden inside will surface. Thus *kaṣāyaṃ* will get converted to *vikṣepa*. Hidden *vikṣepa* is *kaṣāyaṃ*. Unsuppressed and unprocessed *prārabdham* of someone else that was hidden can come up. Once the *kaṣāyaṃ* has been converted into *vikṣepa*, that *vikṣepa* can be handled by the appropriate method.

MK-47 = Chapter – 3, Verses – 44 to 48

Verse 44

लये सम्बोधयेच्चित्तं विक्षिप्तं शमयेत्युनः ।

सकषायं विजानीयात्समप्राप्तं न चालयेत् ॥ ४४ ॥

In this final part of the third chapter, Gauḍapādācārya is discussing the important topic of *nididhyāsanam*, naming it *manonigraha*, disciplining the mind. This is from verse 40 to 47. This *nididhyāsanam* is to be practiced by people who have gone through *śravaṇam* and *mananam* for a length of time and after gaining the knowledge that they are *ātmā* that is ever free and that *ahaṅkāra* is a disguise that they are putting on for the purpose of transaction. After getting this intellectual conviction, *nididhyāsanam* is done for assimilation. There are two types of *nididhyāsanam*. One is *brahma-abhyāsa-rūpa nididhyāsanam* and the other is *samādhi-abhyāsa-rūpa nididhyāsanam*. *Brahma-abhyāsa-rūpa nididhyāsanam* does not require a separate time and effort but is simply remembering the teaching in and through worldly transaction. If a person is able to do that, the teaching will gradually get assimilated. Those people that are able to assimilate the teaching this way will not require *samādhi-abhyāsa-rūpa nididhyāsanam*. It is not compulsory for all. *Samādhi-abhyāsa-rūpa nididhyāsanam* is for people who are not able to derive the full benefit of Vedāntic study even after long *śravaṇam* and *mananam* when Vedānta remains as academic knowledge only. This indicates *brahma-abhyāsa-rūpa nididhyāsanam* is not enough and that *samādhi-abhyāsa-rūpa nididhyāsanam* is required. If the mind is reasonably fit, *samādhi-abhyāsa-rūpa nididhyāsanam* is not required. It is possible to get *niṣṭha* just by receiving the teaching and remembering the teaching. But when the mind has several issues due to adverse *prārabdha*, then this is not enough.

When the mind is disturbed two teachings of Vedānta cannot be assimilated. ‘I am not the mind and I am different from the mind’ can only be assimilated when the mind is relatively quiet.

When the mind is highly disturbed I cannot detach from the mind but I become one with the mind just like the physical body. When the body is healthy I can detach from the body and listen to the teaching. Mind can be seen as *anātmā* only when the mind is reasonably calm. When the mind is disturbed, I will not say that the mind is disturbed but say that I am disturbed.

The second one is that I can never assimilate the teaching that the mind is *mithyā* when the mind is disturbed. If I should see that the mind is *anātmā* and that it is *mithyā*, the mind should be reasonably free from disturbances. If my *prārabdham* is such that there is some problem or the other, I have to devote some separate time and practice regularly the *samādhi-abhyāsa-rūpa-nididhyāsanam* and learn to calm the mind down a little bit. That *abhyāsa* is what Gauḍapāda is discussing.

There are four obstacles to this *nididhyāsanam*. 1. Dozing off, taken care of by an appropriate method; 2. distraction due to external objects, taken care of by remembering that the worldly objects are a source of sorrow or by the knowledge that the world is *mithyā* (*vairāgya*, *abhyāsa* in the *Gita*); 3. mind going to stagnation due to subconscious powerful *rāga* or *dveṣa*, which are the foundation of all the emotions, taken care of by having the *sāksi bhāva* of the mind that will allow the problem to surface, which then can be taken care of by *abhyāsa* and *vairāgyam*. Before talking about the fourth obstacle Gauḍapāda makes an observation. If the mind has been withdrawn from all these obstacles, the mind becomes calm and quiet and available for Vedāntic meditation. When the mind reaches that quiet state, make sure that the three obstacles do not come again and again, and so maintaining the equanimity is important.

Verse 45

नाऽऽस्वादयेत्सुखं तत्र निःसङ्गः प्रज्ञया भवेत् ।

निश्चलं निश्चरच्चित्तमेकी कुर्यात्प्रयत्नतः ॥ ४५ ॥

nā''svādayetsukhaṃ tatra niḥsaṅgaḥ prajñayā bhavet ।

niścalaṃ niścaraccittamekī kuryātprayatnataḥ ॥ 45॥

One should not enjoy the happiness at that time. One should remain detached (from that happiness) through discrimination. By proper effort one should unite the tranquil mind (with the Ātmā) as it goes out. (verse 45)

When the mind has conquered the obstacle called *tamas* that causes dozing and the obstacle called *rajoguna*, which expresses in the form of the mind wandering, *sattva guṇa* becomes predominant. *Sattva* expresses in quietude, calmness, equanimity, etc. When the mind is *sāttvika*, it is pure and clear like a surface that has been polished well. Then *ātmānanda* will get reflected in that *sāttvika* mind, which is called *priya vṛtti*, *moda vṛtti*, or *pramoda vṛtti* depending on the extent of *sattva* in the mind. That experiential pleasure is always reflected *ānanda* including the pleasure that comes in meditation. Gauḍapāda advises that one should not get attached to meditation *ānanda* also because it is not one's original nature but it is only a reflection. How does one experience the original *ānanda*? The original *ānanda* is never experienced but the original *ānanda* should be claimed as oneself.

In the state of meditation, whatever happiness arises because of *sattva* predominance. I should tell myself that this *ānanda* is my own reflection, and that I am the source of this *ānanda* and all the other pleasures in the world. By discriminating between the reflection and the original, I should not get attached to that temporary pleasure because that also is nothing but another type of sense pleasure only.

Then Gauḍapāda gives another instruction. Thus when I am claiming without any distraction that I am *ātmā*, the mind will again tend to go outward. Again I should bring the mind back from all the distractions to my own higher nature revealed in *mantra 7* of the *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad*. I should dwell

upon that higher nature as *śāntam śivam advaitam caturtam manyante sa ātmā*. I should remind myself of my higher nature again and again. All the other things will come and go away. This is similar to the 6th chapter of the Gita: *ātmasaṁsthaṁ manaḥ kṛtvā na kiñcidapi cintayet*; “Making the mind abide in the Self, may one not think of anything else.”

Verse 46

यदा न लीयते चित्तं न च विक्षिप्यते पुनः ।

अनिङ्गनमनाभासं निष्पन्नं ब्रह्म तत्तदा ॥ ४६ ॥

yadā na līyate cittam na ca vikṣipyate punaḥ ।

anīṅganamanābhāsaṁ niṣpannaṁ brahma tattadā ॥ 46॥

When the mind does not sleep and is not disturbed again, then, that motionless, projection-less (mind) has become Brahman. (verse 46)

After successfully crossing over all the obstacles, when the mind does not doze, and is not distracted by family members visiting the mind without permission, and also all the other worldly things do not enter the mind, the mind becomes unwavering and without any worldly thoughts. Then one can practice the two lessons of Vedānta: The mind is *anātmā*; the mind is *mithyā nama-rūpa* like all the other objects of the world. At that time, that mind also is understood as Brahman itself because there is no mind separate from Brahman. There is no mind other than Brahman. The existence of the mind is negated. The origination of the mind is negated. The appearance of the mind alone is accepted. The mind has ‘become’ Brahman meaning the mind is understood as Brahman. There is no such thing called mind at all.

Verse 47

स्वस्थं शान्तं सनिर्वाणमकथ्यं सुखमुत्तमम् ।

अजमजेन ज्ञेयेन सर्वज्ञं परिचक्षते ॥ ४७ ॥

svasthaṁ śāntaṁ sanirvāṇamakathyaṁ sukhamuttamam ।

ajamajena jñeyena sarvajñaṁ paricakṣate ॥ 47॥

(They) declare (this knowledge to be) the highest ānanda which is based on the Ātmā, which is undisturbed, which is coexistent with liberation, which is indescribable, which is unborn, and which is the all-illuminating consciousness, being identical with the unborn Brahman. (verse 47)

In the *Yogaśāstra* language, remaining absorbed in this fact alone is called *samādhi*. When you practice the meditation it is called *dhāraṇā*, when the mind is going up and down it is *dhyānam*, and when the

mind is no more distracted, it is called *samādhi*. The culmination of meditation is *samādhi*. Kṛṣṇa gives an example in the *Gita*:

A lamp, protected from the wind, does not tremble. This illustration is cited for the composed mind of the meditator who practices contemplation of the Self. (6:19)

Gauḍapāda uses *aniṅganam* here. Gauḍapāda is closely following the 6th chapter of the *Bhagavad Gita* here. That meditator is absorbed in *samādhi* abiding as his higher nature, *Turīyam*. That *Turīyam* is being talked about here. Since the meditator is abiding in his own real nature, he himself is *Turīyam* and not *Viśva*, *Taijasa* or *Prājña*. This *Turīyam* is absolutely tranquil that is associated with *mokṣa*, which is indescribable, highest non-experiential *ānanda*, unborn, one with Brahman, the ultimate *jagat kāraṇam* and the illuminator of the waking, dream, and deep sleep states. Thus the meditator is *Turīyam*.

After practicing the *samādhi-abhyāsa-rūpa-nididhyāsanam*, it should become so natural to me that even during worldly transaction, I should remember that I am *Turīyam* only. *Viśva*, *Taijasa*, and *Prājña* are roles that I play but my real nature is *Turīyam*. The roles should be given sufficient importance, neither over-importance nor under-importance. Over-importance is indicated by worries over duties and under-importance expresses in neglect of duties. Keep doing duties without carrying them as burdens. That is called understanding the roles as roles. This is called *sahaja samādhi*. *Samādhi-abhyāsa-rūpa nididhyāsanam* should lead to *sahaja samādhi*. I should remember my *Turīyam* nature. Kṛṣṇa tells in the *Gita*: “I do everything and look at my face, there is always a smile.” Go through life with a smile remembering that everything is a play. With this Gauḍapāda completes the *samādhi-abhyāsa-rūpa nididhyāsanam*. Now he concludes the entire third chapter with an *upasaṃhāra sloka*.

Verse 48

न कश्चिज्जायते जीवः सम्भवोऽस्य न विद्यते ।

एतत्तदुत्तमं सत्यं यत्र किञ्चिन्न जायते ॥ ४८ ॥

na kaścijjāyate jīvaḥ sambhavo'sya na vidyate ।

etattaduttamaṃ satyaṃ yatra kiñcinna jāyate ॥ 48॥

No jīva is born. This (jīva) has no cause. This Brahman is the absolute Truth in which nothing is born. (verse 48)

Gauḍapāda consolidates the entire teaching of the third chapter, which was presented as the four-fold lesson: The existence of the world is to be negated. The origination of the world is to be negated. The appearance and experience of the world are to be accepted. The appearance and experience of the world are due to *māyā* or *avidyā*. These four lessons put together is conveyed by one word, *advaitam*. Of these four also, Gauḍapāda is highlighting the second one. The more you probe into the origination of the

world, the intellect will get more and more disturbed with many unanswerable questions. Never ask the question, ‘Why did *Bhagavān* create the world?’ Gauḍapāda’s answer is that the world has never originated. It only appears. This highlighting the second point is called *ajāti vāda*. Gauḍapāda is famous for the lesson number 2: the origination of the world is to be negated. The fourth chapter also highlights *ajāti vāda* only.

Do not ask why was I born. No *jīva* is created. *Jīva* is another name for Brahman, which has never been created. No world is born. Why? There is no *kāraṇam* for the origination. There is no source or cause for the origination. The nature of Brahman is such that it cannot produce anything because it cannot undergo any change to produce something. Production of something involves undergoing change. Brahman cannot undergo a change. There is only one absolute reality. It is *Turīyam* Brahman. It is called *advaitam*. In that *advaitam* Brahman nothing is born but things appear. That highest truth is myself. With this, the third chapter, *Advaitaprakaraṇam* is over.

MK-48 = Chapter 3, Summary

Today I will give you a summary of the third chapter of *Māṇḍūkya-kārikā*, titled *Advaitaprakaraṇam* consisting of 48 verses. As the very title itself indicates, in this chapter, Gauḍapāda is focusing on the topic of *advaita ātmā* or *advaita Turīyam*. This entire chapter is based on the 7th *mantra* of the *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad* in which *Turīyam* is described in several words. At the end of the verse, we get *śāntam śivam advaitam caturtham manyante sa ātmā sa vijñeyaḥ*. The significance of the word “*advaitam*” is being brought out in this chapter. As we saw in the introduction of this chapter, the word *advaitam* is used in a very *śāstric* manner and it means that which cannot become many. *Advaitam* means that it cannot become *dvaitam* and which cannot produce *dvaitam*. Neither can it divide and become two nor can it multiply and become two. The multiplication can happen either by production or division. *Advaitam* can never become *dvaitam* either by multiplication or division. Therefore *advaita* world can never be born from *advaita* Brahman or *Turīyam*. Therefore the world is never created at anytime. The entire chapter focuses on the negation of *sr̥ṣṭi*. Another word for *sr̥ṣṭi* is *jāti*. Negation of *jāti* is the subject of this chapter and thus the chapter is called *ajāti vāda*. Brahman has created nothing and nothing is born out of Brahman. Brahman alone was, is and will be. This is the tough message of the 3rd chapter. If at all you experience a world, Gauḍapāda says that that experience is not because the world is born out of Brahman, not because a world is existing but only because it is appearing for us. So the entire world is an experience exactly like dream, which is an appearance. The dream is not really created by the mind nor does it really exist, but appears because of *nidrā-śakti*. Similarly the world has not really originated from Brahman, and it does not really exist. The world is an appearance because of *māyā-śakti*. In the case of dream, the appearance is due to *nidrā-śakti*, and at the cosmic level, the word *māyā* is used. This is the message of Gauḍapāda. With this background, we will see the development of the third chapter.

1. Introduction to Advaitam, the Subject Matter of the Chapter (1 - 2)

In the first two verses, Gauḍapāda gives an introduction to *advaitam*. He says that no spiritual seeker can start with *advaitam*. Spirituality should start with *dvaitam* only. *Dvaitam* is a stepping-stone. *Dvaita-bhakti* is very much required. But *dvaita-bhakti* should culminate in *advaita-jñānam*. Both are important. *Dvaita-bhakti* is the means and *advaita-jñānam* is the end. Without *dvaita-bhakti*, *advaita-jñānam* is impossible. Without *advaita-jñānam*, *dvaita-bhakti* is incomplete. You have to go through *dvaita-bhakti* and come to *advaita-jñānam*. You can postpone *advaita-jñānam*, but you can never avoid it. To convey this message, Gauḍapāda says that those people who permanently remain in *dvaita-bhakti* are very unfortunate people. Those who use *dvaita-bhakti* as a temporary stepping-stone are intelligent people but those who are stuck in *dvaita-bhakti* and refuse to transcend *dvaita-bhakti* are unfortunate people to be sympathized with. *Dvaita-bhakti* is practiced in two levels. The first level is called *karma* and the second level is called *upāsana*. In *karma*, the *Bhagavān* is the worshipped and I am the worshipper. The worshipped and worshipper duality is present in *karma*. In *upāsana*, *Bhagavān* is the

meditated and I am the meditator. The meditated and the meditator duality is present in *upāsana*. This is appropriate initially but ultimately you have to come to *advaitam*. Otherwise you are a *kṛpāṇa*. This is the introduction in verses 1 and 2.

2. Logical Negation of the Origination of the *Jīva* and the World (3 - 10)

In verses 3 to 10, Gauḍapāda says that neither the *jīva* nor the *jagat* is born out of Brahman. He establishes this with the help of two examples. The first is the space example and the second is the dream example.

How many spaces are there? Space is only one. Space can always be only one. Space cannot multiply into many. Space cannot also divide into many. Therefore, space remains *advaitam*. Even though space remains *advaitam*, when many containers are made like pot, room etc, even though space is indivisible, in many containers, space seems to be divided like small pot-space, big pot-space, and big room-space, etc. Thus space is seemingly divided without being actually divided. Not only that, we talk about the birth of pot-space when pot is born and the death of pot-space when the pot is destroyed. We talk about the movement of pot-space when the pot is moving. They are all only apparent and seeming plurality, birth, death, and movement. Actually space remains the same, division-less, changeless, and motionless. If space is understood, *ātmā*, the consciousness also is very similar to space. Consciousness can never be divided. Even though consciousness is indivisible, when there are many physical bodies, each body is like an enclosure and in each body there is enclosed consciousness. Thus it appears that there are many enclosed consciousnesses and that consciousness is divided. We name each enclosed consciousness as *jīvātma*. The enclosed consciousness is called *jīvātma* and the all-pervading consciousness is called *paramātma*. It appears that as though there are many *jīvātmas* and that they are born out of *paramātma*. But Gauḍapāda says that just like pot-space, *jīvātmas* are not at all born and that *jīvātmas* are not many and there is only one undivided consciousness, *ekātma*. *Paramātma* and *jīvātma* are two different words like total space and pot-space. But space is one. Therefore, *jīvātma* and *paramātma* are not at all different and one is not born out of the other like pot-space. Pot-space is seemingly born but not really born. Similarly, *jīvātma* is seemingly born but really not born at all. This is the example of space.

The second example is the dream example. In dream, we experience a dream world born. Out of our own mind, a dream world is created but on enquiry, the dream world is seemingly created and appears to be really existent when you are in dream. For a dreamer, the dream is not a dream in dream. Dream is seemingly created and real, but on waking up, a real dream world is known to be not created because the waker continues to be the same one lying down in the bed. Similarly, Brahman also does not create or cannot create a world out of itself. But this world is seemingly created and appears real because of *māyā-śakti*. Therefore, like dream, this world is really not born. Thus the space example is used to negate the creation of the *jīva* and the dream example is used to negate the creation of the world.

3. Scriptural Negation of the Origination of the *Jīva* and the World (11 - 30)

From verse 11 to 30, Gauḍapāda analyzes the Upaniṣad statements because we find a problem while interpreting the Upaniṣad. All this is gathered from the Upaniṣad. Gauḍapāda is not giving his own teaching. The entire *Māṇḍūkya-kārikā* is based on the *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad*. In interpreting the Upaniṣad, we do face a problem, which Gauḍapāda introduces and solves. Gauḍapāda anticipates the problem, which he introduces and gives the solution. What is the problem? Gauḍapāda said that the *jīva* is never created and the world is never created. But the Upaniṣads elaborately talk about creation.

From this Brahman are born prāṇa, the mind, all senses and organs of action, space, air, fire, water and the earth that sustains the entire world of life. (Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad, 2.1.3)

From that (Brahman), which is indeed this ātmā, space is born. From space air (is born). From air fire (is born). From fire water (is born). From water the earth (is born). From the earth plants (are born). From plants food (is born). From food the human being (is born)... (Taittirīya Upaniṣad, 2.1.2)

All the Upaniṣads are talking about the creation of both the *jīva* and the world, and when the Upaniṣads are talking about the creation, how come Gauḍapāda is negating the creation? Gauḍapāda says that no doubt the Upaniṣads talk about creation but they do not say whether the creation is really born or seemingly born. They only say that the world and *jīvas* came out of *paramātma* or Brahman. They do not say whether they are really born or seemingly born. Therefore we have to analyze and find out whether they are really born or seemingly born. How does one know which one of the above the Upaniṣads mean? Gauḍapāda says that we have to study the Upaniṣads completely and then come to a conclusion. When the Upaniṣads are studied thoroughly, it is seen that at the end of the teaching, the Upaniṣads say that really speaking the creation is not at all there. Initially, the Upaniṣads talk about the arrival of the creation but later it is said, “*The plurality that is seen is really not there.*” (*Kāthopaniṣad, 2.1.11*) What about the five elements? “*Earth and water do not (belong to me). Fire does not belong (to me). Air does not belong (to me). Space does not belong to me.*” (*Kaivalya Upaniṣad, 22.*) The Upaniṣads say that all these things are really not there. Therefore, the creation is seemingly born, exactly like the dream world. The dream world is seemingly there when I am in dream, but on enquiry it disappears and that is called conditional reality. It is called *mithyā*. Conditional reality or seeming reality is *mithyā*. The dream world is seemingly real under only one condition, which is, in dream. Since the dream world is seemingly real in dream, it has ETU. In dream, I can experience it, I can transact in it, I can use it for my experience also. It can be experienced, used for transaction and has utility. It has that reality in dream and that is not questioned. But on waking up, the whole thing is non-existent. Now the Upaniṣad says that this world is also exactly like dream and has conditional reality. What is the condition? What is the condition for this world to be real? What is the condition for this class to be real? As long as you manage to keep awake. The moment you doze off, the whole surroundings are gone out of perception. Where is the question of the reality of this world then? Therefore the waking world is real

in the waking state, the dream world is real in the dream state. The waking world is unreal in the dream state, and the dream world is unreal in the waking state. Therefore, none of them is absolutely real. But they can be experienced, used for transaction and have utility. So use them but remember that they are *mithyā* only. Both the waking world and the dream world borrow their existence from the *ātmā*. Both of them borrow existence from *ātmā*, and where is the *ātmā*? Is it inside you or outside you? It is neither inside me nor outside me, *ātmā* is myself. I lend existence to dream by entering into the dream state. I lend existence to the waking world by entering the waking state. I withdraw existence from both by entering the deep sleep state. Therefore, I am the absolute reality, the *Turīyam*. Both waking and dream are *mithyā*. ‘I am *satyaṃ* and the world is *mithyā*’ is the message. Then one more point. The *śruti* negates the *sṛṣṭi* by saying that it is only an appearance and in all the Upaniṣads, in the *mahāvākyams*, it is clearly said that *jīvātma* is not born out of *paramātma*, but *jīvātma* is *paramātma*, ‘*tat tvam asi*’. All the *mahāvākyams* say that *jīvātma* is identical with *paramātma*. When is *paramātma* born? *Paramātma* is unborn. Being identical to *paramātma*, *jīvātma* is also unborn. In the *Bhagavad Gīta*, Lord Kṛṣṇa says:

This (ātmā) is neither born at anytime nor does it die. It will neither come to existence nor will it disappear again. It is unborn, eternal, undergoes no change whatsoever, and is ever new. (It) is not affected when the body is affected. (2:20)

Never think, ‘I am born, I am growing old, I am going to die, I will take next birth and I should be free from rebirth.’ Never say any such thing. There is no first birth. Where is the question of next birth? Don’t worry about all those things. You need not attain liberation. Why? Because you are already free. You will all bravely claim this now. But at the end, you will ask to be blessed on *Gurupūrṇimā* day to get liberation. Gauḍapāda says that you are *Turīyam*, you are free and bondage is a misconception. Trying to remove a non-existent bondage you will miserably fail. Remember the example. The children play by pressing the coin on your forehead and remove the coin. You feel that the coin is still on the forehead. They ask you to hit your forehead and say that the coin will fall. If the coin falls, it is yours. You keep hitting the head and the coin will never fall. You hit harder and any amount of hitting will not make the coin fall because it is not there. When the mirror is shown to you, you get enlightenment that the coin is not there. You realize that you have been struggling to remove something that is not there. Vedānta is the mirror that shows the *jīvātma* that he is struggling to remove bondage, which is not there. The tragedy is that the more you try, the greater will be the failure. Gauḍapāda negates the creation of the *jīva* and the world with the help of the *śruti pramāṇam* in verses 15 to 30.

4. Cessation of the Mind (31 - 39)

From verses 31 to 39, the important topic of *amanībhāvaḥ* is described. What is this? A Vedāntic student will study Vedānta very well. If he is reasonably intelligent, he will understand that the world is *mithyā*. Remember the four assertions: the origination of the world is to be negated, the existence of the world is

to be negated, the appearance of the world is to be accepted and that the appearance of the world is due to *māyā*. The student will thoroughly assert the above. But the problem is that, when you use the word *world*, that world should include your own body and mind also. The mind should also be made a part of the world because the mind is an object of experience. The mind is experienced, made up of the five elements, has attributes, subject to modification, and subject to arrival and departure. The mind disappears in deep sleep and appears on waking up. Thus the mind is also a part of the world and therefore should be understood as *mithyā*. If the mind is not negated as *mithyā* and you continue to identify with the mind as mind, you will always feel you are a *samsāri*. If you are going to judge yourself from the conditions of the mind, you will always feel that you are not progressing because you are mistaking yourself as the mind but the mind is part of the world. It will always be fluctuating and it will have its ups and downs. You can reduce that to some extent by *sādhana* but remember the mind is always subject to fluctuation. The mind is not myself but part of the *mithyā* world. If this is not registered very well, after Vedāntic study also, I look upon myself as the mind. When the mind goes through ups and downs, I will not say that my mind is going through those things, but I will say that I am going through ups and downs, even after all this study. I should never say that. The mind, which is also *mithyā*, which is not originated, and not existent but appears along with the world, that apparent mind has got its *prārabdha*. I am neither the mind nor the owner of the mind. The mind is a temporary instrument useful for worldly transactions. Therefore, I will try to keep it as fit as possible for smooth transaction but I will never identify myself with the mind nor will I claim ownership of the mind because *ātmā* is *asaṅga*, which is not the owner of anything. The toughest part of Vedānta is detaching from your own mind. I have talked about *pañca anātmās*. Detachment from all these five *anātmās*, in increasing scale of stronger attachment, namely possessions, profession, relationships, body, and mind is necessary. Gauḍapāda says that you have to detach from your mind, reduce mind also to *mithyā*. This is *amanībhāvaḥ*. The mind is nothing but Brahman with *nama and rūpa*. How do we detach from the mind? Only by knowledge. By knowing the truth behind the mind, you negate the mind. When you hold the pot in your hand, you can negate the pot by knowledge. What knowledge? By knowing that the pot is nothing but *nama and rūpa*. It is useful but there is no substance called pot. Similarly, the mind is useful but there is no substance called mind. The substance is Brahman, the only substance. This is a very important topic. Verses 31 to 39 describe *amanībhāvaḥ*.

5. Nididhyāsanam (40 - 47)

The last topic is from 40 to 47 called *manonigraha* or *nididhyāsanam*. This is thought management. If we do not know how to handle involuntary thoughts, they will hijack the mind. A mind hijacked by mental chattering is not available for claiming the knowledge nor abiding in the knowledge. *Manonigraha* is learning to retrieve the mind from involuntary thoughts whenever I want. Let the involuntary thoughts happen when I want but not at other times. If the mind is not available because of thoughts centered on *pañca anātmās*, knowledge will not be available. For *manonigraha*, *nididhyāsanam* is prescribed. There are two types of *nididhyāsanam*. One is *brahma-abhyāsa-rūpa*

nididhyāsanam in which I keep the knowledge in the background during daily transaction. This awareness that I am free must be there in and through all worldly transactions. This is difficult for most people because during transaction, they are lost in the transaction. Then the other *nididhyāsanam* becomes very important either in the early morning or in the night or at both times. One is autosuggestion meditation and the other is introspection meditation in which I dwell on this teaching ‘I am *satyaṃ* and the world is *mithyā*.’ (binary format). As far as the *mithyā* world is concerned, I can only be a contributor and I cannot be the controller. In the *Bhagavad Gita*, Lord Kṛṣṇa says:

You have a choice over action alone; never over results. May you not think you are the author of the results of actions. May you not have inclination towards inaction. (2:47)

I do not have control over my mind, body, family, profession and possessions. I will contribute and accept the *mithyā* world as it is. The greatest blessing is that I am never affected by anything that happens in the *mithyā* world, the *mithyā* body or the *mithyā* mind. Whatever happens, I am not affected. This is called *manonigraha abhyāsa*. Gauḍapāda talked about four obstacles: *laya*, dozing off during meditation, *vikṣepa*, wandering mind, *kaṣāyaṃ*, subconscious problems, which make the mind stagnant (neither sleeping, nor wandering, nor meditating), *rasāsvāda*, getting attached to the temporary calmness of meditation. Once these obstacles are crossed, one should abide in the teaching. This is the *nididhyāsanam* topic from 40 to 47.

6. Central Message of the Chapter - Ajāti Vāda, Exposition of Non-Origination (48)

Then in the final 48th verse, Gauḍapāda reminds the central message that nothing has been created out of Brahman, nothing has originated out of Brahman. Many things appear but nothing had originated. That Brahman I am.

No jīva is born. This (jīva) has no cause. This (Brahman) is the absolute Truth in which nothing is born. (verse 48)

This is the *ajāti vāda Advaitaprakaraṇam*. It is a tough chapter but if you assimilate, it is very, very beautiful and useful.

Māṇḍūkya-kārikā
Alātaśānti-prakaraṇam

Transcript of classes given by
SWAMI PARAMARTHANANDA

MK-49 = Chapter 4, Verses 1 to 3

In the last class, we completed the third chapter of *Māṇḍūkya-kārikā* titled *Advaitaprakaraṇam* and with this chapter, Gauḍapāda has comprehensively covered the teaching contained in the *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad* and also dealt with the main Vedāntic teaching, “*brahma satyaṃ jagan mithyā jīvo brahmaiva nāpara*”. Of this, the second chapter established the *jagan mithyātvam*, titled *Vaitathyaprakaraṇam* and the third chapter established *brahma satyatvam*, pointing out that *advaita* Brahman alone is there. And ‘that Brahman I am’ has been revealed in the *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad* itself: *śāntaṃ śivam advaitaṃ caturthaṃ manyante sa ātmā sa vijñeyaḥ*. Therefore, actually the teaching part is over. Really speaking, there is no scope for the 4th chapter of *Māṇḍūkya-kārikā*. But still in this chapter, Gauḍapāda consolidates all aspects of Vedāntic teaching and winds up the teaching. We do not get anything new in the 4th chapter but it is the reinforcement of the teaching given in the first three chapters. Since he is bringing in all the different aspects, the chapter is the biggest chapter with 100 verses.

If you look at the content of the chapter, we can broadly divide it into three parts.

The first part is the elaboration of the *ajātivāda* given in the third chapter, which alone I present in the following four points:

- Existence of the world is to be negated.
- Origination of the world is to be negated.
- Appearance and experience of the world are to be accepted.
- The appearance is because of the power of *māyā*.

These four put together is called *ajātivāda* and in these four points, the second one is the most important point, which is that the origination of the world is to be negated. *Ajāti* is non-origination.

In the second part, the *mithyātvam* of the world is discussed. Even though the world does not originate, it appears in front of us like dream. It appears very real and therefore we are accepting the appearance and experience of the world. The appearance and the experience of the world without origination is called *mithyā*, like rope-snake appears for me without actually originating from the rope. Whenever something appears without origination, it is called *mithyā*, for example blue sky. In the second part, Gauḍapāda emphasizes the appearance and experience of the world as *mithyā* with an example unique to the *Māṇḍūkya-kārikā*, which is *alātaṃ*. This example will be elaborated later. This example is so popular that the 4th chapter got the title *Alātaśāntiprakaraṇam*.

The third part is the summarization of the entire Vedānta in which *ātmasvarūpam*, *ātmasvarūpa jñānam*, *ātmasvarūpa jñāna sādhanam*, and *ātmasvarūpa jñāna phalam* are discussed. These are the main three sections of the 4th chapter. With this background we will enter the chapter proper.

Verse 1

ज्ञानेनाऽऽकाशकल्पेन धर्मान्यो गगनोपमान् ।

ज्ञेयाभिन्नेन सम्बुद्धस्तं वन्दे द्विपदां वरम् ॥ १ ॥

jñānenā"kāśakalpena dharmānyo gaganopamān ।

jñeyābhinnena sambuddhastam vande dvipadām varam ॥ 1 ॥

I bow down to that (Lord) Puruṣottamaḥ who knows the space-like jīvas with (His) space-like consciousness which is not different from the object. (1)

The first two verses are *maṅgala* verses in which Gauḍapāda offers prostration to the *ādiguru*, *Nārāyaṇa*, because we look upon *Nārāyaṇa* or *Bhagavān* as the first guru. The tradition flows from there, which continues up to now. There is a well-known *guru paramparā* verse:

*nārāyaṇam padmabhuvam vasiṣṭam śaktim ca tat putra parāśaram ca
vyāsam śukam gauḍapadam mahāntam govinda yogīndramathāsya śiśyam
sri śankarācāryamathāsya padmapādam ca hastāmalakam ca śiśyam
tam toṭakam vārtikakāram anyān asmad gurūn santatamānatosmi*

The *guru paramparā*: *nārāyaṇam* is *Viṣṇu*, *padmabhuvam* is *Brahma*, *vasiṣṭa* is the *mānasa putra* of *Brahma*, *śakti* is *vasiṣṭa*'s son, *parāśara* is son of *vasiṣṭa*, *vyāsa* is son of *parāśara*, *śuka* is son of *vyāsa*; *Gauḍapādācārya*, *Govindabhagavadpāda*, *Ādi Śankarācārya*; his four well-known disciples are *Sureśvarācārya*, *Padmapādācārya*, *Hastāmalaka*, and *Toṭakācārya*. The entire teacher lineage is bowed down to with this verse.

Here, Gauḍapāda offers his prostrations to the *ādiguru*, *Nārāyaṇa* in verse 1 of this chapter. The second verse is also a *maṅgala* verse offering prostration to the very teaching, *Brahmavidyā* itself as mother *Sarasvatī*.

In this 4th chapter, there are several verses, where the words and the construction of the verses are a little bit difficult and it is difficult to explain every word of the verse and the verse's connection with the other verses. Because it is involved and difficult, if the individual word is concentrated upon, the whole concept will be missed. Therefore, the teaching will be concentrated upon without going into every single word whenever difficult verses are encountered. With the relatively easy verses, word by word analysis will be done. The first verse itself is a difficult one. So the essence will be given.

Who is Nārāyaṇa? Nārāyaṇa is called the greatest among the two-legged ones. Two-legged one here means human being. *Vara* means *uttamaḥ*. So *puruṣānām uttamaḥ* is *Puruṣottamaḥ*, Nārāyaṇa. This Nārāyaṇa is the *ādiguru* of the teaching of the *jīvātma-paramātma* identity. Since Nārāyaṇa gives this knowledge, he also is endowed with this knowledge of identity. How will Nārāyaṇa express that knowledge? We will say that we, the *jīvātma* are identical with *paramātma*. But Nārāyaṇa will say that he, the *paramātma* is identical to the *jīvātmas*. To that Nārāyaṇa who has the knowledge of this identity, I bow down. This is the first message of this verse. The second message is: This knowledge of the identity of *jīvātma* and *paramātma* is unique and different from all the conventional knowledge. In all conventional knowledge, there is the knower, the subject and the known, the object and the instrument of knowledge, like eyes, ears etc, Thus, subject-object-instrument triad is present in all conventional knowledge or the subject-object duality is present. In all conventional knowledge, knower and known are different. But in this knowledge of identity, there is no difference between *jīvātma*, the knower and the *paramātma*, the known. This division is not there for Nārāyaṇa also. Therefore, Nārāyaṇa does not have knower-known division. Because there is no division between *jīvātma* and *paramātma* and there is one *ekātma*, it is like space. Space does not have real division, but only seeming division like pot-space, room-space, etc. Both *paramātma* and *jīvātma* are division-less like space but with seeming division. To that *paramātma*, Nārāyaṇa, who is endowed with the knowledge of identity with only seeming division, prostrations are offered. This is the essence of the first verse. The word *dharmān* occurring in the verse refers to *jīvātma*. The words used in this verse are rare, abstruse words and the sentence and grammatical constructions are also peculiar. Many verses are undecipherable, but Śaṅkarācārya's commentary helps here. For difficult verses, only the essence will be given.

Verse 2

अस्पर्शयोगो वै नाम सर्वसत्त्वसुखो हितः ।

अविवादोऽविरुद्धश्च देशितस्तं नमाम्यम् ॥ २ ॥

asparśayogo vai nāma sarvasattvasukho hitaḥ ।

avivādo'viruddhaśca deśitastam namāmyam ॥ 2॥

Asparśayoga is indeed enjoyable to all beings, beneficial (to all,) dispute-less, noncontradictory, and revealed (by the scriptures.) I bow down to that (yoga.) (2)

This *Brahmavidyā* teaching is known by the name *asparśayoga*, which word was introduced in the 3rd chapter itself. In verse 39, Gauḍapāda introduced the word. *asparśa* means *ātmā*. *Turīya Ātmā* is called *asparśa*. Why is it called *asparśa*? The word *asparśa* means *asaṅga*, no contact, no connection. Why is *ātmā* called *asaṅga*, *asparśa*? *Ātmā* being *satyaṃ* and *anātmā* being *mithyā*, *satyaṃ* and *mithyā* cannot come in contact just as the mirage water cannot wet the ground. Even though water is experienced on the ground, mirage water cannot wet the ground because one is unreal and the other is real. The unreal cannot contaminate the real. Movie cannot contaminate the screen. The dream rain cannot make your

bed wet. *Ātmā* being *satyaṃ*, it is *asaṅga*. *Asparśayoga* means *asaṅga ātmajñānaṃ*. *Yoga* here means *jñānaṃ*. Even though this *ātmajñānaṃ* appears difficult initially, it is worth the trouble because it is liberating knowledge. Therefore, he says that *asparśayoga* is pleasant, enjoyable and beneficial for all types of human beings, irrespective of gender, creed, religion, and nationality. Another glory of this knowledge is that it is never subject to debate, because there is no quarrel for *advaita* with all other systems because all the other systems are talking about the reality obtaining in the waking state. They are all analyzing conditional reality obtaining in the relative world within duality. Vedānta is not analyzing the relative truth but the absolute truth. As far as the relative truth is concerned, these people are giving different opinions and versions. Vedānta does not contradict them because their opinions are from different standpoints. Every system like *Sāṃkhya*, *Nyāya*, and *Vaiśeṣika* are empirically correct for the transactional plane like different medical systems. In the transactional plane, truth is relative. A wall can be viewed as a wall, bricks arranged vertically, mud stack, or molecules and atoms. These are all correct with respect to their standpoints. In the empirical plane, the truth is relative. Vedānta is not interested in joining this debate because all are right from their own standpoints. But all are wrong also from the other standpoints. Vedānta is not interested in the debate about the relative truth, which these people are analyzing, because relative truth cannot give liberation. The dream world is relatively true in the dream state. But that dream knowledge cannot give liberation. Therefore analysis of relative truth will not be useful for a spiritual seeker. For living purposes, knowledge in the relative plane is useful. When a spiritual seeker is interested in the ultimate and fundamental truth, the relative truth is useless. Gauḍapāda says that Vedānta is dealing with the absolute truth and others are dealing with the relative truth. *Advaitam* is indisputable because it does not contradict with the other systems because it does not contradict any system. This wonderful, absolute, and indisputable *advaitam* has been given to us by Lord *Nārāyaṇa*. Gauḍapāda offers prostrations to the knowledge of the absolute reality. In *advaitam*, there are no different standpoints and only *dvaitam* has different standpoints.

