

AVASTHĀTRAYA VIVEKA

(अवस्थात्रय-विवेक प्रक्रिया)

AUTHOR :

BRAHMAJNA KAVI, VEDANTA CHATURA
SRI DEVARAO KULKARNI

TO BE HAD OF :

ADHYATMA PRAKASHA KARYALAYA
THYAGARAJANAGARA ● BANGALORE-560028

Published and Edited by :

MANAS KUMAR SANYAL
182, S. N, Roy Road,
Calcutta-700 038.

First Published : 1990

Books are available at :

1. Adhyatma Prakasha Karyalaya
68, II Block, P.O. Thyagarajanagara,
Bangalore-560 028.
2. Sri Shankarashrama
Yelahanka,
Bangalore North-562116.
3. Adhyatma Prakasha Karyalaya
Hassan District,
Holenarsipur-573 211, Karnataka State.
4. Sarvodaya Book Stall
Howrah Station,
Howrah-711 101, West Bengal.
5. Sanskrit Pustak Bhandar
38, Bidhan Sarani,
Calcutta-700 006, West Bengal.

Printed by

SRIMATI BANI CHAKRABORTY
“bani printers”
4/34, Vidyasagar, P.O. Naktala,
Calcutta-700 047, West Bengal.

avasthaatraya viveka

AUM INTRODUCTION

To realise one's own nature as non-dual Brahman, there are many methods which are usefully applied in *Vedanta*. Though all these methods are included in only one methodology i. e., *Adhyaropa & Apavada*, among all these methods the discrimination of the tribasic view of life which is called as *Avasthaatraya Viveka* is a **Jem** for the aspirants to take a stand in one's own true nature directly and immediately. *Sri Sri Satchidanandendra Saraswati Swamiji* has stated this as "अवस्थात्रयप्रक्रियाया असाधारणधर्माः" in his Sanskrit introduction to the *Mandukya Rahasya Vivritih*. According to Shankara, the whole state including *macrocosm and microcosm* should be taken as an adjunct to one's own true nature of being. The art of this taking a stand in one's own being which is the substratum of the appearance and disappearance of the dualistic state should be known through the teachings of Shastra and Guru only. If once an aspirant has recognised this, he will lose his identification with his individuality and he remains directly as *Turiya* i. e., non-dual Brahman. This is the speciality of this tribasic

method of life.

Here in this book four different viewpoints of the three states *waking dream and deep sleep* in consonance with the utterances of Shankara-Bhashyas and Shruti are explained in the first three chapters. At first I got an insight into this type of different viewpoints hinted in Mandukya Rahasya Vivritihi written by my revered Gurudev (as “सुषुप्तात्मनोऽज्ञत्वं सर्वज्ञत्वं च दृष्टिभेदात्”). By clarifying these viewpoints the student will get rid of all types of doubts regarding the nature and the relationship between the *Avasthaas*. And also he will take a stand in his true nature of the Self as *Turiya* which is absolutely free from the taint of *Avasthaas*. To take a stand in the ultimate Reality (truth), the previous standpoints regarding the *Avasthaas* are used as a ladder to climb up to the top of a building. This new vision of different standpoints regarding *Avasthaas* will help the aspirants to understand the secrets of the teachings of the Upanishads at various places.

Due to want of discrimination we have misunderstood the non-dual Brahman itself as three states. Waking, Dream and Deep sleep are not events occurring in one time-series. For, then they would be experienced as parts of one

continuous state. But nobody experiences as such. There is no cause-effect relationship among the states. They are mutually independent. Strictly speaking each of the three states is a full manifestation of Atman or Reality as otherwise, we cannot explain why the states are not experienced in juxta-position of each other, or why they are not externally connected by time. So it is absurd to say that the *Avasthaas* take place in chronological order in time or that they are side-by-side in space. The very ideas of time and space, though they appear to be infinite, are restricted to a particular state of waking or dream. In deep sleep there is no concept of time or space. But when we translate this direct experience of the intuition in the language of waking intellect then only we say ~~we~~ 'there are three states'. Strictly speaking the triplicity (त्रित्व) itself is a delusion. Though this is the thing, for the purpose of teaching, at first we accept the states as three in number and start to show the different viewpoints regarding every state. This is the Adhyaropa of *Avasthaas*. At last, when the transcendental standpoint is shown and the disciple takes his stand there then he himself realises that there are no *Avasthaas* and he himself remains as *Turiya*, because the Self is

ever devoid of all types of Avasthaas. The Avasthaas are attributed on the Self alone. When this realisation takes place, then the rescission or *Apavada* of the previous supposition of the Avasthaatraya will be realised. So, this *Avasthaaic method* itself comes under the purview of the methodology of Adhyaropa & Apavada, just like other methods which appear in the Upanishads.

In the fourth chapter I have discussed the nature of *Turiya* and also the significance of the method of getting the Turiya according to the teachings of Shankaracharya as interpreted by Sri Satchidanandendra Saraswati Swamiji. *Turiya* (तुरीय) is not a fourth state as usually understood, like Samadhi (trance) etc. According to Shankara's Bhashya, Turiya, which is the substratum of all the three states that are conceived to be really existing owing to ignorance, is in relation to the illusory number three, said to be the *Fourth* for the purposes of teaching alone [*Maya-samkhya Turiya*—मायासंख्या तुरीयम्, as Shankara describes it]. It is only Real Atman as the Upanishads expressly tell us. He is 'neti nety-atma'. As Turiya is no avasthaa or state, so the popular identification of it with Samadhi is altogether unfounded. This has been shown

elaborately in the fourth chapter of this book.

At first I had sent these matters as the answers to the queries of my philosophic friend *Sri Manas Kumar Sanyal, Calcutta*, who is an ardent student of Shankara-Vedanta and the keen follower of the teachings of *Sri Sri Satchidanandendra Saraswati Swamiji*. So these were not prepared with the intention of bringing out in the form of a book. But his enthusiasm has resulted in this book-form. The answers of all the queries sent by Sri Sanyal are typed by my friend **Mr. R. B. Gopinath, Bangalore**, who is also an ardent student of Vedanta. So I have to give credit to Mr. Gopinath for his invaluable service.

The reader who has listened to the *Avasthaatraya Prakriya* that is prevailing now may feel a strange approach in this book but it has to be pointed out that the teachings contained herein are very much consistent with the teachings of Sri Shankara and are in consonance with the approach of Sri Sri Satchidanandendra

¹ *Mr. R. B. Gopinath* also typed very nicely the subject matters what I had dictated to him for preparing my book "*Teaching of Brahman Through the Attributions of Avidya and Maya*" which has already been published from Calcutta. May God grant him a long and prosperous life.

Saraswati Swamiji The aspirant has to feel indebted to Sri Manas Kumar Sanyal for placing this methodology in his hands.

I will be failing in my duty if I do not appreciate the philanthropic attitude displayed by the Editor Sri Manas Kumar Sanyal. I congratulate on his successful attempt in understanding the subject and placing it to the readers as well. I pray to the Almighty Lord and Sri Sadguru Maharaj to bless him and the aspirants with the realisation of Reality.

11th August, 1989
Bangalore.

DEVARAO KULKARNI
1022, Anugraha, 8th Cross,
II Block, P.O. Banashankari
1st stage, Bangalore-560050

**DEDICATED
TO
HIS HOLINESS**

SRI SRI SAT HIDANANDENDRA SARASWATI SWAMIJI
OF REVERED MEMORY

ॐ

“अवस्थात्रितयं यस्य क्रीडाभूमितया स्थितम् ।
तदेव ब्रह्म जानीयादिति वेदान्तडिण्डिमः ॥”

AVASTHĀTRĀYA VIVEKA



(METHOD OF EXAMINATION OF THE THREE
STATES OF CONSCIOUSNESS, VIZ. WAKING,
DREAM & DEEP SLEEP)

“The Vedantic method of *Avasthaas* assumes nothing, entails no belief in authority and seeks the aid of no special intuition. It builds upon the fundamentals of human experience and insists that all the three *Avasthaas*—*the Waking, Dream & Deep Sleep*, should be investigated before we can light upon the Absolute Reality underlying the manifestations of life...By a procedure peculiarly its own, it teaches us to look upon each of the three states as a complete expression of Reality, and then equating each of them to the other two, arrives at the remarkable result that our Atman as the Witnessing consciousness of all the three states, is really the Highest Reality free from the taint of all the three illusory *Avasthaas* which are superimposed upon it by the empirical understanding.”

—Sri Sri Satchidanandendra Saraswati Swamiji.

avasthaatraya viveka

(*Method of examination of the three states of consciousness, that is, waking, dream and deep sleep states*)

The uniqueness of Avasthaatraya Viveka

Man's life, if taken in its totality, comprises the three states of waking, dream and deep sleep. If man wishes to arrive at Truth, he cannot afford to take a partial view of life, giving predominance to waking state alone. The whole gamut of human experiences are subsumed in these three states alone. “ज्ञेयमेतान्येव त्रीणि । एतद्व्यतिरेकेण ज्ञेयानुपपत्तेः ।” (—G. K. Bhashya—4/88). —“There is nothing beyond these three states to be known, for all the postulates of different schools are comprehended in these.” And hence taking into account all these three states of consciousness alone will be the comprehensive vision or outlook of life. Vedanta takes the human experiences of all the three states, viz, waking, dream and deep sleep to arrive at its conclusion, so that they become irrefutable and valid for all times. No other system

of philosophy except Vedanta bases its enquiry on a comprehensive tri-basic view of life and the principle of Universal acceptance. Many people are of opinion that through the valid means of knowledge like perception (*Pratyaksha*), inference (*Anumana*), elder's statement (*Aptavakya*) alone the examination of objects must be carried out. But Shankara says that one should undertake any inquiry by keeping the intuitive experience (*Saakshi Anubhava*) alone, which exists in all the three states of consciousness, viz., waking, dream and deep sleep and which is the substratum for even the valid means of knowledge (*Pramanas*).

Sri Satchidanandendra Saraswati Swamiji has given this peculiar outlook of comprehensive vision of life while explaining the tribasic method of Vedanta i. e., AVASTHAATRAYA. For this the reader is referred to the Sanskrit introduction of Mandukya Rahasya Viviriti by Sri Swamiji. Here he explains the whole range of life which is divided into two parts : That is *Darshana Vritti Avasthaa* (—the states of waking and dream wherein one sees something else) and *Adarshana Vritti Avasthaa* (—the state wherein one sees nothing), based on Shankara Bhashya, Mandukya—5.

“दर्शनादर्शनवृत्तयोः तत्त्वाप्रतिबोधलक्षणस्य स्वापस्य तुल्यत्वात्”

—here Shankara treats both waking and dream as dream since one misconceives Reality in either of them.

In Upanishads the same method is taken as for example in Kena Upanishad—1/4, it is said as *Vidita and Avidita* (‘अन्यदेव तद्विदितादथो अविदितादधि ।’); *Moorta and Amoorta* in Brihadaranyaka—2/3/1. (‘द्वे वाव ब्रह्मणो रूपे मूर्तञ्चैवामूर्तञ्च ।’).

The same thing is said in Bh. Geeta—15/16, as *Kshara and Akshara* (‘द्वाविमौ पुरुषौ लोके क्षरश्चाक्षर एव च ।’); in Bhagavad Geeta—13/12 as *Sat and Asat* (‘अनादिमत् परं ब्रह्म न सत् तन्नासदुच्यते ।’); as *Vyakta and Avyakta* in Bh. Geeta—8/18. (‘अव्यक्ताद्ब्यक्तयः सर्वाः प्रभवन्त्यहरागमे ।’) and *Vyakrita and Avyakrita* in S. Bh.—2/1/27. (‘नामरूपलक्षणेन रूपभेदेन व्याकृताव्याकृतात्मकेन ।’).

Taking these both sides of life (i. e., the whole of life in all its manifested and unmanifested forms) and determining the truth is an important thing in Vedanta. All types of experience just as common man’s experiences, mystic experiences of various Yogis, Upasakas and so on, are included in *Vyakta* or *Darshana Vritti Avasthaa*. And in deep sleep, where there is no appearance of the dualistic world, it is said from the standpoint of waking state which is common to all, that the dualistic world remains in the seed-form, meaning

that it disappears for the time being etc. It is an undeniable fact that there is no third category of experience and this is called as *Avyakta* or *Adarshana Vritti Avasthaa*. This is comprehensive vision of life. This type of analysis of life is not based on any individual experience. The individual experiences which are gained through efforts are bound to time, space and causation factors, but one's own Being which is the substratum of the two states of *Darshana* and *Adarshana Vritti Avasthaas*, is clearly beyond the dualistic conditions such as space, time etc. On this firm ground of one's own Being (i. e., the Witnessing principle of life) Shankara's Vedanta is built. Those who have not noticed this pure Being are clearly unable to understand Shankara's heart properly.