Verse 3

भूतस्य जातिमिच्छन्ति वादिनः केचिदेव हि ।

अभूतस्यापरे धीरा विवदन्तः परस्परम् ॥ ३ ॥

bhūtasya jātimicchanti vādinaḥ kecideva hi ।

abhūtasypāpare dhīrā vivadantaḥ parasparam ॥ 3॥

Disputing mutually, some disputants postulate the birth of the existent. Other thinkers (postulate the birth) of the non-existent. (3)

From here Gauḍapāda starts the *ajātivāda* teaching showing origination can never be explained by any philosopher because there is no origination. Origination of this world or *jīva* cannot be explained by any system including modern cosmology because it has not originated. What is the birth date of the rope-snake and how is it born are not relevant because there is no rope-snake. Therefore no theory of

origination will stand scrutiny or enquiry. This is the topic in the following verses. As long as you think there is origination, there will be different theories of origination. Each theory will keep refuting the other one. Gauḍapāda will show how the different theories of origination will not work.

Among those theories, two are well-known. One is called *sat-kārya-vāda* and the other is *asat-kārya-vāda*. These two theories are at odds with each other. Take any example of creation. Out of clay, a pot is created. Pot has originated from clay. This is our experience. Did the pot exist or not before its origination? One theory says that a non-existent pot originates. The other theory says that the non-existent pot can never originate but only an existent pot can originate. The first theory asks if the existent pot originates, why should it originate at all because it is already existent. Therefore, non-existent pot alone originates. So in the clay, the pot is non-existent and therefore the pot originates from the clay. The first one asks: In the clay the pot is non-existent and the non-existent pot originates from the clay. Suppose there is a cup of water. Pot is non-existent in the water. You say that in the clay also, the pot is non-existent. Then why does the non-existent pot originate only from clay and not from water? Similarly, the non-existent oil does not originate from sand. Oil comes only from the oil seed in which the oil is already existent. Therefore, existent oil can originate only from the seed. Therefore, he says that from a seed if a tree comes, the tree is already existent in the seed. This group says that only existent products alone originate. The other says that only non-existent products can originate. Thus these two quarrel without any end. Some philosophers (*sat-kārya-vādis*, *Sāṃkhya* system) claim the origination of already existent things (effect present in the cause). Others called *asat-kārya-vādis* (*Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika* system) claim that an existent thing need not originate but only a non-existent thing originates. These so-called scholars argue and dispute each other. One negates the origination of the non-existent thing and the other negates the origination of the existent thing. *Ajātivādis* will say that neither the existent nor the non-existent thing originates because nothing actually originates. This is Gauḍapāda's approach.

MK-50 = Chapter 4, Verses – 4 to 9

Verse 3

भूतस्य जातिमिच्छन्ति वादिनः केचिदेव हि ।

अभूतस्यापरे धीरा विवदन्तः परस्परम् ॥ ३ ॥

In this final chapter of *Māṇḍūkya-kārikā* consisting of 100 verses, Gauḍapāda discusses three main topics: *ajātivāda*, *alāta dr̥ṣṭānta* and *Vedānta sāra*. Of these three, first he has taken up *ajātivāda* for discussion. *ajātivāda* has been seen in the 3rd chapter. The *ajātivāda*'s four principles are: the existence of the world is to be negated; the origination of the world is to be negated; the appearance and the experience of the world are to be accepted; the appearance and experience is because of *māyā*, just as the appearance and experience of dream is because of *nidrā*. Even though the existence of the world is negated, we accept that the world appears to exist by borrowing existence from *Turīyam* just as the moon appears bright by borrowing light from the sun. I, the observer, lend existence to the dream world as well as the waking world. Thus with borrowed existence, the world appears but does not originate at all. This negation of the origination of the world is called *ajātivāda*. In this portion Gauḍapāda points out that all the theories of origination, when analyzed, will be seen to have fallacies. Different systems, eastern and western, *vedic* and *non-vedic*, explain the creation of the world by various theories. These theories, when scrutinized will be full of fallacies.

Here, Gauḍapāda introduces the *Sāṃkhya* and *Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika* systems. The debate between these two systems is: Is an existent world created or is a non-existent world created? One says that the non-existent world cannot be created because it is non-existent. Nothing non-existent can be created because matter can never be created or destroyed. The other says that the existent world cannot be created because it is already existent and there is no need to create something which already exists. These systems together negate the creation of the non-existent world and the existent world. The two theories are called *asat-kārya-vāda* (non-existent world originates) and *sat-kārya-vāda* (existent world originates). Thus creation and origination of the world are negated by these two theories.

Verse 4

भूतं न जायते किञ्चिद्भूतं नैव जायते ।

विवदन्तो द्वया ह्येवमजातिं ख्यापयन्ति ते ॥ ४ ॥

bhūtaṃ na jāyate kiñcidabhūtaṃ naiva jāyate ।

vivadanto dvayā hyevamajātiṃ khyāpayanti te ॥ 4॥

The existent is not born; the non-existent is not at all born. Disputing thus, those dualists reveal birthlessness indeed. (4)

Each theory is negating the other. *Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika* says that the existent is not born. *Sāṃkhya* says that a non-existent thing cannot be created. Both these are dualistic or pluralistic *darśanas* and their teaching is that *ātmā* is many but also all-pervading. These dualists, debating in this manner, negate each other thereby indirectly giving credence to the theory of non-origination, *ajātivāda*.

Verse 5

ख्याप्यमानामजातिं तैरनुमोदामहे वयम् ।

विवदामो न तैः सार्धमविवादं निबोधत ॥ ५ ॥

khyāpyamānāmajātiṃ tairanumodāmahe vayam ।

vivadāmo na taiḥ sārḍhamavivādaṃ nibodhata ॥ 5॥

We approve the birthlessness revealed by them. We do not argue with them. Know (this) to be disputeless. (5)

Gauḍapāda says that he appreciates the indirect promotion of the *ajātivāda* by the dualists. For *ajātivāda*, there is no argument with any other *darśana*. Each of those *darśanas* has its own special theory of creation and they debate and negate each other. Vedānta is beyond all the debates. The word *avivādam* (beyond debates) occurs in verse 2. Verses 3, 4 and 5 are commentary on the word.

Verses 6 - 8

अजातस्यैव धर्मस्य जातिमिच्छन्ति वादिनः ।

अजातो ह्यमृतो धर्मो मर्त्यतां कथमेष्यति ॥ ६ ॥

ajātasyaiva dharmasya jātimicchanti vādinah ।

ajāto hyamṛto dharmo martyatāṃ kathameṣyati ॥ 6॥

The disputants postulate the birth of the unborn Reality itself. How can the unborn, immortal Reality indeed be subject to mortality? (6)

न भवत्यमृतं मर्त्यं न मर्त्यममृतं तथा ।

प्रकृतेरन्यथाभावो न कथञ्चिद्भविष्यति ॥ ७ ॥

na bhavatyamṛtaṃ martyaṃ na martyamamṛtaṃ tathā ।

prakṛteranyathābhāvo na kathañcidbhaviṣyati ॥ 7॥

The immortal does not become mortal. In the same way, the mortal does not (become) immortal. Transformation of the intrinsic nature will not take place anyhow. (7)

स्वभावेनामृतो यस्य धर्मो गच्छति मर्त्यताम् ।

कृतकेनामृतस्तस्य कथं स्थास्यति निश्चलः ॥ ८ ॥

svabhāvenāmṛto yasya dharmo gacchati martyatām ।

kṛtakenāmṛtastasya katham sthāsyati niścalaḥ ॥ 8॥

(Suppose) the intrinsically immortal Reality is subject to mortality for a person. How can (that) immortality remain the same for him, since it is a product? (8)

Gauḍapāda said that all the other *darśanas* reveal the fallacy of each other. There is no need to know the fallacies of those systems. However, Gauḍapāda presents the fallacies of some of the other systems for academic interest.

The first one is the *vedic* theory of creation that is accepted by some *vaidikas*. According to this theory, *Bhagavān* is the *jagat kāraṇam* and that *Bhagavān* has created the world. Gauḍapāda says that this should not be accepted. Even though the Veda itself talks about *Bhagavān* creating the world, it should be understood as only a temporary teaching. This is a provisional teaching to enable people to refine their minds. Having accepted the creation temporarily (*adhyāropa prakaraṇam*), Veda itself makes it clear later that from Brahman or *Bhagavān* the world can never originate. Vedas say that not only does the world not originate but it does not exist also. All these were discussed in the 3rd chapter: *Bhagavān* has never created the world. There is no such thing called world. Everything that is experienced is not the world but Brahman, '*sarvam brahmamayaṃ jagat*'. The world has never come out of Brahman. Veda itself negates the creation of the world by Brahman. Logically also, Brahman cannot create the world. Gauḍapāda has lifted verses 20, 21 and 22 of the 3rd chapter and formed the 6th, 7th and the 8th verses of the 4th chapter respectively.

The essence of the verses 6, 7 and 8 is as follows. *Bhagavān, paramātma* or Brahman is clearly described in all the Upaniṣads as limitless or infinite and not subject to any change. Eternal and infinite means not subject to change. Anything that is subject to change will undergo six modifications, *asti, jāyate, vartate, vipariṇāmate, apakṣīyate, and vinaśyati*. If Brahman is *nityam* and *nirvikāram*, it cannot undergo a change. Thus Brahman cannot become a *kāraṇam* because *kāraṇam* has to undergo a change. *Kāraṇam* is *savikāram* and Brahman is *nirvikāram*. How can the *nirvikāram* Brahman be the *kāraṇam* of the world and *jīva*? So *jagat* and *jīva* are not produced. *Paramātma* has not become the *jagat*. *Paramātma* has not become the *jīvātma* also. *Jīvātmas* are not born at all. Gauḍapāda says that what is *nirvikāram* can never become *savikāram* and what is *savikāram* can never become *nirvikāram*. Changeless will always be changeless. Changing will always be changing. The immortal *paramātma* has not become the mortal *jīvātma* because the essential or intrinsic nature cannot undergo any change.

Suppose it is said that the immortal *paramātma* has become the mortal *jīvātma* at the time of creation and the mortal *jīvātma* does varieties of *sādhana* and one day becomes the immortal *paramātma*. This

immortality will only be temporary. Thus immortal cannot become mortal and mortal cannot become immortal. We are already always immortal. Not knowing this, people think that we have come away from *Bhagavān* at the time of creation. Now we are here and *Bhagavān* is in heaven. We now have to reach *Bhagavān*. Even if we reach *Bhagavān* this way, having fallen once away from *Bhagavān*, this fall can repeat again.

It is only because of ignorance that we mistake ourselves to be mortal *jīvātmas*. All we have to do is drop this mistaken notion. It is also wrong to think that dropping the erroneous notion will make one immortal. All one has to do is drop the wrong notion and claim that one is the immortal Brahman. The body, the world and experiences are only appearances. Just as a child sleeping in the lap of the mother dreams that he has gone away from the mother and screams, but upon waking realizes that he was never away from his mother at all, we are never away from *mokṣa*.

Verse 9

सांसिद्धिकी स्वाभाविकी सहजा अकृता च या ।

प्रकृतिः सेति विज्ञेया स्वभावं न जहाति या ॥ ९ ॥

sāṃsiddhikī svābhāvikī sahajā akṛtā ca yā ।

prakṛtiḥ seti vijñeyā svabhāvaṃ na jahāti yā ॥ 9॥

Prakṛti is to be known as that which does not give up itself, which is permanently accomplished, inherent, inborn, and uncreated. (9)

Here Gauḍapāda says that everything in the creation has an incidental nature and an intrinsic nature. Incidental nature is subject to arrival and departure. Intrinsic nature never comes and goes and it is always present. Fire is intrinsically hot but water heated by fire becomes hot, and the hotness of the water is incidental. Gauḍapāda says that the intrinsic nature of an object can never be lost. *Ātmā*'s nature is *mokṣa*. This nature will never be lost. So every *jīvātma* is naturally liberated. What should *jīva* do to get *mokṣa*? If *mokṣa* is not the *jīva*'s nature, the *jīva* will never get it and even if the *jīva* gets it, it will not be permanent. **We study Vedānta not to get *mokṣa* but to understand that we are never bound at anytime.** We have the notion that we are *sādhakas* and so we pray regularly to the *guru* that we should get *mokṣa* in this birth. This is not warranted.

Śaṅkarācārya gives four examples for *prakṛti*. *Prakṛti* is similar to the supernatural powers of *siddha puruṣas* that they are born with. *Prakṛti* is like the intrinsic nature of some objects, like the heat of the fire. *Prakṛti* is like certain faculties of some beings that are present from birth itself, like the flying power of a bird. *Prakṛti* is like the natural tendencies of certain objects, like water naturally finding its level flowing from higher to lower level. All these are called the intrinsic nature of things and that nature will never be lost at anytime. Having defined this, Gauḍapāda says that every *jīvātma* has certain

intrinsic nature, *sat, cit, ānanda*. Happiness, and liberation are intrinsic to us. Swami Dayananda says that we never try to remove the happiness when we are happy because that is our nature. Whenever there is sorrow we try to remove it. The very fact that we try to remove sorrow indicates that it is not our intrinsic nature. Also whenever someone is happy we do not question why that person is happy but we do ask why someone is sad, when he or she is sad. Thus *sat cit ānanda* and *mokṣa* are our intrinsic nature and we should claim it.

MK-51 = Chapter - 4, Verses – 10 to 13

Verse 9

सांसिद्धिकी स्वाभाविकी सहजा अकृता च या ।

प्रकृतिः सेति विज्ञेया स्वभावं न जहाति या ॥ ९ ॥

Gauḍapādācārya reinforces his teaching of *ajātivāda* in this chapter also. It is the highest teaching of Vedānta and is very difficult to accept also. Based on the *ajātivāda*, no creation has come out of any cause either from Brahman or anything other than Brahman. Since no creation has really come out, any theory of creation will be logically fallacious because it is a theory explaining a creation that has not come at all. He shows the logical fallacies in some of the important theories of creation.

First he establishes that Brahman can never produce a creation. Brahman cannot be the cause of any creation and for that the first argument is that for Brahman to create the world a raw material is required and there is no second thing other than Brahman to serve as raw material. The Upaniṣad says that Brahman is non-dual. The only other possibility is that Brahman should become the raw material and then creation can come out of the raw material Brahman itself. If Brahman serves as the raw material, Brahman has to undergo change. Very clearly, the definition of Brahman is that it is changeless. Thus Brahman cannot be the intelligent cause or the material cause of the universe and therefore, the world has not come out of Brahman. If Brahman cannot become the world, Brahman cannot become the *jīvātma* also. This means that Brahman has been Brahman all the time. Therefore, the so-called *jīvātma* is not a modified form of Brahman but it is Brahman itself. When the waker serves as the dreamer in the dream world, the waker has not transformed into the dreamer, the waker only appears as the dreamer while all the time continuing to be the waker lying on the bed. Even though all the seeming things happen in the dream, the waker has all along been the waker. Similarly, Brahman has always been Brahman. We are not *jīvātma* but *paramātma*. If we do not claim this fact, what is the problem? That is said in the next verse.

Verse 10

जरामरणनिर्मुक्ताः सर्वे धर्माः स्वभावतः ।

जरामरणमिच्छन्तश्च्यवन्ते तन्मनीषया ॥ १० ॥

jarāmaraṇanirmuktāḥ sarve dharmāḥ svabhāvataḥ ।

jarāmaraṇamicchantaścyavante tanmanīṣayā ॥ 10॥

All jīvas are totally free from old age and death by nature. Attributing old age and death, they fall because of that very thought. (10)

The aim of Vedānta is to help every *jīvātma* to claim that he is the immortal *paramātma* and that he does not become *paramātma*. Every *jīvātma* is free from old age, death, etc. In short, the *jīvātma* is not mortal. Even though that immortality is *jīva*'s real nature, every *jīva* has the strong notion that he is mortal. Mortality is not a fact but it is a notion. Attributing mortality to oneself, the very thought of mortality is denial of one's nature. Because of the preservation of that misconception very carefully, every *jīvātma* falls into *saṃsāra*. It is an eternal trap. I take myself as *jīvātma*. Once I accept the origination of *jīvātma*, I will have to accept the origination of the world and then *Īśvara* as the creator. Thus, I have fallen into the *jīva-jagat-Īśvara* triangular format. Falling into *saṃsāra* is falling into triangular format. I am a miserable *jīva* constantly facing problems from the world. When every problem comes I have to rush to *Īśvara* and this goes on endlessly. I will never get out of this problem because if I complain to *Bhagavān* that the world is giving me problems, what will be the answer of *Bhagavān*? It will be that as long as I am in triangular format, the most powerful factor is *karma* and not *Bhagavān*. *Bhagavān* only gives *phala* to the *karmas* done by the *jīva*. You can never get out of this problem. Thus *Bhagavān* cannot help. Even death is not the solution. Out of *sañcita-karma*, *Bhagavān* will take a portion and give the *jīva* another body. When will I exhaust *sañcita-karma*? It is inexhaustible. Therefore, once you conclude that you are a *jīva* and that there is a *jagat* and that you have to rush to *Īśvara* to solve the problems of *saṃsāra*, you have to be eternally suffering. Therefore question the fundamental. Instead of assuming that I am a *jīva*, I should ask the question, "Am I really *jīva*?" We never conduct self-enquiry. We conduct all other enquiries. Upon enquiry, we find that the world has never been created. Therefore, *jīva* has never been created. What then has been there all the time? Brahman and where is that blessed Brahman? I am that Brahman. Wake up from dream number 2. I have woken up from dream 1, the dream world, and I have entered into dream 2, the waking world. I have to wake up to still higher nature. I am neither *Viśva* nor *Taijassa* nor *Prājña*. I am *Turīyam*. Thus *brahma-kāraṇa-vāda* or *dvaita-vāda* has been negated from 6th verse to 10th verse. From hereafter, Gauḍapādācārya takes up *Sāṃkya-Yoga* teaching in three verses.

Verses 11 – 13

कारणं यस्य वै कार्यं कारणं तस्य जायते ।

जायमानं कथमजं भिन्नं नित्यं कथं च तत् ॥ ११ ॥

kāraṇaṃ yasya vai kāryaṃ kāraṇaṃ tasya jāyate ।

jāyamānaṃ kathamajaṃ bhinnaṃ nityaṃ kathaṃ ca tat ॥ 11 ॥

The cause is born for him for whom the cause is identical with the effect. How can an originating entity be unborn? And how can that changing entity be eternal? (11)

कारणाद्यद्यनन्यत्वमतः कार्यमजं यदि ।

जायमानाद्धि वै कार्यात्कारणं ते कथं ध्रुवम् ॥ १२ ॥

kāraṇādyadyananyatvamataḥ kāryamajaṃ yadi ।

jāyamānāddhi vai kāryātkāraṇaṃ te kathaṃ dhruvam ॥ 12॥

If the non-difference (of the effect) from the cause (is accepted,) then, the effect will be unborn. If the cause (is not different) from the effect which is born, how can it be eternal for you? (12)

अजाद्वै जायते यस्य दृष्टान्तस्तस्य नास्ति वै ।

जाताच्च जायमानस्य न व्यवस्था प्रसज्यते ॥ १३ ॥

ajādvai jāyate yasya dr̥ṣṭāntastasya nāsti vai ।

jātācca jāyamānasya na vyavasthā prasajyate ॥ 13॥

There is no example for him for whom an effect is born out of a unborn (cause.) There will be infinite regress (in the acceptance) of an effect which is born out of a cause which is born. (13)

These three verses will be summarized. Previously, two powerful theories were talked about. One is *asat-kārya-vāda* of *Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika* system and the other is *sat-kārya-vāda* of *Sāṃkhya-Yoga*. Between these two, *asat-kārya-vāda* is weaker and *sat-kārya-vāda* is stronger. Gauḍapāda does not discuss the *asat-kārya-vāda* because it is too weak for consideration. But we should understand how *asat-kārya-vāda* is a wrong theory.

Asat-kārya-vāda: When a bangle is created out of gold, is a non-existent bangle born or an existent bangle created? Existent bangle need not be created. Therefore, a goldsmith must be creating a non-existent bangle alone from the existent gold. A non-existent bangle originates from the existent gold. In this theory, what is the logical fallacy is the question. We say that there are *śruti-virodha*, *yukti-virodha* and even language *virodha*.

The Upaniṣads clearly say elsewhere that a non-existent thing can never originate at all. *Śruti* negates *asat-kārya-vāda*.

Even by applying simple language rules, one can see the fallacy. The statement is: A non-existent bangle originates. Every sentence should at a minimum have a subject and a verb. Verb refers to an action and the verb cannot be in the sentence without a subject. The verb is ‘originates’. The subject is ‘bangle’. What type of bangle? It is a non-existent bangle. Therefore the sentence is without a subject. Grammatically, *asat-kārya-vāda* statement does not hold true.

The third objection is *pratyakṣa virodha*. Suppose a person says a non-existent bangle newly comes to existence out of existent gold. After the goldsmith creates the bangle, there are now two things. Previously existent gold was there. Thereafter, a new bangle has originated. What is the new bangle? Non-existent bangle came into existence. Now there is an existent bangle according to *asat-kārya-vādi*.

Previously, what was already there? Existent gold was there. Now what is the addition? Non-existent bangle has come to existence. Now, there must be two things. What are they? Existent gold and existent ornament, which has newly come to existence. When there are two things what should be the combined weight? There should be increased weight. When the bangle is made the weight does not increase but only decreases. So one can never talk about the origination of a non-existent entity as a new entity. So according to the law of conservation of matter, nothing new can be created. So the *asat-kārya-vāda* is fallacious. Thus *asat-kārya-vāda* is refuted by the *Sāṃkhya-Yoga vāda*.

Sat-kārya-vādi gives his argument. What does he say? Non-existent bangle never comes to existence because nothing new can be ever created. Bangle was already existent. Therefore, goldsmith does not create a bangle. The bangle was already existent. Then the question is if the bangle is already existent, why should the goldsmith work for the creation of the bangle?

1. For that the *sat-kārya-vādi* says that the bangle already existed but not in a bangle form, but it existed in a different form. What is meant by creation of a bangle is really not creation but only a transformation or modification of the previous substance into a new configuration. The creation is not a production of matter but a transformation that is either natural or artificial. When the transformation takes place, the previous condition is called *kāraṇam* and the later transformed condition is called *kāryam*. *Kāraṇam* and *kāryam* are one and the same substance only. Gold and bangle are one and the same substance only. The creation here is the transformation of the lump form of gold into the bangle form. In *sat-kārya-vāda* nothing is produced. The creation is thus transformation.

2. Since nothing new is produced *kāraṇam* and *kāryam* are essentially one and the same substance in two different forms. When curd is produced from milk, nothing is produced. You have only transformed milk into curd form. Curd production is not production but it is only a transformation. A tree coming out of seed is not creation. It is only transformation of the unmanifest into manifest. Similarly the world has originated due to the transformation of a cause. World is created not by production but by a transformation of a cause, which was the previous condition of the world. The world has been produced by the transformation of its cause, which existed before and the cause is the same as the world only but not in the world form but in a different form. The whole world is created by transformation. *Sat-kārya-vāda* is also known as *pariṇāma vāda*. Creation has come by the modification of a cause, which is nothing but creation in a previous condition and the *Sāṃkhya-Yoga vādi* calls that cause *prakṛti*. *Prakṛti* is the *kāraṇam* and *prapañca* is the *kāryam*. *Prakṛti* does not produce *prapañca* but (“production” will be *Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika* system) transforms or evolves into *prapañca*. It is a transformation otherwise called evolution. Various stages of evolution are given. *Prakṛti* transformed is *prapañca*. *Prakṛti* is *kāraṇam* and *prapañca* is *kāryam*. They are the same substance. This *prakṛti* is *mūla-kāraṇam* and is called *mūla-prakṛti*. This is *sat-kārya-vāda*. Gauḍapādācārya has to now refute this *sat-kārya-vāda*.

In these three verses, **Gauḍapāda refutes *sat-kārya-vāda*** by giving four arguments.

1. (verse 11). We ask the *sāṃkya vādi* what the nature of *prakṛti* is. *Where did prakṛti come from?* The *sāṃkya vādi*'s answer is: *Prakṛti* being *mūla-prakṛti* is the original cause. It cannot come from somewhere. It is without a beginning. It has been there as *prakṛti* always. *Is prakṛti destructible or not?* The *sāṃkya vādi* says that *prakṛti* cannot be destroyed because if *prakṛti* is destroyed, later creation cannot come, and therefore *prakṛti* is *nityam*. According to *sāṃkya vādi*, *prakṛti* is *anādi*, *anantaṃ* and *nityam*. This *anādi-ananta-nitya-mūla prakṛti* evolves into creation. As we even we hear that, the logical fallacy must be clear. That alone is said in this verse. If *prakṛti* is *anādi*, *anantaṃ* and *nityam*, it will not be subject to change (like Brahman). Then *prakṛti* has to be *nirvikāram*. How can it then evolve into a universe? For evolution, it has to undergo change. This is logical fallacy 1 in the 11th verse.

2. In the 12th verse, Gaudapda says: According to the *sat-kārya-vādi*, *kāraṇam* and *kāryam* are essentially the same. One and the same substance is called *kāraṇam* in the prior condition, and *kāryam* in the later condition. If iceberg is melted into water, the same substance water is called *kāraṇam* in the solid condition and *kāryam* in the liquid condition. If ice cubes are produced from water, then the liquid is the *kāraṇam* and the solid is *kāryam*. Thus they are only two different conditions, but the substance is the same. Therefore, Gauḍapāda elaborates: *Prakṛti* is *kāraṇam* and *prapañca* is *kāryam*. So *prakṛti* and *prapañca* are essentially the same substance, which means their essential nature must be the same. According to the *sat-kārya-vāda*, *prakṛti* is *ajam* and *nityam*, unborn and eternal and the world is *jātam* and *anityam*. Now the question is, either it should be said that both are *ajātam* and *nityam* or that both are *jātam* and *anityam*. But what is said is that *prakṛti* is *ajātam* and *nityam* whereas *prapañcam* is *jātam* and *anityam*. Thus the *kāraṇa-kārya-aikya* equation does not tally because two different natures are ascribed to *kāraṇam prakṛti* and *kāryam prapañcam*. This is fallacy 2.

The third and the fourth fallacies are discussed in the 13th verse.

3. When logic is used, there should always be an example to prove it. Wherever there is smoke, there is fire. If smoke is seen in a place, one says logically that there must be fire. This logic can be applied because fire is experienced wherever there is smoke. Based on that experience alone we have developed the idea that wherever there is smoke, there must be fire also. Gauḍapāda argues that in our experience, every *kāraṇam* itself is a *kāryam*. Every *kāraṇam* that we experience is itself born out of its *kāraṇam*. This is our experience. Seed is *kāraṇam* for the tree but is a *kāryam* of a previous tree. That tree itself is a *kāryam*. So *kāraṇam* has a beginning. So if *prakṛti* is a *kāraṇam*, it must be a *kāryam* of some previous condition. It cannot be without *kāraṇam*. If *prakṛti* is *kāraṇam*, it cannot be *anādi*. That is the logical fallacy is number 3.

4. The last argument is: To avoid this problem, if *Sāṃkya vādi* says that *prakṛti* has got a *kāraṇam*, then that *kāraṇam* must have a *kāraṇam* and so on. So *prakṛti* cannot be *mūla-kāraṇam*. *Sat-kārya-vāda* is acceptable for creation within the world like gold, bangle and ornaments etc., but when it comes to

prakṛti and *prapañca*, *sat-kārya-vāda* has got several logical loopholes because its definition of *prakṛti* is not logically convincing.

Therefore *asat-kārya* and *sat-kārya-vāda* are both wrong. Therefore, the world has never been created. Then what has been created? Nothing has been created. All theories of creation are wrong.

MK-52 = Chapter – 4, Verses – 14 to 23

Gauḍapādācārya is reinforcing his primary teaching of *ajātivāda*, which he had introduced in the third chapter and is now being supported by further discussion. Gauḍapādācārya's contention is that we should accept the creation of the universe only in the beginning stage of spirituality, which is technically called *adhyāropa kāla*. At that time we should accept a creation, and that *Īśvara* is the creator, the world is created and we are also part of this creation. Thus *jīva-jagat-Īśvara* must be accepted initially. This is required for following *karma-yoga* and *upāsana-yoga*, and very useful for acquiring the four qualifications for Self-knowledge. Once we have acquired the qualifications and entered Vedāntic enquiry, we have changed from *adhyāropa prakriyā* to *apavāda prakriyā*. Once we are in *apavāda*, we should fundamentally question the very creation itself. The creation that we accepted initially should be totally negated and only then Vedānta *sādhana* will be complete. As long as we do not negate the creation and as long as we retain *jīva-jagat-Īśvara* triangle we can never get out of *saṃsāra*. *Adhyāropa prakriyā* will never help you unless it is followed by *apavāda prakriyā*. Therefore, *srṣṭi niṣedha-jāti niṣedha ajātivāda* has to be reinforced. We have to establish that no theory of creation can explain the process of creation. From that it is clear that creation has never originated at all. What is the so-called creation that we see? It is only an appearance and experience. We can accept the appearance and experience of the creation but can never accept the origination of the creation. The moment that you accept the origination of the creation, you are hooked in *saṃsāra* for good.

With an intention to establish *ajātivāda*, Gauḍapāda refutes various theories of creation, three of them we have seen.

First he said that Brahman couldn't be the cause of the creation. If Brahman has to create a world, Brahman requires raw material out of which a creation can come. There is no raw material because other than Brahman there is nothing present. Brahman itself cannot serve as raw material, because if Brahman is to serve as the raw material, that raw material has to change to shape into this world. But Brahman cannot undergo any change. What cannot change cannot be the raw material for creation. Thus *Brahma-kārya-vāda* was negated.

Thereafter, *asat-kārya-vāda* was negated. Gauḍapāda does not discuss this but it is implied in his discussion. A non-existent thing can never be created because it will contradict the law of conservation of matter and energy. Matter and energy can never be created or destroyed. Nothing new can ever originate.

Then we saw the negation of *sat-kārya-vāda*. In the four verses in the last class we saw that according to *sat-kārya-vāda*, nothing new can be created but still the creation is possible figuratively. When a thing is transformed into another thing, the transformation is figuratively called creation. When milk is transformed into curds, it can be said that curds have been made, but it only means that milk has been

transformed into curds. When X is transformed into Y, X is called *kāraṇam* and Y is called *kāryam* and creation is transformation of X into Y. Gauḍapāda's answer is that this *vāda* is acceptable only with respect to creation of things within this universe. *Sat-kārya-vāda* is perfectly logical when we talk about creating individual things within the world, like carpenter creating furniture. When we talk about the cosmos as a whole, the question of what is the cause of the entire cosmos comes up. *Sat-kārya-vādi* says that *prakṛti* is the cause and *prapañca* is the product. *Prakṛti* evolves or transforms into *prapañca*. *Prakṛti*'s evolution, transformation or manifestation is *prapañca*. Gauḍapāda asks where did *prakṛti* come from. The *sat-kārya-vādi* describes the nature of *prakṛti* as *anādi* and *nityam*. According to *Sāṃkhya darśanam*, *prakṛti* is *anādi* and *nityam*. This is statement number 1. The next statement is that *prakṛti* evolves into *prapañca*. Gauḍapāda says that these two statements are logical contradictions. What is *anādi* and *nityam* cannot undergo change because what is eternal is not subject to the influence of time. So *prakṛti*, which is *anādi* and *nityam*, cannot undergo change. The second statement that the changeless *prakṛti* changes into *prapañca* is an open contradiction. Saying wood changes to furniture is acceptable because wood is subject to change. Similarly gold changing into ornaments and milk changing to curd are acceptable. But *prakṛti* changing into *prapañca* is not acceptable because according to *Sāṃkhya darśanam* itself, *prakṛti* is changeless. Therefore, *sat-kārya-vāda* works at the micro level but fails at the macro level. Many scientific theories fail at the macro level and many others fail at the micro level.

Thus Gauḍapāda has refuted three *vādas*: *Brahma-kārya-vāda* of *dvaitins*, *asat-kārya-vāda* of *Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika* and *sat-kārya-vāda* of *Sāṃkhya-Yoga*. Now we have to do some more. What is the next one? The following topic is discussed in verses 14 to 23. Only the arguments will be given instead of verse-by-verse analysis. In these verses *hetu* and *phalam* are repeated many times.

Verses 14 to 23

हेतोरादिः फलं येषामादिहेतुः फलस्य च ।

हेतोः फलस्य चानादिः कथं तैरुपवर्ण्यते ॥ १४ ॥

hetorādiḥ phalaṃ yeṣāmadirhetuḥ phalasya ca ।

hetoḥ phalasya cānādiḥ kathaṃ tairūpavarnyate ॥ 14॥

Some (hold that) the effect is the origin of the cause and the cause is the origin of the effect. How can beginninglessness of the cause and effect be accepted by them? (14)

हेतोरादिः फलं येषामादिर्हेतुः फलस्य च ।

तथा जन्म भवेत्तेषां पुत्राज्जन्म पितुर्यथा ॥ १५ ॥

hetorādiḥ phalaṃ yeṣāmādirhetuḥ phalasya ca ।

tathā janma bhavetteṣāṃ putrājjanma pituryathā ॥ 15॥

Some (hold that) the effect is the origin of the cause and the cause is the origin of the effect. For them the birth will be exactly like the birth of the father out of the son. (15)

सम्भवे हेतुफलयोरेषितव्यः क्रमस्त्वया ।

युगपत्सम्भवे यस्मादसम्बन्धो विषाणवत् ॥ १६ ॥

sambhave hetuphalayoreṣitavyaḥ kramastvayā ।

yugapatsambhave yasmādasambandho viṣāṇavat ॥ 16॥

If the birth of the cause and the effect (is accepted, their) order has to be found out by you. For, if the birth is simultaneous, there will be no (cause-effect) relationship as between the two horns (of a cow.) (16)

फलादुत्पद्यमानः सन्न ते हेतुः प्रसिध्यति ।

अप्रसिद्धः कथं हेतुः फलमुत्पादयिष्यति ॥ १७ ॥

phalādutpadyamānaḥ sanna te hetuḥ prasidhyati ।

aprasiddhaḥ kathaṃ hetuḥ phalamutpādayiṣyati ॥ 17॥

Being born out of the effect, your cause (itself) is not established (first.) How will a cause, which itself is not established, produce an effect? (17)

यदि हेतोः फलात्सिद्धिः फलसिद्धिश्च हेतुतः ।

कतरत्पूर्वनिष्पन्नं यस्य सिद्धिरपेक्षया ॥ १८ ॥

yadi hetoḥ phalātsiddhiḥ phalasiddhiśca hetutaḥ ।

kataratpūrvaniṣpannaṃ yasya siddhirapekṣayā ॥ 18॥

Suppose the birth of the cause is from the effect and the birth of the effect is from the cause. Which one is born first depending on which is the birth (of the other?) (18)

अशक्तिरपरिज्ञानं क्रमकोपोऽथ वा पुनः ।

एवं हि सर्वथा बुद्धैरजातिः परिदीपिता ॥ १९ ॥

aśaktiraparijñānaṃ kramakopo'tha vā punaḥ ।

evaṃ hi sarvathā buddhairajātiḥ paridīpitā ॥ 19॥

(Your) inability (to reply) amounts to ignorance or violation of the order. Thus, birthlessness is revealed by (these) thinkers by all means. (19)

बीजाङ्कुराख्यो दृष्टान्तः सदा साध्यसमो हि सः ।

न हि साध्यसमो हेतुः सिद्धौ साध्यस्य युज्यते ॥ २० ॥

bījāṅkurākhyo dṛṣṭāntaḥ sadā sādhyasamo hi saḥ ।

na hi sādhyasamo hetuḥ siddhau sādhyasya yujyate ॥ 20॥

The well-known example of seed and sprout is yet to be proved. An example which is to be proved is not at all used for establishing something which is to be proved. (20)

पूर्वापरापरिज्ञानमजातेः परिदीपकम् ।

जायमानाद्धि वै धर्मात्कथं पूर्वं न गृह्यते ॥ २१ ॥

pūrvāparāparijñānamajāteḥ paridīpakam ।

jāyamānāddhi vai dharmātkathaṃ pūrvam na gṛhyate ॥ 21॥

Ignorance of the order is a pointer to birthlessness. How is it that (the cause,) which exists before the originating entity, is not known (to you?) (21)

स्वतो वा परतो वाऽपि न किञ्चिद्वस्तु जायते ।

सदसत्सदसद्वाऽपि न किञ्चिद्वस्तु जायते ॥ २२ ॥

svato vā parato vā'pi na kiñcidvastu jāyate ।

sadasatsadasadvā'pi na kiñcidvastu jāyate ॥ 22॥

Nothing is born either of itself or of another. Nothing is born (whether it is) existent, non-existent, or both existent and non-existent. (22)

हेतुर्न जायतेऽनादेः फलं चापि स्वभावतः ।

आदिर्न विद्यते यस्य तस्य ह्यादिर्न विद्यते ॥ २३ ॥

heturna jāyate'nādeḥ phalaṃ cāpi svabhāvataḥ ।

ādirna vidyate yasya tasya hyādirna vidyate ॥ 23॥

Cause is not born out of a beginning-less (effect.) Effect is also (not born out of a beginning-less cause.) (Both are not born) by themselves also. For, that which has no cause has no birth. (23)

In this portion from the 14th verse to the 23rd verse, Gauḍapāda points out that even the theory of creation presented by the Vedas itself is not ultimately acceptable. This theory is called *vaidika-sṛṣṭi prakriyā*. Gauḍapāda himself is a *vaidika* and his courage and boldness in saying that the very theory of creation given by the Vedas will not be accepted ultimately is to be appreciated. What is widely accepted by the Hindus is to be refuted and so should be understood in the proper perspective. Gauḍapāda's contention is that the Vedas have presented this theory of creation only for a beginner during the *adhyāropa prakriyā*. *Adhyāropa* refers to what is temporarily accepted which has to be dropped later. Scaffoldings used to build a building have to be discarded once their purpose is served. *Vaidika sṛṣṭi* is not the ultimate teaching. It should be accepted at the *adhyāropa kāla* and later it should be refuted.