This methodology of the tribasic intuitional experience is enough to enable a true seeker to take a stand in his true, essential nature of Being or the Witnessing Self directly and immediately.

VARIOUS ASPECTS OF THE AVASTHAAS

The people at large do not have any idea about the viewing of the *Avasthaas* from four different view points. For this purpose the various aspects of the three states are shown below :

a) Waking State→

- (1) From the standpoint of Physical science,
- (2) From the standpoint of Psychology,
- (3) From the standpoint of Religious aspects,
- (4) From the standpoint of Vedantic aspect or the standpoint of the Witnessing principle of life.

b) Dream State→

- (1) From the empirical standpoint,
- (2) From the scriptural standpoint,
- (3) From the standpoint of the Witnessing principle,
- (4) From the standpoint of dream itself.

c) Deep sleep State→

- (1) From the standpoint of fatigue,
- (2) From the standpoint of the seed-form of the world and Vasanas,
- (3) From the standpoint of causal ignorance,
- (4) From the standpoint of the intuitive experience of deep sleep.

Now we shall discuss in detail the various standpoints in subsequent chapters.

CHAPTER-1

FOUR ASPECTS OF WAKING STATE

I. From the standpoint of physical (i. e., material) Science :

Commonly man assumes that the world or the Universe is existing and I am also existing in this world. From this standpoint, one starts understanding the truth about the outer world. For this, man relies on his sense organs, mind etc. The process of material science runs in three ways, i. e., experiment, observation and inference for the verification of the objects. In this way, modern science has discovered so many wonderful things, such as useful machines etc. To discover the truth of outer objects by using so many methods, now science has come to the conclusion that the electrons, protons and neutrons are the basic units for all things in the world and hence the creation. In this way investigation on the animate beings has resulted in the discovery that the underlying principle of animate beings is cells, genes etc. By this, they have started a new type of genetic science. To the question wherefrom do the things like the nucleus, electrons, the

cells, the genes etc., are produced, the scientists have no answer and they explain it away by saying that they are there naturally. Then naturally for these things to function the apriori concepts of time and space are required. Then if they are further questioned as to how time and space have come into existence then they dismiss it away by saying that these questions are concerned to metaphysics. In other words, they admit that these questions are beyond their sphere. All these are the barest description of the material science which pertains to the outer things alone.

Some thinkers of metaphysics hold the view that all the above said Universe is regulated by time, space and causation factor. So these people have started to think over the nature of time and space—what is time, and what is space? In brief, there are three types of opinions :

i) 'Space' means the distance which is there between two things, and the 'Time' means the intervening period between two occurrences (events).

ii) Some hold the view that the above contention is wrong, because to assert 1, 2, 3, etc., there must be the space or time which continues eternally. For example, things which are side by side or existing in space can be called 1, 2, 3, etc.

Here the things are in the space. So the existence of the space is not proved through the things. But the space is the substratum for the things to exist. Then only we will be able to count the things as 1, 2, 3, etc. The same principle will have to be applied to the time factor also i. e., without the substratum of time, there will be no counting of series of events. Thus the above contention is not correct.

iii) Some other Western philosophers say that the concept of time and space are the apriori notions of the mind—meaning, whenever the function of the mind starts inevitably it starts with the notion such as time, space and causation etc. The mind holds the view that the time-space factors are eternal. Hence we cannot know ‘the Thing in itself’ i. e., how the world and the mind are there without these concepts of time & space. The conclusion drawn here is mental concepts. And there is another view also. From this standpoint they say that time, space and causation and the outer things are all connected one with other relatively. Here there is no absolute thing in this world. This is the theory of relativity. And they infer that apart from this phenomenon of the world which is totally in the relative field there may be “Noumenon” (absolute principle) and it may be the God (=the great Geometer).

This final conclusion is drawn by Einstein.

All these types of thinkings regarding metaphysics do not provide final conclusion regarding the world with time, space and causation.

II From the standpoint of Psychology :

These people have shifted their field of enquiry from the outer world to the knowing mind. They study the nature of the mind and the kinds of thoughts etc. Here also probably they examine the minds of other people and animals. This is the study of objective mind. Just as one's own mind is evident through direct intuition, others mind is not so evident directly but can only be inferred. Through these inferences they have classified them (nature of mind etc.) as child psychology, animal psychology etc. In this theory, they hold the view that the mind itself is consciousness. They also have to accept the concepts of time, space, causation to determine the nature of the mind. Even though it is useful in our daily life providing relief from mundane problems, yet they are unable to determine the real nature of time, space, causation and the world.

III. From the standpoint of religious aspects :

The religious ideas say that there is a Soul i.e., Jiva. He who owns the body, mind and the senses is this Jiva. This Soul is capable of controlling the mind, sense organs and the body. And that this Soul is quite different from this gross body. Being a doer, he has to reap the consequences of his actions, good or bad, in this world or in other worlds.

Probably these beliefs are based on the utterances of various scriptures like Veda, Puranas, Granthasahib, Bible, Kuran etc. These ideas are more subjective than the above two views. Here also they accept the existence of many Souls, and an existence of God, quite separate from the world and the Souls, as the creator, sustainer and destroyer of this Universe. When they say that the doer has to reap the fruits of his own actions, they automatically accept the concepts of time, space and causation, In this viewpoint also the final conclusion regarding the real nature of the world, time, space and causation is not possible.

IV. From the standpoint of Vedanta :

In Vedanta Shastra, it is said that the whole Universe is restricted to the waking state. To

explain : the phenomenon of the Universe is divided into three planes :

i) *The Divine plane*—the sun, the moon, the planets, billions of stars etc., and also other worlds like heaven etc.—this group is called as divine plane or *Aadhidaivika prapancha*.

ii) *The Material plane*—the material world which is the conglomeration of the five elements—space (akasha), air, fire, water and earth, all inventions of material science, the physical bodies of all creatures etc.,—this group is called as material plane or *Aadhibhoutika prapancha*.

iii) *The Corporeal plane*—the body, the vital force, organs of action, sense organs, the mind, the intellect, feelings of sufferings and enjoyments and including the 'I-sense' or Me-notion i. e., the idea of I—this group from body to ego is called as corporeal plane or *Aadhyaatmika prapancha*.

The ideas of infinite time, space, causation are also to be included in the phenomenon of the Universe.

According to the Vedanta the whole of the above said Universe with all its multiplicity together with the concepts of infinite time, space and

causation is restricted to the waking state alone. Thus Sri Shankara explains the nature of the Universe itself in his Sutra Bhashya—1/1/2, as follows : "... this Universe that is manifested through name and form ('अस्य जगतः नामरूपाभ्यां व्याकृतस्य'), that is associated with diverse agents and experiences ('अनेककर्तृभोक्तृसंयुक्तस्य'), that provides the support for actions and results having well-regulated space, time and causation ('प्रतिनियत-देशकालनिमित्तक्रियाफलाश्रयस्य') and that defies all thoughts about the real nature of its creation ('मनसापि अचिन्त्यरचनारूपस्य')....".

Whenever the waking state appears, all the above said phenomenon appear simultaneously or co-eval. The Witnessing principle of life i. e., the Self which is beyond Me-notion is the substratum of the appearance of waking state. The aspirant has to realise that 'as I am the witness of the waking state (including the 'Me-notion'), in me the waking state occurs', This is same as in the case of dream state. Before the occurrence of the dream, one's own being is there (in deep sleep), and in that being the whole dream state occurs, with its all phenomena as described for the waking state such as the divine plane, material plane, corporeal plane the concepts of time, space, causation etc. The waking also is to be observed as the

same case. When the aspirant observes this, at the time of observation he takes his stand in his true nature of the Witnessing principle of life and loses the wrong identification with the waking ego as well as with the dream ego. As this Being is not only the substratum of the waking state but there is no other source for this waking state apart from this Being also. Hence the conclusion that arises is that pure Being itself appears in the garb of waking state without forfeiting his true nature. So this form is described as 'VAISHVANA-NARA PADA' (वैश्वानर पाद) in Mandukya Mantra No.—3. Here the Atman is called *Vai-shvaanara* and it is described as having seven limbs (the divine plane is the head ; the sun is the eye ; fire the mouth ; space the waist ; water as the bladder ; and the earth as the feet) and 19 mouths (five organs of actions, five sense organs, five praanas or vital forces, four forms of antahkarana i. e., Manas, Buddhi, Chitta and Ahankaara), because He is the Witnessing principle of all the Universe consisting of the knower, means of knowledge and the object of knowledge, encompassed by the waking state.

An objection is raised here by the Bhashyaka that the Self who is the innermost and beyond the 'I-notion' (i. e., the individual Self), how do

all these concern to him ? (or belong to him ?), because the Self is restricted to a particular body.

For this objection Shankara replies in his Bhashya thus :

“नैष दोषः ; सर्वस्य प्रपञ्चस्य साधिदैविकस्य अनेनात्मना चतुष्पात्त्वस्य विवक्षितत्वात् । एवञ्च सति सर्वप्रपञ्चोपशमे अद्वैतसिद्धिः । सर्वभूतस्थश्च आत्मा एको दृष्टः स्यात् ; सर्वभूतानि च आत्मनि ।... अन्यथा हि खंदेहपरिच्छिन्न एव प्रत्यगात्मा सांख्यादिभिरिव दृष्टः स्यात् ; तथा च सति अद्वैतमिति श्रुतिकृतो विशेषो न स्यात् ।...”

[Mandukya Bhashya—3].

The meaning of this Bhashya statement is that “all the dualistic phenomena of the whole waking state including the *Divine plane* should be taken as an adjunct to the innermost Self (and not the individual Self with the limiting adjunct of the body and senses is referred to here). By this one can sublimate or falsify the waking state and realise the non-dual nature of the Self and he can see all the creatures in him and in all the creatures himself. This type of non-dual nature which is described in Upanishads (Isha—6) and Geeta (—6/29) will be realised only by taking the Self i. e., the Witnessing Atman as conditioned by the associate of the whole phenomenon to the waking state. Then only this right vision of non-dual realisation takes place. It is on this supposition

alone that he can be identified as Brahman really, the conditioning Universe being shown to be only an appearance. Otherwise if we hold the view that the Self is separate in each body, then we will come to the conclusion of the Kapila Sankhya doctrine which is a sophisticated dualism. And if it be so taken, Advaita—the unique teach- of the Shrutis would be missed.” From this stand- point Vedanta discerns the nature of the Universe as Brahman. When one does not know the true nature of Brahman he mistakes the Brahman as the Universe.

How to realise the true nature of Brahman

To realise the true nature of Brahman here five steps are adopted according to the methodology of Vedanta i. e., *Superimposition and Rescission*.

i) Elaborating the superimposed waking state as a whole—the superimposed factors (i. e., *Vaishvanarapada* etc.) are first described in a precise and comprehensive manner, as depicted above.

ii) Pointing out the true nature of the Self as beyond the waking state and bereft of the waking state and untouched by the waking state on the firm ground of the comprehensive vision of

life based on Universal acceptance i. e., by discriminative analysis of 'constancy and variability' i. e., by noting the continuity of persistence of the Atman in all the three states as the residual factor (*Anvaya*) and adventitious & ephemeral nature of the waking state, the not-self, as the differentiating factor (*Vyatireka*).

iii) The Self is the substratum of the waking state and there is no other source apart from this true nature of the Self for the waking state i. e., the very existence of the waking state itself is borrowed from the true nature of the pure Being which is the Self. So there is no independent existence of the waking state apart from the Self. This is evident for all that one's own being is continuing in deep sleep state bereft of waking state, while there is no experience as such apart from one's own being, of the existence of the waking state. Hence the waking state is mere appearance and the Self is the essence and only the truth.

iv) Whenever the waking state occurs in the Self, it is pervaded by the Self completely just as

For details about this *Anvaya-Vyatireka Tarka*, the reader is referred to my book, "Direct Means of Self-knowledge".

the *Vinayaka* (गणेश or गरुड़मूर्ति) that appears in the clay (i. e., which is made up of clay) is fully pervaded by the clay. When one sees this 'all-pervasiveness' of the Self, then for him the waking state is falsified.

v) The final stage is the firm conviction that the all-pervading consciousness is the only Reality. At this time the aspirant intuits the non-dual nature of Brahman as his own Self. When we discriminate the waking state and its substratum i. e., the Self and draw the judgement or conclusion as said above, we will realise that even when we had taken the view that there is the world and there is the Self—only the non-dual Self remains. In the example of the *Vinayaka* made of clay mentioned above, the clay and the *Vinayaka* are not two separate entities, the clay itself is appearing in the form of *Vinayaka*. Hence, the clay is non-dual one even though it appears in the form of *Vinayaka*. Similarly the Self appears in the form of waking state without undergoing any change in his true nature. So there is no real distinction such as the Self is one and the waking state is the second. So the Self is non-dual one.