What is the theory used in the Vedas to talk about the creation? It is called *karma-kārya-vāda*. The law of *karma* is used to talk about the creation. Whenever we talk about *sṛṣṭi* in our tradition, we introduce the law of *karma*, the law of *puṇyam* and *pāpam*. How does the law of *karma* come into being? What is the law of *karma*? First we have seen that Brahman cannot be the cause for the creation because Brahman does not have the raw material and Brahman cannot become the raw material. Then the next question is if Brahman itself cannot be the cause, why can't you say that Brahman with *māyā-śakti*, *Īśvara*, can be the creator? Why can't you accept *Īśvara* as the creator of the world? *Īśvara* has *māyā*, *māyā* can serve as the raw material and so he can create. What is the difficulty in accepting this? For that we discuss in *Brahma Sūtra* thus: When you say that *Īśvara* is the creator of the world, a big question is raised. That question has to do with the creation not being uniform and having diversity. Some *jīvas* are born as plants, some are born as animals, and some are born as human beings. Among human beings, some are born with good health, good parentage, wealth, etc. Different human beings are born with different advantages and disadvantages. Why did *Īśvara* create this universe with so much disparity? How come some people have advantages from birth and some have disadvantages? Why is *Īśvara* partial towards some *jīvas* and cruel towards other *jīvas*? When you talk about *svarga* and *naraka*, why should some *jīvas* be born as celestials and angels in *svarga* and why should some *jīvas* suffer in *naraka*? Why is *Īśvara* good to some people and cruel to some other people? It is a question asked in *Brahma Sūtra*. The answer given is that *Īśvara* does not create according to his personal wish. He only looks at the *karma* of every *jīva*. Whichever *jīva* has a lot of *puṇyam*, that *jīva* will have many advantages and the ones that have a lot of *pāpams* will have many disadvantages. *Īśvara* is not responsible for the disparity and diversity of the creation, but the *karma* of *jīvas* is. Creation explanation starts from Brahman (does

not have raw material), goes to *Īśvara* (not responsible) and goes to *karma*. *Īśvara* is fair and just and if there are differences in the creation they are due to the *karma* of *jīvas*. *Īśvara* is only *sāmānya kāraṇam* and *karma* is *viśeṣa kāraṇam*. This theory of creation based on *karma* is called *karma-kārya-vāda*, which is a *vaidika sṛṣṭi prakriyā*. *Īśvara* serves only as a judge or a supervisor and the cause of *sṛṣṭi* is only *karma*. Different *jīvas* having different bodies is because of different *karma*. The next natural question is how did the *karma* come? Who gave the *puṇya* and *pāpa karma*? If *Īśvara* distributed the *puṇyam* and *pāpam*, *Īśvara* will be again partial. Brahman and *Īśvara* do not give *puṇya-pāpam*. Then the *jīva* alone must have given the *puṇya-pāpam*. How could the *jīva* have given *puṇya-pāpam* to himself at the time of his birth when he has not even started doing any action? The body in the previous birth must have produced the current *puṇya-pāpam*. This is *karma* theory. Thus *karma-śarīram-karma-śarīram* cycle keeps going. Gauḍapāda says that this theory of creation based on *karma* can be accepted temporarily. Based on the law of *karma*, we do *karma-yoga* and *upāsana-yoga*. Gauḍapāda says that when you come to Vedānta, you should start questioning this theory also. He says that this theory of creation will also have several logical problems. So this theory has to be rejected. The law of *karma* also cannot explain the creation. Then how did the creation come? It never came. If it never came, then what is it? It is an experience and an appearance. One can never talk about the chronological step-by-step process of creation. Modern cosmologists are not able to explain the creation. The current M-theory predicts parallel universes each with its own laws.

Gauḍapāda wishes to show what the logical fallacies are with *karma-kārya-vāda*. One should be circumspect about these points with people who are not exposed to Vedānta or new to Vedānta. Gauḍapāda suggests six possibilities of explaining *karma-kārya-vāda* and then refutes each one of them by showing that they are not logically possible. Since all the six possibilities are refuted, *karma-kārya-vāda* is not tenable.

Of the six, the first four are relatively simple explanations given for completeness and the last two are the main ones. We will see all the six explanations. These are taken from verses 14 to 23. First the six explanations are enumerated.

1. *Karma* is the cause, the *mūlakāraṇam* of *śarīram*, the body, which is representative of the entire creation. (*karma* first)
2. *Śarīram* is the *mūlakāraṇam* of *karma*. (body first)
3. Both *karma* and *śarīram* originate simultaneously like the two horns of the cow growing simultaneously.
4. *Karma* and *śarīram* are mutually cause and effect. *Karma* is born of *śarīram*. *Śarīram* is born of *karma*.
5. *Karma* and *śarīram* are part of a long series. From *karma*, *śarīram* comes, from *śarīram*, *karma* comes, from *karma*, *śarīram* comes and so on, like seed and tree series.
6. *Karma-śarīra* series is *anādi*.

These are the six possible options for *karma-kārya-vāda*. Using these can the creation be explained? Gauḍapāda says that all the six ways of explaining will end up with problems.

The first option is that *karma* is the *mūlakāraṇam* of the universe. This is not correct because *karma* (*puṇyam* and *pāpam*) itself can come only out of some *śarīram* that has to do some good or bad action. Without *śarīram* there is no *puṇya-pāpam*. Even *Bhagavān* cannot create *puṇya-pāpam* to generate bodies from. Otherwise he will be seen to be partial. The world cannot produce *puṇya-pāpam* because the world is inert and some living body is required for action and *puṇya-pāpam*. *Karma* cannot be the *mūlakāraṇam* because *karma* itself requires some other *kāraṇam*.

The second option is that *śarīram* is the *mūlakāraṇam* of the universe. First *Bhagavān* gives every *jīva* a body freely and at that time every body's *karma* account is zero. Thereafter, the *karma* account starts. The question here will be what type of body will *Bhagavān* give to the *jīvas*? The type of bodies is determined by *karma*. In the absence of *karma*, *Bhagavān* cannot give body to anyone because the very body is based on *karma*. So *śarīram* cannot be the *mūlakāraṇam* because *śarīram* itself requires a *kāraṇam*.

The third option is *karma* and *śarīram* originate simultaneously. This is not valid because if they originate simultaneously, they cannot have cause-effect relationship. Twin brothers cannot be the cause of each other. Because we accept that *karma* and *śarīram* have cause-effect relationship, their simultaneous origination is not viable.

The fourth option is that *karma* comes from *śarīram* and *śarīram* comes from *karma*. Why can't this pair of *karma* and *śarīram* be mutually cause and effect? For that Gauḍapāda says that it is never possible between two things, if one is cause and the other is effect, they cannot reverse their roles. Gauḍapāda: If *Rāmaḥ* is born of *Daśaratha*, *Daśaratha* cannot be the son of *Rāmaḥ*. The fourth option is like saying that the father is born out of the son. *Karma* and *śarīram* cannot be mutually cause and effect. Thus the first four options are negated.

The last two options will be looked at in the next class.

MK-53 = Chapter – 4, Verses – 23 to 28

Verse 23

हेतुर्न जायतेऽनादेः फलं चापि स्वभावतः ।

आदिर्न विद्यते यस्य तस्य ह्यादिर्न विद्यते ॥ २३ ॥

Gauḍapādācārya is engaged in his main teaching, which is the teaching of the Upaniṣad, *ajātivāda*, which is the negation of the creation. As a part of that, he is pointing out that since creation cannot be accepted at all, any theory of creation will have several logical fallacies. To establish that conclusion, he takes different theories of creation and shows the logical fallacies. We have seen three such theories and we are in the midst of the fourth one. First he refuted *Brahma-kārya-vāda*, creation cannot come out of Brahman. Brahman cannot serve as *nimitta kāraṇam* and Brahman by itself cannot serve as *upādāna kāraṇam* also. Thereafter, he refuted *asat-kārya-vāda* indirectly. This was done with the help of *sat-kārya-vāda*. The third theory he refuted was *sat-kārya-vāda* itself, which is one of the most powerful theories propounded by *Sāṃkya* philosophers. After refuting these three, Gauḍapāda comes to the fourth topic, which is the most disturbing topic. The very Vedic theory of creation is refuted. All the time the teaching is based on the Veda itself but now he is refuting the Vedic theory of creation itself. Later he will point out that Vedas do talk about a theory of creation all right but it should be accepted only temporarily until we get the qualifications for *jñāna-yoga*. Because there is a temporary benefit, Vedas accept that theory but after some time, that Vedic theory have to be refuted also because they also have several fallacies.

The *vedic* theory is the *karma-kārya-vāda*. *Īśvara* is said to be the creator and we say that with the help of *māyā*, *Bhagavān* creates the universe. But if we closely look at this statement, *Bhagavān* can create only if there is *karma* to support him. *Bhagavān* is called *sāmānya kāraṇam* and *karma* is the *viśeṣa kāraṇam*. *Karma* means *punyam and pāpam*, which is different for different people. Otherwise the diversity of the creation cannot be explained. *Bhagavān* cannot create the universe uniformly because *karma* is different for different people. Disparity in the creation cannot be explained without introducing the law of *karma*. Thus *Īśvara-kārya vāda* gets reduced to *karma-kārya-vāda*. Gauḍapāda says that we all accept *karma-kārya-vāda* in the beginning. Hinduism begins with the *karma* theory. Veda says that *karma* theory is very useful for the initial growth of the individual. The *karma* theory is helpful for an individual to accept his life experiences and also for the purification of his mind. *Karma-yoga* and *upāsana-yoga* are based on *karma-kārya-vāda*. Once we have purification of the mind, we should enquire into this *karma-kārya-vāda* and understand that this is also a temporary compromise structure. It is a compromise from the truth. It is not truth at all. It is a deliberate compromised theory given by the Vedas.

The logical fallacies in the *karma-kārya-vāda* is the topic from verses 14 to 23. Gauḍapāda suggests six different formulations in *karma-kārya-vāda* and shows that every formulation will have logical

problems. The first four formulations are relatively simpler. The first is *karma* is the *mūlakāraṇam*, the first cause of the creation. It cannot be so because *karma* can itself come into existence only if there is a *śarīram*. *Īśvara* cannot produce *karma* because he is *akartā*, *abhoktā* and *jñāni*. The second formulation is that body is the first cause. This is refuted because bodies require prior *karma* for their variety, which is seen. The third formulation is that *karma* and body are simultaneously born. If that is the case, their cause and effect relationship cannot be explained and secondly if they are simultaneously born, what is their cause will be the next question. That question cannot be answered. The fourth formulation is that *karma* produces *śarīram* and *śarīram* produces *karma*. Gauḍapāda says that it will be like saying that father produces the child and the child produces the father. It is never possible because if two things have a cause-effect relationship, they can never be reversed. If a particular seed is the cause of a particular tree, that seed will be always the cause and that tree will always be the effect. It cannot be said that the tree once it came produced the past seed from which it came. Therefore mutual cause-effect relationship between *karma* and *śarīram* is also refuted.

The fifth and the sixth formulations are serious ones and have to be carefully understood.

The fifth formulation: *Śarīram* has come out of *karma*. *Karma* has come out of its previous *śarīram* and not some other *śarīram*. The previous *śarīram* came out of its previous *karma*. Its previous *karma* came because of its previous *śarīram*. Thus *karma 1* produces *śarīram 1*, *śarīram 1* produces *karma 2*, *karma 2* produces *śarīram 2*, *śarīram 2* produces *karma 3*, etc., similar to our parents producing us, they are produced by their parents, etc. There is no fallacy of the mutual cause-effect relationship. Therefore *karma-śarīra* series is the creation. Gauḍapāda says that this formulation is not valid because in this particular series you get an endless series without a beginning. The series will have infinite regress with no finality. The final answer cannot be given because every answer leads to another question. This is the infinite regress fallacy. When there is infinite regress problem, one can never talk about *mūlakāraṇam*. How did a particular tree come can be answered. But what is the fundamental original cause is the conundrum of any *darśana*. In this fifth formulation the original cause cannot be determined.

The sixth formulation: The question of the original cause itself is wrong because the series is *anādi*. *Karma-śarīram* series is without a beginning and when the series does not have a beginning how can the question of what is the beginning be asked. According to the Vedic theory, creation is *anādi-karma-śarīra* series. The series of *karma-śarīram* without a beginning is the Vedic theory of creation. What is wrong with this approach? Gauḍapāda says that this is fine up to a particular period during *karma-yoga* and *upāsana-yoga* stages. When you probe into it in the *jñāna-yoga* stage, this theory is not satisfactory because there are logical fallacies in this theory.

There are two fallacies that will be discussed. Two fallacies will be talked about. Gauḍapāda asks the question: When you talk about *anādi-karma-śarīra* series, what does it mean? It means “beginning-less-*karma-śarīram* series”. Vedānta says that *anādi*, beginning-less is an adjective, and when you say

beginning-less *karma-śarīra* series, which one of these three does the adjective beginning-less belong to? *Anādi karma* or *anādi śarīram* or *anādi* series? Which one of these three is *anādi*? You cannot say *anādi karma* because *karma* is never *anādi* because every *karma* is born out of the previous *śarīram*. *Anādi śarīram* is not acceptable because every *śarīram* is caused by previous *karma*. Therefore *anādi* has to go with series, the series only. According to Vedānta, the word ‘series’ is only a concept. There is no such thing called series other than the individual members. Fruit salad example: look for the salad in the plate. Salad is only a word and there are only individual fruits on the plate. Series is only a conceptual construct and there is no such thing called series at all. Therefore *anādi-karma-śarīra* series is not even grammatically possible. This is fallacy number 1.

The next is a more serious fallacy and has to be understood carefully. Gauḍapāda argues that if *karma-śarīra* series is *anādi*, there is no chance for *mokṣa* at all. This is called *anir-mokṣa-prasaṅga doṣa*. Why? Gauḍapāda talks about this in verse 30 but we have to apply it here. If *karma-śarīra* series is without a beginning whatever is *anādi* will be *ananta* also. Brahman is *anādi* and endless also. What cannot be created cannot be destroyed also. If *karma-śarīra* series is *ananta* or endless, there is no chance of *mokṣa* at all. *Karma* cycle never ends and so no chance of *mokṣa* from rebirth. Suppose it is argued that the *karma-śarīra* series is *anādi* but it has an end for a particular case by doing spiritual *sādhana* and end the series one day. Gauḍapāda says that that line of argument also has a problem. Suppose the *anādi-karma-śarīra* series ends one day that will mark the end of *saṃsāra*. When the *saṃsāra* ends, that end of *saṃsāra* will mark the beginning of *mokṣa*. Gauḍapāda says that whatever begins in time will have an end and so the *mokṣa* that begins after *saṃsāra* ends will itself end on some later day. Then *saṃsāra* will begin. Thus there will be a series of *saṃsāra* ending-*mokṣa* beginning-*mokṣa* ending. There will be thus only temporary *mokṣa* and according to Veda, temporary *mokṣa* is not *mokṣa* at all. The *anādi-karma-śarīra* series has the fallacy that no *mokṣa* is possible. How can Veda prescribe a *śrīti* in which *mokṣa* itself is not possible? Veda will never talk about end of *saṃsāra* and beginning of *mokṣa*. What is *mokṣa* then? It is only understanding that *śrīti* is not present in all three periods of time. Origination of the world has to be negated. Existence of the world is to be negated. Appearance of the world has to be accepted and that appearance is because of *avidyā* or *māyā*. Once I understand that this world is *mithyā*, I can claim that I have been *mukta* all the time. I am not working for *mokṣa*. If I work for *mokṣa* and *mokṣa* comes one day, that *mokṣa* will go. I should understand that *aham satyam*, *nitya mukta*, and the world is an appearance and will never affect my *mokṣa* at all and I have never been a *saṃsāri* at anytime. This is Gauḍapāda’s *ajātivāda*. That topic is concluded in the 23rd verse.

The conclusion: *karma* also is an appearance, *śarīram* also is an appearance, because of *māyā*. They are appearances in me the *sākṣi* and that *sākṣi* ‘I’ do not have to get liberation. I only have to understand that I am, have been and ever will be *mukta*. Giving reality to the world is the cause of the problem.

With this, refutation of the Vedic theory is also over. Later Gauḍapāda will discuss one more point. If Vedic theory of creation is not a fact, why did Veda compromise with the fact and talk about a creation? It is a deliberate compromise because a person cannot accept the idea of no creation in the beginning itself. Initially we are all sure that there is a world and so we are attracted to scriptures that talk about a creation. Vedānta takes us out of *saṃsāra*, which was never there to begin with. Initially if the scripture says that there is no *saṃsāra* when we feel *saṃsāra*, we will reject the scripture. Vedānta employs the method of *adhyāropa-apavāda*. It accepts that there is a problem of *saṃsāra*, builds an elaborate scheme of *karma* theory to explain it and then explains later that there is no problem in all three period of time. However within the appearance, *karma* theory has relevance but it does not have absolute reality. With this, all the theories of creation have been refuted.

Verses 24 to 28

प्रज्ञप्तेः सनिमित्तत्वमन्यथा द्वयनाशतः ।

सङ्क्लेशस्योपलब्धेश्च परतन्त्रास्तिता मता ॥ २४ ॥

prajñapṭeḥ sanimittatvamanyathā dvayanāśataḥ ।

saṅkleśasyopalabdheśca paratantrāstitā matā ॥ 24॥

Knowledge should have an (external) cause, because there will not be dualistic cognitions otherwise. Moreover, since there is the experience of pain, the existence (of objects) supported by other systems is accepted. (24)

प्रज्ञप्तेः सनिमित्तत्वमिष्यते युक्तिदर्शनात् ।

निमित्तस्यानिमित्तत्वमिष्यते भूतदर्शनात् ॥ २५ ॥

prajñapṭeḥ sanimittatvamīṣyate yuktidarśanāt ।

nimittasyānimittatvamīṣyate bhūtadarśanāt ॥ 25॥

From logical view, knowledge having an (external) cause should be accepted. From the standpoint of Reality, the (external) cause should be accepted as no cause. (25)

चित्तं न संस्पृशत्यर्थं नार्थाभासं तथैव च ।

अभूतो हि यतश्चार्थो नार्थाभासस्ततः पृथक् ॥ २६ ॥

cittam na saṃsprśatyartham nārthābhāsam tathaiva ca ।

abhūto hi yataścārtho nārthābhāsastataḥ pṛthak ॥ 26॥

Consciousness contacts neither a (real) object nor an apparent object. Because, a real object is non-existent; nor is there an apparent object separate from that (consciousness.) (26)

निमित्तं न सदा चित्तं संस्पृशत्यध्वसु त्रिषु ।

अनिमित्तो विपर्यासः कथं तस्य भविष्यति ॥ २७ ॥

nimittam na sadā cittam saṃspr̥śatyadhvasu triṣu ।

animitto viparyāsaḥ katham tasya bhaviṣyati ॥ 27॥

Consciousness does not contact an (external) object in all the three periods of time. How can that (consciousness) have an error without an (external) object? (27)

तस्मान्न जायते चित्तं चित्तदृश्यं न जायते ।

तस्य पश्यन्ति ये जातिं खे वै पश्यन्ति ते पदम् ॥ २८ ॥

tasmānna jāyate cittam cittadr̥śyam na jāyate ।

tasya paśyanti ye jātiṃ khe vai paśyanti te padam ॥ 28॥

Therefore, an object of consciousness is not born; nor is consciousness born. Those who see the birth of that (consciousness) are indeed seeing footprints in the sky. (28)

Gauḍapāda enters the next important topic in verses 24 to 28. In these five verses, Gauḍapāda enters into another involved discussion based on the Buddhistic system. This is a *nāstika darśanam*. *Āstika darśanams* accept the Vedas as valid source of knowledge. They take into account the Veda in addition to the other means of knowledge. *Sāṃkhya, yoga, nyāya, vaiśeṣika, pūrva mīmāṃsa, and uttara mīmāṃsa* are *āstika darśanams*. *Nāstika darśanams* do not accept the Vedas as valid source of knowledge.

Among *nāstika darśana*, four powerful schools belong to Buddhism. These are *Sautrāntika darśanam* (1), *Vaibhāṣika darśanam* (2), *Yogācāra darśanam* (3), and *Mādhyamika darśanam* (4). The main differences among these four systems that are relevant for our discussion are the following. System 1 says that a real external world exists which is proved by direct perception. System 2 also says that a real world exists outside but is proved by inference. The world must be there because I am experiencing it. Internal experience is the proof for external object. Both systems 1 and 2 say that external world exists proved by direct perception and inference respectively. System 3 says that there is no external world other than the observer, the consciousness principle like the dream world we experience that does not exist separate from the observer. The external world is *mithyā*. The observer consciousness is *satyam*. *Yogācāra, bāhyārtha mithyātva vādinaḥ* is very close to Vedānta (*advaita*). System 4 is *sarvārtha mithyātva vādinaḥ*, the external world is also not there, the observer consciousness is also not there, the world is *mithyā* and consciousness is also *mithyā, sarvam mithyā*. What is *satyam*? *Śūnyam* or nothing. They are called *Mādhyamika* otherwise called *śūnyavādi*. The four schools of Buddhism are: *bāhyārtha pratyakṣa vādinaḥ, bāhyārtha anumeya vādinaḥ, bāhyārtha mithyātva vādinaḥ, sarvārtha mithyātva vādinaḥ* (*artha* meaning things) Gauḍapāda takes these four and make them debate and thereafter he will say he is correct. Therefore a debate among them is introduced in the following verses.

MK-54 = Chapter – 4, Verses – 28, 29

Verse 28

तस्मान्न जायते चित्तं चित्तदृश्यं न जायते ।

तस्य पश्यन्ति ये जातिं खे वै पश्यन्ति ते पदम् ॥ २८ ॥

Gauḍapādācārya established the *ajātivāda*, the teaching of the non-origination of the world by refuting the various *āstika darśanam*s, the schools of thought that accept Veda as *pramāṇam*. *Sāṃkhya*, *Yoga* and *Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika* will come under *āstika darśanam*. They all have different theories of creation like *sat-kārya-vāda* and *asat-kārya-vāda*. Gauḍapādācārya dismissed those two systems as fallacious. Even the Vedic theory of creation is accepted only temporarily at the *adhyāropa kāla* and should be negated later by seeing the fallacy in that theory. The *karma-kārya-vāda*, which is the creation explained with the help of the law of *karma* was analyzed elaborately. *Īśvara-kārya vāda* will always boil down to *karma-kārya-vāda* because *Īśvara* cannot create without *karma*. This *vāda* was also analyzed and dismissed. However, this *vāda* is temporarily accepted. During *karma-yoga* and *upāsana-yoga* the law of *karma* is accepted. This is *adhyāropa* stage. During *jñāna-yoga* only, one does the *apavāda* of the whole *vāda* and establishes that Brahman alone was, is and ever will be. The important verse of the 2nd chapter, verse 32, states that from *pāramārthika dṛṣṭi*, *sṛṣṭi*, *sthiti*, *laya*, *sādhana*, *jñānam*, *mokṣa* are all absent. Only from the *vyāvahārika* angle, these are accepted because *vyavahārikam* serves as a stepping stone to *paramārthikam*.

Gauḍapāda has now come to the *nāstika darśanam* of Buddhism. The *nāstika darśanam*s are considered to be six in number. Of those six, four are the four branches of Buddhism. The fifth one is Jainism and the sixth one is *Lokāyata*, materialism. *Lokāyata*, *Jaina* and the four *Bauddha* branches are the six *nāstika darśanam*s. They are called *nāstika* because they do not accept Veda as *pramāṇam*. *Pūrva-mīmāṃsaka* comes under a peculiar type. It is called *āstika darśanam* because it accepts Veda *karma-kāṇḍa pramāṇam* but peculiarly it does not accept *Īśvara*. From the *Īśvara* viewpoint, *Pūrva mīmāṃsa* is *nāstika* but from the Veda angle it is *āstika*.

Gauḍapāda takes up *Bauddha darśanam* in verses 24 to 28. These verses will be summarized instead of verse by verse analysis. In the last class, four schools of Buddhism were talked about: *Sautrāntika* (1), *Vaibhāṣika* (2), *Yogācāra* (3) and *Mādhyamika* (4). Schools 1 and 2 together are called *Hīnayāna* Buddhism. Schools 3 and 4 together are called *Mahāyāna* Buddhism. The differences among these four schools are: *bāhyārtha pratyakṣa vādinah*, *bāhyārtha anumeya vādinah*, *bāhyārtha mithyātva vādinah* and *sarvārtha mithyātva vādinah*. The first school says that the external world is existent and it is proved by *pratyakṣa pramāṇam*. The second school also says that the external world exists but it is to be inferred from our experiences. We are only aware of our experiences and from that we have to infer the existence of the world. Experience is *pratyakṣam* and the world is *anumeyam*. Both of them say that there is an external world. The third group is the closest to Vedānta and we generally join them initially.

This school says that the external world seems to be present but does not exist separate from the observer, the consciousness principle. Consciousness alone is the reality and the world and objects are not there separate from consciousness just as there is no pot separate from the clay. Pot is only a word and is not a substance. The substance is clay. Reducing further and further, the ultimate substance is the observer, the consciousness. This is very similar to what *advaitam* says. The fourth school says that the observed world is *mithyā* and the observing consciousness is also *mithyā*. Everything is *mithyā* and *śūnyam* is *adhiṣṭhānam*, which means that there is no *adhiṣṭhānam*. This is called *sunya-vāda* or *nirātma-vāda*. These are the four schools of Buddhism.

Gauḍapāda introduces a debate among two. In this debate, the *Mādhyamika* school is not involved because the objector himself is *śūnyam*. The debate is between the first two groups as one side and the third group as the other. In this debate, *Yogācāra* wins establishing that consciousness alone is real and that there is no world separate from consciousness. The first two schools claim that the external world is really externally present. World is *satyaṃ* (groups 1 and 2) versus world is *mithyā* (*Yogācāra*). Gauḍapāda joins *Yogācāra* because Vedānta and *Yogācāra* agree that the world is *mithyā*. The first two schools are introduced in verse 24, the first line is *bāhyārtha pratyakṣa vādi* and the second line is *bāhyārtha anumeya vādi*. They both say that the world is really there because it is being experienced. If consciousness alone is there, no experience is possible. Because the variety is experienced, the variety, namely the world is definitely there. The second school says that varieties of objects must be there because varieties of experiences are there. For them, the varieties of objects are inferred because we have varieties of experiences. For both schools, either directly or indirectly, the external world is there.

From verses 25 to 27, *Yogācāra's* answer to the above is described. Superficially seeing, the external objects are there. But on enquiry they disappear. Logically they seem to be there externally but when you analyze their nature, they are not there. It is like anything in the creation. To give an example, take the case of the ornaments. There are so many ornaments superficially seeing. On enquiry ornaments are only words that we use but what is there are not ornaments but gold alone is there. But is not the gold present? It is also present only superficially but on enquiry gold will also get reduced into the five elements according to the Vedas, or some fundamental particles according to Science. Other than the fundamental particles there are no material things. *Yogācāra* says that when one goes deeper into analysis, the only thing that is present is the observer that lends existence to the observable objects. They appear to be remaining outside but they are not separate from the observer. The best example is the dream in which I clearly experience the external objects outside me, the dream observer. The dream world has ETU. But when I wake up, other than I, the observer, the observed world does not have independent existence. The truth of matter is consciousness. It is a profound statement. What matters very much is that matter is not matter. It is nothing but consciousness. There is no object other than the subject. This is the position of *Yogācāra*.

An interesting question is asked by the objector (schools 1 and 2). If there is no external object at all, how can you talk about erroneous and wrong perceptions? Rope-snake perception is a wrong perception. The rope-snake perception is called wrong because what is there is rope. If you do not accept a rope at all, you can never say snake-perception is a wrong perception. If you do not accept a shell, the silver perception there cannot be said to be a wrong perception. If there is no dry sand, mirage water perception cannot be said to be the wrong perception. The word 'wrong perception' is possible only if there is an object outside. If there is no object outside, there will be no wrong perception. *Yogācāra* says that it agrees because according to them there is no wrong perception at all. There is only one perception and if at all wrong perception is talked about, *Yogācāra*'s definition of wrong perception is different. It is not seeing an object differently. Normally wrong perception is seeing an object wrongly. But in *Yogācāra*'s viewpoint there is no wrong perception because there are no objects. Then what is wrong perception? Seeing the subject consciousness as though it is an external object is wrong perception. Wrong perception is not seeing one object for another. In this school, the rope-snake is not a wrong perception because the rope itself is not there. The rope is consciousness and the snake is also consciousness. Everything is consciousness alone and so the problem raised by the first two schools is not present in *Yogācāra*. Consciousness alone is reality and the world is *mithyā*. There is no origination of the world. The world is only an appearance that is experienced. Vedānta agrees with this. The appearance requires an *adhiṣṭhānam*. *Yogācāra* and Vedānta say that consciousness is the *adhiṣṭhānam*.

What is the fallacy in *Yogācāra*? These *Yogācāra* Buddhists came very close to Vedānta, but finally they made a blunder. They said that consciousness alone appears as various objects. When I see object 1, it is consciousness and when I see object 2, it is consciousness. But in our experience, objects 1, 2, etc., are flowing sequentially. I experience one object, then I turn to another object, object 1 disappears for me and now I am experiencing object 2. The experience of objects is in the form of a flow. Each experience lasts only for a finite period only. Based on this, *Yogācāra* concludes that every experience is consciousness alone because there is no experience other than consciousness. Further *Yogācāra* says that consciousness itself is a coming and going series. It is not one eternal consciousness but several consciousnesses coming and going serially and sequentially. *Yogācāra* qualifies consciousness as *kṣaṇika vijñānaṃ*. Vedānta says that consciousness is *nitya vijñānaṃ*. According to *Yogācāra*, the first experience comes as the first consciousness, then the first experience and the first consciousness go, experience 2 comes, consciousness 2 comes and so on. For *Yogācāra*, consciousness is *kṣaṇika vijñāna* series, the flow of momentary consciousness. This series of momentary consciousness is the observer and this series alone is *satyaṃ*. This is the conclusion of *Yogācāra*. Gauḍapāda does not agree with this. *Vijñānaṃ* is *satyaṃ* is acceptable but *vijñānaṃ* is *kṣaṇika* is not acceptable. The conclusion of Gauḍapāda is given in the important verse 28. An external world is never born (common to both Vedānta and *Yogācāra*) and never exists really and it is only an appearance of consciousness. Consciousness, referred to here by the word *cittam* with a special meaning, also does not appear and disappear. This is the negation of *Yogācāra*. *Yogācāra* says that consciousness appears and disappears. Gauḍapāda does not give the logic for the refutation of *Yogācāra* in this verse. But Śaṅkarācārya discusses these systems

in several of his commentaries. In his commentaries on *Bṛhadāraṇyaka*, *Brahma Sūtra* and in other places, Śaṅkarācārya has analyzed each school of thought. *Upadeśasāhasrī* also analyzes these schools. Śaṅkara gives a simple reason. He asks how does one know that consciousness is coming and going. Who knows the coming and going consciousness? The object cannot know because according to *Yogācāra* the object itself is not there. It cannot be said that consciousness 1 knows the flow of the next one because when consciousness 2 comes, consciousness 1 is already gone. Consciousness 1 can never know about consciousness 2 and consciousness 2 will not know about either 1 or 3 and 3 will not know about 2 or 4. No single consciousness can know the others because each one lasts for one *kṣaṇam* only. The knower of the flow must be outside the flow. Therefore in *kṣaṇika vijñāna vāda*, there is no one to know the *kṣaṇika vijñānaṃ* whereas Vedānta says that there is a *nitya vijñānaṃ* that is capable of witnessing the changing experiences and the changing experiences are not changing consciousness but changing thoughts. Thoughts are flowing and the flow of thoughts are witnessed by consciousness that itself is not changing. Changeless consciousness is the witness of the changing thoughts and even as the experiences are changing the thoughts are changing. Consciousness is not temporary and is *ekam eva advitīyam*.

Gauḍapāda is teasing the *Yogācāra* people who talk about the origination of consciousness by saying that they are seeing things that are not there. He gives the example of a bird flying in the sky and someone seeing the bird flying, and saying that he sees the bird's footprints. This is similar to saying that the origination of consciousness and appearance and disappearance of consciousness is a fact. With the refutation of the *nāstika* Buddhist systems, the refutation of all systems other than Vedānta is also over. Hereafter Gauḍapāda consolidates the teaching.

Verse 29

अजातं जायते यस्मादजातिः प्रकृतिस्ततः ।

प्रकृतेरन्यथाभावो न कथञ्चिद्भविष्यति ॥ २९ ॥

ajātaṃ jāyate yasmādjātiḥ prakṛtistataḥ ।

prakṛteranyathābhāvo na kathañcidbhaviṣyati ॥ 29॥

The unborn (consciousness) is born (according to the disputants.) Since being unborn is the intrinsic nature (of consciousness,) hence, the transformation of the intrinsic nature (of being unborn) will not take place anyhow. (29)

This is a very significant verse. Here Gauḍapāda points out where all the systems uniformly commit the mistake. All the systems that accept a creation will have to make this logical mistake. If this logical fallacy is understood it would be very useful in understanding *mithyā* because in *advaitam*, the toughest topic is not even Brahman but it is the *mithyātvam* of the universe. All these systems that accept that there is a creation and therefore that there is origination of the creation including modern Science will

have to analyze how the universe originated. All these systems seem to solve the problem. Gauḍapāda points out where the flaw is. He says that whenever you talk about the origination of the world, invariably the question will come to the cause for the creation. Any cause that you establish, the *paramāṇu* of *Naiyāyikas* or the *prakṛti* of *Sāṃkhya* will raise another question of how that cause originated. Our experience in life is that every *kāraṇam* has a *kāraṇam*. To answer this question, these systems say that the *mūla-kāraṇam* does not originate. They say that *kāraṇam* is eternal. This is a trap. Once *kāraṇam* is said to be eternal their system collapses logically. The *kāraṇam* status and the eternal status cannot coexist. Whatever is eternal cannot undergo any change. *Nityam* has to be *nirvikāram* is a logical truth. Once the *kāraṇam* is said to be eternal it cannot be a *kāraṇam* because any *kāraṇam* has to undergo a change whether it is *nimittam* or *upādānam* to produce the effect. How can the eternal *prakṛti* evolve into the universe? How can the eternal *paramāṇu* evolve into the universe? Śaṅkarācārya analyzes all this elaborately in *Brahma Sūtra* (2nd chapter, 2nd pada). He shows that *kāraṇam* cannot be eternal and the eternal cannot be *kāraṇam*. Therefore the cause of the universe cannot be talked about. If the cause of the universe cannot be talked about, how can one talk about the origin of the universe? Since the origination of the universe cannot be talked about, there is no origination of the universe. Then what is all this? *Māyā*-projected appearance.

The dream members who come into the dream come without origination. The dream is an appearance. Similarly the entire world is an appearance caused by *māyā*. It has a conditional reality in the waking state just as the dream world has conditional reality in the dream state. Therefore conditional reality must be given its conditional importance because it is conditional reality. Being conditional reality, one should respect that reality. If the dream dog chases you, run with the dream body. Respect conditional reality but never respect it as though it is absolute reality. In the *Vivekacūḍāmaṇi* class I said not to overestimate the world as absolute reality, but do not underestimate the world either as though it is non-existent. It is neither non-existent nor absolute reality. How do you know that you are overestimating or underestimating? If you do your duty, you are not underestimating. When you are underestimating, you refuse to do your duty. If you are worrying over your duties you are overestimating. Do the duty and do not worry. This is healthy living.

MK-55 = Chapter – 4, Verses – 29 to 35

Verse 29

अजातं जायते यस्मादजातिः प्रकृतिस्ततः ।

प्रकृतेरन्यथाभावो न कथञ्चिद्भविष्यति ॥ २९ ॥

After refuting various theories of creation propounded by various schools of thought, Gauḍapāda mentions the fundamental mistake they all commit when they talk about the origination of the world. The mistake is that whenever origination is talked about the *mūla-kāraṇam*, the fundamental cause, comes into the picture. Different systems talk about different fundamental causes. *Sāṃkhya-Yoga* mentions *prakṛti*, *Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika* talk about *paramāṇu* and so on. Naturally, the question of where this fundamental cause came from is raised. These systems reply saying that the fundamental cause has always been present and it is without a beginning. Gauḍapāda counters by pointing out that a fundamental cause without a beginning is a logical contradiction. Whatever that does not have a beginning cannot have an end also and therefore it has to be eternal in nature. This eternality of the fundamental cause is accepted by the systems that propose a fundamental cause for creation. Gauḍapāda says that eternality of the fundamental cause poses a problem. To be eternal is to be changeless. If *mūla-kāraṇam* is eternal, it cannot undergo change. If it cannot undergo change it cannot become a *kāraṇam* because to be a cause is to undergo a change, whether it is a material or an intelligent cause. *Nityatvam* and *kāraṇatvam* cannot coexist like darkness and light cannot coexist in one place. Vedānta says that *nityam* Brahman remains *nityam* without undergoing change. Even in the manifestation, what is there is Brahman only; A creation has not come and if you talk about creation, it has not originated and it is only an appearance. Therefore, origination of the world cannot be talked about. This is the height of Vedānta.

Verse 30

अनादेरन्तवत्त्वं च संसारस्य न सेत्स्यति ।

अनन्तता चाऽऽदिमतो मोक्षस्य न भविष्यति ॥ ३० ॥

anāderantavattvaṃ ca saṃsārasya na setsyati ।

anantatā cā"dimato mokṣasya na bhaviṣyati ॥ 30॥

The end of a beginning-less saṃsāra cannot be established and the endlessness of mokṣa, which has a beginning, is not possible. (30)

A question may arise. Gauḍapāda said that what is eternal cannot be a *kāraṇam* because a thing has to undergo change to be a *kāraṇam*. Now a serious question from modern Science is why is it said that what is eternal cannot undergo change. Why do you not consider matter that we are experiencing? Matter cannot be created or destroyed. Matter is therefore eternal. The material world has always been present. It cannot be created or destroyed. Matter undergoes change. Why can't you accept a universe

that is eternal and changing? Gauḍapāda does not discuss this directly but this question needs to be addressed. If you say the world is eternal, first one has to give up the idea of creation because what is eternal can never be created or originated. If you drop the idea of creation and origination, you cannot talk about a *mūla-kāraṇam* also. When the world is not a *kāryam*, you cannot talk about a *mūla-kāraṇam* for the world. Once a universe that is eternal and without a beginning is accepted, *kāraṇam* for the world becomes irrelevant.

So Science accepts that the universe has not originated. Therefore the universe does not have a *mūla-kāraṇam*. The universe is eternal and the universe is always changing also. Why can't we accept such a universe? Gauḍapāda answers in this verse. Once you accept such a universe, *dvaitam* is real and eternal. Accepting that the universe is real is accepting duality. The world is itself dual in nature and there is duality in the form of 'I' the subject and the world the object. If the world is accepted, it is acceptance of *dvaitam*. *Dvaitam* is *saṃsāra* according to Veda. In a changing world mortality cannot be avoided. Mortality is *saṃsāra*. Therefore accepting an eternal universe is accepting eternal *dvaitam* and eternal *saṃsāra*. Once *saṃsāra* is accepted as eternal, there is no possibility for *mokṣa*. Science cannot talk about *mokṣa* but can only talk about *saṃsāra*. All the systems including the *nāstika* ones are working for *mokṣa* only. The beginning-less *dvaitam* will never end and all the spiritual *sādhanas* will be useless. The answer then is that *dvaitam* is eternal but it is eternally *mithyā*. In *advaitam* we do have a scope for *mokṣa* because we also accept that *dvaitam* is eternal but it is eternally *mithyā* and we can claim liberation because the eternal *mithyā* can never affect my *svarūpam* of *mokṣa*. In *advaitam* alone, *mokṣa* possibility is there.