All these discriminating activities pertain to the 'Me-notion alone. When we have lost the

identification with the 'I-notion' and take a stand in the true nature of our Being, then there is no complaint regarding the word or concept of waking state. At this stage, we will realise the non-duality of the Self. For this purpose *Vaishvaanaratva* (वैश्वानरत्व) is attributed in Self i. e., to remove the notion of individuality the Vedanta has attributed the Vaishvaanarahood to the Self. After that, pointing out the non-dual nature of the Self, the previous attribution of Vaishvaanarahood is also removed. At this stage, the Vaishvaanara himself remains as *Turiya* (तुरीय). This is said by Shankara in this connection. 'When one cognises that the whole waking state resides in me, and I am the substratum of the waking world, then he will realise the non-dual nature of the Self as well as the cession of the waking world'—

“एवं च सति सर्वप्रपञ्चोपशमे अद्वैतसिद्धिः,
सर्वभूतस्थश्चात्मा एको दृष्टः स्यात्, सर्वभूतानि
चात्मनि ।”

[Mandukya Bhashya—3] -

The Vedantic viewpoint is most subjective and relied on the Universal acceptance and comprehensive vision of life. Hence the conclusion that arises through this method

remains unshaken. All other sciences do not have this idea of the Witnessing principle of life which is the substratum of the whole waking state. So this fourth viewpoint of examining the waking state, from the standpoint of Vedantic teaching, is quite unique one.

CHAPTER-II

FOUR ASPECTS OF DREAM STATE

I. Dream state from the empirical i. e., waking standpoint :

Every one thinks that 'I am in this world ; I work here ; after sometime I will get tired and so I go to sleep to take rest, and in sleep, I get dream occasionally ; when I wake up I remember the dream and so the dreams are only illusory appearances due to Vasanas and so on.' In Vedanta, this view is first accepted and described as follows :

According to Vedanta, the heart is the residence of our mind, and the brain is the office room from which it acts and deals with all the transactions of daily life. When we wake up, the mind comes to the brain and takes all the sense organs and the body in its possession and starts daily transactions. When body and senses are tired, then mind wants to take rest and thus one wants to go to sleep. Here, the mind withdraws all the faculties of the sense organs such as seeing, hearing etc., and slowly it starts descending from brain to heart, which is its residence. It descends

through subtle nerves which are called *Nadis*. This is said in Briha. Upanishad—4/3/20 and in Prasna Upanishad, it is described in fourth prasna that the mind withdraws along with all the faculties of sense organs and descends through Nadis. While descending from brain to heart, in the middle the mind is forcibly stopped by other Nadis carrying juices such as blue, white, pink, green etc. When the mind gets into this obstacle, it stops in the middle—in between the brain and the heart. In Patanjala Yoga Shastra, it is said that at this point the mind remains in the region of the neck. They hold the view that dream takes place when the mind comes in this region. In Kaivalya Upanishad also it is described in a similar manner. When the mind is thus stopped, the impressions start emerging. In this stage, the mind starts throwing images according to impressions. This is described in Prasna Upanishad—4/5 and Brihadaranyaka—4/3/9 to 20.

When the red juice which is endowed with sunlight (*Sourena Tejasa*), comes out of the Nadi which is called *Pitta* it overwhelms all other Nadis. In this stage, the dream ceases to exist. When mind is released from the clutches of Vasanas by the above event then it goes to the heart and it enters in *Puritat* (पुरीत्त) i. e., the

cover of the heart and then it goes in the middle part of the heart where there is a space of the area of thumb. When the mind reaches this *Hridayaakaasha* (हृदयाकाश), the space of the heart, then it merges. This is called as 'deep sleep'. This is the process of going to sleep from the waking via dream (Refer 'Prasna—4/6, Briha—4/3/20 and Sutra Bhashya—3/2/7'). When the mind merges, then the Jiva or the Soul remains in his true nature of Brahman and this is also described in Brahma-Sutra Bhashya—3/2/7—ब्रह्म तु अनपायि सुप्तिस्थानम् ।

Sometimes, when Jiva comes from sleep to waking, in the middle also he can have the dreams according to the above process in the Nadis. So the dream is possible to be experienced by both the ways.

This is the first viewpoint of the dream which is described in the Vedanta. Here it is accepted that the dream state occurs. So this is called as empirical viewpoint. From this standpoint the dream is due to Vasanas and it is a false appearance, while the waking is real. We can reconcile some other sciences just as Ayurveda which says that the dreams occur due to irregularity of the food etc., due to imbalance of Vata (वायु), Pitta (पित्त) and Kapha (कफ). In

psychological investigations they have also taken this view that the same mind which functions in the waking state, enjoys the dreams. Recently they have started recording the dream state through the E. E. G. which graphs on the screen. From this we can understand that according to Vedānta also which says that the dream occurs due to mind-vibrations in the Nādis through the brain and the above E. E. G., confirms this view also which records these vibrations. It must be noted that this viewpoint of the Vedānta is from the empirical standpoint only. Thus we can reconcile all the sciences which observe the dream state from the waking standpoint only.

II. From the Scriptural standpoint (i. e., from the point of view of Religion) or Vaidika Vyavahaara Drishti :

In the view of religion, one should accept the existence of the Soul apart from the gross body. The Nihilists or the Athiests won't agree with this point. They say that the consciousness is a by-product of the five gross elements. So apart from the body and the mind there is nothing like Soul as such which has to take rebirth & nothing is left to enjoy the other worlds after death.

Because there is no proof for the existence of the Soul apart from the psycho-physical complex. Only on the ground of blind belief, relied on the utterances of the scriptures, we have to accept the existence of the Soul. This is the standpoint of the athiests. Previously this argument was called as *Chāruvākavāda*. But in the scriptures it has been admitted that there is a Soul who departs from this body and takes rebirth or enjoys in the other worlds such as heaven etc. What is the proof to accept the existence of the Soul? For this crucial question, Vedānta has given the satisfactory answer which is based on the Universal acceptance of the experience of the dream :

In Brihadāranyaka-Upanishad, the sage Yājñavalkya teaches the king Janaka that all the dealings of the mind and body etc, take place in the light of the Self-effulgent Self which is every one's true nature. 'आत्मनैवायं ज्योतिषास्ते पल्ययते कर्म कुरुते विपल्येतीति'—Briha.—4/3/6. When the Soul remains in this body, his all dealings are dealt in the light of this Self. After departing from this body, the same Soul takes another body or goes to heavenly worlds etc. and enjoys there according to his meritorious actions here and suffers according to demeritorious actions here. At this stage

Janaka asks the question : Why do we have to accept the existence of the Soul apart from the gross body and the mind ? What is the proof for such an existence apart from the utterances of the Shāstra or should we simply believe because it is said in the Shāstras ?

For this the sage **Yājñavalkya's reply** is : "Everyone experiences the dream. In dream state he himself is there. He, the dreamer deals with all the conscious dealings such as hearing, seeing, thinking etc, but he has not been followed by this gross body in the dream state i. e., he has not taken this body there. This gross body will lie along the bed while he is dreaming. So one should accept that apart from this gross body, his existence is there. He feels during the dream time that he has got a body. This shows that the Soul can take another body after the death. This dream experience is an indication to assert that the Soul is different from this gross body and that he may take another body and that he may enjoy other worlds. Probably his dream will be according to Vāsanās or impressions that he gathers while performing actions in this waking world. While this is commonly experienced by all, there may be different types of dreams also, though rarely. By this we can assume that 'as he sows,

so he reaps'. According to this, the merit and demerit and the consequences of these actions become acceptable." So all these religious points are supported on the 'Universal acceptance of the dream' in Vedānta. By this it is proved that one has to observe the morality in our life here. Thus Vedānta supports the religious ideas by giving the Universal experience of dream :

- a) *Existence of Soul apart from the body.*
- b) *Soul taking rebirth.*
- c) *Existence of other worlds like heaven and hell etc.*
- d) *The necessity of leading austere life here, etc.*

Though the dream itself is not rebirth, it indicates the possibility of rebirth (Briha. Bhāshya—4/3/8).

This is the second view point regarding the dream state which supports the *Vaidika-vyavahāra* i. e., scriptural dealings.

In other religions like Christianity and Islam, though they do not accept the previous births and rebirths, they say that the Soul after departing from this body rests eternally in the heaven or hell according to his meritorious and demeritorious works. He who follows the religious sacred duties and who does not follow, both for them the haven

and the hell will be permanent abodes respectively. To believe this also they have to accept the existence of the Soul apart from this gross body. To accept this, there is no sound evidence as it is in this *Sanātana Vaidika Dharma*. The existence of the Soul shown on the firm ground of Universal acceptance of the dream experience is found only in the Upanishads which belong to the Sanātana Vaidika Dharma i. e., Vedas. But the experience which is shown here is Universal. So the merit of showing the existence of the Soul inevitably goes to the Sanātana Vaidika Dharma.

This is the second view point of the dream state.

III. Dream state from the standpoint of Witnessing principle of life i. e., SAAKSHI :

In the first viewpoint i. e., Loukika vyavahāra Driṣhti it is accepted that the man or Purusha is known as predominantly from the viewpoint of the body while sleeping. But in the second standpoint it is shown that the man is really not the gross body ; he is a Soul who resides in this gross body and that he takes rebirth etc. In this third view we have to change the standpoint from

Ego to Witness. So it is the standpoint of Witnessing principle of life. To understand this, the following points should be remembered :

a) As I am the witness of the 'Ego-sense' or 'Me-notion' and as my nature is the pure-Being, in me the dream state arises.

b) In that dream, the 'Me-notion', which is conditioned by that state appears with its respective world. So, I am quite different from the Ego or 'Me-notion' of the dream state.

c) As it is dealt with in previous chapter regarding the waking state, so one should remember that 'as I am pure Being and as I am the substratum, in me the waking state arises with its full retinue i. e., ego and the world'.

d) Hence I am the substratum of these two states.

Holding this viewpoint, the conclusions which are drawn in Vedānta are as follows :

i) The Self, who is the Witness and the substratum of these two states is untainted by these two states.

ii) The self-effulgent Self by whose light the dream and the waking states are illumined is ever free from these two states.

iii) He is non-dual because there is no other source for these two states and He is one who

pervades both the states.

iv) Though from the empirical viewpoint the waking is real and the dream is unreal (because this dream occurs due to Vāsanās), holding this view also the self-effulgent Self is the illuminer of these two states. As He is the illuminer, He is the transcendental reality i. e., really real. From this really real standpoint, both the states are equally unreal, because they are of adventitious and ephemeral nature, in the Self, while the Self is the constant truth i. e., unchanging reality.

These four conclusions are drawn in Bhāshya in various places. For the present we shall give some excerpts from the Shankara's Bhāshya, Kathopanishad — 2/1/4 — (S V A P N Ā N T A M JĀGARITĀNTAM....); the significance of the above mantra is explained by Shankara in his Sutra Bhāshya—2/1/6, while showing the Shrauta Tarka—

“स्वप्नान्तबुद्धान्तयोः उभयोः इतरेतारव्यभिचारात् आत्मनः
अनन्वागतत्वम्।”

—The waking and the dream states when they appear, one necessarily cancels the very existence of the other, but the Atman being the very substratum of these two states remains ever

untainted by them.

In Bṛihadāraṇyaka Bhāṣhya—1/4/10, Shankara says,

“तया अविपरिलुप्तया नित्यया दृष्ट्या स्वरूपभूतया स्वयं
ज्योतिः समाख्यया इतरामनित्यां दृष्टिं स्वप्नान्तबुद्धान्तयो-
र्वासनाप्रत्ययरूपां नित्यमेव पश्यन् दृष्टेर्द्रष्टा भवति ।”

— meaning, “Through that unfailing eternal vision, which is identical with It and is called the self-effulgent light, the Self always sees the other, transitory vision in the dream and waking states, as impressions (Vāsanās) and perceptions respectively, and becomes the seer of sight.”

So, in this third viewpoint, it is taken here as the dream is due to Vāsanās or latent impressions, while the waking is a real perception from the Vyāvahārika standpoint.