If the uncreated matter, the universe and the uncreated duality are without a beginning and eternal, there will be no end to the *saṃsāra*. This *doṣa* is called *anirmokṣa prasaṅga*. In *karma-kārya-vāda*, out of the six formulations therein, the sixth formulation is derived from the second line of this verse. If *saṃsāra* is beginning-less it will not end and therefore no *mokṣa* is possible. Suppose *saṃsāra* ends even though it is beginning-less. Gauḍapāda says that the end of that *saṃsāra* will be the beginning of *mokṣa*. It looks reasonable but not on analysis. If *mokṣa* has a date of beginning it will have an expiry date. No *mokṣa* is possible if *dvaitam* is eternal and beginning-less. *Dvaitam* is neither beginning-less nor eternal because it does not exist at all. It is only an appearance. If *mokṣa* begins at some time, it will not be permanent. All the *darśanas* have accepted *mokṣa* to be permanent. There are differences in the description of *mokṣa* but all systems agree about eternal *mokṣa*. *Advaita* Vedānta never talks about the arrival of *mokṣa* because arriving *mokṣa* is not *mokṣa* but what needs to be done is dismissing the misconception that *mokṣa* arrives. I need to claim *mokṣa*, which is my *svarūpam*, irrespective of the appearing and disappearing world, events and people. Events, world and people appear and disappear but they do not affect my state of liberation. I am free not because of something. I am free in spite of things happening. Kṛṣṇa refers to this in the *Bhagavad Gita*:

Oh Arjuna! Sense organs and objects which cause cold, heat, pleasure, and pain are subject to arrival and departure. They are impermanent. Oh Arjuna! Endure them. (2:14)

May you learn to tolerate them and you can do so only when you understand that the nature of the world and the events is *mithyātvam*. What is *mithyātvam*? The four points: existence of the world is to be negated. The origination of the world is to be negated. Appearance of the world is to be accepted. The appearance is due to *mūlā-avidyā* or *māyā*.

Verse 31

आदावन्ते च यन्नास्ति वर्तमानेऽपि तत्तथा ।

वितथैः सदृशाः सन्तोऽवितथा इव लक्षिताः ॥ ३१ ॥

ādāvante ca yannāsti vartamāne'pi tattathā ।

vitathaiḥ sadṛśāḥ santo'vitathā iva lakṣitāḥ ॥ 31॥

That which does not exist in the beginning and in the end is so in the middle also. (Even though) they are identical with unreal objects, they are regarded as though real. (31)

To establish the *mithyātvam* of the universe we should remember all these four features of the universe. The four features put together are *mithyā*. Of these four features, different *ācāryas* emphasize different features. The *mithyātvam* of the world can be defined by emphasizing any one of these features. Gauḍapāda generally highlights the second feature, which is, the origination of the world is to be negated. Whatever the explanation for creation is, it is falsifiable. Negation of the world is *ajātivāda*. In verses 32 of the second chapter and 48 of the third chapter Gauḍapāda stresses that nothing is born and the world is not born. Śaṅkarācārya, in all the other Upaniṣads, does not stress the second feature because it is too difficult to accept especially when one experiences the world all the time. It is not that Śaṅkarācārya is against the second feature, he also accepts the second feature, but does not highlight the second feature. He emphasizes the third feature, which is that the appearance of the world has to be accepted. This is called *adhyāsa vāda* or *mithyājāti vāda*. Śaṅkarācārya does not say that the world is not born. The world appears and its appearance has ETU, it is experienced, transactions take place in it and it is very useful. Even though it has ETU, it is *mithyā* only. ETU does not prove reality because ETU is possible for the appearing world. How can the world be only an appearance but has ETU? Gauḍapāda's answer was given in the second chapter. The appearance can have ETU just like the dream world. Thus Gauḍapāda himself comes to *adhyāsa vāda* here if *ajātivāda* is too difficult to accept. He already discussed *adhyāsa vāda* in the second chapter. He restates several verses from the second chapter in verses 32 to 35 in this chapter. Instead of saying that the world has no origination he says that it has an appearance. During its appearance, it will be real but conditionally real. A summary of the verses 32 to 35 will be given. Verses 31 to 35 correspond to the second chapter verses 6, 7, 1 (with slight modification), 2 and 2 respectively.

Verses 32 to 35

सप्रयोजनता तेषां स्वप्ने विप्रतिपद्यते ।

तस्मादाद्यन्तवत्त्वेन मिथ्यैव खलु ते स्मृताः ॥ ३२ ॥

saprayojanatā teṣāṃ svapne vipratipadyate ।

tasmādādyantavattvena mithyaiva khalu te smṛtāḥ ॥ 32॥

Their utility is contradicted in dream. Therefore, they are indeed considered to be unreal only, since they have a beginning and an end. (32)

सर्वे धर्मा मृषा स्वप्ने कायस्यान्तर्निदर्शनात् ।

संवृतेऽस्मिन्प्रदेशे वै भूतानां दर्शनं कुतः ॥ ३३ ॥

sarve dharmā smṛṣā svapne kāyasyāntarnidarśanāt ।

saṃvṛte'sminpradeśe vai bhūtānāṃ darśanam kutaḥ ॥ 33॥

All entities in dream are unreal, since they are seen within the body. How can there be the perception of objects within this limited space? (33)

न युक्तं दर्शनं गत्वा कालस्यानियमाद्गतौ ।

प्रतिबुद्धश्च वै सर्वस्तस्मिन्देसे न विद्यते ॥ ३४ ॥

na yuktaṃ darśanam gatvā kālasyānīyamādgatau ।

pratibuddhaśca vai sarvastasmindeśe na vidyate ॥ 34॥

Seeing (the dream entities) after reaching (them) is not possible because of the inconsistency of the duration with regard to travel. Again, after waking up, no one continues to be in that place. (34)

मित्राद्यैः सह संमन्त्य सम्बुद्धो न प्रपद्यते ।

गृहीतं चापि यत्किञ्चित्प्रतिबुद्धो न पश्यति ॥ ३५ ॥

mitrādyaiḥ saha saṃmantrya sambuddho na prapadyate ।

grhītaṃ cāpi yatkiñcitpratibuddho na paśyati ॥ 35॥

After conversing with friends and others (in dream,) the waker does not find (it real.) Again, after waking up, he does not see anything which was received (in dream.) (35)

Gauḍapāda says that the dream world appears to be very real in dream. Nobody believes dream is a dream when one is in dream. For a dreamer dream is not a dream in dream. He looks upon the dream as waking only and takes the dream world as real. Further the dream world appears to be common and

objective that is available to everyone and not a private projection while in dream. But we cannot logically accept the dream world to be real because it all happens in our minds only. After waking up, the dream world is known to be an appearance because sufficient space and time for a real dream world are not present in our minds. Gauḍapāda adds two more points here, which he did not discuss in the second chapter. A dream conversation with a friend cannot be verified with that friend upon waking. Similarly a gift received from someone in the dream will not be present upon waking. Gauḍapāda gives examples such as these so we can meditate upon these features of the dream. Understanding dream is very useful for understanding the *mithyātvam* of this world. Thus the world is only conditionally real just like the dream world. But the dream world should be respected in dream. Vedānta never says that this world should be neglected. Do all your duties properly because the waking world is real in the waking state and so should be given its due regard. At the same time remember that the waking world does not have absolute reality. What about I, the observer? I, the observer, am unlike the waking world. The waking world has conditional reality but I have unconditional absolute reality. I will not be affected by any events that take place. This is capsule 4 of Vedānta. That capsule is that I am never affected by any event that takes place in the material world or the material body-mind complex and I am *asaṅga*. If this is remembered, events in life will not affect one too much. This knowledge is a powerful shock absorber.

MK-56 = Chapter – 4, Verses – 36 to 39

Verse 35

मिन्नाद्यैः सह संमन्त्य सम्बुद्धो न प्रपद्यते ।

गृहीतं चापि यत्किञ्चित्प्रतिबुद्धो न पश्यति ॥ ३५ ॥

In these verses beginning from the 30th verse, Gauḍapādācārya is reminding the dream example which he has already discussed in the second chapter. The dream example is the most important example in Vedānta. To understand *mithyā* the best example we have, is only dream even though there are several examples available. Therefore, Gauḍapāda is connecting all the four features of *mithyā* to the dream also and thus they can be extended to the waking world also. The existence and origination of the *mithyā* world are not facts. The appearance is a fact and the appearance is caused by ignorance, which is called *avidyā* at the individual level or *māyā* at the macrocosmic level. Even though all these features are applicable to dream and can be understood well, the moment we enter the dream world we are not able to accept these facts. For a dreamer the dream is not a dream in dream. He experiences the dream world as waking world only and he never looks at it as his own projection. He looks at the dream world as objectively existing not only for himself but for others also. He will think that even if he dies in dream, the dream world will continue for others. This is the perspective of the dreamer in dream. The objective existence of the dream world is accepted in dream, and the dream world is seen to be not objectively real only when we wake up. Similarly when we look at this world from the waking state angle this world will have objective existence, it will seem to be originating from some cause, it will seem to continue for others even if we are dead and gone. Thus the objective existence of the world is very factual in the waking state. But on deeper enquiry, it cannot be logically established because it is exactly like dream. It is unbelievable but it is the fact. The waking world is like the dream world and both borrow existence from myself who is not *Viśva*, *Taijassa* or *Prājña* but *Turīyam*. After gaining the knowledge of *Turīyam*, live in the waking world accepting it as a fact because the waking world is real in waking state just like in dream state the dream world is real. Give the respect to the world that it deserves without either overestimating or underestimating it. This is called *jīvanmukti*. As he did in the second chapter, Gauḍapāda is equating the dream and the waking worlds by adding a few more important points. Up to the 35th verse it is a repetition of the second chapter.

Verse 36

स्वप्ने चावस्तुकः कायः पृथगन्यस्य दर्शनात् ।

यथा कायस्तथा सर्वं चित्तदृश्यमवस्तुकम् ॥ ३६ ॥

svapne cāvastukaḥ kāyaḥ pṛthaganyasya darśanāt ।

yathā kāyastathā sarvaṃ cittadrśyamavastukam ॥ 36॥

The physical body in dream is unreal because of the experience of another body, distinct (from the dream body.) Just as the body (in dream is unreal,) so also, every object of consciousness is unreal. (36)

When we enter the dream the first thing we do is project a body-mind-sense complex for our own use. With the waking body-mind-sense complex we cannot do any transaction in dream. The dream body that is transacting in dream is different from the waker's body that is resting on the bed. That the dream body is a projected body is known only after waking up. In dream the projection of the dream body will never be accepted. This is the glory of *nidrā-śakti*. The dream body is an object of experience in actuality and so is *mithyā*. Whatever is an object of experience is *mithyā* is the fundamental law in *Māṇḍūkya-kārikā* and *satyaṃ* is whatever is not an object of experience. That is I, the experiencer, am not an object. If this law can be applied with regard to dream, it should be applied to waking also.

Like the dream *śarīram*, everything obtaining in waking state also is an object, including the waking body, mind and the world. All these are objects. First we experience our mind, through the mind we experience our body and through our body we experience the world. The mind is the primary object, the body is the secondary object and the world is the tertiary object. Even though these three are at three different levels what is common to all the three is that they are all objects. **The second line of the 36th verse is an important line of the *Māṇḍūkya-kārikā*. Just like the dream mind, body and the world, everything that is an object of experience is *mithyā*.** It is conditionally real known as *vyāvahārika satyaṃ*. What about God? If God is an object of experience in either waking or dream state (*Saddarśanam*), that God is also conditional reality. God as an object cannot be the ultimate truth as is given in *Kena Upaniṣad: nedam yadidamupāsate – the object of upāsana cannot be the ultimate reality*. When God is recognized as *ātmā*, the *Turīyam*, God is real, *śāntaṃ śivam advaitaṃ caturthaṃ manyante*.

Verse 37

ग्रहणाज्जागरितवत्तद्धेतुः स्वप्न इष्यते ।

तद्धेतुत्वात् तस्यैव सज्जागरितमिष्यते ॥ ३७ ॥

grahaṇāj्jāgaritavattaddhetuḥ svapna iṣyate ।

taddhetutvāttu tasyaiva sajjāgaritamīṣyate ॥ 37॥

Dream is considered to be caused by the waking-state, since (dream) is experienced like the waking-state. However, the waking-state is considered to be real for that (dreamer) alone, since it is the cause of dream. (37)

The waking world is *mithyā* just like the dream world for another reason also. It is easy to accept that the dream is conditionally real. Generally we consider that the waking world is the cause for the experience

of the dream world. The experiences in both worlds are similar. This leads to the judgment that waking is *kāraṇam* for dream.

Since the dream world is experienced very much like the waking world, generally the dream is considered to be the product of the waking world. If that is so, from that, a principle can be extended. Since the waking world is the cause for the dream world, both should have similar nature, as effect and cause have similar nature. The dream world is real in dream for the dream experiencer. Similarly the waking world is real for the waking observer in waking. Thus waking reality must be similar to that of the dream world. Both require the appropriate conditions for their reality. Further the dreamer does not call his experience dream. Even the words waking and dream are not applicable because they are relative. In a particular state the world obtained is real for the particular observer in that state. Thus both waking and dream are on par in all respects.

Verse 38

उत्पादस्याप्रसिद्धत्वादजं सर्वमुदाहृतम् ।

न च भूतादभूतस्य सम्भवोऽस्ति कथञ्चन ॥ ३८ ॥

utpādasyāprasiddhatvādajam sarvamudāhṛtam ।

na ca bhūtādbhūtasya sambhavo'sti kathañcana ॥ 38॥

Since birth is not established, everything is said to be unborn (Brahman.) Again, birth of a non-existent entity out of an existent entity does not take place anyhow. (38)

Gauḍapāda understands the difficulty of the students in understanding this toughest topic of *advaitam*. *Brahma satyaṃ* can be very easily accepted but *jagat mithyātvam* is difficult to grasp. A relevant question comes up. How can waking and dream be equated? The waking world exists independent of us but the dream world exists depending on us. The dream world is subjective projection but the waking world seems to have an independent existence. On what basis can the two worlds be equated? When I go to sleep and enter the dream, I leave the waking world. The same waking world is experienced when I wake up. The waking world seems to exist independent of me, whether I am awake, sleeping, observing or not observing. Therefore the waking world must have originated from some other cause and so I cannot claim that I am lending existence to the world. The world is really present independent of me and has been originated by a cause other than me. This is the doubt that will repeatedly arise. Gauḍapāda gave one answer earlier and here he gives a different answer. The earlier answer is that the same argument is given in the case of the dream also. Dream is accepted as a projection only in the waking state and never accepted as projection in the dream state. Similarly this world is an objective world as long as it is looked at from the *Viśva's* perspective. But if looked at from the *Turīyam* angle, the waking world will not remain objective.

Here Gauḍapāda gives a different answer. Assuming that the waking world is not my projection and that it has an independent existence of its own, then there must be a cause for the world. It was asked earlier as to what that cause was. This was analyzed from the standpoint of various theories of creation such as *sat-kārya-vāda* of *Sāṃkhya-Yoga*, *asat-kārya-vāda* of *Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika*, *karma-kārya-vāda* of a *vaidika* and Buddhist theories. The analysis showed that the creation of the world can never be logically established and so the objective existence of the world is not a viable fact.

Since a creation is not logically established by any theory of creation as discussed from verse 6 to 28 in this chapter, it cannot be argued that there is an objective created world. This teaching is based on the *Upaniṣads*. *Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad* declares:

All this in front is the immortal Brahman alone. Brahman alone is behind. Brahman alone is on the right as well as on the left. Brahman spreads out below and above also. This world is this exalted Brahman alone. (2.2.12)

What an ignorant person calls the world is, in the vision of the scriptures and the wise person, is nothing but Brahman only. World is only a word and there is nothing but Brahman. Intellect always asks for cause and Gauḍapāda is demolishing the idea of causation and causality. There is neither cause nor effect. There is only Brahman, which is neither the effect of something nor a cause for something as said in *Kaṭha Upaniṣad*:

This omniscient one does not originate or die. It did not originate from anything. It did not (become) anything. It is unborn, deathless, decay-less, and growth-less. It is not afflicted when the body is affected. (1.2.18)

Brahman did not come from anywhere nor anything came out of Brahman also. Brahman was, is and ever will be. In between if the world is seen it is because of solid ignorance alone. A non-existent world that is only an appearance cannot originate from Brahman. Neither the dream world nor the waking world has originated.

Verse 39

असज्जागरिते दृष्ट्वा स्वप्ने पश्यति तन्मयः ।

असत्स्वप्नेऽपि दृष्ट्वा च प्रतिबुद्धो न पश्यति ॥ ३९ ॥

asajjāgarite dṛṣṭvā svapne paśyati tanmayah ।

asatsvapne'pi dṛṣṭvā ca pratibuddho na paśyati ॥ 39॥

Seeing the unreal (world) in the waking-state (and) being impressed (by that,) one sees (the same) in dream. Seeing the unreal (world) in dream also, one does not find (it) after waking up. (39)

In one of the previous verses, verse 37, Gauḍapāda said that it is widely held that the waking world is the cause of the dream world because the experiences are similar in both the worlds. By saying this Gauḍapāda indicates that he does not accept that conclusion. He clarifies that in this verse. He says that there is no *kārya-kāraṇa* relationship between the dream and the waking worlds. Waking *deśa-kāla* and dream *deśa-kāla* are different. Objects are different in both the worlds. A relationship is possible between two things or persons existing in the same state. Waking and dream have different realms of time and space and so there cannot be a cause-effect relationship between them. Why is there a similarity between the two? It is not because there is a cause-effect relationship between them. Waking experiences are registered in my mind as *vāsanās*. When I go to dream, that *vāsanā* projects a *mithyā* object and I lend existence to that object. In the waking state, we experience the *mithyā* waking world and we register that in our *cittam* as memory or *vāsanā*. In dream, soaked in the *vāsanās* of the waking world, the dreamer sees another *mithyā* universe in dream also. The waker records the waking *mithyā* and projects the dream *mithyā*. When I wake up from the dream after experiencing the *mithyā* world in the dream, the dream *mithyā* world is dissolved. Then the waking *mithyā* world is experienced and this will continue until one wakes up to the Brahman knowledge. Waking up from dream falsifies the dream and the dream disappears. Waking up to Brahman knowledge falsifies the waking world but it will not disappear. This is *jīvanmukti*.

MK-57 = Chapter – 4, Verses – 39 to 42

Verse 39

असज्जागरिते दृष्ट्वा स्वप्ने पश्यति तन्मयः ।

असत्त्वप्नेऽपि दृष्ट्वा च प्रतिबुद्धो न पश्यति ॥ ३९ ॥

Gauḍapādācārya is establishing his *ajātivāda* that a real creation has never originated from Brahman and that the creation is only an appearance and experience. To understand this aspect of the creation, the only example that we have, is the dream example. With regard to the dream also we find the same condition. The existence and origination of the dream world are not acceptable and the appearance and experience of the dream are acceptable. Both are due to *nidrā-śakti* otherwise called ignorance. This is the thesis of Gauḍapādācārya throughout *Māṇḍūkya-kārikā*. This is not a mere intellectual debate or a philosophical discussion because the consequences of this thesis are very important. It is important to understand why Gauḍapāda is so insistent. Once you accept the origination of the world, then you have to accept the world as *jagat*, your own existence as an individual *jīva* and that the creator of both is the *Īśvara*. Thus the moment we accept a creation we have inadvertently landed in the triangular format, which leads to God-dependence in handling problems in worldly transactions. However facing problems in experiences of life is due to *karma* and not God. God does not have control over our *karma* but only manages our *karmaphalam*. In the triangular format, *karma* is the controlling factor that governs our experiences and God's role is the giver of results of our *karma*. Our total accumulated *karma* cannot be exhausted that easily even in several births. Thus remaining in the triangular format does not solve the fundamental problem of life. Acceptance of a *śr̥ṣṭi* is falling into the trap of the triangular format. So we have to question the very *śr̥ṣṭi* itself. Then alone we can go from the triangular format to the binary format. Both the dream and the waking worlds are not created ones because there is no cause for creation. Both are *mithyā* appearances only. Once you know that both are only *mithyā*, the question of *adhiṣṭhānam* for both is raised. That *adhiṣṭhānam* cannot be any one of the objects in the waking and the dream worlds. That *adhiṣṭhānam* is outside both the worlds and that is the witness of the appearance of both the worlds, which is 'I' the *ātmā*. If it is difficult to understand and accept this, one should continue in triangular format until the mind is ready for assimilation of this teaching. Without this assimilation there is no lasting solution for *samsāra*. Even if assimilation is not possible now, it is worth noting that such a teaching exists. One can always come to this at a later time.

In this verse, Gauḍapāda says that the waking world does not produce the dream world. Because of their similarities, the waking and the dream worlds seem to have cause-effect relationship. Both are separate projections in the respective world.

Verse 40

नास्त्यसद्धेतुकमसत्सदसद्धेतुकं तथा ।

सच्च सद्धेतुकं नास्ति सद्धेतुकमसत्कुतः ॥ ४० ॥

nāstyasaddhetukamasatsadasaddhetukaṃ tathā ।

sacca saddhetukaṃ nāsti saddhetukamasatkutaḥ ॥ 40॥

A non-existent (effect) from a non-existent cause is not possible. Similarly, an existent (effect) from a non-existent cause (is not possible.) Moreover, an existent (effect) from an existent cause is not possible. How can there be a non-existent (effect) from an existent cause? (40)

This verse is similar to verse 22. The essence of this verse is that the *sat-kārya-vāda* and *asat-kārya-vāda* will never explain the creation. An existent thing cannot originate because it is already existent. A non-existent thing cannot originate because it is non-existent. Therefore neither an existent thing nor a non-existing thing can originate either from an existing thing or a non-existing thing. A non-existing thing is not born out of a non-existent thing. A non-existent thing is not born out of an existent thing. An existing thing is not born out of an existing thing. An existing thing is not born out of a non-existent thing. Thus the very word ‘creation’ is illogical. Humanity uses this word without thinking and by doing that it traps itself. How do you say that nothing is created? Certainly there is a creation of pot from clay. Certainly there is creation of ornaments out of gold. When we are experiencing so many such creations, how do you swear so confidently that creation is a misnomer? Should you not take into account our practical experience? Śāṅkarācārya himself raises this question. He answers that the creation of a pot from clay is also a misnomer. When it is said that pot is created from clay, the potter does not create anything. He is only shaping the already existent clay from its lump form into another defined form. The substance remaining the same, a new name has been given to the changed shape of the clay. Clay and pot are two names in the past and the present respectively and not two substances. There is no substance called pot separate from clay created by a potter. We have two words but only one substance. Because there are two words, we make the mistake of thinking that there are two substances. Not only that, but we also create a relationship between the two as cause-effect. Śāṅkara and Gauḍapāda say that ‘two substances’ are imagination and the relationship between the two is also imagination. Once you know that there was clay, there is clay and there will be only clay and thus there is only one thing, relationship is meaningless because the relationship requires two things. In *advaita*, relationship is not possible. To say that pot is born out of clay is *māyā*’s delusion. Exactly like clay, previously Brahman was there, now also there is Brahman. The present Brahman has been renamed world and we think that Brahman and world are two things. Assuming duality, we talk about cause-effect relationship. There is no such thing as world but it is only name and form. What Vedānta says is that we can use names for communication. Different ornaments have to be given different names for transaction even though we know that all the ornaments are nothing but gold. Similarly, *jīva*, *jagat* and *Īśvara* are three different names and not three different substances but is only one Brahman with the appearance of three different *nāma* and *rūpa*.

Sattva-pradhāna nāma-rūpa is *Īśvara*, *rajas-pradhāna nāma-rūpa* is *jīva* and *tama-pradhāna nāma-rūpa* is *jagat*. Three different names, but only one substance and that substance is called *Turīyam* and that *Turīyam* is ‘I’ myself. Until I come to this, life will be a meaningless, burdensome and boring struggle. If life should be inspiring all the time, I should see all the variety as my own glory only.

Verse 41

विपर्यासाद्यथा जाग्रदचिन्त्यान्भूतवत्स्पृशेत् ।

तथा स्वप्ने विपर्यासात् धर्मास्तत्रैव पश्यति ॥ ४१ ॥

viparyāsādyathā jāgradacintyānbhūtavatsprśet ।

tathā svapne viparyāsāt dharmāstatraiva paśyati ॥ 41॥

Just as, in the waking state, one contacts unreal (objects) as though real due to error, in the same way, in dream, one sees (unreal) objects belonging to the dream alone (as though real) due to error. (41)

Gauḍapāda pointed out that the *mithyā vastu* appears and is experienced because of ignorance of the *mithyā* waking world and the *mithyā* dream world. *Mithyā* is understood as *mithyā* only in the wake of knowledge. During the time of ignorance, *mithyā* will appear as *satyaṃ* only. *Mithyā* will never be appreciated as *mithyā* as long as ignorance continues. Only when ignorance goes, it will be *satyaṃ* and until then, *mithyā* is a serious problem because it is taken to be *satyaṃ*. The rope-snake is taken seriously until it is known to be only rope. A person who imagines that he may have a terminal disease suffers until it is shown that he does not have the disease. Thus an apparent thing can cause stress and fear. Because the world creates real *samsāra*, the world cannot be considered *satyaṃ*.

Gauḍapāda gives an example. In the waking state, because of a misperception, a person experiences false entities, rope-snake, shell-silver, mirage water, etc., as though they are real. *Samsāra* is solidly real for those who have not assimilated the teaching. Similarly the dream is real in dream when the dreamer experiences various things in dream.

Verse 42

उपलम्भात्समाचारादस्तिवस्तुत्ववादिनाम् ।

जातिस्तु देशिता बुद्धैः अजातेस्त्रसतां सदा ॥ ४२ ॥

upalambhātsamācārādastivastutvavādinām ।

jātistu deśitā buddhaiḥ ajātestrasatām sadā ॥ 42॥

Creation is taught by the wise for those who are ever afraid of the unborn (Reality,) and who assert the reality (of the creation) because of (its) experience and orderly behavior. (42)

Here Gauḍapāda says that assimilating this *ajātivāda*, *advaitavāda* and *jaganmithyātva-vāda* is extremely difficult according to the Vedas even though the final teaching of the Vedas is *ajātivāda* only. The Upaniṣads clearly declare that other than Brahman, there is nothing. In *Kaṭhōpaniṣad* it is said that there is no pluralistic universe at all. In *Kaivalya Upaniṣad*, it is said that the five elements are really not born. If all these are not there what is there? *Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad* says that what you call the world is nothing but Brahman only. Thus the final teaching of the Upaniṣad is *ajātivāda*, *advaitavāda*, and *jaganmithyātva-vāda*, but the Upaniṣads know that many people cannot assimilate this because of two powerful obstacles that are very difficult to get over.

The world has ETU. The world is experienced, available for transactions and has utility for our various needs. Human beings consider that whatever has ETU must be real. This is the intellectual conclusion of humanity. Whatever is clearly experienced, can be transacted and has utility, has to be *satyaṃ*. Vedānta challenges this conclusion by quoting the dream example, which has all the same features. Dream is only conditionally real and is not absolutely real. Our intellectual conclusion that whatever has ETU must be *satyaṃ* is the first obstacle to accept the teaching of *ajātivāda*. Gauḍapāda uses two words, *upalambha*, (can be experienced) and *samācāra*, (can be transacted and useful) for ETU.

The second and more powerful obstacle: Because of our self-ignorance we have concluded that we are individual *jīvātmas*. This self-ignorance is without a beginning. In dream we conclude that we are dream individuals in the vast dream universe. Similarly from birth we have concluded that we are finite individual *jīvātmas*. This finitude gives a sense of limitation and incompleteness, which creates physical and emotional dependence on the external world and relationships for peace, security and happiness. Because of self-ignorance we need several crutches, supports. So we have concluded that we need the *dvaita* world and when that world support is lacking at times we turn towards *Īśvara* for support. When Vedānta gives this teaching of *Advaita*, the human mind that needs all this support because of ignorance will naturally reject the teaching. So *advaitam* becomes a cause of fear because all the crutches are taken away by the *advaita* teaching. The second obstacle to *advaita jñānaṃ* is the fear of losing the supports. So Veda keeps the *advaita* teaching at bay for sometime. It is not introduced straightaway. Vedānta prepares the mind and then removes the two-fold walker, world and *Īśvara*. Our journey is from world-dependence to God-dependence to Self-dependence. Self-dependence is independence. Independence is *mokṣa*.

MK-58 = Chapter – 4, Verses – 42 to 46

Verse 42

उपलम्भात्समाचारादस्तिवस्तुत्ववादिनाम् ।

जातिस्तु देशिता बुद्धेः अजातेस्त्रसतां सदा ॥ ४२ ॥

Gauḍapādācārya presented the ultimate teaching of Vedānta, Upaniṣads, namely *ajātivāda* otherwise called *advaitavāda*, *jaganmithyātva-vāda* or *ātma-adhiṣṭhānatva-vāda*. *Ajātivāda* means that nothing is born out of Brahman. Brahman alone was, is and will be there. Nothing has originated. *Ajāti* means non-origination or non-creation. *Ajātivāda* is called *advaitavāda* since no second thing is born out of Brahman. Brahman continues to be non-dual without a second thing. Thus *ajātivāda* is also known as *advaitavāda*. It is also known as *jaganmithyātva-vāda* because we accept the experience of duality but we should not count it as a second thing and so duality is non-countable; hence the name *jagan mithyātva-vāda*. *Jagat* means duality and *mithyā* means non-countable. The same thing is known by a fourth name, which I am introducing now. If the entire *jagat* is considered as *mithyā* it requires a *satyaadhiṣṭhānam*. Without *adhiṣṭhānam*, support or a base, *mithyā* cannot appear and the support for the entire *mithyā* world is *ātmā*, myself. Therefore, it is called *ātma-adhiṣṭhānatva-vāda*. All the four names are synonymous and they convey the same thing: *brahma satyaṃ jagan mithyā jīvobrahmaiva nā para*. This statement is presented as four types of *vāda*. Gauḍapāda presented this as the ultimate teaching of the Upaniṣads and that everyone has to come to this teaching sooner or later. We can postpone this teaching but we can never avoid this teaching because this teaching alone give freedom from *saṃsāra*. *Puruṣasūkta* says: *One who knows Him thus becomes immortal (even) here. There is no other path for liberation than this.* If you consider this very difficult you prepare yourself so this teaching becomes easy. One has to come to this teaching because it is the only liberating teaching. Gauḍapāda admits that this teaching is difficult to understand and accept. There are two powerful obstacles. They are:

1. This world has ETU. When the scriptures say that this world is *mithyā* and does not have an existence of its own, we find it hard to accept that because of a fundamental misconception we have. We have concluded that whatever is experienced, available for transaction and useful must be real, *satyaṃ*. This is ingrained in our sub-conscious mind. Vedānta challenges this by saying that whatever has ETU does not have to be real. This is explained by the dream example. The dream also has ETU but we do not accept dream as *satyaṃ*. We know the dream is *mithyā*. ETU is not a sufficient condition for reality. The counter question is how can dream be equated to waking. For that Gauḍapāda says that the dream example is really another waking example. When one is in dream the dream is not looked at as dream. For the dreamer in dream the dream is a waking state. We have two waking states. Both the dream and waking states have ETU and are *mithyā*. Vedānta challenges our conclusion and is asking us to train ourselves to see the waking world as exactly similar to the dream world. Respect it in the waking state and respect the dream in the dream state

but never take both as absolutely real. In spite of all these explanations, a majority of the people will not accept this teaching. Gauḍapāda says that Veda itself recognizes this difficulty.

2. *Advaitam* is scary. In *dvaitam* we are comfortable. We need objects for material security and close relationships for emotional support. God dependence is also available in *dvaitam*. In *advaitam* all support systems are lost. Gauḍapāda answers that we only think that we need all these support systems due to our ignorance. But with this teaching, the support systems will go but they will not be missed. In fact it will become clear that we are the support for the entire cosmos. This is stated in the *Kaivalya Upaniṣad*:

Everything is born in me alone; everything is based on me alone; everything resolves into me alone. I am that non-dual Brahman. (19)

In spite of this assurance, most do not have confidence in this teaching. To such diffident people *advaita* teaching should not be given. Veda keeps *advaita* teaching for later. So Veda accepts *dvaitam* as a fact temporarily. In the *veda-pūrva bhaga*, *advaita* is not introduced at all. Veda talks about a *Bhagavān* in a remote place that created this world. Thus Veda accepts *Bhagavān*, creation, world, people, and duality and says that you get security with all these things. Does Veda accept *dvaitam*? Veda accepts *dvaitam*, *Īśvara*, security, etc., temporarily even though it is compromising with the fact. Veda deliberately compromises with the fact and it is a deliberate *doṣa*, called *jāti doṣa*. This is compromising with the truth by temporarily accepting the creation. It is not a fact but this temporary acceptance is called *adhyāropa*. The benefit of accepting *dvaitam* temporarily is that Veda can prescribe *karma-yoga* and *upāsana-yoga* as spiritual *sādhana* for mental preparation. The disadvantage of this is that *saṃsāra* will continue for some more time. Thus Veda accepts *dvaitam* to enable people to do *sādhana* for preparation for *jñāna-yoga*.

For those people who argue that *jagat* is *satyaṃ* because of ETU and are scared of *advaitam*, Vedas accept creation provisionally as a deliberate compromise with the truth.

Verse 43

अजातेस्त्रसतां तेषामुपलम्भाद्वियन्ति ये ।

जातिदोषा न सेत्स्यन्ति दोषोऽप्यल्पो भविष्यति ॥ ४३ ॥

ajāteśtrasatāṃ teṣāmupalambhādvīyanti ye ।

jātidoṣā na setsyanti doṣo'pyalpo bhaviṣyati ॥ 43॥

The disadvantages of (accepting) creation will not affect those who are afraid of the unborn (Reality,) and who disagree (with the idea of birthlessness) due to the experience (of a creation.) The disadvantage, if any, will be insignificant. (43)

When Veda is compromising with the truth and introducing *dvaitam* as *adhyāropa*, will it not create problem for the student? Veda seems to mislead the student from *advaitam* to *dvaitam*. For people who suffer from the two obstacles mentioned in the previous verse, this compromise will not pose any serious problem. There will be the problem of *saṃsāra* continuing. *Karma-yogi* is a *saṃsāri* and so is an *upāsana-yogi*. However, following *karma-yoga* and *upāsana-yoga* a person will become ready for the final teaching of *advaita*. Kṛṣṇa refers to this in the *Bhagavad Gita*:

In this way you will be released from the bondage of karma, which is in the form of desirable and undesirable results. Being one whose mind is endowed with renunciation and karma-yoga, you will come to Me liberated. (9:28)

Even though *saṃsāra* is perpetuated, the seeker will be ready sooner or later to understand this *ajātivāda*.

Verse 44

उपलम्भात्समाचारान्मायाहस्ती यथोच्यते ।

उपलम्भात्समाचारादस्ति वस्तु तथोच्यते ॥ ४४ ॥

upalambhātsamācārānmāyāhastī yathocyate ।

upalambhātsamācārādasti vastu tathocyate ॥ 44॥

Just as an illusory elephant is said (to be non-existent) because of (its) experience and orderly behavior, so also, an object is said to be existent of (its) experience and orderly behavior. (44)

Ultimately after accepting *dvaitam* as *satyaṃ* for sometime, and practicing *karma-yoga* and *upāsana-yoga* for sometime, we have to come to *advaitam* and see the *dvaitam* as similar to the dream world. Gauḍapāda here gives a different example of a magic show conducted by a magician. The events displayed in the magic show are experienced and have utility but they are not real. *Bhagavān* gives a fantastic magic show in the form of creation and everything in it. We are part of it. Enjoy the show but do not ascribe absolute reality to it. In *Dakṣiṇāmūrtistotram*, Śaṅkarācārya says:

To Him, who, like a magician or even like a great Yogin, displays, by his own will, this universe which at the beginning is undifferentiated like the sprout in the seed, but which is made again differentiated under the varied conditions of space and time posited by māyā; to Him, of the preceptor, the blessed Dakshinamurthi, may this obeisance be (2)

A magician's elephant, because it is experienced, transacted, and useful is taken as really there. In the same way, Brahman or *Bhagavān*, the greatest magician, has the magical skill called *māyā*, with which he makes this creation appear and people take it as real because of ETU.

Verse 45

जात्याभासं चलाभासं वस्त्वाभासं तथैव च ।

अजाचलमवस्तुत्वं विज्ञानं शान्तमद्वयम् ॥ ४५ ॥

jātyābhāsaṃ calābhāsaṃ vastvābhāsaṃ tathaiva ca ।

ajācalamavastutvaṃ vijñānaṃ śāntamadvayam ॥ 45॥

The appearance of birth, the appearance of motion, and the appearance of object are (all nothing but) consciousness which is unborn, motionless, non-material, tranquil, and non-dual. (45)

Therefore Gauḍapāda says that the entire creation is a magic show conducted by Brahman with his *māyā-śakti*. Brahman with *māyā* is called *Īśvara*. The dream world is *jīva*'s magic show. The waking world is *Īśvara*'s magic show. Being a magic show all the happenings are intense experiences. But when probed they will disappear. Quantum Mechanics reduces tangible matter to intangible energy. Because of very high-speed vibrations, the intangible, invisible energy appears as tangible visible matter. Vedānta says that even energy is nothing but the consciousness principle. All objects, their origination and their movements are nothing but intense motion in Brahman. Therefore all these are nothing but one consciousness. The motion is only a seeming motion caused by *māyā*. Brahman cannot have any motion because it is all pervading. Motionless, non-dual, consciousness called Brahman alone appears as objects, their origination and movements. All these are experiences and not factual. What is the nature of Brahman? It is free from birth, motion and all the objects.

Verse 46

एवं न जायते चित्तमेवन्धर्मा अजाः स्मृताः ।

एवमेव विजानन्तो न पतन्ति विपर्यते ॥ ४६ ॥

evaṃ na jāyate cittamevandharmā ajāḥ smṛtāḥ ।

evameva vijānanto na patanti viparyate ॥ 46॥

Thus, consciousness is not born and thus, jīvas are considered to be unborn. Only those who know thus do not fall into misfortune. (46)

Therefore one should conclude that there is no duality, origination and movement. In that duality the most important one is I myself. Without me this dualistic universe cannot exist. Therefore this *jīvātma* is the most important. So the status of this *jīvātma* must be clearly understood. If that status is not understood there will be problems. If the *jīvātma* is considered to be born, you will get into the problems of origination, duality and movement. This leads to *saṃsāra*. One has to come out of the notion of an individual *jīva* and claim one's true nature that is Brahman. Only then one can relax in life.