“अपि च स्मृतिरेषा (तद्वासनाविशिष्टः) यत् स्वप्नदर्शनम्,
उपलब्धिस्तु जागरितदर्शनम् ।”

—Sutra Bhāṣhya—2/2/29 & 1/1/9.

This empirical assumption is taken for granted here to denote that real nature of the Self is untainted by these two states. And in Bṛihadāraṇyaka Upanishad—4/3/8 to 18, the following subjects are dealt with :

i) The dream is the illustration for the rebirth,

ii) *The nature of the Self* who is the Witness of both the dream and waking states, is *Self-effulgent* one, here it is called as SVAYAMJYOTI ('अत्रायं पुरुष स्वयं ज्योतिर्भवति'—Briha.—4/3/9). Though in waking state also the nature of the Self is self-effulgent one, reference to the dream state will clearly show the self-effulgent nature of the Self. Because one may think that in waking state, there are some other lights just as the sun, the moon, etc. But in dream state all these lights are absent. And one has seen the things in the dream state through one's own light. Not only this, but the whole dream state is grasped through one's own nature of pure consciousness also. That nature of pure consciousness is the self-effulgent Self. So in this connection the word 'light' or 'effulgence' denotes the nature of consciousness alone and not in an ordinary sense like light, darkness etc. This nature of consciousness, seeing the darkness and light is merely seeing the effects of right and wrong deeds ("दृष्टवै पुण्यं च पापं च"—बृहः—4/3/16). So the nature of the Self is taught through this superimposition of Self-effulgence.

iii) And also that the *nature of the Self is untainted*. For the words used in these mantras are 'ASANGO HYAYAM PURUSHAHA'

(— असङ्गो ह्ययम् पुरुषः—Briha—4/3/15). He, the Self, has no taint of perceptions which occur in the waking state as well as no taint of Vāsanās which appear in dream state because the Vāsanās pertain to Antahakarana alone and not to the Self. It is clearly stated in Briha. Bhāshya—2/3/6.

iv) *The Self is non dual one.* This is shown by using the words 'EKAHAMSĀHA' (—हिरण्य पुरुषः एकहंसः—Briha.—4/3/11 and 4/3/12) and the words 'EKA DRASHTĀ ADVAITA' (एक द्रष्टा अद्वैत—Briha.—4/3/32). This non-dual nature of the Self is to be understood in two ways :

a) The same Self is the substratum for both the states and there is no other source for these two states.

b) There is no real distinction such as the Self is one and the state is the second, because whenever a state appears in the Self, it is fully pervaded by the Self and the Self is the reality and the state is a false appearance due to Avidya. So the Self is ever non-dual one.

All these are dealt with in the above third point and all these are shown in Brihadāraṇyaka—4/3/8 to 18. Through this teaching, the aspirant realises his true nature and takes his stand there by falsifying both the states. This is the utility

of this viewpoint.

IV. Observing the dream from the standpoint of the dream state itself :

Probably everyone thinks that the waking state is real & the dream state is false. Taking this view also one can realise his true nature through the pretext of these states. But, it is very difficult to think regarding the dream state from the standpoint of the dream experience as it was exactly. This thinking requires rigorous indispasionate thinking. The thinker should give up the ideas regarding the dream which are there in his present waking mind. If one is ready to take up this task of indispasionate thinking, then only he can understand the following arguments.

For the present to understand clearly this fourth standpoint regarding dream, we shall show here two types of arguments :

a) The arguments regarding the dream state from the standpoint of waking state.

i) In waking state, there is a continuity of time. So if we take up any work, we shall finish little by little in due course for example

construction of house etc. But the dream-time has no continuity. When dream disappears, at once everything will vanish. The above example of construction of house etc., will vanish when the dream state disappears. So the waking is real and dream is false.

ii) The waking world is common to all but the dream, as it is an individual experience is different for different persons. So waking is real and dream is false.

iii) The things that appear in waking are real for ever and hence we try to accumulate and keep for future use, whereas the things that we see in dream state are not so. For example, one may get a huge sum of money as lottery in dream, but that will not come to the waking state, but whereas when we earn something in waking state, that continues so to serve us for future time also.

iv) The waking world is regulated by rigorous rules and regulations of time, space, causation. So we can find things here as they are, for example, a man as a man only ; animal as animal ; a dead person will never come back to life etc. While in dream state there is no regulation of time, space, causation etc., and the things will change in very strange manner. For

eg, a man may fly like a bird, dead man can be seen as alive in dream etc. and vice versa. So, due to Vāsanās (latent impressions), dream appears in a wild manner. And hence the waking is real and dream is unreal.

All other sciences like Psychology, Medical science, Upāsana Shāstras etc., confirm the above idea that the dream is a Vāsanā and a subordinate state to the waking state. In Shankara's Bhāshya also it is said that the dreams are indications for the happenings in waking world, good or bad. Brahma Sutra Bhāshya—2/1/14 :

तथा च श्रुतिः—‘यदा कर्मसु काम्येषु स्त्रियं स्वप्नेषु पश्यति । समृद्धिं तत्र जानीयात्तस्मिन् स्वप्ननिदर्शने’— इति असत्येन स्वप्नदर्शनेन सत्ययाः समृद्धेः प्रतिपत्तिं दर्शयति । तथा प्रत्यक्षदर्शनेषु केषुचित् अरिष्टेषु जातेषु ‘न चिरम् इव जीविष्यति इति विद्यात्’, इत्युक्त्वा ‘अथ स्वप्नाः, पुरुषं कृष्णं कृष्णदन्तं पश्यति स एनं हन्ति’ इत्यादिना तेन तेन असत्येन एव स्वप्न दर्शनेन सत्यं मरणं सूच्यते इति दर्शयति । प्रसिद्धं च इदं लोके अन्वय-व्यतिरेककुशलानाम् ईदृशेन स्वप्नदर्शनेन साध्वागमः सूच्यते. ईदृशेन असाध्वागमः इति ।”

(and refer to Sutra Bhāshya—3/2/3 & 3/2/4 also).

In all these places Shankara explains that the dream is due to Vāsanās. In Mandukya—4 &

Brihadāranyaka also, the same argument is put forth by the Āchārya. Hence, the dream is a false appearance and waking is the real one. It being so, arguing with the idea that the dream and waking are equal and both are unreal is absurd. These are the arguments from the standpoint of the waking regarding the dream.

b) Arguments regarding dream state from the standpoint of dream experience alone :

i) From the standpoint of waking intellect, we have kept the name as *dream* to that state, But strictly speaking no one feels while dreaming that 'that is a dream'. There will not even be least doubt regarding the unreality of that state. Everyone feels there—'this is the real state'. So calling by the name as dream itself is due to the bias towards waking state. But dream experience says that 'I am not dreaming at all, I am the true waking in my realm.' From the standpoint of waking state. you may say that it is a dream. But from the standpoint of actual experience of the dream state, it is true waking.

ii) The waking intellect objects that the continuity of time is there in the waking state, while it is not so is dream state. After waking. the time concept which was in the dream has not

continued in the waking state. So the concept of time in the dream is unreal. This is the objection. For this the reply is that in dream state, the concept of time was eternal, infinite and real. There also in the dream we feel thousands of years of span of time as real. So in the dream state, the concept of time is real. The main objection is that this time-series of the dream has not continued in the waking state. If we were to see vice-versa then we can say the infinite concept of time which is concerned to the waking state, is also not continued in the dream. So, we have to agree with the point that the concept of continuity of time is restricted only to the respective state alone. There is no common denominator of time or space between these two states. So, the feeling of continuity of time is not a criterion to determine the reality.

iii) The dream world is also common to all people who have appeared in the dream state. If we had started the Vedantic discussion in our dream, we will object all the above points regarding dream state. Because during the dream inevitably we hold the view that it is true waking. From that standpoint we say there also that this waking world is common to all of us. But the dream is an individual experience. So, the

waking world is common to waking people and dream world is common to dream people.

iv) The things which appear in the dream state are useful in that state. The things which pertain to waking state are useful in waking state alone. The things which are seen in dream state are termed unreal because these things are not seen in our daily life—this was the objection. For this we say, “Why should we not say that the waking things are not useful in the dream and therefore, they are also unreal?” So the utility of the things and the concept of reality of the things are restricted to the respective states alone.

v) The objection raised here was that the waking world has got rigorous rules and regulations while the dream is uncertain. For this we say that in the waking state the rules and regulations are real and these are restricted to the waking state alone. So the reality of these things are here alone. While we are staying in dream, the strange thing which appear to have occurred in dream appear to be real and natural in that dream state. For example, the aeronauts go beyond the orbit of the earth and in that outer space they float easily in the space because there is no gravitational force to draw them or pull them down. The same aeronaut, when comes back to

the earth, then he has to follow the rules and regulations of the gravitational force of the earth. As the rules and regulations of the gravitation do not govern in the space beyond the gravitational pull of the earth, so also with the case of dream and waking. Hence the rules and regulations are not the criterion for reality.

All other sciences like Medical science, Psychology, Upāsanā-Shāstras, Omens about good or bad etc., are all based on the biased view of waking state. So their conclusion is not sufficient to determine the reality, that which is really real.

To understand all the above counter arguments regarding dream and waking states, the aspirant should observe that as his true nature is the Witness of these two states, substratum, Self-fulgent & untainted by these two states, in that Self the waking and dream states appear and disappear, i. e., the nature of the states are of adventitious and ephemeral nature. So he has realised that "in me (as I am the substratum) the dream state appears and the same is the case with the waking and hence these two appearances are equal for me". The feeling that the waking is real and the dream is due to Vāsanās is only from the waking state. The mind clinging to the

waking state alone is the cause of all these ideas or feelings. This judgement is drawn from the standpoint of the true nature of the Self which is transcendental reality. From this standpoint, waking and dream are equal. The reader is referred to—

Māndukya Kārikā—2/4 to 2/10 with commentary on these kārikās in MĀNDUKYA RAHASYA VIVRITIHI and Mān-kārikā—4/31 to 4/41 with Shankara's commentary and MĀNDUKYA RAHASYA VIVRITIHI. Here Gowdapāda argues in the following manner :

Commonly people hold the view that the Vāsanās (latent impressions) of the waking state is the cause for the dream. By this it is meant that the waking state is the cause and the dream is the effect. How is it possible to believe that the real cause produces the unreal effect ? Sometimes people hold the view that the dream is the cause and the waking, the effect ; for example, one may say that 'I saw a tiger in my dream which was ready to pounce on me. At once I feared and after waking also the fear and shivering in the body were continuing.' Here the dream was the cause, the shivering etc, are the effects which concern to the waking. Here also we ask the question how can the unreal cause produce the

real effect ?' If one were to say that both the states are real, then there will be no cause and effect relation between the two. If one were to hold the view that both are unreal, then to accept the cause and effect principle is absurd. So in all the viewpoints it is said that the waking and dream are both false appearances and both are unreal. So between false appearances no one accepts one to be the cause and the other the effect. So all the relationships or the causationships between these two states are imagined from the point of the waking intellect only.

Here, we have not intended to prove that waking is also unreal just like dream, but the true intention of this argument is to assert or confirm the transcendental reality which is the Self, is itself the essence of these two states. So to teach the nature of the Self we have taken these two false appearances namely waking and dream. This is clearly said in Māndukya Kārikā from 2/11 to 2/18.

The argument of Sri Gowdapāda regarding the unreality of the waking state is quite unlike the Buddhist's arguments. Buddhists rely on the waking intellect alone and they want to show the unreality of the waking state through the very same intellect. But in Vedānta we have

relied on the firm ground of Universal acceptance and comprehensive vision and taken a stand in the Witnessing principle of life and from that firm ground we have shown the equal unreality of both these states. Shankara says in Brahma Sutra Bhāshya—2/2/31.

“न हि अयं सर्वप्रमाणप्रसिद्धः लोकव्यवहारः अन्यत्
तत्त्वम् अनधिगम्य शक्यते अपह्नोतुम्, अपवादाभावे
उत्सर्गप्रसिद्धेः।”

—The practical dealings of the waking state which are based on all the authorities of the means of right knowledge, are impossible to be denied or negated unless and until one has not shown the other type of reality which transcends all the empirical dealings. Because if there is no exception, the general rule alone stands there.

According to this rule, Vedāntins have shown the transcendental reality which is the Self of all. On that firm ground they have negated the reality of the waking state. So it is quite unlike the Buddhistic view.

From the empirical standpoint, meaning from the standpoint of Adhyāropa we accept the reality of the waking state compared to the dream state. But from the standpoint of the transcendental reality only we say that both the states are unreal.