MK-59 = Chapter – 4, Verses – 46 to 52

Verse 46

एवं न जायते चित्तमेवन्धर्मा अजाः स्मृताः ।

एवमेव विजानन्तो न पतन्ति विपर्यते ॥ ४६ ॥

Gauḍapādācārya pointed out that there are two powerful obstacles for gaining this *advaita jñānam*. That is why the scriptures do not introduce *advaitam* in the beginning. In the *Veda-pūrva bhaga*, the scriptures talk about *dvaitam*. Just as a mother uses the language of the child for communication with the child, the Veda uses the language of *dvaitam* in the beginning of the teaching. Using the *dvaitam* temporarily, the Vedas introduce *karma-yoga* and *upāsana-yoga* to strengthen our minds and make us mature so that these two powerful obstacles can be avoided.

The two obstacles are: 1. We conclude that the world is *satyaṃ* based on the idea that the world has got ETU. The world is experienced, allows for transaction and has utility. Thus taking the world to be real is a very powerful obstacle. Based on the dream example and learning to look at the dream from the viewpoint of the dream individual, it is seen that even though the dream has ETU, it is not real. It is conditionally real and therefore has temporary reality. By repeatedly dwelling upon the dream we have to realize that the world is also very similar to dream. This assimilation is very important for getting out of the first obstacle. 2. The second obstacle is more powerful and it is emotion-centered. We want to hold on to *dvaitam* for support. For emotional and moral support we want to hold on to certain things and people. Our comfort is based on the assumption that certain people are around us. This is similar to the baby playing happily when the mother is somewhere around. We want emotional support in the form of worldly relationships and religious relationships, which is the sacred relationship with an external God. Thus *dvaitam* seems to give us support and so we have strong attachment to the *dvaitam*. Religious attachment is often more powerful than even worldly attachment. Gauḍapāda is knocking off all kinds of duality both secular and sacred through his powerful logic. The logic may be intellectually convincing but emotionally it is very difficult to give up the attachments. Thus *advaitam* is frightening. In many religions, *mokṣa* is presented in dualistic terms in which the God-devotee duality is maintained, i.e., *mokṣa* is a condition in which the devotee lives with God happily for a long time. Considering that Gauḍapāda negates this also, some people call him an atheistic Buddhist in Vedānta disguise. When the fear of *advaitam* comes, how should it be handled? Spiritual progress is world-dependence to God-dependence and finally to Self-dependence. Self-dependence means that self has been transformed. It does not refer to *jīvātma* because *jīvātma* is undependable. When one comes to Self-dependence, the self is understood to be not the *jīvātma* but the *ātmā*. When I have woken up to the waker's true nature which is *paramātma*, *advaitam* is no more fearful but *ānanda*. I do not need any support but I am the support of all. Until the conviction comes, one should continue to depend on God. But once in a while I should try to come out of that dependence. Otherwise one will be always in the triangular format. One should come

out of the second obstacle by understanding that one can stand upon one's own emotional feet. In the *Bhagavad Gita*, Kṛṣṇa describes that state:

When a person gives up all the desires, as they appear in the mind, happy in oneself with oneself alone, Arjuna! that person is said to be one of ascertained knowledge. (2:55)

The world does not have origination or existence but it is only an appearance in me and I am the *adhiṣṭhānam* of the waker's world just like I am the *adhiṣṭhānam* of the dream world. With the *nidrā-śakti*, I support the dream world and with the *māyā-śakti*, I support the waking world.

In this manner, all the *jīvātmas* are really not *jīvātmas* with a date of birth and a date of death. We have to break the limiting shackles. The *jīvātmas* are unborn but eternal and they are of the nature of consciousness. The body is an appearance caused by *māyā*. Only if you know this, you can be out of *saṃsāra*. By knowing in this manner only, a *jñāni* avoids *saṃsāra*. Having the notion that one is born out of God or part of God leads to *saṃsāra*. Knowing that one is identical with God, '*aham brahmāsmi*' alone will get a person out of *saṃsāra*.

From the next verse onwards, Gauḍapāda talks about the famous example of *alāta*. This discussion is from verse 47 to verse 52.

Verses 47 and 48

ऋजुवक्रादिकाभासमलातस्पन्दितं यथा ।

ग्रहणग्राहकाभासं विज्ञानस्पन्दितं तथा ॥ ४७ ॥

rjuvakraḍikābhāsamalātaspaṇḍitaṃ yathā ।

grahaṇagrāhakabhāsaṃ vijñānaspanditaṃ tathā ॥ 47॥

Just as the appearance of straight and curved patterns is the motion of the firebrand, so also, the appearance of the perceiver and the perceived is the (apparent) motion of consciousness (47)

अस्पन्दमानमलातमनाभासमजं यथा ।

अस्पन्दमानं विज्ञानमनाभासमजं तथा ॥ ४८ ॥

aspaṇḍamaṇamalātamanabhāsamajaṃ yathā ।

aspaṇḍamaṇaṃ vijñānamanaḅbhāsamajaṃ tathā ॥ 48॥

Just as the motionless firebrand is free from appearances and is unborn, so also, the motionless consciousness is free from appearances and is unborn. (48)

The word ‘*alātaṃ*’ means a torch with a handle and flame on one end. For the sake of explanation, let us take the example of an incense stick or a firebrand, which is a stick with a flame tip on one end.

Gauḍapāda reveals *advaitam* through this example. Imagine a dark room and you are in the room with an incense stick. The glowing tip represents Brahman, which is one, and the surrounding darkness is the *māyā tattvam*. Suppose you start moving the firebrand. Even though it is one glowing tip, as it moves, different patterns will appear in the dark room depending upon the type of movement. Gauḍapāda calls this movement of the *alātaṃ*, *alāta spandanam*. The patterns are *dvaitam* because several patterns appear and disappear. Thus we have *advaita alātaṃ* and *dvaita ābhāsa*, appearances or patterns. *Advaita alātaṃ* and *dvaita ābhāsa* are caused by *alāta spandanam*. *Alātaṃ*, *spandanam*, *dvaitam*; firebrand, motion, patterns are the two sets of key words here. *Alātaṃ* is compared to *paramātma* and the patterns are compared to the entire cosmos. When *alātaṃ* is stationary there are no patterns. When *alātaṃ* is in motion, the patterns appear. So by *anvaya-vyatireka* logic, motion is the cause of the appearance of patterns. Motion belongs to the *alātaṃ*. So *alātaṃ* in motion alone appears as several patterns.

Gauḍapāda says that consciousness in the dark room called *māyā* has got different violent motions as it were in the form of thoughts. In the waking and dream states, consciousness seems to move and multiply because of thoughts resulting in experiences like I am conscious of wall, etc. Thus one consciousness seems to become many. This plurality of experience is available in the waking state and the dream state, but in the deep sleep state, when the mind and the thoughts subside, consciousness alone is present without any change of thoughts or motion. In that condition, there is no plurality experienced, and there is only *advaitam*. Consciousness in motion gives rise to *dvaita anubhava* and consciousness at rest is *advaitam*. In the waking and the dream states, consciousness is in motion but in the deep sleep state, consciousness is at rest. Thus consciousness in motion appears as the world patterns. This is the *anvaya-vyatireka* logic. In the 47th verse, *anvaya* is given, and in the 48th verse the *vyatireka* is given.

The *anvaya* in the 47th verse is as follows. The appearance of straight and curved patterns is due to the motion of the firebrand. One consciousness itself gets divided into subject-object duality. Just like one waker gets divided into the perceiver-perceived duality in dream, one *ātmā* seemingly gets divided into subject and object because of the seeming motion of consciousness. It is unbelievable. Quantum mechanics states that all objects in the world are not solidly tangible substances but only intangible energy in motion. Vedānta goes one step further and says that consciousness in motion is the world.

The *vyatireka* is in the 48th verse. When the firebrand is at rest all the patterns experienced totally disappear. The firebrand remains the same without either being *kāryam* or *kāraṇam*. Similarly in deep sleep state the world disappears and consciousness alone is present without any motion. The sleeping person cannot say in sleep that other people who are awake, are experiencing the world, because in sleep he cannot know that others are even present. Even if there are people experiencing the world while someone is sleeping, it is because consciousness is in motion in the experiencing people’s waking

condition. If all living beings are at rest in sleep, who can talk about an existing world? The motionless consciousness is free from any appearances and is unborn.

Verses 49 – 52

अलाते स्पन्दमाने वै नाऽऽभासा अन्यतोभुवः ।

न ततोऽन्यत्र निस्पन्दान्नालातं प्रविशन्ति ते ॥ ४९ ॥

alāte spandamāne vai nā''bhāsā anyatobhuvah ।

na tato'nyatra nisvandānnālātaṃ praviśanti te ॥ 49॥

When the firebrand is in motion, appearances do not come from elsewhere; nor (do they go) apart from that motionless (firebrand;) nor do they enter the firebrand. (49)

न निर्गता अलातास्ते द्रव्यत्वाभावयोगतः ।

विज्ञानेऽपि तथैव स्युराभासस्याविशेशतः ॥ ५० ॥

na nirgatā alātāste dravyatvābhāvayogataḥ ।

vijñāne'pi tathaiva syurābhāsasyāviśeśataḥ ॥ 50॥

They do not emerge out of the firebrand, since they do not have substantiality. (Appearances) will be the same only with regard to consciousness also because of the similarity of appearance. (50)

विज्ञाने स्पन्दमाने वै नाऽऽभासा अन्यतोभुवः ।

न ततोऽन्यत्र निस्पन्दान्न विज्ञानं विशन्ति ते ॥ ५१ ॥

vijñāne spandamāne vai nā''bhāsā anyatobhuvah ।

na tato'nyatra nisvandāna vijñānaṃ viśanti te ॥ 51॥

When consciousness is in (apparent) motion, appearances do not come from elsewhere; nor (do they go) apart from that motionless (consciousness;) nor do they enter consciousness. (51)

न निर्गतास्ते विज्ञानाद्द्रव्यत्वाभावयोगतः ।

कार्यकारणताभावाद्यतोऽचिन्त्याः सदैव ते ॥ ५२ ॥

na nirgatāste vijñānāddravyatvābhāvayogataḥ ।

kāryakāraṇatābhāvādyato'cintyāḥ sadaiva te ॥ 52॥

They do not emerge out of consciousness, since they do not have substantiality. Since they have no cause-effect relationship (and) since they are indefinable always, (they are unreal.) (52)

In these four verses Gauḍapāda extracts the powerful message of *Māṇḍūkya-kārikā*, which is *ajātivāda*. What is the relationship between the firebrand, which is *advaitam* and the patterns, which are pluralistic in number? The normally given answer is invariably wrong. It is that the firebrand is *kāraṇam* and all the patterns are products born out of the firebrand and therefore their relationship is *kārya-kāraṇa* relationship. Gauḍapāda says that *kārya-kāraṇa* relationship should never be seen in this case. A relationship can exist only between two separate things. A relationship is not possible when there is only one thing. We assume a relationship to exist because we are counting the firebrand as one thing and the patterns as the other thing. Gauḍapāda says that patterns cannot be counted as a second separate entity at all. Patterns are different names given to the same firebrand alone. Firebrand is alone there and patterns are different names given to the firebrand itself in motion and the patterns are not separate entities. A child born out of the mother can be counted as a second entity because the mother and the child can exist independent of each other. Then, there can be a relationship between the two. Patterns do not come out of the firebrand and exist independently. Patterns are not entities, things or substances but they are only appearances. Therefore they cannot be counted as separate entities. If they cannot be counted as such, then there cannot be a *kārya-kāraṇa* relationship between *alātaṃ* and *ābhāsa*. With the firebrand and patterns we should assimilate this principle that there is no cause-effect relationship because there is no *dvaitam* and that there is only one firebrand with different names and appearances. Then we can extend this and say that consciousness, Brahman is only one and Brahman and the world cannot have any relationship because the world is another name for Brahman and it is not a separate entity. Because of a certain pattern of appearance we have given a new name, the world, but it is not a new entity. Therefore Brahman and the world cannot have a *kārya-kāraṇa* relationship. This is *ajātivāda*.

Gauḍapāda asks four questions: When the firebrand is in motion, one talks about patterns.

1. Do the patterns come out of the firebrand? 2. Do the patterns come from outside the firebrand?

The normal wrong answer will be that patterns come out of the firebrand. Patterns do not come out of the firebrand because the patterns do not come at all because they are not things or substances. They only appear as solid substances and the solidity belongs to the firebrand alone. Patterns do not come out of the firebrand nor do they come from outside the firebrand. The fact that the patterns cannot exist separate from the firebrand shows that they are not discreet substances, but only appearances. The answer to the two questions is that the patterns do not originate at all.

3. and 4. When the firebrand comes to rest where do the patterns go? Do they go outside the firebrand or inside the firebrand?

The normal answer is that the patterns go inside the firebrand. Gauḍapāda says that the patterns neither go inside the firebrand nor do they go outside the firebrand because they are not present at all as substances but are only appearances. Patterns do not come from inside or outside or do not go inside or outside the firebrand. They only appear and disappear. There is no such substance called patterns, there is no duality, there is no relationship, and *kārya-kāraṇa bhāva* cannot exist between the firebrand and patterns. In the same way, Gauḍapāda says that one should never

say Brahman and the world. Only in the preliminary stages of teaching, a division is created between God and the world having a cause-effect relationship. This is acceptable during *karma-yoga*, *upāsana-yoga* but in *jñāna-yoga*, never say God and world. They are not two separate entities. God alone is appearing as the world. God is like the firebrand and the world is like the patterns. Two names for one entity only. That is why in the 11th chapter of the *Bhagavad Gita*, Kṛṣṇa said that all these things that you are experiencing are not the world but God only. Do not close your eyes for *Īśvara darśanam*. That only reveals our ignorance. A *jñāni* never closes his eyes for *Īśvara darśanam*. What is *Īśvara* is really a wrong question, and the right question is what is not *Īśvara*? There is no relationship between God and the world. In motion, it is the world, in non-motion, it is called Brahman, *paramātmā*, etc. This is what is said in these verses and we will see that in the next class.

MK-60 = Chapter – 4, Verses – 52 to 57

Verses 51 and 52

विज्ञाने स्पन्दमाने वै नाऽऽभासा अन्यतोभुवः ।

न ततोऽन्यत्र निस्पन्दान्न विज्ञानं विशन्ति ते ॥ ५१ ॥

न निर्गतास्ते विज्ञानाद्द्रव्यत्वाभावयोगतः ।

कार्यकारणताभावाद्यतोऽचिन्त्याः सदैव ते ॥ ५२ ॥

In these six verses 47 to 52, Gauḍapādācārya gives the example of *alātaṃ*, the firebrand, to establish *ajātivāda*, the profound teaching. When a firebrand with a glowing tip is moved very fast in a dark room, different patterns are experienced. The glow is only one but the patterns are many. The patterns do not exist as independent things at all. When the firebrand is moved the patterns do not come from outside and join the firebrand. Patterns do not come from inside or outside the firebrand but the patterns are clearly experienced. When the movement of the firebrand is stopped the patterns suddenly disappear. It cannot be said that the patterns went inside the firebrand or somewhere else when the firebrand's movement is stopped. These patterns appear from nowhere and disappear into nowhere and this is the nature of the patterns. They cannot be dealt with as a separate entity. Since the firebrand and the patterns cannot be counted as two separate entities, one cannot talk about them as *kāraṇam* and *kāryam*, because that relationship would require two separate things. Thus the patterns do not have existence and origination but they have only appearance.

In the same way there is only one consciousness principle called *Turīyam* or Brahman and the whole world is nothing but different patterns. Like the patterns of the firebrand the world does not have an existence as a separate entity. The world does not have an origination from Brahman. When the consciousness is in motion through *māyā*, the world just appears and disappears and thus there is no *kāraṇa-kārya* relationship between Brahman and the world. Since the world is not a product of Brahman and does not originate from Brahman, creation or origination of the world is not viable and so *ajātivāda* alone is the final truth. There is one Brahman but a lot of appearances, nothing more and nothing less.

In verse 52, it is said that patterns are not considered as separate substance or entity. We use the word 'patterns' but that does not mean that there is a substance called patterns. This is the message of the whole *Māṇḍūkya-kārikā*. The word 'pot' is used but that does not mean that there is a substance called pot. The substance is the clay. Clay is also a word. Thus everything that is talked about exists only in the form of words only and none of them is a substance and there is only one substance, which is Brahman alone. That Brahman is *Turīyam*. That *Turīyam* is 'I'. What is present are 'I' and some confusions and that is *saṃsāra*. When the confusions are resolved there is no *saṃsāra*.

There is no *kārya-kāraṇa* relationship between the firebrand and the patterns, Brahman and world, or consciousness and matter. Matter is nothing but consciousness in motion. Matter is appearances without explanation. It is inconceivable, indescribable. It cannot be said to be existent because it does not have an existence of its own but cannot be said to be non-existent also because it is experienced. It is not *sat* or *asat* but it is *mithyā*, *anirvacanīyam*. The more *mithyā* is probed, the more mysterious it becomes.

Verse 53

द्रव्यं द्रव्यस्य हेतुः स्यादन्यदन्यस्य चैव हि ।

द्रव्यत्वमन्यभावो वा धर्माणां नोपपद्यते ॥ ५३ ॥

dravyaṃ dravyasya hetuḥ syādanyadanyasya caiva hi ।

dravyatvamanyabhāvo vā dharmāṇāṃ nopapadyate ॥ 53॥

A substance is the cause of a substance only. One entity (is the cause) of another entity (which is distinct from that.) Substantiality or distinction of the jīvas cannot be established. (53)

The absence of *kāraṇa-kārya* relationship is explained further. Two separate, different, and independent entities are required for a *kāraṇa-kārya* relationship to exist. The two things in a cause-effect relationship must be entities and independent. Between clay and pot and similarly between Brahman and world this relationship cannot exist. In comparison to Brahman, *jagat* or *jīva* does not have separate substantiality or separate being. Therefore God and world cannot be counted as two separate entities. Gauḍapāda emphasizes that looking for God separating the world from that effort will fail. What is required is not looking for God elsewhere apart from the world but learning to look at the world itself with a different perspective. Then it will be known that what is mistaken as the world is only Brahman. It is like looking at some patterns on a sheet of paper and seeing a defined picture after some time. What is world for an ignorant person is Brahman for a wise person.

Verse 54

एवं न चित्तजा धर्माश्चित्तं वाऽपि न धर्मजम् ।

एवं हेतुफलाजातिं प्रविशन्ति मनीषिणः ॥ ५४ ॥

evaṃ na cittajā dharmāścittaṃ vā'pi na dharmajam ।

evaṃ hetuphalājātiṃ praviśanti manīṣiṇaḥ ॥ 54॥

Thus, objects are not born out of consciousness, nor is consciousness born out of objects. Thus, the wise (people) arrive at the birthlessness of both the cause and the effect. (54)

In this manner the objects of the world are not born out of consciousness. Matter is not born out of consciousness nor is consciousness born out of matter. Nothing is born out of a second thing. The world is not produced out of Brahman or vice-versa. There is only Brahman, in the past, present or future and the world is only an appearance. Some say that God created man and some others say that man created God. Gauḍapāda says that neither of those statements are correct but that there is only one existence which people divide into God and man or *jīvātma* and *paramātma*. *Jīvātma* and *paramātma* are divisions made by ignorant people but there is only *ekātma*. The wise people know that *karma* and body do not have a cause-effect relationship.

Verse 55

यावद्धेतुफलावेशस्तावद्धेतुफलोद्भवः ।

क्षीणे हेतुफलावेशे नास्ति हेतुफलोद्भवः ॥ ५५ ॥

yāvaddhetuphalāveśastāvaddhetuphalodbhavaḥ ।

kṣīṇe hetuphalāveśe nāsti hetuphalodbhavaḥ ॥ 55॥

As long as there is obsession with cause and effect, so long, there will be the origination of cause and effect. When the obsession with cause and effect is subdued, the origination of cause and effect does not take place. (55)

If you are caught in the trap of cause and effect due to ignorance it is very difficult to get out. This will result in the strong notion of individuality with a time of birth and anxiety over future. The result will be getting trapped in the past or the future both of which are non-existent. The wise are not obsessed too much with the past or the future. They do what they have to do in this drama of life without thinking too much about the past or the future.

Getting steeped in the cause-effect trap, the mind gets preoccupied with the past or the future and the trap gets stronger the more one engages in it. Every hurt in the world happens only once but that hurt happens hundreds of times in the mind when it is re-lived again and again. Thus the mind gives it life and strength. The whole world gathers the capacity to hurt me because I have given the world the capacity and strength to do so. We look for the source of our problems outside and for solutions also outside and do not realize that it is us that generate the problems and we are the solution also. As long as you are obsessed with this world of cause and effect, the more it will get stretched further. When this obsession gradually comes down through *śravaṇa-manana-nididhyāsanam* of *Ātmasvarūpam*, there will not be any more continuation of *saṃsāra* due to the perceived cause-effect nature of the world. The notion that the world and its trappings are needed to complete oneself will weaken and the *Turīyam* self will be accepted as it is. Thus one should discard the cause-effect teaching and accept the non-origination teaching.

Verse 56

यावद्धेतुफलावेशः संसारस्तावदायतः ।

क्षीणे हेतुफलावेशे संसारं न प्रपद्यते ॥ ५६ ॥

yāvaddhetuphalāveśaḥ saṃsārastāvadāyataḥ ।

kṣīṇe hetuphalāveśe saṃsāraṃ na prapadyate ॥ 56॥

As long as there is obsession with cause and effect, so long, saṃsāra is extended. When the obsession with cause and effect is subdued, one does not enter saṃsāra. (56)

As long as this obsession continues, the feeling of limitation is always traced to an external cause but not to self-ignorance. Tampering with external things seems to be the solution. There is always something to get rid of or something to acquire. Thus we keep on tampering with the world and people. This expectation of a perfect world will never materialize. No external factors are needed to make us full and complete. Until this knowledge is obtained, life will be *saṃsāra* which is nothing but struggling to be different from what we are at present. This lack of self-acceptance as we are at anytime results in adjusting the surroundings. We are *sat-cit-ānanda svarūpa* and claiming that, will make us comfortable with what we are at any time. This *pūrṇatvam* will release one from the trap of cause-effect. *Mokṣa* is not the result of *sādhana* but *sādhana* is for disclaiming *saṃsāra*, which is our misconception. As long as you are trapped in the cause-effect world, *saṃsāra* keeps extending. Finite cannot become infinite by getting a few things. Infinite does not need anything to become infinite. For transactional purposes we need a few things like food, clothing, shelter, etc. But to be at home with oneself, a person does not need anything. When the obsession with cause and effect ends through *śravaṇa-manana-nididhyāsanam*, *saṃsāra* goes away.

Verse 57

संवृत्या जायते सर्वं शाश्वतं नास्ति तेन वै ।

सद्भावेन ह्यजं सर्वमुच्छेदस्तेन नास्ति वै ॥ ५७ ॥

saṃvṛtyā jāyate sarvaṃ śāśvataṃ nāsti tena vai ।

sadbhāvena hyajaṃ sarvamucchedastena nāsti vai ॥ 57॥

Everything is born because of ignorance. Therefore, nothing is indeed permanent. As Brahman, everything is indeed unborn. Therefore, there is no destruction at all. (57)

Gauḍapāda concludes that there are no two things and so no *kāraṇa-kārya* relationship. Even though there are no two things, there are two versions of one and the same thing depending on our vision like rope and snake. Rope and snake are two versions of the same entity. The one that has clear vision sees

rope but someone that has deluded vision sees snake. Brahman and world are not two things but are two visions. Kṛṣṇa refers to the *jñāni*'s vision in the *Bhagavad Gita*:

In that which is night for all beings, the one who is wise, who has mastery over oneself, is awake. That in which beings are awake, is night for the wise one who sees. (2:69)

For an ignorant person what is available is the world of cause and effect because of the veiling caused by ignorance. He experiences a world that is continuously coming, briefly existing and going. Nothing is permanent. For a *jñāni*, what is called world is nothing but the unborn Brahman. What was named as an elephant, which looked very real before is nothing but wood. What is world is nothing but Brahman as Kṛṣṇa says in the *Bhagavad Gita*:

The means of offering is Brahman. The oblation is Brahman, offered by Brahman into the fire, which is Brahman. Brahman indeed is to be reached by him who sees everything as Brahman. (verse 4:24)

From *nāma-rūpa* angle there is birth and death. From Brahman angle there is no birth or death. Do you see eternity or do you see mortality? This depends on one's own vision.

MK-61 = Chapter – 4, Verses – 57 to 60

Verse 57

संवृत्या जायते सर्वं शाश्वतं नास्ति तेन वै ।

सद्भावेन ह्यजं सर्वमुच्छेदस्तेन नास्ति वै ॥ ५७ ॥

As I have often mentioned, the final Vedāntic message has three portions as presented by Śaṅkarācārya in his famous verse, ‘*brahma satyaṃ jagan mithyā jīvo brahmaiva na para anena vedyam tat sāstram iti Vedānta dīṇḍima*’. *Brahma satyaṃ*, *jagan mithyā* and *jīvo brahmaiva na para* are the three portions of the Vedāntic message that have to be thoroughly assimilated. Even a slight vagueness about any of these three portions will be a hindrance to *mokṣa*. Of these three, *brahma satyaṃ* is the *Turīyam* revealed in the 7th *mantra* of the *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad*, which is the consciousness principle, myself, my real nature. *Jagan mithyā* refers to the entire world of experience that includes the external world, body, and mind. This *mithyātvam* is the toughest message to assimilate in Vedānta. Gauḍapāda makes a great effort to communicate *mithyā*. He is not negating the experience, transactional nature, and utility of the world. Retaining all of these he declares that the world is *mithyā*. Only when the world is understood as *mithyā*, we can make the statement that *mithyā* cannot affect *satyaṃ*. It is similar to the movie appearing on the screen. If the world is also *satyaṃ* like Brahman, the world will affect Brahman. The fourth capsule of Vedānta will be meaningful only when the *mithyātvam* of the world is very clear. Only in *Māṇḍūkyakārikā*, a maximum effort is put forth to explain the *mithyātvam* of the world. The word ‘*mithyā*’ conveys four important ideas: the existence of the world is to be negated; the origination of the world is to be negated; the appearance and experience of the world are to be accepted; and that appearance and experience should be understood to be due to *avidyā* or *māyā*. To understand *mithyā*, these four points have to be assimilated. *Ajātivāda* emphasizes the first two points in the following verses in *Māṇḍūkyakārikā*.

There is no dissolution, no creation, none who is bound, none who strives (for liberation), none who seeks liberation, and none who is liberated - this is the absolute truth. (2:32)

No jīva is born. This (jīva) has no cause. This (Brahman) is the absolute Truth in which nothing is born. (3:48)

Māyājātivāda emphasizes the last two points. Until now Gauḍapāda emphasized *ajātivāda*. In these verses, he emphasizes *māyājātivāda*. Both these *vādas* are two sides of the same *mithyā* coin as it were. ‘The world is not born’ (*ajātivāda*) and the ‘world is seemingly born’ (*māyājātivāda*) are saying the same thing.

Gauḍapāda is dealing with *māyājātivāda* in the 57th verse. From the standpoint of *māyā*, *avidyā* or *vyāvahārika dṛṣṭi*, the world seems to be born just like the dream appears to be born from the standpoint

of the dreamer. Whatever is born of ignorance will last as long as ignorance lasts and is not permanent. Then Gauḍapāda seems to contradict what he said about the world being temporary. Really speaking the world is not temporary also. As long as the ignorance continues the rope will appear as snake and the ignorant person is told that when the knowledge of the rope comes, the snake will go away. The snake is born of ignorance and it will go away upon the arrival of knowledge. After knowledge, there is no more a snake. Did the snake go away? The person who has the knowledge will realize that even during the time of ignorance the snake was only an appearance. Thus the snake cannot be called temporary or permanent because there was never a snake at anytime. Similarly after knowledge that everything is Brahman, it is realized that there is no such thing called the world. So there is no question of destroying the world because there was no world at anytime. Elimination of the world and *samsāra* is nothing but understanding that there is really no world or *samsāra* at all to be eliminated. Thus *samsāra* is neither permanent nor temporary, but is non-existent.

Verse 58

धर्मा य इति जायन्ते जायन्ते ते न तत्त्वतः ।

जन्म मायोपमं तेषां सा च माया न विद्यते ॥ ५८ ॥

dharmā ya iti jāyante jāyante te na tattvataḥ ।

janma māyopamaṃ teṣāṃ sā ca māyā na vidyate ॥ 58॥

Those entities, which are born in this manner, are not born really. Their birth is comparable to illusion and that illusion does not exist. (58)

All things and beings, which are born in this manner due to *avidyā* are not really born at all similar to the dream world (due to the ignorance of the waker as the waker, *nidrā-śakti*) and the snake on the rope (due to the ignorance of the rope). Therefore this creation is similar to the production of things by a magician. The things produced by the magician come and go. Similarly the world is due to the cosmic magician, *Īśvara*, as is stated in the *Dakṣiṇāmūrtistotram*,

To Him, who, like a magician or even like a great Yogin, displays, by his own will, this universe which at the beginning is undifferentiated like the sprout in the seed, but which is made again differentiated under the varied conditions of space and time posited by māyā; to Him, of the preceptor, the blessed Dakṣiṇāmūrti, may this obeisance be! (verse 2)

Īśvara is Brahman plus *māyā*. Brahman alone projects this universe by its magical power called *māyā*. When it is said that the world is a magical projection by Brahman through *māyā*, it seems that two things are now accepted, Brahman and *māyā*. Gauḍapāda says that *māyā-śakti* is also as real as the world is. *Māyā* is *mithyā*. *Māyā* does not have existence and origination. It appears and is experienced because of *māyā*. The example that is given for *māyā* is darkness. Is there darkness? The darkness is experienced

and seems to be existent. The objects are covered in darkness. What is the nature of darkness? When it is investigated with the help of light and eyes, it vanishes without a trace. The destruction of a tangibly existent thing should leave some remnants of itself. Thus, existence and origination of darkness cannot be established. But it is experienced. *Māyā* and the world are similar. *Māyā* cannot be established and it is magic. It is experienced but not existent.

Verse 59

यथा मायामयाद्बीजाज्जायते तन्मयोऽङ्कुरः ।

नासौ नित्यो न चोच्छेदी तद्बद्धर्मेषु योजना ॥ ५९ ॥

yathā māyāmayādbījājāyate tanmayo'ṅkuraḥ ।

nāsau nityo na cocchedī tadvaddharmeṣu yojanā ॥ 59॥

Out of an illusory seed a similar sprout is born. It is neither eternal nor destructible. (This) logic (has to be extended) in the same manner in the case of all entities. (59)

Gauḍapāda comments on the word *māyopamaṃ* of the previous verse. He refers to a magician's trick in which a sprout and a plant comes from a magical seed in a short time. Similarly this world is a magical creation by *Īśvara*. The magical tree is not really existent. This world is neither permanent nor impermanent because the world is really not present at all. The entire world is a mystery and the more it is probed, the more mysterious it becomes. When it is said that *avidyā* is the cause of the universe it is only a philosophical presentation. It really means that the answers to the nature of the universe cannot be known.

Verse 60

नाजेषु सर्वधर्मेषु शाश्वताशाश्वताभिधा ।

यत्र वर्णा न वर्तन्ते विवेकस्तत्र नोच्यते ॥ ६० ॥

nājeṣu sarvadharmeṣu śāśvatāsāśvatābhidhā ।

yatra varṇā na vartante vivekastatra nocyate ॥ 60॥

In the case of all (those) entities which are unborn (Brahman), the word 'permanent' or 'impermanent' cannot (be applied). Distinction cannot be maintained with regard to an entity where words do not function. (60)

In the previous verse the magic example was given. This universe is also a magic show by *Īśvara*. You cannot give any description to the world. You cannot say it is permanent or it is impermanent. You cannot say that it is there or it is not there. As you go deeper all questions will not have answers.

Superficially some answers can be given. However cause and effect cannot always be correlated. There are many things that cannot be explained. All the things and beings of the world, which are really not born but really only Brahman, cannot be described as permanent or impermanent, existent or non-existent. Superficially the objects of the world seem different but the difference is inexplicable. No description can be given to the world. It is *anirvacanīya māyā*.

MK-62 = Chapter – 4, Verses – 60 to 67

Verse 60

नाजेषु सर्वधर्मेषु शाश्वताशाश्वताभिधा ।

यत्र वर्णा न वर्तन्ते विवेकस्तत्र नोच्यते ॥ ६० ॥

In analyzing the nature of the world, Gauḍapāda emphasizes the fact that ‘I’, the *ātmā*, am the substratum of the world. Ultimately the understanding of myself is the most important thing because *saṃsāra* is centered on the dissatisfaction that I have about myself. The image and the assessment I have about myself produce dissatisfaction and the whole life is one of continuously bettering myself. Even the efforts to change the world and people are really directed at changing my self-image with respect to them. Vedānta attempts to help us change the perception that we have about our self-image. The teaching of the *mithyā* world is to show that if the entire world is *mithyā* then it requires a substratum. *Mithyā* cannot exist by itself and it borrows existence from some other source. Gauḍapāda in stressing the *mithyā* nature of the universe is exhorting us to see that we are the substratum of the entire universe. *Mithyā jagat adhiṣṭhānam* is the focus and not *mithyā jagat* by itself. Once it is understood that I am the supporter of the *mithyā* universe, I will not need support from external worldly and religious sources, namely God. So to focus on *mithyātvam* is to focus on *satyaṃ* only. Secondly, all my interactions are supported by me, the *adhiṣṭhānam*. I am not interacting with the world. All the interactions are between the *mithyā* body-mind and the *mithyā* world. These interactions are inevitable and the consequences are unknowable, and even when known, they are not controllable. Life is a series of such interactions. Body and mind should be allowed to interact in such a way because it is unavoidable. My status is not affected by any event. Trying to adjust all the images that we try to maintain belong to *ahaṅkāra* and *mamakara*, which belong to the *mithyā prapañca* and we are different from them. We are the *adhiṣṭhānam* and when this is remembered we can also play along with the world but will not be seriously affected.

The *mithyā* world does not have existence or origination and to emphasize these two features is *ajātivāda*. The *mithyā* world appears and the appearance is due to *māyā* and when these two features are emphasized it is called *māyājātivāda* or *mithyājātivāda*. Gauḍapāda swings between these two teachings in *Māṇḍūkya-kārikā*. The dream world is the metaphor for *māyājātivāda*. An additional information that Gauḍapāda gave in the 60th verse, 2nd line is that *māyā prapañca* that is born out of *māyā* is beyond description. As one goes deeper and deeper into the analysis of the world one will encounter only grey area. No description and definition can be definite. The sentient-insentient differentiation is very clear at the gross macro level but when one goes into the analysis of matter at the micro level the difference between sentient and insentient becomes fuzzy. *Māyā* is a term used to represent this vagueness. The vagueness is due to the fact that the world is only an appearance and does not really exist. Darkness is experienced but when analyzed with the help of a light it disappears. The more the world is analyzed the more mysterious it becomes. Yet another meaning of *mithyā* is mystery. Probing too much into the world will only produce confusion. Clarity in understanding is not possible.

Verse 61 and 62

यथा स्वप्ने द्वयाभासं चित्तं चलति मायया ।

तथा जाग्रद्द्वयाभासं चित्तं चलति मायया ॥ ६१ ॥

yathā svapne dvayābhāsaṃ cittam calati māyayā ।

tathā jāgraddvayābhāsaṃ cittam calati māyayā ॥ 61॥

The mind spins a seeming duality in the waking-state through māyā just as the mind spins a seeming duality in dream through māyā. (61)

अद्वयं च द्वयाभासं चित्तं स्वप्ने न संशयः ।

अद्वयं च द्वयाभासं तथा जाग्रन्न संशयं ॥ ६२ ॥

advayaṃ ca dvayābhāsaṃ cittam svapne na saṃśayaḥ ।

advayaṃ ca dvayābhāsaṃ tathā jāgranna saṃśayaṃ ॥ 62॥

The non-dual mind alone is the seeming duality in the dream; there is no doubt. In the same way, the non-dual mind alone is the seeming duality in the waking-state; there is no doubt. (62)

Gauḍapāda goes to the dream example because the understanding of the waking will be clear only when the *mithyā* nature of the dream is understood. These two verses are reproduction of two previous verses 29 and 30 of the third chapter. Here the word *cittam* is used and the word *manaḥ* was used in the earlier verses. One mind alone gets divided into the observer-observed duality in dream. Similarly one *māyā* gets divided into the observer body-mind complex and the observed universe in the waking state. The waking state is considered *mithyā* even though it has ETU similar to the dream state even though it also has ETU in dream. The dream is real for a dreamer in dream. The waking state is also a longer dream but we do not consider it so because we are part of this waking dream itself. Just like the dream is known to be a dream upon waking up, this waking dream also will be known as such upon waking up to the *Turīyam*, our own real nature. Gauḍapāda highlights one more point about the dream state in the following five verses that he has not discussed previously.