For this the reader is referred to Brahma Sutra Bhāshya—3/2/4.

“न विद्यदादि सर्गस्य अपि आत्यन्तिकं सत्यत्वमस्ति ।
प्रतिपादितं हि ‘तदनन्यत्वम् आरम्भणशब्दादिभ्यः’— इत्यत्र
समस्तस्य प्रपञ्चस्य मायामात्रत्वम् । प्राक् तु ब्रह्मात्मत्व-
दर्शनात् विद्यदादिप्रपञ्चः व्यवस्थितरूपः भवति,
सन्ध्याश्रयस्तु प्रपञ्चः प्रतिदिनं बाध्यते, इत्यतः वैशेषिकमिदं
सन्ध्यस्य मायामात्रत्वमुदितम् ।”

“...Yet the creation of space etc., also has no absolute reality ; for under the aphorism ‘the effect is non-different from the cause since the terms like ‘origin’ etc., are met with (Sutra Bhāshya—2/1/14), we showed that the whole creation is but Māyā (illusory). But before realization of the identity of the Self with Brahman, creation counting from space etc., continues just as it is, whereas the creation within dream is abrogated every bay. Hence the statement that dream is merely Māyā has a special significance.”

An objection :

One ardent student of Shankara Vedānta had questioned regarding this problem of dream and waking as follows :

In all the Prasthānatraya Bhāshyas regarding

the dream states Shankara asserts that the dream is a Vāsanā (i. e., dream is caused by the latent impressions of the waking) and the waking is real. For example in Māndukya mantra—4 (=मनस्तद्वासनारूपा च स्वप्ने), in Sutra Bhāshya, in Brihadāranyaka Bhāshya, in Chāndogya Bhāshya etc. Thus in about 95 percent of the Bhāshya, this view is stated. While commenting on the Gowdapāda's kārikās alone, especially in chapters 2 & 4, he argues that both the states are equal and both are unreal. Is it not a contradictory statement ?

Supposing that Sri Gowdapāda is his Grandguru and he knows the Vedāntic tradition well and so he is called SAMPRADĀYAVIT (अत्रोक्तं वेदान्तार्थं सम्प्रदायविद्विराचार्यैः—Sutra Bhāshya—2/1/9) and so Shankara has not dealt against the grandguru in his Mandukya kārikā Bhāshya, then also the question arises that where is the voucher to Gowdapāda to argue that both the states are equally unreal according to Upanishad ?

Answer to the above objection :

It is true that Sri Shankara has said in most part of the Bhāshyas that the dream is caused by the latent impressions of the waking as e. g., Shankara writes : “तद्वासनाविशिष्टः स्वप्नान् पश्यन् मनःशब्द-

वाच्य भवति”—Sutra Bhāshya—1/1/9—that the Jīva goes to the dream state taking the mental impression & is called by the name of Manas and the waking is real from empirical standpoint. But, does Shankara say anywhere that waking experiences are real from the standpoint of the Ultimate Truth ? He has clearly declared from the standpoint of transcendental reality, that the waking is also a false appearance.

i) Refer to Brahma-Sutra Bhāshya—which is just stated above :

“न च वियदादिसर्गस्य अपि आत्यन्तिकं सत्यत्वमस्ति ।
प्रतिपादितं हि ‘तदनन्यत्वम् आरम्भणशब्दादिभ्यः’ इत्यत्र
समस्तस्य प्रपञ्चस्य मायामात्रत्वम् । प्राक् तु ब्रह्मात्मत्व-
दर्शनात् वियदादिप्रपञ्चः व्यवस्थितरूपः भवति, सन्ध्या-
श्रयस्तु प्रपञ्चः प्रतिदिनं बाध्यते इति, अतः वैशेषिकम्
इदं सन्ध्यस्य मायामात्रत्वम् उदितम् ।”

(Sutra Bhāshya—3/2/4)

— Here he says, “by saying that the dream is illusory or māyic one should not confuse that the waking world is real. It is not really real, it is also an illusory appearance i. e., Māyā due to ignorance (= मायामात्रत्वम्). We have dealt with this while commenting on Sutra Bhāshya—2/1/14. But from the standpoint of empirical view, unless and until one realises the non-dual Brahman as

his own Self, the waking continues to appear to be real with all its rules and regulations, while the dream falsifies every day, when one awakes from the dream. For this purpose, we said here that the dream is illusory (=मायामात्रत्वम्). When this awareness of Brahman takes place then he realises that the waking state also is only a false appearance.” So, Shankara does not accept the dream as due to Vāsanās as a final conclusion.

In Upanishad Bhāshyas :

ii) Shankara said in his Chāndogya Upanishad Bhāshya—8/5/4, thus :

“ननु स्वप्ने दृष्टाः प्रतिबुद्धस्यानृता भवन्ति विषयाः।
सत्यमेव, जाग्रद्विषयानुत्त्वं, न स्वतः। तथा
स्वप्नविषयानुत्त्वं, न स्वतः।....
प्राक् सदात्मप्रतिबोधात् स्वविषयेऽपि सर्वं सत्यमेव
स्वप्न-दृश्या इवेति न कश्चिद्विरोधः।”

—The perception of things in the dream becoming falsified or unreal is caused by the viewpoint of waking knowledges but not in itself. Similarly, the perception of things in waking state also becoming unreal or falsified is caused by the viewpoint of dream knowledge alone, but they are not unreal by themselves. Till we intuit the ultimate reality, both the states during their respective times are real in their own form only ;

but after we realizing them as identical with the ultimate reality both are unreal or illusory i. e., both are real in the form of Brahman (pure Existence) alone.

In this regard it is not possible to mention any difference whatsoever between these two states—waking & dream. Thus there is no contradiction.

iii) In Aitareya—1/3/12 Upanishad, it is said that all the three states are dreams,

“तस्य त्रय आवसथास्त्रयः स्वप्नाः ।”

Shankara clearly comments on this Mantra and takes one objection thus, ‘the waking state is endowed with awareness, so how the waking be called as dream?’ And he answers thus; “Not so, this waking state is also a dream (Swapna eva). How? In the waking state also there is no awareness of the true nature of the Self which is transcendental reality and he sees the not-selves which are not really there, as if they are there just as in dream.” In this sentence, Shankara clearly states the equality of the waking and dream states.

iv) In Taittiriya, 2/8/5—

“स यश्चायं पुरुषे यश्चासावादित्ये स एकः।”—
भाष्यम्—“जाग्रत्स्वप्नयोरन्यस्य ग्रहणात् सत्त्वमेवेति चेत्,
न ; अविद्याकृतत्वात् जाग्रत्स्वप्नयोः, यदन्यग्रहणं जाग्रत्-
स्वप्नयोः तदविद्याकृतम्, विद्याभावे अभावात्।”

“Objection : Duality has existence because of its perception in the dream and waking states.

Answer : No, for the dream and waking states are creations of ignorance. The perception of duality that occurs in the dream and waking states is the result of ignorance, because it ceases on the cessation of ignorance.”

Here Shankara declares that अविद्याकृतत्वात् जाग्रत्स्वप्नयोः—the waking and dream having both been conjured up by avidyā.

v) In Brihadāranyaka Bhāshya—4/3/19—

—“जागरितेऽपि यद्दर्शनं तदपि स्वप्नं मन्यते श्रुतिः।
अत आह ‘न कञ्चन स्वप्नं पश्यति’ इति। तथा च
श्रुत्यन्तरम्—‘तस्य त्रय आवसथाम्नायाः स्वप्नाः’ इति ॥”

—Āchārya Shankara remarks here : The Shrutī considers even the experience of waking state to be but dream and hence it says, ‘where one sees no dream whatever’. Another Shrutī passage bears this out : ‘He has three abodes,

three dream states.’

vi) In Māndukya Upanishad—3 and 4, it is declared that VAISHVĀNARA (वैश्वानरः) and TAIJASA (तैजसः), both have got 19 mouths (एकोनविंशतिमुखः) and 7 limbs (सप्ताङ्गः). Here Shankara has written—

“वह्निर्विषया इव प्रज्ञा अविद्याकृता अवभासते....जाग्रत्प्रज्ञा अनेकसाधना वह्निर्विषया इवावभासमाना मनः स्पन्दनमात्रा सती etc.”

— i. e., “Consciousness appears, as it were, related to outward objects on account of Avidyā. Waking consciousness, being associated as it is with many means (subject-object relationship, agency, instrumentality etc.), and appearing conscious of objects as if external, though in reality they are nothing but mental existents produced by Avidyā etc.”

vii) In Brihadāranyaka Bhāshya—2/1/18.

“तस्मात् स्वप्ने मृषाध्यारोपिता एव आत्मभूतत्वेन लोका अविद्यमाना एव सन्तः । तथा जागरितेऽपि—इति प्रत्येतन्वयम् ।”

—“Therefore in dreams worlds that never exist are falsely superimposed as being a part of the Self. One must know the worlds experienced in the waking state also to be such.”

On this firm ground of utterances of the Shruti, Gowdapāda has declared that waking and dream are equal. Sri Satchidānandendra Saraswatī Swāmiji has clearly shown this in his English introduction of MĀNDUKYA RAHASYA VIVRITIH viz.,

“The identity of waking and dream Ātmans—hinted at in the Shruti by the two epithets (सप्ताङ्गः, एकोनविंशतिमुखः)—‘seven-organed’ & ‘ninteen-faced’ (Mantras 3 & 4) and in Āgama Prakarana by two epithets (कार्यकारणबद्धौ) ‘bound by cause & effect’ and (स्वप्ननिद्रायुतावाद्यौ) ‘having both sleep and dream’—is clarified in the second chapter of the kārikā. In the Sanskrit introduction of the same book he has said that :

“तत्र वैतथ्ये तावत् ‘स्वप्नाङ्ग एकोनविंशतिमुखः’ इति वैश्वानरतैजसोभयविशेषणसमर्पिकां श्रुतिं व्यपाश्रित्य स्वप्नजागरितयोः सर्वसमत्वमुपपादितं प्रपञ्चवैतथ्यावगमाय ।”

Hence from the standpoint of transcendental reality which is the true nature of the Self, both the states—waking and dream—are equally false appearances due to ignorance. It is strengthened here in this fourth view-point of the dream state—i. e., examining the dream from the standpoint of the dream experience as it was during the dream time.

CHAPTER-III

FOUR ASPECTS OF DEEP SLEEP STATE

Regarding deep sleep there are four standpoints or viewpoints according to Shankara's Bhāshyas.

I. From the standpoint of fatigue :

Nidrā (निद्रा) means *Tamoguna* (तमोगुणः) (*Gītā Bhāshya*—14/8 and 18/39—तमः गुणः सर्वेषां देहवतां .. प्रमादालस्यनिद्राः ताभिस्तत् तमः निबध्नाति). This is the viewpoint of body. When it is tired by work in its waking state and when the *Tamoguna* acquires the body, then the sense organs will stop their work and the mind wants to merge. In this stage yawning and drowsing etc., will start. This is called as *Nidrā* by common people. This is essential to our life, but it should be controlled by observing regulation in food and work etc. [Refer *Bhagavat Gītā*—6/17]. This modification in the body which occurs due to tiredness etc., is called *Nidrā*. The experience of this *Tamoguna* is observed in the waking state before and after the sleep. This does not pertain to the deep sleep state ; it concerns to the waking state alone. But most persons hanker confusion and get confound-

ed regarding this. According to them 'in deep sleep state there is *Tamoguna* ; we feel this *Tamoguna* after waking etc.' So one should clearly understand that the experience of Tamoguna which occurs before and after sleep is concerned to the body and belongs to waking state. It is not the direct intuitional experience of the deep sleep.

II. From the standpoint of seed-form of world and vaasanaas :

According to the common man's experience, he who sleeps, will himself awake as he was before. By this experience the seed-form of the ego with *vāsānās* etc., is there in deep sleep without losing his potentiality of differentiation. Because again it appears in various forms as it was before. This is to be inferred from the standpoint of *adyāropa* of Jiva and his states like waking, dream and deep sleep etc. This is accepted by Shankara from the *Vyāvahārika* standpoint in his *Sutra-Bhāshya*—2/1/9, particularly in the sentences :

“यथा हि सुषुप्तिसमाध्यादौ अपि सत्यां स्वाभाविक्याम्
अविभागप्राप्तौ मिथ्याज्ञानस्य अनपदितत्वात् पूर्ववत् पुनः
प्रबोधे विभागः भवति, एवम् इहापि भविष्यति।”

....“यथा हि अविभागे अपि परमात्मनि मिथ्याज्ञान-
प्रतिबद्धः विभागव्यवहारः स्वप्नवत् अव्याहृतः स्थितः
दृश्यते, एवम् अपीतौ अपि मिथ्याज्ञानप्रतिबद्धा एव
विभागशक्तिः अनुमास्यते ।”

Just as in *Sushupti* and *Samādhi*, there is attained the intrinsic state of absence of distinctions, and yet distinction reappears in waking as before on account of *mithyājñāna* not being removed, so also it may well happen in this case of dissolution also.” “Just as even in Supreme *Ātman* without any distinction. it is seen in practical life that distinctions based upon *Mithyājñāna* (or *Avidyā* of the nature of *adhyāsa*) function unobstructed even in the period of sustenance of the world as they do in a dream ; so also one may infer the potency of distinctions owing to *Mithyājñāna* in the period of dissolution also.” And in *Sutra-Bhāshya*— 3/2/9 particularly the sentence :

“अपि च न जीवः नाम कश्चित् परस्मात् अन्यः विद्यते,
यः जलविन्दुः इव जलराशेः सतः विविच्यते । सदेव तु
उपाधिसम्पर्कात् जीवः इति उपचर्यते इति असकृत्
प्रपञ्चितम् । सः एव अयम् उपाधिः स्वप्नप्रबोधयोः
बीजाङ्कुरन्यायेन इति अतः सः एव जीव प्रतिबुध्यते इति
युक्तम् ।”

—There is no such entity like *Jiva*, different

from the supreme Self, which has to be distinguished from pure existence like a drop of water from a mass of water. It has been shown more than once that pure existence Itself comes to be called indirectly Jīva, because of the intervention of limiting adjuncts. That very same set of adjuncts persists in deep sleep and waking states on the maxim of the seed and seedling, so that the reasonable position is that the selfsame Jīva wakes up from deep sleep.

This is accepted from the standpoint of Adhyāropa, which means empirical standpoint. So the seed-form of vāsanās and potential form of the Antahkarana are accepted in deep sleep according to empirical experience.

Along with the ego the whole waking state merges in the deep sleep and remains there in the seed-form with its potency of diversity. It is said in Māndukya Upanishad—5, particularly in Bhāshya portion :

“तथा रूपापरित्यागेन अविचेकापन्नं नैशतमोग्रस्तमिवाहः
सप्रपञ्चम् एकीभूतमितुच्यते ।”

—Here Shankara says that the waking and dream states merge here (in Sushypti) without losing their potential form of diversity and they have taken seed-form. This seed-form is called as

JAGADBEEJA (जगत्बीजम्), AVYAKTA (अव्यक्तम्) etc. This is the second attribution made by Shāstra from the VAIDIKAVYAVAHĀRA DRISHTI.

III. From the standpoint of causal ignorance :

The attribution of causal ignorance (तत्त्वाप्रति-
बोधमात्रमेव हि बीजम् – G. K. Bh.—1/11) in deep sleep
is made from the standpoint of the Vaidika
Vyavahāra i. e., with a view that one should get
the Self-knowledge (‘तुय्ययाथात्म्यावधारणार्थम्’ – G. K.
Bh.—1/11). Though from the standpoint of
Shruti and enlightened persons Sushupti is
non-dual Self alone, the pure Consciousness
alone, it is not Sushupti from their standpoint
But from the standpoint of common man,
as he is ignorant regarding his true nature of
the Self and as he has to obtain the Self-
knowledge—from this standpoint the causal
ignorance i. e., non-perception regarding the real
nature of the Self, is attributed to deep sleep.
In waking and dream the common man has got
the causal ignorance, i. e., non-perception
regarding the true nature of the Self as well as
the misconception (See the commentary by
Shankara in Mān-kārikā—1/11). In deep sleep,

he has no misunderstanding or wrong identification with the body, mind etc. Though this is the thing, he has no right knowledge regarding his true nature in deep sleep and it is impossible to get the Self-knowledge in deep sleep because of the absence of the mind and the teachings of the Guru and the Shāstra and Sādhanas. From this standpoint, it is attributed that in deep sleep, the causal ignorance remains there. So it is said that PRĀJNA is bounded only by causal ignorance (तत्त्वाप्रतिबोधमात्रमेव हि बीजम् प्राज्ञत्वे निमित्तम्—G. kārikā Bh.—1/11). When one cognises his true nature through the teachings of the Guru and the Shāstra, then the previous attribution of the Sushupti will be removed, along with the attributions of VĀSANĀBEEJA & JAGAD-BEEJA (seed-form of the intellect and the world etc.) and the causal ignorance (तत्त्वाग्रहणलक्षणं बीजम्) also will be removed.

At the stage, previously he who was called as PRĀJNA as having seed-form, the same prājna will be recognised as TURIYA and ever free from all the attributes of seed-form and sprout-form etc. See the particular sentence of Shankara Bhāshya on Mān-kārikā—1/2, viz,

“तामबीजावस्थां तस्यैव प्राज्ञशब्दवाच्यस्य तुरीयत्वेन देहादि-
सम्बन्ध जाग्रदादिरहितां पारमार्थिकीं पृथग्वक्ष्यति ।”

“That which is designed as *Prājna* (when it is viewed as the cause of the phenomenal world) will be described as *Turiya* separately when it is not viewed as the cause, and when it is free from all phenomenal relationship i. e., in its absolutely real aspect.”

Here Shankara clearly says that the same PRĀJNA is recognised as TURIYA through Viveka. From the standpoint of ignorance only, the seed-form of ignorance (causal ignorance) and seed-form of the Universe etc., are attributed by the Shāstra for the purpose of teaching. For this reason, Shankara has shown the main differences between the deep sleep and the state of enlightenment i. e., Turiya in his commentary on Gaudapāda kārīkā—3/34 & 3/35.

Hence the attributions of the state of Sushupti, Vāsanā-bīja, seed-form of the Universe (*Jagad-bīja*) and causal ignorance (तत्त्वाप्रतिबोध) are all superimposed on the pure nature of the Self from the various standpoint of the waking world for the purposes of teaching alone.

IV. From the standpoint of the direct intuition of the deep sleep :

Now we have to give up the standpoint of

the waking state. We have to observe the intuitive experience of the deep sleep. From this standpoint the Shruti describes :

“यत्र सुप्तो न कञ्चन कामं कामयते, न कञ्चन स्वप्नं पश्यति, तत् सुषुप्तम्।” [Bṛhadāraṇyaka—4/3/19 & Māndukya—4].

Here Sushupti means one's own true nature of being bereft of waking and dream. As waking and dream states are false appearances concocted by Avidyā, on the true nature of the Self, so also the seed-form of the world etc., are the false imaginations from the standpoint of the waking state. So SUSHUPTI means the true nature of the Self. We have kept the name *Sushupti* on the real Self, from the standpoint of the waking state. As that is our true nature, it is impossible to give up the true nature at any cost. It is said by Shankara thus in his Brahma-Sūtra Bhāshya—3/2/7 in the sentence :

“अपि च न कदाचिद् जीवस्य ब्रह्मणा संपत्तिर्नास्ति, स्वरूपस्यानपायित्वात्। स्वप्नजागरितयोस्तु उपाधिसंपर्क-वशात् पररूपापत्तिमिवापेक्ष्य तदुपशमात् सुषुप्ते स्वरूपा-पत्तिर्विवक्ष्यते।”

—“Besides, there is no time when Jīva has not become one with the Brahman for one's intrinsic nature can never disappear. Only

relative to the seeming foreign aspect which he assumes in dream and waking owing to contact of conditioning associates, it is proposed to say that he attains his own form on the dissolution of that foreign aspect.”

From the standpoint of the Shruti and the Guru, always the Jīva is Brahman in his true nature. But from the standpoint of the adjuncts like the waking and dream which are concocted by Avidyā and which are only the false appearances, the same Brahman appears as if he has taken the form of Jīva or the soul. So, Jīva goes to sleep and comes back to the waking etc., are all false notions.

Conclusive Remarks :

a) From the standpoint of the world, the seed-form of world is attributed on the pure Self. From the VAIDIKA VYAVAHĀRA meaning dealings according to Shāstra, one should obtain the Self-knowledge in this life—so from this standpoint the causal ignorance is attributed on the Self. The Self is the substratum for the seed-form of the world as well as the appearances of the world. From this standpoint the Self is described as SARVAJNA, MAHĀMĀYAM, SARVESHVARA, NĀMAROOPAYOR

NIRVAHITĀ, (—He who differentiates the names and forms which were in seed-form into manifested form) etc. Hence to PRĀJNA all these three types of attributions (seed-form, having causal ignorance and being Sarvajna) are attributed from the various standpoints of the Universe which is conjured up by Avidyā.

b) But from the standpoint of direct intuition of the deep sleep, it is only the pure Self, pure-Being, pure-Consciousness and pure-Bliss (refer Bṛhadāraṇyaka Bhāṣhya—3/4/22 to 32). Here Shankara takes this stand of direct intuition and said that the true nature of the deep sleep is pure Self. This is the illustration of Mōksha. In Sūtra Bhāṣhya—1/1/9,

“सः उपाधिद्वयोपरमे सुषुप्तावस्थायाम् उपाधिकृतविशेषा-
भावात् स्वात्मनि प्रलीनः इव इति 'स्व' हि अपीतः भवति
इत्युच्यते ।”

—Here Shankara says that when the two types of adjuncts i. e., waking and dream disappear, then the Self remains in its pure nature in deep sleep. It is called as if Jīva has merged in his true nature in sound sleep. And in Sūtra Bhāṣhya—3/2/7, Shankara says,

“स्वप्नजागरितयोस्तु उपाधिसम्पर्कवशात् पररूपापत्तिम् इव
अपेक्ष्य तद्दुपशमात् सुषुप्ते स्वरूपापत्तिः विवक्ष्यते, 'स्वम्
अपीतो भवति' इति ।”

—i. e., When two types of adjuncts appear as if they are there is the Self, then the Self appears as if he has taken the form of Jīva and he is said to resume his own nature in sleep on the dissolution of those two types of adjuncts. In these two sentences particularly one has to observe the words “PRALEENA IVA” (प्रलीन इव) and “PARAROOPĀPATTIM IVA” (पररूपापत्तिम् इव). So from the standpoint of ignorance alone, it is said that in deep sleep, Jīva remains in his true nature or merges and he comes back etc. But when we give up the standpoint of adjuncts, he is always Brahman, and he never ceases to be Brahman. To take this standpoint the common experience of Sushupti alone is sufficient. There is no need of getting any new experience of “ASAMPRAJNĀTA SAMĀDHI” (असम्प्रज्ञात समाधि) etc., according to commentators. It is possible only through the instructions of the Shāstra and the Guru and Viveka. For this refer the following Bhāshya portions :

The intuitional experience of deep sleep is described as the illustration for Mōkshā (Bṛhadāraṇyaka Bhāshya—4/3/21 to 32)—recognising one’s own true nature, here and now also as it is, as it was in deep sleep and not affected in the least by the appearance of dream and waking

states in him, just like a screen in a cinema. This recognition occurs through Viveka alone with the help of the teachings of the Shāstra and the Guru. For this purpose, some references in Shankara Bhāshyas are given.

a) Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upanishad Bhāshya—4/4/6, here Shankara says that,

“यो हि सुषुप्तावस्थमिव निर्विशेषमद्वैतम् अलुप्तचिद्रूप-
ज्योतिः स्वभावम् आत्मानं पश्यति....स इहैव ब्रह्म, यद्यपि
देहावानिव लक्ष्यते, स ब्रह्मैव सन् ब्रह्माप्येति....न हि
विदुषो मृतस्य भावान्तरापत्तौ जीवतोऽन्योभावः,
देहान्तरप्रतिसन्धानाभावमात्रेणैव तु ब्रह्माप्येतीत्युच्यते।”

i. e., He who sees himself as permanent pure consciousness as in deep sleep, becomes Brahman. A man of realisation, after his death, has no change of condition—something different from what he was in life, but he is only not connected with another body. This is what is meant by his becoming ‘merged in Brahman’.

b) Brahma-Sūtra Bhāshya—3/2/7, the last sentence is :

“ब्रह्म तु अनापायि सुप्तिस्थानम् इति एतत् प्रतिपादयामः ।
तेन तु विज्ञानेन प्रयोजनमस्ति जीवस्य ब्रह्मात्मत्वावधारणं
स्वप्नजागरितव्यवहारविमुक्तत्वावधारणं च । तस्मात् आत्मा
एव सुप्तिस्थानम् ।”