Verses 63 to 67

स्वप्नदृक्प्रचरन्स्वप्ने दिक्षु वै दशसु स्थितान् ।

अण्डजान्स्वेदजान्वाऽपि जीवान्पश्यति यान्सदा ॥ ६३ ॥

svapnadṛkpracaransvapne dikṣu vai daśasu sthitān ।

aṇḍajānsvedajānvā'pi jīvānpaśyati yānsadā ॥ 63॥

Moving about in dream, the dreamer constantly sees various beings born of eggs, born of moisture, etc. existing in all the ten quarters. (63)

स्वप्नदृक्चित्तदृश्यास्ते न विद्यन्ते ततः पृथक् ।

तथा तद्दृश्यमेवेदं स्वप्नदृक्चित्तमिष्यते ॥ ६४ ॥

svapnadṛkcittadrśyāste na vidyante tataḥ pṛthak ।

tathā taddrśyamevedam svapnadṛkcittamiṣyate ॥ 64॥

Those (beings), which are objects of the dreamer's mind, do not exist apart from that (mind). Similarly, the mind of the dreamer is accepted to be the object of that (dreamer) only. (64)

चरञ्जागरिते जाग्रद्विक्षु वै दशसु स्थितान् ।

अण्डजान्स्वेदजान्वाऽपि जीवान्पश्यति यान्सदा ॥ ६५ ॥

carañjāgarite jāgraddikṣu vai daśasu sthitān ।

aṇḍajānsvedajānvā'pi jīvānpaśyati yānsadā ॥ 65॥

Moving about in the waking state, the waker constantly sees various beings born of eggs, born of moisture, etc. existing in all the ten quarters. (65)

जाग्रच्चित्तेक्षणीयास्ते न विद्यन्ते ततः पृथक् ।

तथा तद्दृश्यमेवेदं जाग्रतश्चित्तमिष्यते ॥ ६६ ॥

jāgraccitekṣaṇīyāste na vidyante tataḥ pṛthak ।

tathā taddrśyamevedam jāgrataścittamiṣyate ॥ 66॥

Those (beings), which are objects of the waker's mind, do not exist apart from that (mind). Similarly, the mind of the waker is accepted to be the object of that (waker) only. (66)

उभे ह्यन्योन्यदृश्ये ते किं तदस्तीति नोच्यते ।

लक्षणाशून्यमुभयं तन्मतेनैव गृह्यते ॥ ६७ ॥

ubhe hyanyonyadrśye te kiṃ tadasīti nocyate ।

lakṣaṇāśūnyamubhayaṃ tanmatenaiva grhyate ॥ 67॥

Both of them are indeed mutually perceived. Does either (of them) exist? 'No' - thus it is said. Both of them are indefinable. (Each one) is grasped because of the notion of the other only. (67)

In verses 63 and 64, Gauḍapāda analyzes the dream from the standpoint of the dreamer and makes one or two observations that will be extended to the waking state later. In the dream the dreamer is very

much a part of the dream experiencing everything in the dream world with a dream body and mind. In the dream it all appears to be real similar to what is found in the waking state. The dreamer travels and experiences varieties of the living beings different from himself but he does not know that they are his own creations or projections. Gauḍapāda describes the different types of living beings based on the *śāstric* classification as; all the living beings with an intervention of an egg, microorganisms born in a humid atmosphere, beings born out of a womb, plants and trees that come out from under the ground. The dreamer experiences these beings as different from himself even though he is the only one dreaming. When the dreamer experiences varieties of objects, the dreamer has an internal thought corresponding to the experienced object that is ‘external’ with respect to the dream body. The dream consists of two components, an external object and the corresponding internal thought. After waking up the waker knows that the object is unreal but in dream both the object and the thought are considered real. On waking both of them are known as *mithyā* but the dreamer experienced both of them in the dream. The object is called *drśyam* and the thought is called *cittam*. All the dream objects put together is called *svapna prapañca* (the dream world) and all the dream thoughts put together is called *svapna cittam*. Both of them are projected by one waker’s mind alone. After waking up the waker realizes that there was no *svapna prapañca* or *svapna cittam*. Both of them do not exist separate from the observer. Gauḍapāda extends this to the waking state. All the objects of the world, *jāgrat drśyam* and all the corresponding thoughts are projected by one *māyā*. I, the observer, am experiencing both the thoughts and objects. Both the world and the mind are projected by one *māyā*, which is the *śakti* of *Turīyam*. By my *māyā-śakti*, I project both the waking world and the waking mind, which are objects of my experience. When I say I am free, the mind should not be included. I use the mind but it should not be included. The mind is part of the waking world and so I cannot have full control over it just as my body. When I say I am free, I should never include the mind and the body. In my claiming, ‘I am free’, the ‘I’ is the *Turīyam Ātmā*. Use the mind to claim your glory but do not depend on it for total freedom. Gauḍapāda here gives a very important message that the mind should never be included in the meaning of ‘I’. For worldly transactions body and mind are included in the word ‘I’ but for one’s self-image, the body and mind should not be included in ‘I’.

In the 67th verse, Gauḍapāda says that the mind and the world rise and dissolve together. You cannot prove the existence of one without the other. Both the world and the mind coexist together. The mind and the world existing independent of each other is never possible nor provable. As long as the mind is awake the world is experienced. Even when the mind is partially awake the dream world is experienced. When the mind is fully asleep, no world is experienced. In meditation, the attempt to remove all the *anātmā* results in sleep. The mind requires an object or an imaginary object for its existence. So both the mind and the world are dependent on each other. A second example: To prove a sound, we use the ears. How do you know that you have a hearing instrument? The proof for the hearing instrument is some sound that can be heard. In the absence of any sound, the hearing instrument cannot be proved. To prove the ears, you require a sound. To prove the sound, you require ears. Gauḍapāda asks which proves which one. Both are mutually dependent and it cannot be said that one is the proof for the other. The mind and

the world are not independently proved. Each one is proved because of the other. Both do not have proof for independent existence and both are dependent. If both of them are dependent, they both must be borrowing existence from something else. The mind and the world are borrowing existence from something else. We saw this in *Saddarśanam* also:

*dhiyā sahodeti dhiyāstameti
lokastato dhīpravibhāsya eṣaḥ ।*

*dhīlokajanmakṣayadhāma pūrṇaṃ
sadvastu janmakṣayaśūnyamekam ॥ 9॥*

Although the world and its knowledge rise and set together, it is by the knowledge alone that the world is made apparent. The Whole, wherefrom the world and its knowledge rise and wherein they set, but which shines without rising and setting - that alone is the real. (verse 9)

I lend existence to the *mithyā* world and the *mithyā* mind. Lending existence to the mind is fine but because of self-ignorance I conclude that I am the mind. If I know that I am the user of the mind, and different from the mind, then I can use it and drop it. But if I identify with the mind, I get lost in the mind. *The mind alone is the cause of people's bondage and liberation (Amṛtabindu Upaniṣad, 2)*. The mind becomes heavy and burdened and thereby life itself is a burden. External situations can be handled by getting away from them but when the mind itself is a problem that will not work because the mind follows me wherever I go like my own shadow. One should learn to detach from the mind.

MK-63 = Chapter – 4, Verses – 67 to 73

Verse 67

उभे ह्यन्योन्यदृश्ये ते किं तदस्तीति नोच्यते ।

लक्षणाशून्यमुभयं तन्मतेनैव गृह्यते ॥ ६७ ॥

Based on the dream experience Gaudapādācārya arrives at a very profound conclusion that the entire creation consists of a complimentary pair of the mind and the world. The entire creation at any level, and waking or dream consists of a complimentary pair of the mind and the world, which are mutually dependent on each other. Both do not have existence of their own. Mind validates the world and the world validates the mind. One of these cannot be proved without the help of the other. This is the *mithyā* game that the *mithyā* mind-world is playing. Once we understand the game we are never trapped but not understanding the game leads to a miserable life. How does that happen? Both the mind and the world do not have existence of their own. By identifying with the mind first I lend existence to the mind. Thus the mind gets empowered because of me. During deep sleep I am there, the mind is not operational and therefore there is no world and no complaints also. The moment the mind becomes alive I come to the waking state and I become a *Viśva* and identify with the mind. This mind validates the world and gives reality to the world. Once the world is empowered by the mind the world starts harassing the mind. The world borrows power from the mind and harasses the mind. Thus they mutually attack each other. The mind gets affected because of the world and the world gets affected because of the mind. It is difficult to get out of this. Even imaginary situations affect the individual. Through a particular pattern of thought I lend reality to the situation and that affects me immensely. Because of the thought the object exists and because of the object the thought gets strong. But I should not reject the mind and the world because as long as I am alive I have to be in the waking state. I have to live in the world. The mind and the world should be allowed to interact but constantly I should remember that I am not the mind nor the world. On one side there is the mind and on the other the world. I accommodate them, bless them, enliven them, let them hang around me but let them not overwhelm me. This is possible only when I understand that the creation is a complimentary pair of the mind and the world only.

This is a very profound verse. The mind and the world are evident only because of each other.

Verse 68 - 70

यथा स्वप्नमयो जीवो जायते म्रियतेऽपि च ।

तथा जीवा अमी सर्वे भवन्ति न भवन्ति च ॥ ६८ ॥

yathā svapnamayo jīvo jāyate mriyate'pi ca ।

tathā jīvā amī sarve bhavanti na bhavanti ca ॥ 68॥

All these jīvas appear and disappear just as a dream jīva appears and disappears. (68)

यथा मायामयो जीवो जायते प्रियतेऽपि च ।

तथा जीवा अमी सर्वे भवन्ति न भवन्ति च ॥ ६९ ॥

yathā māyāmayo jīvo jāyate mriyate'pi ca ।

tathā jīvā amī sarve bhavanti na bhavanti ca ॥ 69॥

All these jīvas appear and disappear just as an illusory jīva appears and disappears. (69)

यथा निर्मितको जीवो जायते प्रियतेऽपि वा ।

तथा जीवा अमी सर्वे भवन्ति न भवन्ति च ॥ ७० ॥

yathā nirmitako jīvo jāyate mriyate'pi vā ।

tathā jīvā amī sarve bhavanti na bhavanti ca ॥ 70॥

All these jīvas appear and disappear just as a materialized jīva appears and disappears. (70)

All the things and beings obtaining in the waking state appear and after some time they just disappear like the patterns of the flame tip without having existence of their own. They have the capacity to appear with borrowed existence but do not have independent existence or origination. When they appear you have to handle them but do not get involved in them too much. Gauḍapāda gives three examples one each in the first line of the verses 68, 69 and 70. In 68, the example is *svapnamaya jīva*, in 69 *māyāmaya jīva*, and in 70 *nirmitako jīva*. The first example is the dream being that appears in dream and disappears on waking. The dream can happen in a fraction of a second. The second example is the magical *jīva* projected by a magician who also appears and disappears. The third example is the materialized *jīva* because of yogic powers that is short lived, appearing and disappearing. In all these examples the *jīvas* do not have existence, origination but only have appearance. These examples should be extended to the universe, which is difficult. Our bodies appear to be continuous entities but the body cells are constantly changing. The conclusion of this discussion is given in verse 71.

Verse 71

न कश्चिज्जायते जीवः सम्भवोऽस्य न विद्यते ।

एतत्तदुत्तमं सत्यं यत्र किञ्चिन्न जायते ॥ ७१ ॥

na kaścijjāyate jīvaḥ sambhavo'sya na vidyate ।

etattaduttamaṃ satyaṃ yatra kiñcinna jāyate ॥ 71॥

No jīva is born. This (jīva) has no cause. This (Brahman) is the absolute Truth in which nothing is born. (71)

Gauḍapāda comes to the *ajātivāda* again by quoting the verse 48 of chapter 3 here showing that both the *mithyājātivāda* and *ajātivāda* are nothing but one and the same teaching seen from two different angles similar to the statements, ‘the cup is half-full’ and ‘the cup is half-empty’. Saying the world is seemingly born is *māyājātivāda* and saying the world is not actually born is *ajātivāda*. Gauḍapāda says that both the teachings are the same only.

No *jīva* or *jagat* is really born. The word ‘really’ is important even though the *jīva* or *jagat* is seemingly born. There is no origination for the *jīva*. We have refuted several theories, such as *sat-kārya-vāda* and *asat-kārya-vāda*. Even the Vedic theory of the law of *karma* will not work ultimately. No theory of creation can be logically convincing. Therefore there is no origination of the world. But then one should not say that there is nothing. There is one absolute reality called *Turīyam*, which is the highest reality. The dream world is called *prātibhāsika satyaṃ*, seemingly real in dream state, the waking world is called *vyāvahārika satyaṃ*, seemingly real in the waking state and *ātmā*, the *Turīyam* is called *pāramārthika satyaṃ*, real in all the states. These are called subjective reality, empirical reality and absolute reality respectively. The *Turīyam* is the absolute reality in which nothing is really born.

Verse 72

चित्तस्पन्दितमेवेदं ग्राह्यग्राहकवद्वयम् ।

चित्तं निर्विषयं नित्यमसङ्गं तेन कीर्तितम् ॥ ७२ ॥

cittaspanditamevedaṃ grāhyagrāhakavadvayam ।

cittaṃ nirviṣayaṃ nityamasanṅgaṃ tena kīrtitam ॥ 72॥

This duality, consisting of the subject and the object, is nothing but the (apparent) motion of consciousness. Consciousness is ever free from objects. Therefore, it is said to be relation-less. (72)

How does the appearance of the waking and the dream world take place? Gauḍapāda refers to the firebrand again. The flame tip is only one but because of the whirling movement there is the appearance of plurality. Similarly one consciousness seems to move violently and this seeming motion of consciousness alone is the waking and the dream world. This is called *caitanya spandanam*. The word ‘*cittam*’ in this verse is *caitanya*. How does the *caitanya* seemingly move? It is because of the movement of thoughts. When there are no thoughts there is no waking or the dream world. **The seeming motion of consciousness is caused by the rise and fall of thoughts. The thoughts come from the mind and the mind comes from *māyā*. Therefore *māyā* alone through the thought movement is producing all.** When thoughts are resolved there is neither the waking world nor the dream world. In the presence of moving thoughts, consciousness appears to move, producing various object-knowledge. When one object is perceived, there is consciousness and that object-thought. When a different object is perceived, consciousness does not change, but the thought has now changed to that object-thought. Thus one experience has changed to another experience and the experiences flow. Thoughts move and

experiences flow and you get a virtual reality, which is like a hologram that appears very tangible. Thus the thought motion creates the appearance of the world. Thought means *māyā*. *Māyā* alone causes all this.

This entire creation is the seeming motion of consciousness caused by the motion of thoughts or the mind. The complimentary pair of mind-world is nothing but the seeming motion of one *māyā* only. Therefore there is no object for consciousness.

In the initial stage of Vedānta, we do *ātmā-anātmā viveka*, *dr̥g-dr̥śya viveka* using the principle that the subject is always different from the object, the experiencer is different from the experienced object. The experiencer is *ātmā* and the experienced is *anātmā*. It is also said that *anātmā* has *dr̥śyatvam*, *bhautikatvam*, *saguṇatvam*, *savikāratvam*, and *āgamapāyitvam*. It is said that consciousness is the observer and the world is the observed. Thus the observer-observed duality is talked about initially. The ultimate in *advaita* that has to be said is that there is no observed object other than the observer subject. Gauḍapāda says that here. He says that the observer consciousness is really free from the object that is observed. The observed *anātmā* is an appearance all the time and does not have an existence of its own. When the observed *anātmā* is negated, *ātmā* cannot be called the observer also. The observer status is valid only as long as the observed is accepted similar to the status of the teacher that is valid only as long as there are students. The teacher does not disappear but the teacher status is no longer valid. Thus consciousness is beyond any relational names once *anātmā* is negated. *Pramātā*, *sākṣi*, etc., are all names given to *ātmā* in relation to the known and observed. But these names have to be retracted once the known and observed *anātmā* is negated. But can *ātmā* be called consciousness? Śāṅkarācārya says that even the word consciousness is relevant only with reference to the world, which is insentient. The concept of sentiency can be appreciated only when there is insentience present. So even the words *sat*, *cit* and *ānanda* and *adhiṣṭhānam* are all relational names. Consciousness does not have relationship with anything because there is no second thing at all.

First the existence of *anātmā* is accepted and therefore relationship between *ātmā* and *anātmā* is talked about. Gauḍapāda says that this relationship cannot be talked about because *anātmā* does not exist separate from *ātmā*. *Anātmā* is another name used for the only substance *ātmā*. The example of clay and clay-pot is relevant here. First we talk about clay and then we talk about clay-pot. Now we have two words clay and pot. Then we imagine that there are two substances and the relationship between the two is talked about. One is *kāraṇam* and the other is *kāryam*. Clay and pot are two words but are there two substances? Can you make clay and pot occupy two separate places? These two words are useful for transaction. The usefulness of the two are not questioned but the counting of the pot and clay as two different substances is questioned. They are not two different things and so the relationship between the two is born out of ignorance. Similarly the relationship between *ātmā* and *anātmā* is a myth and there is no *kārya-kāraṇa* relationship. Therefore Brahman is neither *kāraṇam* nor *kāryam*. In *Bṛhadāranyaka Upaniṣad*, a very famous *mantra* is quoted, “*tad etat brahma apūrvam anantaṃ anaparam anantaram*

abhayaṃ”. *apūrvam anantaraṃ* means that *Turīyam* is neither cause nor effect because *kārya-kāraṇa* relationship requires duality and there is none. Where is that *Turīyam*? Do not look up, down, outward or inward also. Knowing *Turīyam* is only claiming that ‘*I am Turīyam*’, which is nothing but a thought that has to take place in the mind with understanding. When I claim that I am the *Turīyam*, the word ‘I’ means the consciousness. When I claim this, life is a play. Without claiming this, life is a meaningless burdensome, boring struggle. What should be life is our choice.

Verse 73

योऽस्ति कल्पितसंवृत्या परमार्थेन नास्त्यसौ ।

परतन्त्राभिसंवृत्या स्यान्नास्ति परमार्थतः ॥ ७३ ॥

yo'sti kalpitasaṃvṛtyā paramārthena nāstyasau ।

paratantrābhisaṃvṛtyā syānnāsti paramārthataḥ ॥ 73॥

This (duality), which exists from the apparent empirical view, does not really exist. It exists from the empirical view of the other systems. It does not really exist. (73)

Gauḍapāda clarifies that *māyājātivāda* and *ajātivāda* are the same teaching that use two different terminology, ‘seemingly born’ and ‘really not born’. That which is accepted as existent seemingly for the sake of *vyavahāra* is *saṃvṛtti*, meaning worldly transaction and is a Buddhist terminology that Gauḍapāda has borrowed. The words that are used for worldly transaction like sunrise and blue sky do not refer to anything real. Even night, day and names of places are transactional words. Use the empirical terminology but do not be trapped by the words. The entire cosmos is a just a name for transaction but does not really exist. But it is accepted as existent by two groups of people. One group is the lay people who are not philosophers. They go by ETU and they accept the world. The second group is the confused systems such as *Sāṃkhya*, *Yoga*, *Nyāya*, *Vaiśeṣika*, *Pūrva Mīmāṃsa*, *Viśiṣṭādvaitam*, and *Dvaitam* who make the mistake of accepting the world as existent. From the standpoint of *advaitam* the world has appearance and no existence.

MK-64 = Chapter – 4, Verses – 73 to 77

Verse 73

योऽस्ति कल्पितसंवृत्या परमार्थेन नास्त्यसौ ।

परतन्त्राभिसंवृत्या स्यान्नास्ति परमार्थतः ॥ ७३ ॥

Gauḍapāda points out that the entire world of our experience is accepted as existent because it is available for transaction, which Gauḍapāda calls empirical transaction, *mithyā vyavahāra* or *kalpita saṃvṛtti*. It is available for experience, transaction and has utility (ETU). Based on the availability in this manner we make the conclusion that the world is existent. The aim of Vedāntic enquiry is to determine whether this conclusion is right. When an enquiry is made it is found that every object is nothing but *nāma* and *rūpa* and the objects do not have any substance of their own. Any object can be reduced to fundamental particles and further deeper analysis does not reveal anything that is substantial. Thus the world is given the status of *mithyā*. It has empirical value but does not exist as a substance. But without enquiry most people conclude that there is a substantial thing called world, which is an unfortunate blunder. Gauḍapāda points out that this mistake is made not only by lay people but in the vision of many systems, the same mistake is made after long enquiry. The world is existent from the standpoint of lay people and confused philosophers. But enquiry based on *śāstra pramāṇam* will reduce the entire world into *nāma* and *rūpa*. If everything is *nāma-rūpa*, what is then the substance? Vedānta says that that substance will never be found by any amount of enquiry. Probing both at the micro and macro *nāma-rūpa* levels one can never come across that fundamental substance. Gauḍapāda says that this is so because that ultimate truth, essence or substance is the enquirer, *ātmā* itself. Once this essence is named *ātmā*, then *ātmā* can be construed as another *nāma-rūpa*. Thus the essence *ātmā* cannot be given a name because if it is done, a corresponding concept about *ātmā* will arise. So no name for *ātmā* is possible. If no name is used how can the *guru* teach? Words have to be used for communication without the words pointing to a *rūpa*. Thus a word is used for description of *ātmā* and is later withdrawn. It is like using a thorn to remove a thorn and later throwing away the thorn. So words are used in the teaching and later withdrawn. This is the message that Gauḍapāda is trying to convey. Only from the standpoint of other *darśanas*, the world is a substance but the Vedāntic teaching is that the world does not exist as a substance and it only exists as *nāma-rūpa*.

Verse 74

अजः कल्पितसंवृत्या परमार्थेन नाप्यजः ।

परतन्त्राभिनिष्पत्त्या संवृत्या जायते तु सः ॥ ७४ ॥

ajah kalpitasamvṛtyā paramārthena nāpyajah ।

paratantrābhiniṣpattyā saṃvṛtyā jāyate tu saḥ ॥ 74॥

In fact, (consciousness) is not even unborn. It is (said to be) unborn in accordance with the apparent empirical view. (For), it is (said to be) born in accordance with the empirical view arising out of other systems. (74)

The entire world is non-substantial and is only *nāma-rūpa*. For the same reason *ātmā* cannot be given a name because otherwise *ātmā* will fall into the realm of *nāma-rūpa*. When a name is used the mind will form some sort of a concept. Really speaking *ātmā* does not have a name. But for communication temporary names are used. The whole world is *nāma-rūpa* and is continuously changing. Everything in our experience has a beginning and an end. Based on this, most philosophers think that *ātmā* is also subject to change like worldly things. So a description is used for *ātmā* based on the misconception that it is changeful. That description is that *ātmā* is changeless. This does not mean that *ātmā* is a substance that has the attribute of changelessness. That descriptor is used to differentiate *ātmā* from substances that are changeful. In some other system, consciousness is said to have origination. In *Yogācāra Buddhism*, consciousness is born during the waking state and during sleep it disappears. According to this school, *ātmā* is inert, is only matter. The mind is also inert matter and in the waking state *ātmā* and the mind combine resulting in the birth of consciousness. In sleep the contact between *ātmā* and the mind is disrupted and consciousness is lost. To counter this contention, Vedānta describes *ātmā* as unborn, changeless, without attribute, etc. These are descriptors used for communication and they are not attributes of the *ātmā*.

From the standpoint of worldly transaction, *ātmā* is temporarily called unborn. From its own standpoint *ātmā* cannot be called unborn. From the standpoint of expressions used by other *darśanas*, it is said to be subject to birth and so Vedānta says that *ātmā* is unborn. It is like calling a vessel that has nothing in it “an empty vessel”. Emptiness is not an attribute of the vessel but that word is used to differentiate it from other vessels that contain something. All descriptions of *ātmā* are used from the standpoint of *mithyā nāma-rūpa* and from its own standpoint there are no descriptors for *ātmā*. So *ātmā* is not unborn also.

Verse 75

अभूताभिनवेशोऽस्ति द्वयं तत्र न विद्यते ।

द्वयाभावं स बुद्ध्वैव निर्निमित्तो न जायते ॥ ७५ ॥

abhūtābhiniveśo'sti dvayaṃ tatra na vidyate ।

dvayābhāvaṃ sa buddhvaiva nirnimitto na jāyate ॥ 75॥

There is no duality in that (consciousness). There is (only) an obsession with the unreal (duality). Having known the non-duality, one is not born, being free from (its) cause. (75)

By pointing out that the world is only *nāma-rūpa* and not a substance in itself, Vedānta is not rejecting the world. The world is available for transaction, experience and above all has utility. This *mithyā nāma-rūpa* world has all varieties of things and experiences and by all means this world should be used. While utilizing the world the status of the world should be remembered. If not, the *nāma-rūpa* can become too overwhelming. Our body-mind is also another *nāma-rūpa*. One can get lost in the personal *nāma-rūpa*, family *nāma-rūpa* and the world *nāma-rūpa* and all these can affect the person adversely. It is like our own dream overpowering our own mind. The whole *nāma-rūpa* world is a projection of I, the *Turīyam*. I should not get obsessed with any particular thing of the world. I should remember my higher nature every now and then. Obsession caused by attachment or aversion can cause problems. The fifth capsule of Vedānta should be remembered: 'by forgetting my real nature I convert life into a burden and by remembering my higher nature I convert life into a blessing'. Avoid obsession with anything. In *Vivekacūdāmaṇi*, Śaṅkarācārya describes this obsession with the world, *viṣaya-anu-cintā*, repeated thinking about an object, person or an event. Thinking about these is all right but repeated thinking leading to obsession should be avoided. Gauḍapāda uses the word, '*abhūtābhiniveśa*' to describe this type of obsession with the past, present and future. Everyone is obsessed with one thing or the other to such an extent that it becomes a huge burden. But the objects of obsession are only *nāma-rūpa* and as a thing the world is not at all there. Liberation is using the world without obsession. The sign of obsession is the continuous preoccupation of the mind, the result of which is that the whole world is carried within one's mind. Kṛṣṇa gives an instruction in the *Bhagavad Gita* as to what one should do before meditation: "May you keep the external world outside." (6:27). Why does Kṛṣṇa say this? The advice is given because the world is not only outside but more than that it is very much inside. We are carrying every person and thing in our mind. Do what you have to do and do not carry too much in your mind. This is *jñāni*'s operational mode in life. Having understood the absence of duality other than *nāma-rūpa*, the *jñāni* transcends all the causes of *saṃsāra*. Therefore the *jñāni* is free from the cycle of birth and death.

Verse 76

यदा न लभते हेतूनुत्तमाधममध्यमान् ।

तदा न जायते चित्तं हेत्वभावे फलं कुतः ॥ ७६ ॥

yadā na labhate hetūnuttamādhama-madhyamān |

tadā na jāyate cittaṃ hetvabhāve phalaṃ kutaḥ || 76||

When one does not find superior, medium, and inferior causes (of birth), then, consciousness is not born. How can there be an effect when there is no cause? (76)

Gauḍapāda is explaining the cause of *saṃsāra*. *Karma* is the cause of *saṃsāra*. *Karma* is divided into superior, medium, and inferior. The *jñāni* does not see any of these *karma* because in his understanding the whole world including all the *karma* is reduced to *nāma-rūpa*, which does not have an existence of its own. The *karma* of the dream is seen to be only *nāma-rūpa* upon waking up. Similarly, in the waking

state, all the laws of *karma* apply to the body-mind and upon shifting the vision to that of the higher nature, *ātmā*, they are seen to be *nāma-rūpa*. When the *karma* is transcended from the standpoint of *jñānaṃ*, the *jñāni* says, 'I, the *ātmā*, am never born'. From the body and mind standpoint, the laws of *karma* are operational but they are not operational from the *ātmā*, the consciousness standpoint. The body-mind has to reap the consequences of *karma*.

Verse 77

अनिमित्तस्य चित्तस्य याऽनुत्पत्तिः समाऽद्वया ।

अजातस्यैव सर्वस्य चित्तदृश्यं हि तद्यतः ॥ ७७ ॥

animittasya cittasya yā'nutpattiḥ samā'dvayā ।

ajātasyaiva sarvasya cittadrśyaṃ hi tadyataḥ ॥ 77॥

The non-origination of consciousness which is free from the cause of birth, and which alone is in the form of everything, is eternal and absolute, because that (birth) is indeed an (apparent) object of consciousness which is unborn. (77)

The consciousness principle is not the cause of *saṃsāra*. *Ātmā* does not have birth or *karma*. The absence of birth for *ātmā* is always the case. When ignorant, birth and death are taken to be real. After knowledge, birth and death are seen to be unreal for *ātmā*. The presence of birth is imagination when ignorant and the absence of birth is seen clearly with the vision of the knowledge that *ātmā* is never born.

MK-65 = Chapter -4, Verses – 78 to 80

Verse 77

अनिमित्तस्य चित्तस्य याऽनुत्पत्तिः समाऽद्वया ।

अजातस्यैव सर्वस्य चित्तदृश्यं हि तद्यतः ॥ ७७ ॥

In these verses from the 75th verse up to the 79th verse, Gauḍapāda talks about the benefit for a person who has received and assimilated the teaching presented in all these verses. This is abstract and the highest teaching of Vedānta. First, the nature of the *mithyā* world needs to be assimilated, which does not have existence or origination, has an appearance that is due to ignorance or *māyā*. These four points should be thoroughly assimilated and there should be conviction. Then the next step is that if the entire world is *mithyā* it requires an *adhiṣṭhānam* because the world appears with borrowed existence. The statement that *mithyā* world appears should be understood as the world appearing with borrowed existence. That requires that there should be a lender of existence. That lender is myself. *jagat mithyā aham satyaṃ*. The ‘I’ here is not the body or the mind because they are part of the *mithyā* world. The ‘I’ is the *sākṣi caitanyam*, the witness consciousness that lends existence to the entire world including time and space. I am not located in any place but rather everything is located in me. I am the *Turīyam Ātmā*. Gaining this knowledge is *mokṣa*, which is freedom from the cycle of birth and death.

This freedom is explained in two ways. For junior students, the explanation is: I am a *jīva*. I have got three types of *karma*, *sañcita*, *prārabdha* and *āgāmi*. I have taken several births and now I am a human being by birth. Because of *jñānaṃ* all my *sañcita-karma* has been destroyed, *āgāmi-karma* is avoided and I am now spending my *prārabdha-karma*. Once all the *prārabdha* is exhausted, I will end my last birth and thereafter I will not be born. I was repeatedly born until now, but hereafter I will not be born. This is freedom explained for the junior students. For the senior students, the first statement ‘I am a *jīva*’ should itself be rejected and it is said that I am Brahman, the *Turīyam*. I am neither a doer nor an experiencer. There is no *karma* and I have not gone through even a single birth and so there is no future birth. I do not accept the superior, medium and inferior *karma* leading to celestial birth, human birth and birth as lower beings respectively. These *karmas* are *mithyā*. The *mithyā karma* exists in me, the *ātmā*, but do not belong to me. I am the *adhiṣṭhānam* for the entire cosmos and so the *karmas* float in me but they do not touch me. The waker *adhiṣṭhānam* is not affected by anything that the dream individual does. The waker is not associated with any *karma* that is done by the dream individual. Therefore there is no question of exhausting of *prārabdha-karma* because they are not there. *Turīya Ātmā* is understood to be liberated always. *Ātmā* does not have any past, present or future birth.

The freedom of a *jñāni* is uniformly available at all times because the freedom is his very nature. In *advaitam*, *mokṣa* is not even dependent on God’s will because what is natural is not dependent on anybody’s will. We need God’s grace not for *mokṣa* but for understanding that *mokṣa* is our very nature.

Verse 78

बुद्ध्वाऽनिमित्तां सत्यां हेतुं पृथगनाप्नुवन् ।

वीतशोकं तथा काममभयं पदमश्रुते ॥ ७८ ॥

budhdvā'nimittatām satyām hetuṃ pṛthagāpnuvan ।

vītaśokaṃ tathā kāmamabhayaṃ padamaśnute ॥ 78॥

Having known the absence of causality to be the fact and not acquiring separately any (karma which is a) cause (for birth), one attains the goal which is free from sorrow, desire, and fear. (78)

The topic of the benefit of *jñānaṃ* is continued. It is clearly understood that there is no cause (*karma*) responsible for my past or future birth because being unborn is my intrinsic nature. *Mokṣa* is that clear conviction in the intellect. Based on our experiences we have made certain false conclusions. Vedānta does not aim to change our experiences but to change our wrong conclusions based on those experiences. That I do not have birth or death, as Kṛṣṇa says in the *Bhagavad Gita*, should be a clear fact for me.

This (Self) is never born; nor does it die. It is not that, having been, it ceases to exist again. It is unborn, eternal, undergoes no change whatsoever, and is ever new. When the body is destroyed, the Self is not destroyed. (2:20)

The greatest benefit of this is that all the complaints regarding life are gone. Freedom from complaint is *mokṣa*. In the *mithyā* world, changing situations are present caused by *deśa*, *kāla* and *karma*. These changing situations will always be there in the *mithyā* world. Nobody can stop that because it is the nature of the *mithyā* world. It is not worth complaining. Complaining that fire is hot and ice is cold displays a confused outlook. The *jñāni* knows that nothing is worth complaining about. The greater wisdom is that all these things happen but I, the *adhiṣṭhānam*, continues to be unaffected. This two-fold awareness removes complaint from life. Complaint is *saṃsāra*. I enjoy the freedom from all types of binding desires, that is desires for my fulfillment. Desires from the relative role standpoint are no more binding. I am only a contributor and not a controller. Desires that cause anxiety and fear are not present. Freedom from the sense of insecurity comes. Complaint and sense of insecurity are signs of *saṃsāra*. *Anātmā* is never secure and *ātmā* is never insecure. Working for *anātmā*'s security and working for *ātmā*'s security are meaningless. Freedom from sorrow, desire and fear is *mokṣa*. Thus *mokṣa* is discerned from our own state of mind.

Verse 79

अभूताभिनवेशाद्धि सदृशे तत्प्रवर्तते ।

वस्त्वभावं स बुद्ध्वैव निःसङ्गं विनिवर्तते ॥ ७९ ॥

abhūtābhiniveśāddhi sadṛśe tatpravartate ।

vastvabhāvaṃ sa buddhvaiva niḥsaṅgaṃ vinivartate ॥ 79॥

Indeed, that (consciousness) engages in a similar field (of duality) because of the obsession with the unreal (duality). Having known the absence of objects alone, he turns away with detachment. (79)

Security is my very nature but when I do not understand this as fact, I think that it is a thing available outside. I seek completeness from outside. Outside, only *mithyā* world is there and it cannot give completeness or security. I assume that objects outside will make me full and complete. In each *mithyā* object I seek the non-existent completeness. Initially it is a mistake but when I go on repeating that thought, it becomes an obsession with regard to a non-existent thing. Just like a deer looking for mirage water, we are looking for completeness that the society prescribes. This goes on for the entirety of one's life.

Because of the obsession with the external security, completeness and happiness which are not there, a person runs after those non-existent destinations. This is similar to a musk deer that runs all over seeking the musk fragrance, not realizing that the fragrance is of its own body. But a *jñāni* knows that he is the only source of security, peace and happiness. Having understood the absence of external security, peace and happiness he drops all attachments. Kṛṣṇa refers to this in the *Bhagavad Gita*:

When a person gives up all the desires, as they appear in the mind, happy in oneself with oneself alone, Partha! that person is said to be one of ascertained knowledge. (2:55)

You can do the duty towards the family, but if you postpone completeness and fulfillment, thinking that only after completing that duty you will become full and complete, you are getting into a trap. Know that you are full and complete fundamentally and enjoy doing the duty without connecting your fullness to the performance of your duty. The successful completion of the duty is not in our hands. We may succeed or may not succeed. Know that you are full and complete and enjoy playing whatever roles you have to in life. Such a person withdraws with detachment.

Verse 80

निवृत्तस्याप्रवृत्तस्य निश्चला हि तदा स्थितिः ।

विषयः स हि बुद्धानां तत्साम्यमजमद्वयम् ॥ ८० ॥

*nivṛttasyāpravṛttasya niścalā hi tadā sthitiḥ |
viśayaḥ sa hi buddhānāṃ tatsāmyamajamadvayam || 80||*

At that time, the state of that (consciousness) which is withdrawn (from existing activities) and not engaged (in fresh activities), is indeed undisturbed. It is (of the nature of Brahman which is) uniform, unborn, and non-dual. This is indeed accessible to the wise (only). (80)

Such a *jñāni* of such a wisdom who does not seek security and happiness from outside but plays his roles in the society enjoys a state of mind that is very difficult to describe. The mind of such a *jñāni*, which is relaxed and not full of anxiety and worry is like the peaceful ocean without any turbulences, even if he is a householder.

Kṛṣṇa describes such a *jñāni* in the *Bhagavad Gita*:

Just as water flows into the ocean that is brimful and still, so too, the wise person into whom all objects enter, gains peace, (remains unchanged) whereas, the desirer of objects does not gain peace. (2:70)

He has withdrawn from seeking completeness from outside and does not seek anything externally for completeness. He is careful not to be pulled into *samsāra* by situations and people who are not *jñānis*. Action, planning and execution are prescribed but worrying is never required to be a responsible person. Kṛṣṇa characterizes worry as an *āsuri sampad* in the 16th chapter of the *Bhagavad Gita*. Even as a *karma-yogi*, worry is not warranted because all actions are dedicated to *Īśvara*. Kṛṣṇa says in the *Bhagavad Gita*:

Offering all actions unto Me with a mind that is discriminating, fight without expectations, without possessiveness, (and) without anxiety. (3:30)

Withdraw from worry and never enter into worry again. The state of an anxiety-free mind is available only for the wise people. A *jñāni*'s mind can never be seen or evaluated. Only by being a *jñāni* one can know. That state of mind is called *brāhmisthiti*. It is identical to *Turīyam brahma*. It is ever uniform, never subject to arrival and departure and non-dual. That state is identical to Brahman.

MK-66 = Chapter – 4, Verses – 81 to 83

Verse 80

निवृत्तस्याप्रवृत्तस्य निश्चला हि तदा स्थितिः ।

विषयः स हि बुद्धानां तत्साम्यमजमद्वयम् ॥ ८० ॥

In these verses from the 75th verse, Gauḍapādācārya is talking about the benefit of this knowledge, which needs to be assimilated in the form of *anātmā* world not having existence, origination, has appearance and the appearance is caused by *avidyā* or *māyā*. Therefore, in the *jñāni*'s vision, *anātmā* does not have origination or birth. He has understood that he is the *Turīyam Ātmā* that does not have an origination because it is without a beginning, limitless and eternal. *Ātmā* and *anātmā* do not have birth. When there is no first birth of *ātmā* or *anātmā* there is no question of rebirth at all. Therefore there is no question of avoiding rebirth. The elimination of rebirth is nothing but the elimination of the misconception that there is a possibility of rebirth. The elimination of this misconception alone is *mokṣa*. In the 80th verse, Gauḍapāda said that after discovering of the nature of *ātmā*, which is full and complete, there is no question of seeking fulfillment from the external world. All the desires are fundamentally driven by the idea that one is not complete. A *jñāni* may be engaged in several activities for the sake of the welfare of the world or based on the worldly roles, but in these pursuits there is no expectation of completeness coming from these activities. Instead of working for completeness, he works out of or with completeness. After having withdrawn thus, he does not get into the old rut because ignorance once gone is gone for good. His state of mind is undisturbed. A *jñāni*'s state of mind can only be known by being a *jñāni*. Only the *jñānis* know this state of *mokṣa*. The definitions of *mokṣa*, Brahman and *jñāni* are one and the same. That state of fullness or completeness is ever the same, unborn and non-dual.

Verse 81

अजमनिद्रमस्वप्नं प्रभातं भवति स्वयम् ।

सकृद्विभातो ह्येवैष धर्मो धातुस्वभावतः ॥ ८१ ॥

ajamanidramasvapnam prabhātaṃ bhavati svayam ।

sakṛdvibhāto hyevaiṣa dharmo dhātusvabhāvataḥ ॥ 81 ॥

This Ātmā is indeed unborn, dreamless, sleepless, self-effulgent, and ever-effulgent by its very nature. (81)

The *svarūpam* of *ātmā*, Brahman and *mokṣa* are one and the same. So Gauḍapāda reminds the nature of *ātmā* given in the definition of *ātmā* in the 7th *mantra* of the *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad* using different terms here: *ajam*, *anidram* and *asvapnam*. *Ajam* is without birth. This is with respect to the gross body. So *ātmā* is without birth. *Ātmā* is not *Viśva* or *Virāt*. *Asvapnam* refers to the *ātmā* not being associated with

dream or the subtle body. *Ātmā* is not *Taijassa* or *Hiraṇyagarbha*. *Anidram* refers to *ātmā* not being associated with sleep. *Ātmā* is not *Prājña* or *antaryāmi*.