— We are going to prove that Sushupti means Brahman. Such a knowledge serves a purpose, namely that individual Jīva is ascertained to be identical with Brahman and it is realized to be free from the dealings consequent on the dream and waking states. Hence the individual's deep sleep means ĀTMAN.

c) From this standpoint, the non-perception in deep sleep i. e., the common man's experience that 'I know nothing in deep sleep' is not due to causal ignorance or BEEJĀVIDYĀ, but due to oneness of the Self. It is clearly stated in Br̥ha. Upanishad Bhāshya—4/3/23 to 4/3/30.

d) In Sūtra Bhāshya—2/3/18, refer the sentence :

“यत्तु सुप्तादयः न चेतयन्ते इति .. एतदुक्तं भवति—
विषयाभावात् इवम् अचेतयमानता, न चैतन्याभावात्
इति। यथा वियदाश्रयस्य प्रकाशस्य प्रकाश्याभावात्
अनभिव्यक्तिः, न स्वरूपाभावात् तद्वत्।”

—As for the objection that the people in deep sleep etc., have no awareness....this appearance of absence of awareness is owing to the absence of objects of knowledge, but not owing to the absence of consciousness. Here Shankara gives one illustration that in the dark night a torch light is illumined and directed towards the sky,

and though there is light we cannot see anything. Because there is nothing else to be illumined by this torch light. So also in deep sleep the nature of the Self is full of pure consciousness, but there is no other second thing to be known apart from the Self.

e) “स यदि आत्मा अत्र अविनष्टश्चैतन्यस्वरूपः स्वेनैव रूपेण वर्तते, कस्मादयम् अहमस्तीत्यात्मानं वा वर्हिवा इमानि भूतानीति जाग्रत्स्वप्रयोरिव न जानातीति ? अत्रोच्यते, शृणु—अत्राज्ञानहेतुम्, एकत्वमेवाज्ञानहेतुः।”

—[Bṛhadāraṇyaka Bhāshya—4/3/21]

—Here Shankara says, in deep sleep the individual is freed from ignorance which is the cause of duality. Ātman is pure consciousness. He is capable of seeing anything. He does not see anything in deep sleep because nothing other than Ātman exists there to see. The individual Jīva is one with SAT and SAT only. Therefore he does not know anything.

Previously it is said in Shaṅkara Bhāshya on Māndukya Kārikā Āgama Prakāraṇa—2 that,

“बीजावस्थापि ‘न किञ्चिद्वेदिषम्’ इत्युत्थितस्य प्रत्यय-दर्शनाद्वेहे अनुभूयत एव, इति त्रिधा वेहे व्यवस्थित इत्युच्यते।”

The causal condition is also verily experienced

in this body from such cognition of the man who is awakened from deep sleep, as, 'I did not know anything (at the time of deep sleep).' Therefore it said that one *Ātman* is perceived as three fold (*Vishva, Taijasa & Prājna*) in this body and in the Jāgrat state alone.

This is said from the standpoint of empirical view – the non-perception in deep sleep is attributed to the Self. But in the above said manner, the standpoint has been changed from the empirical to the direct experience of the Self. So from the standpoint of Viveka, Sushupti-hood of Sushupti will be removed and it is recognised as the true nature of the Self. This is the *fourth viewpoint of Sushupti*

Neglecting these viewpoints post-Shankara sub-commentators have taken the empirical viewpoint as the standard and have said that :

i) In Sushupti there is seed-form of the world with *Ātman* and the same seed-form is called as *Mūlāvidyā* and *Vāsanābīja* etc., that is the cause for this Universe.

ii) Hence one should get the experience of *Asamprajñāta Samādhi* where there is no deep sleep as well as the appearance of dualistic world, then he will transcend *avidyā* and hence the experience of the Sushupti is not enough or

sufficient to get Self-knowledge. All these types of wrong notions including the idea that Jīva goes to Sushupti and comes back etc., are propagated. The author of Vivarana (commentator of the Panchapādikā) writes :

“ननु ब्रह्मात्मानुभवद्वैतदर्शनयोः कुतः साहित्यमुच्यते ?
न वयं साहित्यं ब्रूमः । कदाचित् असंप्रज्ञात्—आत्मैकत्व-
दर्शनम्, कदाचित् आरब्धकर्मोपस्थापितदोषनिमित्तद्वैतदर्शनं
चेति ।” —[पञ्चपादिका-विवरणम्].

—According to Vivarana, the intuition of non-dual Atman is in the Yogic trance of Asamprajnāta Samādhi, while the perception of duality is due to the defect engendered by the Prārabdha Karma (i. e., fructified karma).

This explanation of Vivarana, is in direct opposition to Shankara who says in emphatic terms :

“न चायं व्यवहाराभावोऽवस्थाविशेषनिबद्धोऽभिधीयत इति
युक्तं वक्तुम् ; ‘तत्त्वमसि’ इति ब्रह्मात्मभावस्यानवस्था-
विशेष निबन्धनत्वात् ।”

—[Sūtra Bhāshya—2/1/14]

—The Self is not to be attained in any particular state or condition, for the identity of the Self and Brahman stated is ‘That Thou Art’ is not contingent on any particular state.

This innovation is diametrically opposed to Gaudapāda's dictum (Gaudapāda Kārikā—1/17) also that Atman is always *Nisrapancha* (निष्प्रपञ्च) i. e. free from all duality.

According to Sri Satchidānandendra Saraswatī Swāmīji's teachings and Shankara's Bhāshyas if we try to understand the various standpoints adopted for the purpose of teachings, then all our doubts will get removed.

CHAPTER-IV
**DETERMINING THE NATURE OF
TURIYA**

When is one established in Turīya ? It is thus replied by Gaudapāda :

“अन्यथा गृह्यतः स्वप्नो निद्रा तत्त्वमजानतः ।
विपर्यासे तयोः क्षीणे तुरीयं पदमश्नुते ॥”

[Gaudapāda Kārikā—1/15]

Dream belongs to one who wrongly cognises the Reality and sleep to one who does not know the Reality. When the erroneous knowledge in these two is removed one attains the state that is *Turīya* called the ‘*Fourth*’.

To explain the above Kārikā, here it will be given some important points regarding the *Avasthātraya* and the nature of *Turīya*.

I. Description of the three states from four different viewpoints :

The three states are described in Māndukya Upanishad and Gaudapāda Kārikās from the standpoint of four different *aspects* (angles of vision) :

i) As is commonly known by all that the present state is the *waking state*. When we speak about our entering the deep sleep and where we do not know anything, that is the *state of deep sleep*. In the middle, before waking, we experience sometimes the dream and this is the *dream state*. According to this common belief Vedānta starts to teach one's own true nature which is the substratum of these three states and explains in the first place that the appearance of the real nature of the Self in the form of waking state is the *Vaishvānara Pāda* (वैश्वानर पाद), the appearance in the form of dream state as the *Taijasa Pāda* (तैजस पाद). When both the states are absorbed in the Self, it is called *Prājña Pāda* (प्राज्ञ पाद).

This is one type of discrimination about the three states.

ii) According to Sri Gaudapāda, these three states are explained from the standpoint of their special features. According to this the functions of sense organs with the outer world is *waking*, the functions of mind alone is *dream*, and the merging of the mind in one's own Self is the *sleep*. From this standpoint we can observe the experiences of all the three states in this present

waking state alone. This is said in Kārikā—1/2, and more elaborately in the commentary on this Kārikā by Sri Swāmiji of Holeṅarsipur, in his Māndukya Rahasya Vivritiḥi.

This is the second type of the description of the three states.

iii) From the standpoint of *Mōksha Vyavahāra*, according to Shāstra, one should get the knowledge or realisation of one's own true nature of the Self to get *Mōksha* (मोक्ष). From this standpoint, Sri Gaudapāda explains the three states in his Kārikās from 1/11 to 16. According to this portion, non-perception of the real nature of the Self is the *sleep*, and misunderstanding regarding the nature of the Self (such as misunderstanding the nature of the Self as waking, dream etc.) is *dream* and realising the real nature of the Self through Viveka is the *real waking*. When this real waking takes place the aspirant himself remains as *Turīya* (तुरीय). When a person awakes to the truth, he realises there neither this sleep (=non-perception) nor this dream (=misunderstanding) from the standpoint of the intuition of Turīya, the real Ātman. These are explained in Kārikās—1/11 and 1/16.

This is the third type of discrimination of the

three states.

From the standpoint of third description of Avasthātraya, the *generic* and *specific* characters are ascribed on *Vishva* and *Taijasa* and also on *Prājna* that is, on the three states of consciousness — waking, dream and sleep. According to this, we do not know our true nature of the Self while we are in waking state. Not only this, but we have also misunderstood our true nature as ‘I am a man, I am a doer of actions, I am happy, I am miserable’ etc. So there is non-perception regarding the real nature of the Self and there is misconception also. As it is in the case of waking, so also it is in the case of dream. The non-perception is called causal ignorance (*Kāranāvidyā*) and the misconception is called effective ignorance (*Kāryāvidyā*). In deep sleep, though from the standpoint of Shruti and realised persons, Ātman of the nature of pure consciousness alone remains there, from the standpoint of Mōksha Vyavahāra, there is no possibility of getting the Self-knowledge in deep sleep. Hence what is superimposed here, is the non-perception regarding the real nature of the Self in sleep. From this viewpoint it is said that ‘Prājna is bound by causal ignorance’ (‘प्राज्ञकारण-बद्धस्तु—Gaudapāda Kārikā—1/11). In this way

the “non-perception” of the real nature of the Self is the *generic* or common characteristic of all the three states. But “misunderstanding” is the *specific* nature of Vishva and Taijasa. So also the ‘non-perception’ is the *specific* feature of Prājna. Therefore, the three states are classified into two groups only and these are deliberately imputed to the Self for the purpose of teaching. All these ways of attributions are enumerated in ‘I-(iii)’ above. When the error of absence of knowledge and the error of misconception are sublated by the dawn of the true knowledge, then one comes to be convinced that he is really the Turiya (the 4th) beyond all the illusory states.

iv) The three states are also described by Gaudapāda in the fourth chapter of Māndūkya Kārikā using some Buddhistic terminology such as *Laukika* (लौकिक), *Suddha Laukika* (शुद्धलौकिक), *Lōkōttara* (लोकोत्तर). These words are used in the context of comparative study of Buddhism and Vedānta and to show the difference between the two doctrines by Shri Gaudapāda. In the last portion of the book Shri Gaudapāda wants to show his own *Prakriyā* which is taught in Vedānta— *the tribasic method*. But the intention here is that the words like Laukikā, Shuddha Laukikā

and Lōkōttara which are used in Buddhistic literature for a particular sense and which are to be achieved through the practice of Yōga according to their system in order to get the mystic experience of these three states which are concerned to an individual person—but the same words can be used here to denote that the words can be applied more appropriately to the Tribasic method of Vedānta rather than to the Buddhistic philosophy and determining the nature of Turīya is the main purport for describing in this way. This is also clearly stated by Shankara in his commentary on Māndūkya Kārikās—4/87, 88 & 89.

Gaudapāda applies the terms '*Laukika*' (common experience), '*Suddha Laukika*' (pure experience) and '*Lōkōttara*' (transcendental experience) to *waking*, *dream* and *deep sleep* respectively, unlike a Vijnānāvādīn who recognizes three grades of consciousness. The three states are really no states of consciousness. They are only the Witnessing pure consciousness taking the garb of these states, pure consciousness being unaffected by their appearance or disappearance. The three states admit neither of juxtaposition in space nor of succession in time.

This is a way to describe the Avasthās and

this is the fourth kind of description of Avasthās.

II. Determining the true nature of the Self through the viveka.

Before going to determine the true nature of Turīya through *Viveka*, which as an important thing in Vedānta, we have to remember some crucial points :

a) Turīya is not a state at all as is usually understood like *fourth avasthā* by present-day Vedāntins. It is the real nature of Self.

b) The substratum of the waking is Turīya, so also in the case of the dream.

c) From the standpoint of waking and dream the name of sleep is attributed on the Turīya itself.

d) The reality which appears in the form of three states to the ignorant—that very reality itself is Turīya as it is the substratum of all the three states.

e) Turīya is absolutely free from the taint of avasthās i. e. It remains unaffected by the appearance or disappearance of the three states.

f) Turīya in relation to these three states which are conceived to be really existing owing to ignorance, is said to be the Fourth for the purpose

of teaching alone.

g) As Turīya is no avasthā or state, so the popular identification of it with *Nirvikalpa Samādhi* (निर्विकल्प समाधि) is altogether unfounded.

h) The Turīya has no specific features which could be described by words (सर्वशब्दप्रवृत्तिनिमित्त-
शून्यत्वात् तस्य शब्दानभिधेयत्वम् इति—Māndūkya Mantra
Bhāshya—7).

i) The Turīya is the self-evident inmost Self and hence no description, definition or proof of its existence is needed. It is not to be gained newly by efforts.