Ātmā is self-evident and self-effulgent. It is self-revealing as “I am” all the time. Even the mind has to be revealed by myself only. First I lend consciousness to the mind. Through the mind I lend consciousness to the sense organs and through the sense organs to the body. The third capsule of Vedānta: By my mere presence, I lend life to the material body and mind and through the material body and mind I experience the material universe. By myself I am neither the material universe nor the material body nor the material mind. *Ātmā* is said to shine once because it shines eternally. *Ātmā* always shines as ‘I am’. In *Dakṣiṇāmūrtistotra*, Śaṅkarācārya refers to the eternal *ātmā*:

I bow to Sri Dakshinamurthi in the form of my guru: I bow to Him, who in His loving-kindness reveals to his worshippers, the eternal Ātmā, which, through the changes of waking, dreaming, and dreamless sleep, through childhood, youth, maturity, and old age persists as the inexhaustible flow of consciousness, revealing itself in the heart as the ever present sense of “I”. (7)

We never get *mokṣa* but only drop the notion that we are bound.

Verse 82

सुखमाव्रियते नित्यं दुःखं विव्रियते सदा ।

यस्य कस्य च धर्मस्य ग्रहेण भगवानसौ ॥ ८२ ॥

sukhamāvriyate nityaṃ duḥkhaṃ vivriyate sadā ।

yasya kasya ca dharmasya graheṇa bhagavānasau ॥ 82॥

Because of the perception of one object or the other, this Ātmā is easily covered at all times and it is known at any time with difficulty. (82)

Gauḍapādācārya gives a warning to all the Vedāntic students by pointing out that through *śravaṇam* and *mananam* Vedānta can be grasped by a reasonably mature mind. Receiving the teaching is not difficult but what is more difficult and important is not mere reception but retention of the teaching that is possible only through *nididhyāsanam*, which is an alert way of living. Two types of *nididhyāsanam*, *samādhi-abhyāsa-rūpa nididhyāsanam* in which exclusive time is allotted to dwell on the teaching. If that type of *nididhyāsanam* is not required, it can be dropped and the second type, *brahma-abhyāsa-rūpa nididhyāsanam* should be engaged in. This involves practice that makes the knowledge available in and through all the transactions. Transaction is not uniform because it is controlled by *karma*. If you lose your alertness, the dualistic world, that is only an appearance, will take on the status of reality. Getting lost in the appearance will ‘convert’ the *mithyā* world into *satyaṃ* or the *satyaṃ* ‘I’ into the *mithyā jīva*.

Once slipped from the state of knowledge, it will be difficult to get back to it. So Gauḍapāda gives a strong warning.

The essential nature of *ātmā* is easily covered or forgotten. Remembering the fifth capsule of Vedānta: by forgetting my real nature I convert life into a burden, by remembering my real nature, I will convert life into a blessing. Gauḍapāda says that forgetfulness of one's true nature is very easy because there are challenges coming from all over. Coming down from the absolute to the empirical is a downhill process which easily happens, but climbing from the empirical to the absolute is an uphill task. This forgetfulness happens regularly and once slipped, recovery is difficult. Additionally, worrying and feeling guilty over slipping down is a greater *saṃsāra*, a meta-*saṃsāra*.

For this slipping the entire dualistic world is not normally responsible but just one object of attachment or hatred is enough because that object of like or dislike will be raised from the *mithyā* level to the *satya* level. It is like one mosquito inside the mosquito net is sufficient to ruin our sleep. Any object, however small it might be, can trick you into *saṃsāra*. Perception of objects or people is not the problem but it is the obsession with them causing preoccupation is the binding duality. Even a *saṃnyāsi* is not immune to this because the problem is in the mind. This way *ātmā* is covered. Gauḍapāda uses the word '*bhagavān*' for *ātmā*. Gauḍapāda has consistently negated everything *anātmā* and so *Īśvara*, considered as a remote being, has also been refuted by him. Devotees who think of *Īśvara* as a powerful remote being will be upset with Gauḍapāda. Gauḍapāda does not negate *Īśvara* but only the idea of *Īśvara* as *anātmā*. For him, *Īśvara* is *śāntam śivam Turīyam Ātmā*. Gauḍapāda reinstates *Īśvara* as *ātmā*. That is why Lord Kṛṣṇa said in the *Bhagavad Gita*:

Gudakesa (Arjuna)! I am the Self, who resides in the hearts of all beings and I am the cause of the creation, sustenance, and resolution of all beings and things. (10:20)

Until we are ready to understand *Bhagavān* as *ātmā*, *Bhagavān* is considered as *anātmā*.

Verse 83

अस्ति नास्त्यस्ति नास्तीति नास्ति नास्तीति वा पुनः ।

चलस्थिरोभयाभावैरावृणोत्येव बालिशः ॥ ८३ ॥

asti nāstyasti nāstīti nāsti nāstīti vā punaḥ ।

calasthirobhayābhāvairāvṛṇotyeva bāliśaḥ ॥ 83॥

It is existent, it is non-existent, it is existent and non-existent, or it is totally non-existent - holding such views, the indiscriminate one verily covers (this Ātmā) by (attributing) change, changelessness, both (change and changelessness), or non-existence. (83)

Any *anātmā*, thing or being, small or big, that we have like or dislike towards can bring us down from our essential absolute nature. Gauḍapāda says that this *anātmā* that brings one down need not be concrete or tangible. Attachment to intangible things like ideas, concepts and philosophical systems can create *samsāra*. Even abstract *anātmā* like other *darśanas* and even Vedānta, if converted into a *darśana* is *anātmā* and therefore can cause *samsāra*. Words like *satyaṃ*, *jñānaṃ* and *anantaṃ* are not for describing some object *ātmā*, but for pointing to me who is aware of this teaching. The description should help me claim that I am that description. The description is not a concept but it is myself. *Satyaṃ*, *jñānaṃ* and *anantaṃ*, etc., are not concepts. Attachment to these as concepts of a philosophical system will result in conflicts. We are not learning to fight with anyone. We do not give *satyaṃ* status to anyone to deserve quarreling with them. We should not get carried away by any *darśana*. This will cover our true nature. An advice that is given to the Vedāntic student is to never argue with others. Śāṅkara: *budha janaiḥ vādaḥ parityajyatāṃ dustarkāt suviram yataṃ*. Nārada says in the *Bhakti Sūtras* that argument means the ego is predominant and that will make us forget our real nature.

Gauḍapāda mentions four *darśanas* that have different ideas about *ātmā*. Gauḍapāda asks not to quarrel with them. *Asti* is the *Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika* system that says that there is an *ātmā* other than the body-mind complex, that it is material, all-pervading, many in number and with attributes like *rāga*, *dveṣa*, etc. Vedānta says that *rāga-dveṣa* belong to the mind. *Nāsti* is *Yogācāra Buddhism*. This system says that there is an *ātmā* that is not different from *buddhi*. The continuous flow of thought is the *ātmā* and it is named *kṣaṇika vijñānam*. *Asti-nāsti* is *Jainism* also known as *anekāntavāda*, *saptabhaṅgivāda*, *syādvāda*. This system does not define anything precisely because according to this system nothing can be defined precisely. Anything can be defined in different ways according to the different angles from which it is looked at. *Nāsti-nāsti* is *śūnyavāda Buddhism* that says that nothing exists, *ātmā* or *anātmā*. Vedānta does not join any of these systems, which quarrel with each other. We do not claim Vedānta as one of the *darśanas* because if it is classified as such then there will be problems as with the other systems. Vedānta is a teaching that helps us understand our own nature and it is not a system. If Vedānta is entered as a system, one will forget oneself.

Ātmā is subject to change according to *nyāya-vaiśeṣika*. The steady *nāsti-bhāva* is held by the *kṣaṇika vijñāna vādi*. The double *asti-nāsti* is held by the *jainas*. Total non-existence is advanced by the *śūnyavādi*. Going around these different concepts one will keep arguing forgetting the *ātmā* behind the argument. One gets lost in what is being argued and what is behind the arguing, the *ātmā*, is lost sight of. All these indiscriminate people, spiritually childish people, cover their own higher nature. Covering itself is not a problem because we do this in sleep regularly without causing problems but covering makes one slip down to the lower nature, which is the cause of *samsāra*. Gauḍapāda's message is that we should be alert in our transactions.

MK-67 = Chapter – 4, Verses – 84 to 86

Verse 83

अस्ति नास्त्यस्ति नास्तीति नास्ति नास्तीति वा पुनः ।

चलस्थिरोभयाभावैरावृणोत्येव बालिशः ॥ ८३ ॥

Gauḍapādācārya pointed out that even after knowing that I am *Turīyam* different from *Viśva*, *Taijassa* and *Prājña*, a person has to continue in the empirical world. The body-mind complex continues as long as its *prārabdham* is present. This means that we have transactions in the world and during transactions we have to put on the role of *Viśva*. Otherwise no transaction is possible. In the course of playing various roles we have to handle different *anātmā*. In those situations we have to be alert. *Nididhyāsanam* to remember one's real nature should be done during transactions. However much a person is careful a situation may come in which a particular *anātmā* gets important. Then *rāga-dveṣa* may be activated and *Viśva*, which was only a role becomes prominent as though *satyaṃ*. Then *Turīyam* will become as though *mithyā*, less prominent and the person slips. Therefore alertness is important. Any *anātmā* can cause the slip. In this verse, Gauḍapādācārya says that it need not be a concrete *anātmā* but even an abstract idea or different philosophical systems can create problems. A particular idea, if it is an object of attachment can distract a person. Obsession with anything can create *saṃsāra*. Even virtues can become *sāttvika* bondage. Gauḍapāda says that the systems of *nyāya*, *yogācāra*, *jaina*, and *śūnyavāda* can create problems if one is involved in scholarly pursuits. A spiritually indiscriminate person forgets his higher nature getting lost in the analysis of different *darśanas*. Vedānta does not come under a *darśana* competing with the other systems. Vedānta is not a philosophy. It is only a teaching that helps me abide in my own nature.

Verse 84

कोट्यश्चतस्र एतास्तु ग्रहैर्यासां सदाऽऽवृत्तः ।

भगवानाभिरस्पृष्टो येन दृष्टः स सर्वदृक् ॥ ८४ ॥

koṭyaścatasra etāstu grahairyāsāṃ sadā'vṛtaḥ ।

bhagavānābhiraśprṣṭo yena drṣṭaḥ sa sarvadṛk ॥ 84॥

These are indeed the four views by constantly holding which (the Ātmā) is covered. Ātmā is untouched by these (views). He by whom (this) is understood is omniscient. (84)

There are four standpoints as mentioned before: *asti*, *nāsti*, *asti-nāsti* and *nāsti-nāsti*. All systems will fall under one of these four. Vedānta does not take any position. A particular position means an idea, and therefore *anātmā*. Even Vedānta, after it has done the job, has to be dropped. Vedānta is also *anātmā*. Once I have dropped my knower status through the study of Vedānta, Vedānta, a means of knowledge, should be dropped. If a person forgets and holds on to any one of the four positions, the real nature of

the person is concealed. Life involves handling *anātmā* but obsession with *anātmā* should be avoided. From the empirical level, the *Turīya Ātmā* is not affected by any of these four different standpoints. Gauḍapāda uses the word ‘*bhagavān*’ to indicate the *Turīya Ātmā* here. A *jñāni*, having known that everything is Brahman, and that he himself is *ātmā* that transcends all standpoints like the screen for the world-movie, is not affected by different standpoints and does not see the need to compete with any position. *Brahmajñānaṃ* is *sarvajñānaṃ*.

Verse 85

प्राप्य सर्वज्ञतां कृत्स्नां ब्राह्मण्यं पदमद्वयम् ।

अनापन्नादिमध्यान्तं किमतः परमीहते ॥ ८५ ॥

prāpya sarvajñatām kṛtsnām brāhmanyam padamadvayam ।

anāpannādimadhyāntam kimataḥ paramīhate ॥ 85॥

Having attained total omniscience and the non-dual state of brahminhood which is free from beginning, middle, and end, what does he desire thereafter? (85)

The benefit of the *jñānaṃ* is restated here. The benefit is attainment of fulfillment. Normally people have mixed conclusions about whether their lives are a success or a failure. No one can claim complete success at all levels as *ahaṅkāra*. Claiming one’s higher nature alone will give the proper perspective towards the accomplishments at the *ahaṅkāra* level. *Ahaṅkāra* has its limitations. Success and failure are unavoidable. For these to be insignificant, a person should claim the only significant thing, which is the *Turīyam*.

Having attained this omniscience in the form of Brahman knowledge, which is that Brahman is the essence of all and having attained the state of non-duality in the form of knowledge, which is ‘I am non-dual’ in spite of the experience of duality, this *jñāni* attains fulfillment. There can be temporary experiential non-duality like in deep sleep but permanent experience of non-duality is not possible. Only a *jñāni* that knows that he is the *ātmā* that is free from the three *guṇas* is a *brāhmaṇa*. Thereafter, whatever that person does is not done for fulfillment. He does not have any binding desires, i.e., desires engaged in for fulfillment. He does not have any binding pursuits also. Fulfillment does not mean that a person should withdraw from action. Action should be engaged in without bondage as Kṛṣṇa says in the *Bhagavad Gita*:

Partha (Arjuna)! For me, there is nothing to be done. In the three worlds, there is nothing to be gained by me, which is not yet gained. Yet, I remain engaged in action. (3:22)

Verse 86

विप्राणां विनयो ह्येष शमः प्राकृत उच्यते ।

दमः प्रकृतिदान्तत्वादेवं विद्वान्ज्जमं व्रजेत् ॥ ८६ ॥

viprāṇāṃ vinayo hyeṣa śamaḥ prākṛta ucyate ।

damaḥ prakṛtidāntatvādevaṃ vidvāṅśamaṃ vrajet ॥ 86॥

This is modesty. Mind-control (as well as) sense-control of the wise people is indeed said to be spontaneous because of natural self-restraint. Thus, the wise person attains peace. (86)

Here Gauḍapādācārya conveys another important idea about the conduct, behavior or trait of a *jñāni*. Before coming to *jñānaṃ* and *niṣṭha* he must have practiced many disciplines as *sādhana*. At the *karma-yoga* level Lord Kṛṣṇa has prescribed several *sādhana*s. In the 13th chapter, there is a list *amānitvam*, *adambhitvam*, etc., twenty of them. In the 16th chapter another big list of twenty-six virtues, *abhayaṃ*, *saṃśuddhi*, etc., are enumerated. In all the Vedānta texts, *sādhana catuṣṭaya sampatti* is highlighted. All of them are started when the spiritual life starts. It is long and consists of *karma-yoga*, *upāsana-yoga*, *śravaṇam*, *mananam* and life-long *nididhyāsanam*. *Karma-yoga* and *upāsana-yoga* are for preparation. *Śravaṇam* and *mananam* are for attainment of *jñāna*. *Nididhyāsanam* is for *jñāna-niṣṭha*. If a person has diligently followed all the *sādhana*s, all the virtues will be natural to him during *nididhyāsanam*. He does not have to deliberately follow the virtues. Thus a *jñāni* is one who spontaneously expresses all or most of the virtues. The *jñāni* will also work on making any virtue that is not natural become natural. A seeker should cultivate these values deliberately or have them spontaneously. At no point he can be free from them. A *jñāna-niṣṭha* is a *dhārmic* person spontaneously. From Vedāntic angle *dharma* or values is *mithyā* also. People may misinterpret this teaching by thinking that once *jñānaṃ* is obtained *dharma* can be forsaken. Gauḍapāda warns that there is no such concession. Transactional life should be governed by *dharma* whether one is an *ajñāni*, *jñāni* or a *jñāna-niṣṭha*. Kṛṣṇa tells in the *Gita* that even *Bhagavān*, when he takes an incarnation and comes to the empirical plane, cannot claim an exemption. Veda never makes Vedānta compulsory but makes *dharma* compulsory. Whether one's *puruṣārtha* is *artha-kāma* or *mokṣa*, *dharma* is the foundation upon which these pursuits should be engaged in.

For the *jñāni*, virtues *amānitvam*, etc., are natural and effortless. It is not a blessing that *Bhagavān* has given him but the *jñāni* has worked for them. Knowledge should make one humble. The *jñāni* has *sādhana traya sampatti* because he has known that *mokṣa* is his *svarūpam* and thus he does not have *mumukṣutvam*. Thought discipline and sensory discipline have become natural to the *jñāni* because of long practice. All kinds of thoughts will rise in the mind because of *vāsanās* and that cannot be stopped. Because of *jñānaṃ* and discipline, the *jñāni* has the natural capacity to not entertain thoughts that are inimical to Vedānta. Thus all the virtues are natural to the *jñāni* or are in the process of becoming natural. In this manner a wise person calms down in life. FIR reduction with regard to emotional

disturbances and increased CCC, calmness, cheerfulness (that flows naturally to others), and confidence in facing one's future is *jīvanmukti*.

MK-68 = Chapter – 4, Verses – 87 to 90

Verse 86

विप्राणां विनयो ह्येष शमः प्राकृत उच्यते ।

दमः प्रकृतिदान्तत्वादेवं विद्वान्ज्जमं व्रजेत् ॥ ८६ ॥

In this important verse, which we completed in the last class, Gauḍapāda gives a significant message, i.e., while the *jñāna-yoga* of *śravaṇam*, *mananam* and *nididhyāsanam* is in progress, the refinement of the mind should also be in progress in parallel because *jñāna-yoga* and mental refinement are complimentary to each other. The mental refinement in *Tattvabodha* language is called *sādhana catuṣṭaya sampatti* and in the *Bhagavad Gita* language it is *daivī-sampat* increase and *āsurī-sampat* decrease. If a seeker pays attention to both of them very well by the time he comes to the *nididhyāsanam* level, both will become natural and spontaneous. Even if there is deficiency it will be made up in *nididhyāsanam*. So then in *jñāna-niṣṭha*, there is the assimilation of the knowledge and spontaneity of the virtues. *Jñāna-niṣṭha* is the assimilation of the knowledge and spontaneity of the virtues put together. In the 85th verse, Gauḍapādācārya talked about the assimilation of the knowledge. In the 86th verse, he talks about the spontaneity of the virtues. Both of these verses must be read together. Śaṅkarācārya gives a contextual meaning of the word ‘*vinaya*’. The word’s popular meaning is humility and in Kṛṣṇa’s language it is *amānitvam*. The pronoun ‘this’ appears in front of ‘*vinaya*’. *Brahma-niṣṭha* was talked about in the previous verse. Therefore, Śaṅkarācārya takes ‘*vinaya*’ to be the very *brahma-niṣṭha* itself. In the 2nd chapter of the *Bhagavad Gita*, Kṛṣṇa uses the word: *brāhmisthiti*.

Verse 87

सवस्तु सोपलम्भं च द्वयं लौकिकमिष्यते ।

अवस्तु सोपलम्भं च शुद्धं लौकिकमिष्यते ॥ ८७ ॥

savastu sopalambhaṃ ca dvayaṃ laukikamiṣyate ।

avastu sopalambhaṃ ca śuddhaṃ laukikamiṣyate ॥ 87॥

(That state of) duality which consists of experiences along with external objects is considered to be the waking-state. (That state), which consists of experiences without external objects, is considered to be the dream-state. (87)

Before winding up the entire *kārikā* teaching in these next verses, which started with the *Āgamaprakaraṇam* chapter, Gauḍapāda wishes to remind us of the *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad* itself. He summarizes the central teaching of the Upaniṣad, which is the *avasthā-traya-viveka*. He defines the *jāgrat*, *svapna* and *suṣupti* and points out that *Turīyam* is the substratum of all the three, which are subject to continuous change. The changing three *avasthās* are located based upon the changeless *Turīyam* and that changeless *Turīyam* is the *avasthā-traya-adhiṣṭhānam*, which is the real me and ever

free. He uses special words for each *avasthā*, perhaps borrowed from Buddhistic books. For the *jāgrat avasthā* the word used is *dvayaṃ laukikam*. *Dvayaṃ* refers to *jāgrat avasthā*. *Śuddhaṃ laukikam* refers to *svapna avasthā*. *Lokottaram* refers to *suṣupti avasthā*. This word appears in the next verse. *Jāgrat avasthā* is a state in which there are experiences and corresponding to experiences there are objects outside. The pair of experiences and objects is the indication of *jāgrat avasthā*. Now I am experiencing so many people and corresponding to every experience there is an object. Thus in *jāgrat avasthā*, both the experience and the corresponding objects are present. In dream *avasthā*, there is experience but there are no corresponding external objects because the sense organs are closed. Only the mind is operational and from the *vāsanās* of the mind, experiences are generated but there are no corresponding external objects. Experience without external objects is *svapna*. Experience with objects is *jāgrat*.

Verse 88

अवस्त्वनुपलम्भं च लोकोत्तरमिति स्मृतम् ।

ज्ञानं ज्ञेयं च विज्ञेयं सदा बुद्धैः प्रकीर्तितम् ॥ ८८ ॥

avastvanupalambhaṃ ca lokottaramiti smṛtam ।

jñānaṃ jñeyaṃ ca vijñeyaṃ sadā buddhaiḥ prakīrtitam ॥ 88॥

(That state) which is without experiences and without external objects is considered to be the sleep-state. Knowledge, the object of knowledge, and the (Ātmā) to be known are always discussed by the wise. (88)

Suṣupti avasthā is defined as the state in which there is no experience and no objects. Gauḍapāda uses the word *lokottaram* for *suṣupti*, meaning transcendence of both the internal and external worlds. What do the *jñānis* talk about? The *jñānis* are aware of three things: *jñānaṃ*, *jñeyaṃ* and *vijñeyaṃ*. *Jñānaṃ* refers to the experiences and *jñeyaṃ* are the corresponding objects. Both of them keep changing. They are empirical *satyaṃ*. These changes require a changeless *adhiṣṭhānam*, which is the PSE, projector, sustainer and experiencer. Just as the waker projects the dream, sustains the dream and enters the dream to experience the dream, similarly *ātmā* alone with the help of *māyā* has projected the *jāgrat prapañca*, sustains it and experiences or witnesses it. That *adhiṣṭhānam* PSE is changeless. That changeless *Turīyam adhiṣṭhānam* is called *vijñeyaṃ* in this verse. This ‘*vijñeyaṃ*’ occurs in the 7th mantra of the *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad*. *Vijñeyaṃ* is *satyaṃ*. *Jñānaṃ* and *jñeyaṃ* are *mithyā*. The wise people know both *satyaṃ* and *mithyā* and they talk about these. Kṛṣṇa refers to this in the *Bhagavad Gita*:

For the unreal (mithyā), there is never any being. For the real, there is never any non-being. The ultimate truth of both (the real and the unreal) is seen by the knowers of the truth. (2:16)

Wisdom means that you understand *satyaṃ* as *satyaṃ* and *mithyā* as *mithyā*. This clear knowledge of both *satyaṃ* and *mithyā* is the essence of *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad*. The wise people have this knowledge and discuss it when asked.

Verse 89

ज्ञाने च त्रिविधे ज्ञेये क्रमेण विदिते स्वयम् ।

सर्वज्ञता हि सर्वत्र भवतीह महाधियः ॥ ८९ ॥

jñāne ca trividhe jñeye krameṇa vidite svayam ।

sarvajñatā hi sarvatra bhavatīha mahādhiyaḥ ॥ 89॥

When the threefold knowledge and the (threefold) object of knowledge are known in order, that man of great intelligence indeed enjoys omniscience by himself in this birth everywhere. (89)

Gauḍapāda is presenting the essence of *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad* in a slightly different language. Each of the three *avasthās* has got experiences and the relevant objects. In *jāgrat avasthā* there is *sthūla anubhava* and the *sthūla prapañca* is the experienced object. In *svapna* there is experience and even though there are no external objects there are dream objects within the dream. Thus both *jāgrat* and *svapna* have experience and external or internal objects. In *susupti* there is experience. There are two things experienced in deep sleep. Total blankness or *ajñānaṃ* and *sukham* are experienced. *Ajñānaṃ* and *ānandam* are objects that are experienced in the deep sleep state. Thus in all the three *avasthās* there are relevant experiences and relevant objects. In the previous verse, the words *upalambham* and *vastu* were used for experience and objects respectively. In this verse, Gauḍapāda uses the words *jñānaṃ* and *jñeyam* for experience and objects respectively. All of these three pairs of experiences and objects are subject to continuous change and are *mithyā* or empirical *satyaṃ*. There is an *adhiṣṭhānam* for these three pairs. It is the *Turīya Ātmā*. The wise person is one who knows both the *adhiṣṭhānam* and the three pairs.

The three-fold experiences and the three-fold objects of experience are learnt gradually. Thereafter withdrawing from these three pairs, one has to come to the *vijneya ātmā*. Knowing the *Turīyam* is only claiming that I am *Turīyam*. For that student of great intellect, fullness and completeness is the benefit. He does not miss anything and does not have any wants in life. Nothing is away from him because he is in the form of everything.

Verse 90

हेयज्ञेयाप्यपाक्यानि विज्ञेयान्यग्रयाणतः ।

तेषामन्यत्र विज्ञेयादुपलम्भस्त्रिषु स्मृतः ॥ ९० ॥

heyajñeyāpyapākyāni vijñeyānyagrayāṇataḥ |
teṣāmanyatra vijñeyādupalambhastriṣu smṛtaḥ || 90||

Things to be rejected, known, acquired, and made ineffective are to be understood first. Other than (the Ātmā) to be known, three of them are considered to be (mere) appearance. (90)

The previous two verses are each a summary of the entire *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad*. Each one is a complete summary of the *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad*. Now Gauḍapāda addresses the *manda* and *madhyama* students. *Manda* students are those that do not receive the teaching at all. *Madhyama* students are those that receive the teaching but do not retain it. Practical benefits are missing for these students. Arjuna complained that the teaching does not stay with him. *Uttamaḥ* students are those that receive and retain the teaching. *Karma-yoga* is for *manda adhikārī*, *upāsana-yoga* is for *madhyama adhikārī* and *jñāna-yoga* is for the *uttamaḥ adhikārī*. Gauḍapāda says that even if you do not understand the teaching it is not a great problem. Vedānta *śravaṇam* itself is capable of purifying the mind. *Jñāna-yoga* serves as a *pramāṇam* and a purifier of the mind. One can continue the *śravaṇam* and continue to prepare the mind and as the mind gets prepared the understanding will get better and better.

Gauḍapāda addresses the preparation in this verse. Before coming to Vedānta four factors must be noted for checking to see if one is ready for *jñāna-yoga*. What are these factors?

Heyam – all the impurities of the mind like the weeds in a garden. The mind should be free from *rāga*, *dveṣa*, etc., *āsurī-sampat*.

Āpyam – all those virtues that are to be acquired and nourished, *daivī-sampat*, which includes *śravaṇam*, *mananam*, and *nididhyāsanam*. Kṛṣṇa also refers to *jñāna-yoga* itself as *daivī-sampat*.

Pākyāni – certain tendencies that have to be roasted, rendered ineffective. A roasted seed cannot germinate. *Rāga* and *dveṣa* cannot be totally removed as Kṛṣṇa notes in the *Bhagavad Gita*:

There are longing and aversion (potential) in every sense object. May one not come under the spell of these two because they are one's enemies. (3:34)

Some *rāga-dveṣas* are universal and natural. There are unavoidable legitimate *rāga* and *dveṣa*. But there are binding *rāga-dveṣa*, which have inbuilt hurting capacity. We have to remove the hurting capacity of *rāga-dveṣa* and make the binding *rāga-dveṣa* into non-binding *rāga-dveṣa*. We should be prepared to accept all the results according to the law of *karma* and then the *rāga-dveṣa*, even though present will not hurt us. The details are in *Bhagavad Gita*, particularly in the 2nd chapter:

Taking pleasure and pain, gain and loss, victory and defeat to be the same, prepare for battle. Thus, you will gain no sin. (2:38)

That *samatvam* building is called *rāga-dveṣa* roasting. *Samatvam* building through proper attitude, *Īśvara-arpaṇa bhāvanā* and *Īśvara-prasāda bhāvanā* as detailed in the 3rd chapter of the *Bhagavad Gita* will blunt the sharpness of *rāga-dveṣa*. Un-roasted *rāga-dveṣa* will create a preoccupied and shallow mind. That kind of a mind will not be able to do *śravaṇam*. Only a non-preoccupied deep mind can listen attentively for a length of time and receive the message deeply and retain it in the heart.

Jñeyam – Brahman, the goal must be kept in mind by the seeker. All these four factors have to be noted when anyone comes to the spiritual path.

MK-69 = Chapter – 4, Verses – 90 to 92

Verse 90

हेयज्ञेयाप्यपाक्यानि विज्ञेयान्यग्रयाणतः ।

तेषामन्यत्र विज्ञेयादुपलम्भस्त्रिषु स्मृतः ॥ ९० ॥

Gauḍapādācārya presented the teaching very clearly in the form of ‘*brahma satyaṃ jagan mithyā / jīvobrahmaiva nāpara* //’. This teaching being extremely subtle, many people will find it very difficult to grasp. Some people may grasp the teaching but are not be able to retain the teaching. Some people may grasp and retain but do not assimilate enough to transform the very personality. If this is happening what is the cause for that? Not only do we have to know the cause but we have to rectify also. Therefore Gauḍapādācārya said that every spiritual seeker should note four factors in the spiritual path right from the beginning itself. One factor is the final goal of the spiritual *sādhana*, which is knowing Brahman. *Jñānaṃ* alone gives liberation. *Brahma-jñānaṃ* requires *śāstric* enquiry because *śāstra* alone is the *pramāṇam*, which reveals Brahman. *Śāstra-vicāra* is the primary *sādhana* to know Brahman, which is the ultimate thing to be known, and this must be remembered all the time. Gauḍapāda refers to this as *jñeyam*, the thing to be known. This knowledge has to take place in the mind only like any other knowledge. *Ātmā* is not the locus of knowledge. Since knowledge has to take place in the mind, the mind should be fit enough to receive, retain and assimilate the knowledge. Whatever refinement of the mind is needed should be taken care of. It is similar to the preparation of the land for the plant to grow. *Brahma-jñānaṃ* is a plant that gives the *mokṣa* fruit and it requires an appropriately prepared land (mind).

This preparation requires more attention than the Vedāntic study even. Three factors are mentioned with regard to the mental preparation: *heyam*, *āpyam* and *pākyam*. *Heyam* is all those traits that are not conducive to Vedāntic knowledge described in the 16th chapter of the *Bhagavad Gita* as *āsurī sampatti*. *Āpyam* is all the virtues that are favorable for receiving the knowledge enumerated as *daivī sampatti* by Kṛṣṇa. *Pākyam*: *rāga* and *dveṣa* cannot be totally avoided but they have the toxic power of disturbing the mind emotionally. They will never allow the mind to remain calm and still worse keep the mind pre-occupied. The mind should be relaxed, deep, and receptive and have long attention span, but *rāga-dveṣa* will work to prevent the mind from achieving this state. So the *rāga-dveṣa* should be roasted. The roasted *rāga-dveṣa* will remain with the person as preferences. Any number of preferences is fine. One has to convert *rāga-dveṣa* into non-binding preferences. All these three are preparation and Vedānta *śravaṇam* is the primary *sādhana*. All the four factors that Gauḍapādācārya mentions here should go together and even if any one of them is missing, the knowledge will not take place. If spending a long time in Vedānta does not produce the desired result of assimilation, one of these factors is missing and so a seeker should be constantly vigilant regarding these four factors.

Of these four factors, three belong to empirical reality and only one is absolute reality. *Jñeyam* is absolute reality whereas *heyam*, *āpyam*, *pākyam* are all empirical reality. The thing to be known, Brahman, *Turīyam* is the absolute reality. Hit the absolute reality and transcend all these. The world does not have existence and origination but has appearance, which is *mithyā*. *Heyam*, *āpyam* and *pākyam* are *mithyā* and *jñeyam* is *satyam*. With this Gauḍapāda has completed the topic of *sādhana* (*heyam*, *āpyam* and *pākyam*). Gauḍapāda does not elaborate because this *sādhana* is elaborated in the *Bhagavad Gita*.

He concludes the entire *Māṇḍūkya-kārikā* by giving the essence of the teaching in the following verses. He highlights two points. Both are very important.

The first point is that what every human being seeks fundamentally is already the nature of the human being. Unfortunately we are missing our nature and we are searching for it elsewhere. It is like losing a ring from one's finger and searching for it in every place except in the place where it was lost. Our own nature is peace, security and happiness but everyone is seeking for these universally outside. In fact, peace, security and happiness are not even in us but we are all of these.

The second message is that *dvaitam* is *saṃsāra* and *advaitam* alone is *mokṣa*. As long as a person is obsessed with *dvaitam* and taking it as a fact so long that person will be a *saṃsāri*. Experiencing *dvaitam* is not *saṃsāra* but obsession with duality thinking that it is a fact is *saṃsāra*. One should know that *dvaitam* is an appearance but it is not a fact. That *dvaitam* is a fact is a wrong conclusion that we have made based on our experience. We need not change the experience but we have to change the conclusion. Sun going around the earth is our experience but taking it as a fact is our conclusion. All the education is to show that the earth goes around the sun. More importantly, even after changing the conclusion the experience will continue to be the same. Knowledge does not bring about a change in experience because our organs are designed for such an experience. *Advaitam* is the knowledge but our experience will be always *dvaitam* because our sense organs are designed to experience duality. What we have to change is not the experience but question the conclusion and change the conclusion. The conclusion is that there is no *dvaitam* and there is only *advaitam*. There is only one truth that is myself. I alone am appearing as this dualistic universe. As is stated in the *Taittirīya Upaniṣad*, I am the subject, I am the object and I am the instrument. I, the non-dual, appear as the dual. *Dvaitam* is *saṃsāra* and *advaitam* is *mokṣa*.

Verse 91

प्रकृत्याऽऽकाशवज्जेयाः सर्वे धर्मा अनादयः ।

विद्यते न हि नानात्वं तेषां क्वचन किञ्चन ॥ ९१ ॥

prakṛtyā"kāśavajjñeyāḥ sarve dharmā anādayaḥ ।

vidyate na hi nānātvam teṣāṃ kvacana kiñcana ॥ 91 ॥

By nature, all jīvas should be known to be unborn (and pure) like the space. There is indeed no difference at all among them at anytime. (91)

Every *jīvātma* should understand himself or herself as the all-pervading consciousness principle, which is like space. Like space, I am all-pervading, formless, accommodate every thing, not contaminated by anything, and *advaitam*. Every *jīvātma* is all-pervading and non-dual like space by nature. I cannot become limitless because what is limited can never become limitless. Finite cannot become infinite. Therefore I do not have to do *sādhana* to become limitless. It will never work. What I have to do is claim limitlessness, which is already my very nature. Consciousness is not limited by the boundary of the body. Body has boundary but the consciousness that blesses the body is not limited by the boundary of the body. Not only is there no limitation spatially but there is no limitation time-wise also. Everyone is the unborn *ātmā*. The body's birthday is mistaken to be our birthday. Celebrating the birthday is fine but one should remember that *ātmā* is without a beginning. Without any exception every one can claim this fact. There is no plurality in the *ātmā*. Normally it is thought that there are many *jīvātmas*. Gauḍapāda says that plurality belongs to the body, which is the enclosure for Consciousness. Plurality does not belong to Consciousness. If there are five pots how many spaces are there? Space is one even though it appears like there are several pot-spaces, small, medium, big, etc. Pot-spaces seem to be many but seeming plurality is not actual plurality. What is seeming is not actual. *Jīvātmas* are seemingly many but there is no actual plurality at anytime or at anyplace. The part-whole teaching, *jīvātma* is part of *paramātma*, is not correct. Consciousness is part-less. *Advaitam*, limitlessness, fullness and completeness is our *svarūpam*.

Verse 92

आदिबुद्धाः प्रकृत्यैव सर्वे धर्माः सुनिश्चिताः ।

यस्यैवं भवति क्षान्तिः सोऽमृतत्वाय कल्पते ॥ ९२ ॥

ādibuddhāḥ prakṛtyaiva sarve dharmāḥ suniścītāḥ ।

yasyaivaṃ bhavati kṣāntiḥ so'mṛtatvāya kalpate ॥ 92॥

By nature, all jīvas are self-evident (and) evident from the very beginning. He who enjoys contentment with this knowledge is fit for immortality. (92)

When a person is not a spiritual seeker, that worldly person wants to acquire many things and there is the associated anxiety. When a person comes to spirituality he may come out of worldly anxiety but those will be invariably replaced by spiritual anxiety. Spiritual anxiety is whether *mokṣa* will be attained. When the *guru* says that for *mokṣa* self-knowledge is needed, anxiety for *mokṣa* is replaced by anxiety for realization, enlightenment, *ātma-jñānaṃ*, *brahma-jñānaṃ*, *ātma-anubhava*, *brahma-anubhava*, etc. Gauḍapādācārya says that no one need have anxiety for *ātma-anubhava* because *ātmā* is something that is experienced by all the people all the time in the form of 'I am'. The word *ātmā* means 'self' and 'self'

is 'I'. *Ātma-anubhava* means self-anubhava. Self-anubhava means I-anubhava. I-anubhava need not be worked for because the 'I' is experienced all the time. Consciousness is self-revealing. *Anātmā* requires a revealing light. *Ātmā* does not require a revealing light. *Ātmā* being self-revealing, every one is *ātma-jñāni* from *anādi kāla*. Never desperately attempt for Self-Knowledge. Then, what are we doing studying Vedānta? We are studying not for Self-Knowledge because the self is all the time available as 'I am'. But what we do is after saying, 'I am' we add a few adjectives to 'I am'. If we say, 'I am' and stop we are all *jñānis*. Saying, 'I am a man', 'I am old', and 'I am sick', etc., we add all these adjectives that do not belong to us, the *ātmā* but belong to the *anātmā*, either the body, or the mind or the sense organs. *Śāstra* only says that after saying, 'I am', stop. That is *brahmajñānam*. If I add an attribute to 'I am' I become a *jīvātma*. If I drop the attributes, I am called *paramātmā*. 'I am' without attributes is called Brahman. Saying, 'I am attribute-less' is not adding another attribute. It is only indicating that 'I am' is free from attributes. We study Vedānta not for Self-Knowledge but for dropping self-misconceptions. Therefore Gauḍapāda says that we should not have anxiety for Self-Knowledge because it is already there as 'I am'.

Every *jīvātma* is self-revealing consciousness. Therefore all the *jīvātmas* are enlightened regarding themselves even before starting *jñāna-yoga*. What is the proof? Because we all start with any sentence 'I am'. 'I am' reveals the self-revealing *ātmā* by its very nature. If the Vedāntic message is not understood properly, which is called filtered listening, a person will be looking for Self-Knowledge even after studying many Vedāntic texts. The person who has understood the message of Vedānta will say, 'I am' and stop adding adjectives to 'I am'. Adjectives limit me, who is limitless. During sleep we do not take the attributes of *anātmā* and we are limitless. Upon waking up we continue the mistake. Vedānta is dropping the adjectives. Having understood thus, the person is relaxed without anxiety for Self-Knowledge or experience of the Self. We do not need to get Self-Knowledge because we already have it in the form of 'I am'. The person that understands this can claim immortality at once. Immortality is already our nature. When I say, 'I am a man' I have already identified with the body. The moment that happens immortality cannot be claimed. But if I say, 'I am' and stop, immortality that is my nature already can be claimed.

MK-70 = Chapter – 4, Verses – 93 to 96

Verse 92

आदिबुद्धाः प्रकृत्यैव सर्वे धर्माः सुनिश्चिताः ।

यस्यैवं भवति क्षान्तिः सोऽमृतत्वाय कल्पते ॥ ९२ ॥

Gauḍapādācārya is summarizing the whole teaching from the 91st verse up to the end of this chapter. Two important messages are given. The first one is that all the fundamental things that every human being seeks are already one's own real nature and they need not be acquired from outside. Those fundamental things that everyone seeks are peace, security and happiness. All these three things being our very nature we need not get them from outside but more importantly we cannot get from outside because the outside world does not have any one of these as its nature. Even if any one of these three is obtained it is not really coming from outside. Whenever we find peace, security or happiness in any external object, Vedānta says that the external object temporarily serves as a mirror only. Whichever external object gives peace, security or happiness (PSH), it is not giving from its own resources but it is only reflecting our own peace, security or happiness in that person or object. No doubt that we can enjoy our PSH reflected but the *nāma-rūpa* mirror is not steady. As we even enjoy the PSH, the situation may change or the person will change or our minds will change. It is like looking at our reflection in shaky water. Enjoy when it is available but when it goes understand what Kṛṣṇa says in the *Bhagavad Gita*:

Arjuna! The contacts of the sense organs with the sensory world that give rise to cold and heat, pleasure and pain, which have the nature of coming and going, are not constant. Endure them, Arjuna! (2:14)

We should understand that the peace that was experienced comes from us but if we conclude that the peace is gone along with the object we become *samsaris*. Objects will go but the PSH will never go because that belongs to us.

When it is said that PSH belongs to me, one should clearly understand which 'me'. Gauḍapāda reminds us. Four types of 'me' are mentioned in the *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad* as *catuspāt*. 'I' identified with the *sthūla śarīram* is called *Viśva*, 'I' identified with the *sūkṣmā śarīram* is *Taijassa*, and the 'I' in deep sleep is *Prājña*. Thus there are *Viśva-me*, *Taijassa-me* and *Prājña-me*. In all of these 'I' or 'me', PSH will not be permanent because these roles are subject to time. I am not the *Viśva*, *Taijassa* or *Prājña*. Behind all these three is the real 'I or me' described in *mantra 7*. So the 'I' mentioned in these concluding verses is the *Turīyam*. *Viśva* and *Taijassa* are many and *Prājña* are potentially many. *Turīyam* is one. I am that *Turīyam*. Even self-knowledge need not be worked for because it is always there in the form of 'I am' the subject. What we should do is to hand over the physical attributes to the gross body, the emotional attributes to the subtle body, and the attributes of the sleep state to the causal body. The one that remains

as 'I am', once the attributes are removed this way, is *Turīyam*. That 'I am' is immortal. He has not obtained immortality but he has claimed immortality because it is his very nature.

Verse 93

आदिशान्ता ह्यनुत्पन्नाः प्रकृत्यैव सुनिर्वृताः ।

सर्वे धर्माः समाभिन्ना अजं साम्यं विशारदम् ॥ ९३ ॥

ādisāntā hyanutpannāḥ prakṛtyaiva sunirvṛtāḥ ।

sarve dharmāḥ samābhinnā ajam sāmyaṁ viśāradam ॥ 93॥

By nature, all jīvas are totally free, unborn, uniform, division-less, and peaceful from the very beginning. (Ātmā) is indeed unborn, uniform, and pure. (93)

Every *jīvātma* is *Turīyam* by very nature incapable of being disturbed at anytime. The mind is subject to temporary disturbance or peace. Generally the peace we know is the gap between two disturbances. The mind is subject to fluctuations but I, who is different from the mind and who is the witness consciousness, the *sākṣi caitanyam*, am *śāntam*, *śivam* and *advaitam*. This peace has been there from beginning-less time. Because I am *Turīyam*, I am free from the cycle of birth and death all the time. Freedom from rebirth is freedom from the misconception that I have rebirth. Misconception is in the mind and no correction is needed anywhere else. All the *jīvātmās* are same and each is non-different from the other. *Jñānis* claim this fact but others refuse to claim this fact. As *Viśva*, *jīvas* are different. But from the *ātmā* angle all *jīvas* are the same. Birthlessness, sameness, and purity are our nature.

Verse 94

वैशारद्यं तु वै नास्ति भेदे विचरतां सदा ।

भेदनिम्नाः पृथग्वादास्तस्मात्ते कृपणाः स्मृताः ॥ ९४ ॥

vaiśāradyaṁ tu vai nāsti bhede vicaratāṁ sadā ।

bhedanimnāḥ pṛthagvādāstasmātte kṛpaṇāḥ smṛtāḥ ॥ 94॥

There can be no purity at all for those who dwell upon separateness all the time. Dualists are inclined to (the idea of) separateness. Therefore, they are considered to be unfortunate. (94)

In the previous verse, the first message that whatever we want we already have or already are and that we have to learn to claim that fact was given. Claiming this fact leads to a relaxed mind. Then we should turn our attention to *anātmā*.

Remembering the nature of *anātmā*, which is that *anātmā* does not have origination or existence and that it has only an appearance, do whatever is needed to improve the *anātmā* and not connect your peace to the conditions of *anātmā*. If one's fulfillment is connected to *anātmā*, the fulfillment will never come consistently. Approach *anātmā* objectively with the understanding that you do not have control over *anātmā*. You can only contribute your best whether it is your own body, mind, or your family or your property, or your own profession. You do not have any control over the *pañca anātmā*. Even *Bhagavān* cannot have total control over *anātmā*. *Anātmā* cannot be controlled by *jīva* or *Īśvara* but is controlled by the law of *karma*. This does not mean fatalism because you have a contributing freewill. With this awareness you are free as *ātmā* and you can contribute to *anātmā* and this is called *jīvanmukti*. The moment you start controlling *anātmā*, *saṃsāra* will affect you because your expectations may not be fulfilled. *Saṃsāra* is endless complaint of *anātmā*, which is not worth complaining about. Whatever you seek you claim with yourself.

From the 94th verse, the second message is that *advaitam* is the reality and *dvaitam* is *mithyā*. You can handle *dvaitam* but never get obsessed with *dvaitam*. *Dvaitam* obsession is *saṃsāra* but *dvaitam* perception is not *saṃsāra*. Those people who are all the time dwelling upon *dvaitam* with *rāga* and *dveṣa* leading to mental preoccupation do not have any mental clarity, relaxation or purity. Purity of mind is calmness of the mind. A constantly disturbed mind alone is the impure mind. Even obsession with one's worldly duties can cause a disturbed mind and this is also *saṃsāra*.

All dualistic philosophers, *sāṃkhya*, *yoga*, *nyāya*, *vaiśeṣika*, *pūrva-mīmāṃsa*, *dvaita* Vedānta, and *viśiṣṭādvaita* Vedānta accept duality and dwell upon differences. They are inclined towards differences and they are unfortunate ones. There is a significant statement in *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad*, 'as long as there is a second thing there will be fear'. (1.4, *Puruśavida Brāhmaṇam*). Interacting with a second person or an object will generate *rāga* or *dveṣa* towards that person or the object. Both cause fear in two different ways, fear of departure (*rāga*) or fear of arrival (*dveṣa*). *Advaitin* also experiences duality but he does not see anything different from himself because he knows that one *ātmā* alone is appearing as different *nāma-rūpa*.

Verse 95

अजे साम्ये तु ये केचिद्भविष्यन्ति सुनिश्चिताः ।

ते हि लोके महाज्ञानास्तच्च लोको न गाहते ॥ ९५ ॥

aje sāmnye tu ye kecidbhaviṣyanti suniścitāḥ ।

te hi loka mahājñānāstacca loko na gāhate ॥ 95॥

On the other hand, those who are firmly established in the unborn, uniform (Brahman) are indeed people of great wisdom in the world. The common man, however, does not understand that. (95)

Gauḍapāda says that a person who has come to this knowledge is a rare one, admirable one and one that has to be congratulated because he has gone through a long journey to come to the binary format. Starting in *karma-yoga*, I deliberately enter into a triangular format and accept *Bhagavān*. I depend on God for support. Depending on God I follow *karma-yoga* and *upāsana-yoga* to acquire *sādhana-catuṣṭaya sampatti*. Then by the grace of *Bhagavān*, I get *guru* and *śāstram*. I go through *śravaṇam* and *mananam* and with the grace of the Lord, *śravaṇam* and *mananam* become successful. When I have the understanding of my real nature, I switch over from triangular format to the binary format. Each person has to decide for himself whether the understanding has taken root. I should be thoroughly convinced that I am Brahman who supports everything and that I do not need any support. I need to decide whether I am ready to enter binary format dropping God-dependence. Entering binary format is the beginning of *nididhyāsanam*. There may be many falls back to the triangular format but over time staying in binary format will get longer and longer and eventually will become natural. Binary format becoming natural is called *jñāna-niṣṭha*, or *brāhmisthiti*. A person that has come to this stage is a rare one as Kṛṣṇa describes in the *Bhagavad Gita*:

Among thousands of people, a rare person makes effort for mokṣa. Even among those seekers making effort, (only) a rare person comes to know Me in reality. (7:3)

A person who goes through several intermediate stages and abides in this knowledge firmly, doubtlessly and spontaneously always is in *sahaja samādhi*. He does not attempt to remember the teachings of Vedānta. People in this state are of the greatest wisdom. An *ajñāni* can never understand the mental state of a *jñāni*. One who is a *jñāni* alone can know another *jñāni*. The lay people cannot fathom the state of mind of such a *jñāni*.

Verse 96

अजेष्वजमसङ्क्रान्तं धर्मेषु ज्ञानमिष्यते ।

यतो न क्रमते ज्ञानमसङ्गं तेन कीर्तितम् ॥ ९६ ॥

ajeṣvajamasāṅkrāntaṁ dharmeṣu jñānamiṣyate ।

yato na kramate jñānamasaṅgaṁ tena kīrtitam ॥ 96॥

Consciousness in the unborn jīvas is accepted to be unborn and relation-less. Since consciousness does not contact (any object), it is said to be relation-less. (96)

Advaitam can be established only when *dvaitam* is completely negated. In Vedānta *dvaitam* is introduced initially. This is required in the beginning stage of Vedānta. This is maintained for a long time and ultimately this also has to be resolved. To reveal the *ātmā*, it is said that *ātmā* is the experiencer of everything, *dr̥g svarūpam*. This *ātmā* is different from whatever is experienced and thus we introduce *dr̥g-dr̥śya viveka*. This is done very elaborately detailing the five features of *dr̥śyam*; *dr̥śyatvam*,

bhautikatvam, saguṇatvam, savikāratvam, āgamapāyitvam. After understanding myself as *Turīyam* I have to fold *anātmā* into myself by understanding that there is no *anātmā* separate from me. In the beginning it is said that I am different from *anātmā, neti, neti.* I am different from the body, mind and the world. They are all objects. Consciousness is differentiated from matter and finally matter is resolved into consciousness by understanding that there is no matter separate from consciousness. What we call as matter, the solid world, is only *nāma* and *rūpa* and it does not exist separate from me. This resolving of the *anātmā* into *ātmā* is talked about in the remaining final verses of the *kārikā*. These are very profound verses.

MK-71 = Chapter – 4, Verses 96 to 100

Verse 96

अजेष्वजमसङ्क्रान्तं धर्मेषु ज्ञानमिष्यते ।

यतो न क्रमते ज्ञानमसङ्गं तेन कीर्तितम् ॥ ९६ ॥

In these final ten verses of the fourth chapter, Gauḍapāda is summarizing the entire teaching given in the *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad* in general and in the 7th *mantra* in particular. He makes an important point that *advaitam* is a teaching that is based on the *śāstric* revelation and it negates *dvaitam*, which is a conclusion we have made based on our experience. Vedānta does not negate the *dvaita anubhava* and does not want to change *dvaita anubhava*, does not want to give a new *dvaita anubhava*. Vedānta does not work in the field of experience at all. Let all the experiences continue as they are. They need not be stopped and cannot be stopped also because the sense organs are designed to report *dvaitam* only. What Vedānta challenges is the conclusion that we have made that *dvaitam* is *satyaṃ* based on our experience. Vedānta makes us enquire into that conclusion with the help of *śāstra pramāṇam*, the enquiry being what is *satyaṃ* based on *śāstra pramāṇam*. When the enquiry is done we learn that *dvaita anubhava* is present but is not *satyaṃ* and that *advaitam* alone is *satyaṃ*. The stars that are experienced as small are known to be big based on scientific knowledge. Even after that knowledge the experience continues. Another example is the sun experienced as moving across the sky. Between *anubhava siddham* and *pramāṇa siddham* one should hold on to the *pramāṇa siddham* even as the *anubhava siddham* continues.

What is the basis for our wrong conclusion? The proponents of *satya dvaitam* reason as follows. Every experience proves *dvaitam*. In every experience there are two things. One is I, the experiencing consciousness principle. The other is the object. In every experience, consciousness is in contact with one object or another. Every experience thus includes consciousness and an object. Should not *dvaitam* be accepted?

Gauḍapāda admits that there is an experience of *dvaitam* in interaction with the world. But he answers that the world does not have origination or existence but has only an appearance. Consciousness contacts only the appearing world but the world does not have an existence of its own. It is similar to the waker contacting the dream objects but it is known that the dream objects do not exist separate from the waker. *Dvaitam* is an appearance but it is not *satyaṃ*. *Advaitam* is *satyaṃ* and *dvaitam* is not there. The corollary is that if there is no second thing other than me, I cannot have any relationship with a second thing also. In *advaitam*, there is no *saṅgatvam*. The eternal consciousness in every *jīva* really does not contact a second object just as the clay can never contact the pot. There is no pot other than clay and so there is no relationship between them. Two words are used and the utility of the pot is recognized but there is not even a *kārya-kāraṇa* relationship between clay and pot. Similarly *ātmā* and *anātmā* are like clay and pot. *Ātmā* is like clay and the world is like pot. The ETU of the *anātmā* is recognized but there is no relationship between *ātmā* and *anātmā*. There is no *anātmā* separate from *ātmā* even as the *anātmā*

is fully utilized for transaction. We experience the world and use the world but we never accept the world as separate from the observer *ātma*. Since the consciousness does not come in contact with a second object, *ātma*, the *Turīyam* is *asaṅgam*. *Viśva*, *Taijassa* and *Prāñña* have *saṅga* but *Turīyam* does not have any *saṅga*. That *Turīyam* is myself.

Verse 97

अणुमात्रेऽपि वैधर्मे जायमानेऽविपश्चितः ।

असङ्गता सदा नास्ति किमुताऽऽवरणच्युतिः ॥ ९७ ॥

aṇumātre'pi vaidharme jāyamāne'vipaścitaḥ ।

asaṅgatā sadā nāsti kimutā''varaṇacyutiḥ ॥ 97॥

Even if an atom different (from Brahman) is (accepted to be) born, the relationlessness (of Brahman) will cease to be for ever for that indiscriminate one. What to talk of the end of ignorance? (97)

If this fact is not understood and assimilated, what will be the consequence? What is the consequence of missing the fact that I am *advaitam*, there is no second thing as real as me and that I do not have any relationship with anything? The screen does not have any relationship with the movie characters. The consequence is instantaneous *saṃsāra*. Experiencing a second thing is not *saṃsāra* but attributing reality to it and developing *rāga* and *dveṣa* results in anxiety, fear, etc. For the dull-witted person who accepts the existence of *anātmā* and gives reality to it, *asaṅgatvam* is gone and that person then claims a limited and selective circle of people and objects as his own. A mutual sense of belonging develops. The individual *jīva* has a sense of insecurity and tries to overcome this by developing this mutual sense of belonging. Śāṅkarācārya defines *saṃsāra* as '*aham eṣām mama ete*': 'I belong to them and these belong to me' in the introduction to his commentary on the *Bhagavad Gita*. The one who is caught up in *saṅga* problems (attachment, aversion, sorrow, delusion) cannot get out of self-ignorance. *Mokṣa* becomes far away.

Verse 98

अलब्धावरणाः सर्वे धर्माः प्रकृतिनिर्मलाः ।

आदौ बुद्धास्तथा मुक्ता बुध्यन्त इति नायकाः ॥ ९८ ॥

alabdhāvaraṇāḥ sarve dharmāḥ prakṛtinirmalāḥ ।

ādau buddhāstathā muktā budhyanta iti nāyakāḥ ॥ 98॥

All jīvas are naturally pure, free from ignorance, self-effulgent, and liberated from the very beginning. The wise (people figuratively say) that they know. (98)

In the previous verse, Gauḍapāda said that those who are caught up in the transactions based on *saṅga* can never remove the ignorance about the self. This may be taken to imply that there are two things, *Ātmā* and *āvaraṇam* (concealment). Is *ātmā* really concealed? *Ātmā* is never covered by ignorance because *ātmā* is consciousness that is always available in the form of 'I am-self-awareness'. Whether I am aware of the world or not I am always aware of myself. It is only because of this, I am even aware of the external objects. Since there is self-awareness always, there cannot be any covering of it. If *ātmā* is ever available as 'I am', then what are we doing studying Vedānta? Self, the *ātmā* is available all the time as 'I am' and along with the 'I am' the body experience also is there and we are transferring the attributes of the body to the already known Self. We are not covering the *ātmā* but we are transferring the wrong attributes to the *ātmā*. When the body is young, I do not say that the body is young but say that I am young. When the mind is disturbed I say that I am disturbed. Self-ignorance is nothing but the transference of the *anātmā* attributes and Self-knowledge is the removal of the wrong attributes or re-transference of the attributes to where they belong.

All the *jīvātmas* are all the time self-revealing as 'I am'. They are ever pure. All the *jīvātmas* are enlightened all the time. Saying, 'I am' indicates enlightenment. Any addition to that 'I am' betrays ignorance. All the *jīvas* are liberated all the time. **Vedānta does not give knowledge and does not give liberation. Vedānta removes only the misconceptions in the mind. When the misconceptions are removed, that removal is figuratively called enlightenment.** We are not learning a new thing and we are not experiencing a new thing. The experience of 'I am' is common to all the *jñānis* and *ajñānis*. Any bodily experience is common to both but the *jñāni* will not have the sense of 'I have the pain'. The *jñāni* distances himself from the bodily experience. This internal distancing or detachment itself will reduce the impact of the bodily experience. The sages figuratively call the removal of misconceptions as Self-enlightenment.

Verse 99

क्रमते न हि बुद्धस्य ज्ञानं धर्मेषु तायिनः ।

सर्वे धर्मास्तथा ज्ञानं नैतद्बुद्धेन भाषितम् ॥ ९९ ॥

kramate na hi buddhasya jñānaṃ dharmeṣu tāyinaḥ ।

sarve dharmāstathā jñānaṃ naitadbuddhena bhāṣitam ॥ 99॥

Consciousness of the adorable, wise (person) does not contact objects at all. All jīvas are the same. This knowledge is not expressed by the Buddha. (99)

In the first line Gauḍapāda talks about the thinking of a *jñāni*. In the second line, Gauḍapāda says that this is true for the *ajñāni* also but that they do not know about it. *Jñāni* says that he is *advaitam* and *asaṅgam*. The *ajñāni* is also the same. The difference is that the *jñāni* knows this fact and the *ajñāni* does not know this fact. Every *jīva* is *advaitam* and *asaṅgam*.

The consciousness of a wise person, which is all-pervading Brahman, does not contact a second thing because the *jñāni* knows that there is no second thing. In the case of the *ajñāni* also, this is a fact. The *ajñāni* does not have the *pramāṇa siddham*. He can make use of the Veda, get the *pramāṇa siddham* and claim his *advaita* nature. Gauḍapāda makes a proclamation that this teaching is given only by Veda *pramāṇam* and not any other system. Gauḍapāda specifically mentions that Buddha did not give this teaching. Buddhism has many similarities to *advaitam*. They also say that the world is *mithyā* and Consciousness is *satyaṃ*, especially the *Yogācāra Buddhism*. For the Buddhists, Consciousness is real but exists only momentarily. With every experience consciousness is arriving and then departing when the experience is over. There is a continuous flow of momentary consciousness and this is *ātmā* according to the Buddhists. But the Upaniṣads teach that there is eternal consciousness. Further Buddha refuted Veda *pramāṇam*. He accepted only what is arrived at logically. Gauḍapāda is a *vaidika* and Vedas talk about eternal consciousness as the truth and the Buddhists do not accept the eternal consciousness. Some academicians claim that Buddhism and *Advaita Vedānta* are identical in their view of *ātmā* but if that is the case, there is no need for another system called Buddhism because the Vedic teaching predates Buddha.

Verse 100

दुर्दर्शमतिगम्भीरमजं साम्यं विशारदम् ।

बुद्ध्या पदमनानात्वं नमस्कुर्मो यथाबलम् ॥ १०० ॥

durdarśamatigambhīramajam sāmyaṃ viśāradam ।

buddhvā padamanānātvaṃ namaskurmo yathābalam ॥ 100॥

Having known the Reality which is incomprehensible, very profound, unborn, uniform, pure, and non-dual, we offer salutations according to our capacity. (100)

Gauḍapāda concludes the *kārikā* by offering prostrations. Even though he talked *advaita* he comes down to the empirical level in which the *guru*-disciple pair holds. He expresses gratitude to *Īśvara*, *Guru* and *Śāstra*. *Īśvara* brings the appropriate *guru* and the *guru* brings the *śāstra*. Having discovered the non-dual destination *Turīyam*, that is difficult to grasp, extremely subtle, eternal, uniform, and pure, let us offer our *namaskāra* to *Īśvara*, *guru* and *śāstra* in the way we are able to. Let us offer *namaskāra* to *Turīya Ātmā*, which is nothing but abiding as *ātmā*. Grasping *Turīyam* and abiding as *ātmā* is just remaining as ‘I am’ and dropping all the attributes and identifications. Ramana Maharshi said in *Saddarśanam*, ‘I meditate on God by remaining as God’.

With this, *Alātaśāntiprakaraṇam*, the *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad* and the *kārikā* are over.

MK-72 = Chapter – 4, Summary

Today, I will give you a summary of the fourth chapter of *Māṇḍūkya-kārikā*, titled *Alātaśāntiprakaraṇam* and the biggest chapter consisting of 100 solid verses. Gauḍapāda has presented the main teaching of Vedānta in the second and third chapters in which *brahma satyaṃ* and *jagat mithyā* was clearly established. The second chapter, titled *Vaitathyaprakaraṇam* established the *mithyātvam* of the world by taking the dream example. *Vaitathyam* means *mithyātvam*. The third chapter titled *Advaitaprakaraṇam* clearly established the *Brahma satyatvam*. Thus *brahma satyaṃ jagat mithyā* was established. In the Upaniṣad, that Brahman is revealed as the very *Turīya Ātmā*. Therefore the Upaniṣad brings out *jīvo brahmaiva nāpara*. Thus the complete teaching, *brahma satyaṃ jagat mithyā jīvo brahmaiva nāpara*, is over.

The question then is why the fourth chapter at all. While defining *mithyā* the four features of *mithyā* were talked about. *Mithyā* does not have existence, does not have origination but has got only an appearance and the *mithyā* appearance is due to *māyā* or *avidyā*. By saying that the world is *mithyā*, Gauḍapāda says that the world has no existence, has no origination, has only an appearance and that is due to *māyā*. **That the world does not have origination must be well assimilated to understand the *mithyātvam* of the world.** This is not that easy because there are many systems that claim to explain the origination of the world. This can create doubts. Gauḍapāda feels that it is not enough that Vedānta says that there is no origination of the world but it is also important to refute the contentions of the other systems. Whoever talks about the origination of the world has committed a logical fallacy is Gauḍapāda's determination. Thus this chapter is *mananam*, Vedānta *pratipakṣa nirākaraṇam*. The first three chapters are *śravaṇam*.

1. Negation of Different Theories of Creation (1 - 27)

Gauḍapāda takes various different theories of creation and negates all of them. This is from verse 1 up to verse 27. Five systems are taken and refuted.

The first one is *asat-kārya-vāda* of *Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika* system. They say that the non-existent world originated from its *kāraṇam*. Whatever the *kāraṇam* is not relevant but the non-existent world originated. Gauḍapāda refutes this without giving elaborate reasoning. But we can look at the reasoning: whenever we want to produce something in the world we always look for a particular cause. For a mango tree, we go for mango seed. A relevant seed is needed for a particular tree. This is so because those products are in their appropriate causes in a hidden potential manner. Therefore, the product is existent. Thus the non-existent world cannot originate.

Secondly the *sat-kārya-vāda* of *Sāṃkhya* and *Yoga* is rejected by Gauḍapāda. They say that the whole world was present in its *mūla-kāraṇam* called *mūla-prakṛti*. From that *mūla-prakṛti*, the world that was

already there evolves. *Prakṛti* evolves into the world. Gauḍapāda asks whether *prakṛti* undergoes transformation while evolving. Evolution requires transformation. However *sat-kārya-vādin*s say that *prakṛti* is eternal and this eternal *prakṛti* undergoes transformation. Gauḍapāda says that this statement is a logical contradiction. What is eternal cannot undergo change. Eternity and change cannot coexist. So eternal *prakṛti* cannot evolve into the creation.

The third is some Vedāntic systems like *Viśiṣṭādvaita* and others, who say that Brahman becomes the creation. The world has come out of Brahman. This is called *Brahma-kārya-vāda*. Brahman is eternal and eternal Brahman cannot undergo change to produce the creation.

The fourth *vāda* is *karma-kārya-vāda*. The whole world is born because of *karma*. If *karma* is the cause of the creation, when did the first *karma* come? For *karma* to come a body is required and for a body to come *karma* is required. These *vādis* say that *karma* is *anādi*. From *anādi kāla*, *karma-śarīram paramparā* has been coming. If *karma-śarīram* is *anādi*, then *saṃsāra* will also be *anādi*. If that is the case, one can never talk about *mokṣa*. What is without a beginning cannot end. Even if *saṃsāra* ends and *mokṣa* comes, such a *mokṣa* that has a beginning will have an end. So *karma-kārya-vāda* is not acceptable, even though this *vāda* is temporarily accepted during the *karma-yoga* stage.

The fifth one is the buddhistic theory. *Hīnayāna Buddhists* say that creation has originated because we experience a creation. *Mahāyāna Buddhism* negates the *Hīnayāna* theory by saying that experience is not the proof for reality. Gauḍapāda uses this reasoning to refute this *vāda*. The dream is clearly experienced but that experience is not a proof for the reality of dream as the dream is unreal outside of dream. Even though the dream is deemed real in dream, it is known that it is only an appearance. Similarly the world is experienced but it does not exist separate from the observer. Thus the *prapañca-astitva-vāda* of *Hīnayāna Buddhist* is refuted.

Thus no theory of origination is logically correct. The world has not originated but only appears. The world's appearance is not refuted. ETU is another word for *mithyā*. ETU of the world is accepted but ETU does not prove the world's existence or origination. Both the waking world and the dream world have ETU but they do not have any existence or origination and they only have appearance.

2. Reconciliation of the Vedic Theory of Creation (28 - 71)

From verses 28 to 71, Gauḍapāda answers a possible and important question. Other non-vedic systems can be refuted by pointing out their logical mistakes. But Veda itself talks about the origination of the world. Vedas are revealed scriptures and Vedas cannot commit mistakes. Almost all the Upaniṣads talk about creation. Some examples are:

Taittirīya Upaniṣad:

From that (Brahman), which is indeed this Ātmā, space is born. From space air (is born). From air fire (is born). From fire water (is born). From water earth (is born). From the earth plants (are born). From plants food (is born). From food the human being (is born).... (2.1.2)

Mundaka Upaniṣad:

From this Brahman are born prana, the mind, all senses and organs of action, space, air, fire, water, and the earth that sustains the entire world of life. (2.1.3)

Chāndogya Upaniṣad:

It (Being, or Brahman) thought: 'May I be many; may I grow forth.' It created fire. That fire thought: 'May I be many; may I grow forth.' It created water. That is why, whenever a person is hot and perspires, water is produced from fire (heat) alone. (6.2.3)

That water thought: 'May I be many; may I grow forth.' It created food (i.e. earth). That is why, whenever it rains anywhere, abundant food is produced. From water alone is edible food produced. (6.2.4)

Taittirīya Upaniṣad:

He desired thus - "Let me be born. Let me become many." He performed tapas. Having performed tapas, He created all this - whatever this is. Having created this, He entered this itself. Having entered this, (He) became the formed and the formless, the defined and the undefined, the supporter and the non-supporter; the sentient and the insentient, as well as the real and the unreal. Brahman became all this - whatever this is. They declare that (Brahman) to be (the absolute) Truth. (2.6.3)

The Upaniṣads talk about Brahman as *kāraṇam* and the world as *kāryam*. How does one account for these Vedic statements? These statements cannot be refuted outright but have to be explained in their context. Gauḍapāda explains that the Vedas talk about the origination of the world but that is only temporary and provisional acceptance until the student becomes mature to come into *advaitam*. *Advaitam* is only for mature students who do not have intellectual and emotional difficulties in accepting *advaitam*. The intellectual difficulty is that since the world is appearing solidly in front of me how can I refute its origination? Emotionally every *jīva* needs security from outside. Everyone wants to hold on to one family member or another or God for security. Every *jīva* feels insecure from the beginning and for this emotional requirement *dvaita* world is needed. Until the Turīyam is revealed *dvaita* is maintained temporarily. This is *adhyāropa prakaraṇam*. During *karma-yoga* and *upāsana-yoga* we accept *dvaita* and *Īśvara* is accepted. Veda accepts the creation provisionally. It is provisional because the very same Veda negates the creation later. If the creation has really originated from Brahman, Veda cannot negate this. There are several statements in the Upaniṣads negating the creation.

Katha Upaniṣad:

This has to be attained through the mind alone. There is no plurality at all here. One who sees here plurality, as it were, goes from death to death. (2.1.11)

Brhadāranyaka Upaniṣad:

.... Now, therefore, the description of Brahman: "Not this, not this" (Neti, Neti); for there is no other and more appropriate description than this "Not this." (2.3.6)

Kaivalya Upaniṣad:

..... Puṇya and pāpa do not belong to me. There is no death (for me). Birth, body, sense organs, and intellect do not belong (to me). Earth and water do not (belong to me). Fire also does not belong (to me). Air also does not belong (to me). Space also does not belong to me. (22)

The world does not exist, it only appears. If the world does not have existence and has only appearance then why do we say, the wall is, the earth is, etc. This means that we are accepting the existence of the world. If the world is only an appearance our experience cannot be that the world is. But it should be that the world is not. If the world does not have existence how come we experience existence associated with the world? The answer is that it is like moonlight. The moon does not have light but we talk about moonlight. The moon has only borrowed light. Similarly the world's existence does not belong to the world but is borrowed. The world's existence is borrowed from ME, the observer. Just as the waker lends existence to the dream world and gets frightened, I lend existence to the world. The world is an appearance with borrowed existence. The creation is provisionally accepted by the Veda and it withdraws that acceptance later. Thus the Veda does not really accept the origination. The initial acceptance is called *adhyāropa* and the later negation is called the *apavāda*.

Gauḍapāda gives two examples for the appearance of the world. One was already given in the second chapter, which is *svapna dṛṣṭānta*. Dream is the best example for *mithyā*. Gauḍapāda talks about dream very elaborately in the 4th chapter. The second example given in this chapter is the *alāta dṛṣṭānta*, the appearance of patterns in a dark room when a stick with a fire tip is moved. Even though the fire tip is *advaitam*, patterns are seen. The patterns do not exist separate from the fire tip. Even though they do not have existence they appear for us. The patterns are the example for appearance with borrowed existence. The world is also like the patterns and appears with borrowed existence. This is *alāta dṛṣṭānta* and since it is a unique example, the fourth chapter, in which the example occurs, is called *Alātaśāntiprakaraṇam*. This is the reconciliation of Veda *sṛṣṭi*, Veda *sṛṣṭi samanvaya* from verses 28 to 71.

3. Cause of Samsāra (72 - 86)

From verses 72 to 86 the topic is the cause of *samsāra*. Normally, body identification, ignorance, sense of being a doer and an enjoyer, etc., are given as *kāraṇam*. Here Gauḍapāda gives a unique cause, which is that once you accept the origination of the world, you will have the inescapable question of why. Why this world and why is this suffering? If *karma* is the reason, why does *Bhagavān* make us do such *karma*? After all *Bhagavān* is omnipotent and omniscient, why are deficiencies seen in the world? If he is compassionate, how come he is silently seeing the sufferings of his own devotees? The ‘why me?’ syndrome is *samsāra*. This question will never go away as long as you accept the origination of the world. Origination means *kāryam*, and *kāraṇam* hunting follows. Gauḍapāda calls this *hetu-phala-āveśa*, obsession with the question why. What is *samsāra*? It is asking why. *Mokṣa* is stop asking why. Then what is this all? It is only an appearance. Go through life without asking too many ‘whys’. *Samsāra* is obsession with cause hunting. At the superficial level, we can find cause-effect. At the deeper level, cause is not easy to find. Quantum Mechanics at the micro level, Cosmology at the macro level, and Biology at the consciousness or life level are not able to find causes.

4. Analysis of the Three States of Experience (87 - 89)

Avasthā-traya-viveka is summarized from 87 to 89 just to remind us the *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad* on which the *kārikā* is based. I am the consciousness principle called waker in association with the waking state. I am called dreamer in association with the dream state. I am called sleeper in association with the deep sleep state. I am called *Turīyam* when I am dissociated from all these three. How to dissociate? I cannot experientially dissociate because I will be in one of the three states life-long. Dissociation is only through knowledge, ‘*aham asaṅga asmi*’. Space cannot get associated with anything. It does not get wet with water nor dirty with smoke. Similarly I, *Turīyam*, cannot be associated with anyone. Association is a misconception born of ignorance. I am never associated with any of these three states. I am never a waker, a dreamer or a sleeper. I mistake myself as these because of my ignorance or my identification with the body-mind complex. Dissociation through knowledge is *Turīya avasthānam*.

5. Important Sādhanas (90)

In the 90th verse, Gauḍapāda gives some important *sādhanas* for the student. If these *sādhanas* are lacking, the mind will not be refined enough to accept the teaching. Receiving the teaching requires tremendous mental refinement and accepting the teaching requires still more refinement. Assimilation of the teaching requires still more refinement and living the teaching requires even more refinement. Kṛṣṇa describes the *jñāna-niṣṭha* in the *Bhagavad Gita*:

The one who is together, who knows the truth, thinks, ‘I do not do anything at all’, even while seeing, hearing, touching, smelling, eating, walking, sleeping, breathing... talking, releasing, grasping, opening

and closing the eyes, (the person) knowing (full well that) the organs are engaged in their objects. (5:8,9)

If we are not able to be such a person as described in the *Gita*, the *sādhana*s have to be focused on. *Heyam*, unhealthy tendencies (*āsurī-sampat*) that are not Vedānta friendly like desire, anger, pride, jealousy, etc., have to be given up. *Āpya*, *daivī-sampat*, virtues that are friendly to Vedānta have to be nourished. *Pākyam* means *rāga-dveṣa* to be roasted so they become non-hurtful and non-binding *rāga-dveṣa* and this is accomplished through *karma-yoga*. Kṛṣṇa describes the equanimity that is gained through *karma-yoga* in the *Bhagavad Gita*:

Taking pleasure and pain, gain and loss, victory and defeat to be the same, prepare for battle. Thus, you will gain no sin. (2:38)

If these three *sādhana*s are followed, *jñeyam*, the *Turīyam* can be assimilated.

6. Conclusion (91 - 100)

The last portion is the conclusion from 91 to 100. Here Gauḍapāda gives two important messages. First, everything we are seeking outside is already with us, *śānti*, *ānanda*, *abhayaṃ*. All these are our own very nature. These need not be sought from outside and more than that they cannot be got from outside because they are not located outside. Second, *dvaitam* is *saṃsāra* and *advaitam* is *mokṣa*. *Dvaita anubhava* is not *saṃsāra*. Experiential *dvaitam* cannot be avoided by anyone. There is no need to do anything about experiential *dvaitam*. *Dvaitam* does not exist as a second thing separate from me. *Dvaitam*'s independent existence has to be negated. *Dvaita satyatvam* should be negated. *Dvaita anubhava* need not be negated and cannot be negated. Have *dvaita anubhava* dismissing the *dvaita satyatvam*. Watch the movie enjoying the movie but know that in front there is only one thing, which is the white screen. Knowing that there is only the white screen, we purchase tickets, watch the movie, and even shed tears. Knowingly shedding tears the movie becomes a good movie. Have the entertainment but do not get trapped. With this Gauḍapāda concludes.

Gauḍapāda starts the fourth chapter with a prayer to the Lord and ends also with a prayer indicating that he is an *āstika* and not a *nāstika* like Buddha. Many people think that the fourth chapter is a *buddhistic* work but it is not so. It is written by the *āstika* Gauḍapāda who accepts *Īśvara* and does *Īśvara namaskāra*. He clearly says that this teaching is not given by Buddha. It is the *upaniṣadic* teaching that existed long before Buddha was born. With this the fourth chapter is over. The *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad* and the *kārikā* are also over.

Visit website www.arshaavinash.in

To download the following

Books in English On Vedanta

Books on Indian culture, Yoga, Gita, Upanisads, Brahma Sutra and Vedanta Texts

Books in Tamil on Vedanta

Books on Indian culture, Upanisads and Vedanta Texts

Books on Sanskrit Grammar

Books on Dhatukosah, Astadhyayi and Sanskrit Grammar for Vedanta Students

Books on Sanskrit Texts

Text Books in Sanskrit on Gita, Upanisads and Brahma Sutra with Sankara Bhasyam

Books on Indian Culture

Books in English on Yoga and Indian Culture

Books for Youth

Books in English on Yoga, Indian Culture & Self improvement

Books for Children

Books in English on Indian Culture

Books on Holy Chant

Books in English and Sanskrit on Holy Chant

Articles

Articles in English on Indian culture & Vedanta Texts

PARTICIPATE IN ONLINE QUIZ

Online Quiz on Gita, Upanisad and Brahma Sutra

Website of:



Arsha Avinash Foundation
104 Third Street, Tatabad, Coimbatore 641012, INDIA
Phone: + 91 9487373635
E mail: arshaavinash@gmail.com
www.arshaavinash.in