Here it is said in Kārikā (—1/15) that “when the two errors of these two (i. e. non-apprehension and misapprehension of Reality) which are deliberately attributed on the Turīya for the purpose of teaching, are removed one attains the state that is Turīya.” Strictly speaking it is not a state at all and also it is not to be attained newly by some efforts. But from the standpoint of superimposition of three states it is said in the manner—‘the Turīya is the state which will be attained’. And those errors are rescinded in Kārikā—1/16 :

“अनादिमाश्रया सुप्तो यदा जीवः प्रबुध्यते ।

अजमनिद्रमस्वप्नमद्वैतं बुध्यते तदा ॥”

—When the Jīva or the individual Soul

wakes up from his beginningless illusory dream, then he becomes aware of the truth, by dint of teaching imparted by the Shrutis & the preceptor, that it is really the secondless one (—the non-duality) unborn, forever unsullied or untainted by the sleep of ignorance or by the dream of wrong knowledge”.

So by the negation of the false appearance of these three states through *Viveka* one can remain in his true nature, at the very end of discrimination and this true nature is ever-luminous Turīya.

Shankara clearly states that Turīya is not a separate state apart from these three states. It is the substratum of these three states. If it were to be the fourth state (i. e. beyond the experience of these three states) there will be no way to realise the nature of Turīya. Hence the teaching of the Shāstra will be a futile exercise and Turīya would be a void (=the ultimate Reality itself does not exist). So it is not a separate state, the ultimate Reality itself is appearing in the forms of these three states of consciousness (Māndūkya Bhāshya of Mantra—7)¹ and further in same place

¹ “यदि हि त्रयवस्थात्मविलक्षणं तुरीयमन्यत्, तत्प्रतिपत्ति-
द्वाराभावात् शास्त्रोपदेशानर्थक्यं शून्यतापत्तिर्वा ।”

—[Māndūkya Mantra Bhāshya—7]

Shankara says that these three states are only imaginations, that is Vikalpas (विकल्प) and when this thing is realised through Viveka and the appearance of these three states is negated or falsified by means of right intuitive knowledge, then the ultimate Reality manifests itself As It Is i. e., one will remain himself as Turiya at that time and there remains no need to search for any other means of knowledge or any other discipline for the realisation of Turiya after comprehending the import of the Vedāntic texts.² Here Shri Satchidānandendra Saraswatī Swāmīji has given a foot note in his Kannada translation of the Bhāshya that apart from Viveka there is no need to get the fourth Avasthā like *Samādhi* etc., and there is no need of disciplines such as Prasankhyāna (repetition of knowledge of Vedānta Vākyas) etc. Elsewhere he has said, Persons who have not understood this truth imagine that, the Vedāntic text only yields in

² “रञ्जुरिव सर्पादिभिर्विकल्पयमाना स्थानत्रयेऽपि आत्मैक एवान्तःप्रज्ञादित्वेन विकल्पयते यदा तदा अन्तःप्रज्ञादित्व- प्रतिषेधविज्ञानप्रमाणसमकालमेव आत्मनि अध्यारोपित अनर्थप्रपञ्चनिवृत्तिलक्षणं फलं परिसमाप्तम् इति तुरीया- धिगमे प्रमाणान्तरं साधनान्तरं वा न मृग्यम् ।”

indirect knowledge (परोक्षज्ञान) of Ātman and hence the repeated practice of the knowledge of the Mahāvākyas (वाक्यज्ञानाभ्यास or प्रसंख्यान) or the merging of the world of multiplicity in Ātman by means of meditation (प्रपञ्चप्रविलय or Laya-chintana) or the practice of Pātanjala Yōga (पातञ्जल योगानुष्ठान) etc., are necessary, to get Ātma-Sākshatkāra or fourth Avasthā like Samādhi.’

In one occasion Shankara explicitly states that “one who is the Prājña (प्राज्ञ) having the seed-form of the world and having causal ignorance (seed-form of ignorance or Avidyā Bīja).—that same Prājña in his true nature is the Turīya, when his being the potential seed of the world is not taken into account.” See the following Bhāshya portion of Māndūkya Kārikā—1/2 :

“तामबीजावस्थां तस्यैव प्राज्ञशब्दवाच्यस्य तुरीयत्वेन देहादि-
सम्बन्धजाप्रदादिरहितां पारमार्थिकीम् पृथग्वक्ष्यति ।”

Here Shankara clearly says that “one who is Prājña from the standpoint of attribution of world and ignorance, that same Prājña is Turīya in his true nature, altogether free from the body and other conditioning associates.” For this the readers have to refer the fourth viewpoint regarding Sushupti (सुषुप्ति) which is explained

previously in Chapter—III. Thus when one cognises his true nature of the Self as ever Tur-ya, then the two types of errors. viz., non-perception and misconception regarding the real nature of the Self will be removed. The same thing is said in the Kārikā No.—1/15 which is quoted in the beginning of this Chapter.

III. Process of determining the nature of Turīya (Turīyatva Pratipatti Kramaha) :

The scriptures (Upanishads) teach or signify the essential nature of Turīya (Ātman) by *Ataddharma Nivartana* i. e. by negating all the qualities or characteristics of Anātman i. e., not-self, which are superimposed on our Ātman or misconceived in Ātman through Avidyā.

The process of determining the nature of Turīya is given very beautifully by Shri Swāmīji in his Māndūkya Rahasya Viviriti. I shall give the the significances of this portion—तुरीयप्रतिपत्तिक्रमः” which contains the six types of *negations* on the ground of intuitional experience of the real nature of the Self For this purpose Shankara declares in the Māndūkya Bhāshya 7 that :

“तस्मात् प्रतिषेधविज्ञान-प्रमाणव्यापारसमकाल एव आत्मनि
अध्यारोपितान्तःप्रज्ञत्वाद्यनर्थनिवृत्तिरिति सिद्धम् ।”

—Therefore, it is established that the rescission of unreal attributes superimposed upon Ātman is accomplished simultaneously with the manifestation of the knowledge which, in itself is the means for the negation of duality. Here 'Vijnāna' means the intuitional experience of one's own true nature. On this firm ground the *Pratishedha* (प्रतिषेध) or *negation* of the superimposed appearance will take place. To negate this misconception the Pramāna (प्रमाण) is the sentences of Vedānta and the instruction of the Guru. So the Shāstra & the Ācharya are the pramānas which negate the attributions on the firm ground of intuitional experience. Shankara further remarks :

“द्वैताभावे शास्त्रव्यापारः, नाद्वैते विरोधात्, ... 'सिद्धन्तु निवर्तकत्वात्' इत्यागमविदां सूत्रम् !”

—[Gaudapāda Kārikā Bhāshya—2/32]

—The function of the Shrutis is to remove duality and not to affirm something about non-duality, for that would be a contradiction in terms. The fact is that the negation of the superimposed factors is the only way to direct the attention of the seeker towards the Turīya as it is Self-evident inmost-self of the seeker. Hence the aphorism of the right tradition : “Its

validity is substantiated by its *negation* of wrong ascriptions.” At last, at the sametime one takes a stand in his true nature which is Turiya. So *Viveka* is the only means to get Turiya. This is the significance of the sentence of Bhāshya (Māndūkya—7) quoted above (for more details see next article No.—IV).

Now for Turiyatva Pratipattikramaha (तुरीयत्व प्रतिपत्तिक्रमः), I shall furnish the significances of *six types of negations* which are furnished by the Swāmiji in his Māndūkya Rahasya Vivriti as already noted above.

Turiya is sought to be indicated by the negation of all attributes (characteristics) :

“विशेष-प्रतिषेधेनैव तुरीयं निर्दिदिक्षति।” —Shankara
[Māndūkya Bhāshya—7]

i) *Pramātritya Nirākarana* (प्रमातृत्व प्रतिषेधः).

According to common experience we are Pramātrīs meaning ‘knowers of the external objects through the means of right knowledge such as Indriyas and Antahkaranas’. Due to this knowership we see the dualistic world as if it is there really. But according to Shruti, all these are Brahman and there is no multiplicity at all (नेह जानास्ति किञ्चन—बृहः—4/4/19), but we see the

multiplicity here. So this is the misconception: To remove this misconception the aspirant should observe the following process :

The knowership which appears in the waking or in dream state is due to Adhyāsa or taking wrong identification with Antahkarana. and mutual transference of the natures of Antahkarana and the Real Self. Hence it is here 'Pramāṭṛtva is Ādhyāsika'. When an aspirant realises his true nature which is the *witness* of these two states, from that standpoint of transcendental reality, he is the pure and absolute nature of consciousness. By cognising this truth, he falsifies his own pramāṭṛtva (knowership). By this the misconception of seeing the dualistic world is removed. Here 'seeing' the dualistic world as if it is there is itself a dream because it is the misconception due to Adhyāsa. This type of dream will vanish through the discrimination shown above. The first type of negation is called as PRAMĀTRITVA NIRĀKARANA. The dualistic world will be there only from the standpoint of Pramāṭṛ and not from the Witness. This is the secret here.

- ii) *Agrahana Nirākarana and Bijabhāva Nirākarana* (अग्रहणरूप बीजभाव प्रतिषेधः).

From the standpoint of waking and dream

states we say that in deep sleep we know nothing. This non-perception of the dualistic world is attributed on deep sleep state from the standpoint of waking and dream alone. This wrong notion is called as '*Agrahana or Nidā*'. To remove this wrong notion one should observe that the pure Being which is our true nature—from that pure Being alone the states like waking and dream emerge out and sustain by the same being and at last they merge in the same being. So, the false appearance of the states disappear and they become one with the Being. This pure Being which remains in deep sleep is called as *Avyakṣitātmā* (अव्याकृतात्मा), meaning having unmanifested seed-form of both the states. This attribution is made from the standpoint of appearance and disappearance of the dualistic states i. e., waking & dream. But from the standpoint of the intuitional experience of the deep sleep as it is, the *Avyākṛitātmā* is the pure and absolute consciousness without the second. This is the true nature of everyone. From this standpoint there is no question of knowing or not-knowing because it is the pure consciousness. By this process of discrimination one will get rid of the wrong idea that, 'I know nothing in deep sleep'. This is *Agrahnaṣoopa Nidrāvīparyāsa*

Kshayaha.

From this, we shall observe that the attribution of the seed-form of the Universe which is superimposed from the standpoint of Vaidika Vyavahāra also will be removed because the appearance of the Universe is only a false appearance and hence the seed-form also is a false attribution. As the Self is of the nature of non-dual one in deep sleep, this nature continues uninterruptedly while the waking and dream states appear. Thus the attribution of the *Jagat Bija* is also removed. When one discerns that the nature of the Self is pure and absolute consciousness and non-dual one, then he will get rid of idea of 'not knowing' the non-dual nature of the Self also, which is called as causal ignorance or *Bijāvidyā* or *Avidyā-Bijā*. Because as the Self is pure consciousness, he has no Agraphana (अग्रहण) or Anyathāgraphana (अन्यथाग्रहण) just as in the sun whose nature is ever resplendent there cannot be any possibility of non-shining or shining in any way other than that of the sun ('न हि सवितरि सदा प्रकाशात्मके तद्विरुद्धमप्रकाशनम् अन्यथाप्रकाशनं वा सम्भवति ।' —Māndūkya Kārikā Bhāshya—1/12).

This second type of negation is called AGRAHANA NIRĀKARANA AND BIJABHĀVA NIRĀKARANA. Here the *Bija* means the seed-

-form of the world as well as Avidyā Bīja.

iii) *Anekātmya Nirākarana* (अनेकात्मत्वप्रतिषेधः).

Either in waking or in dream we assume that there are so many souls or selves in this world. According to Sāṅkhya, Vaisheshika, Pātanjala Yōga etc., this hold is taken as real. So they agree that there are many souls (*Anekātma Vāda* — अनेकात्मवाद), because they have no comprehensive vision of life which is denoted in Upanishads. According to Vedānta, from the standpoint of empirical view when we believe that 'I am in this world' etc., by taking the identification with the body, then it is correct to say that there are so many other persons and creatures in this world. But, from the standpoint of the true nature of the Witness of the whole state, the same witness of waking or dream. is called as *Vaishvānara* or *Taijasa*, because this witnessing principle is the substratum and the essence of these states. From this view-point the same Witness appeared in the form of all souls (Jīvas) either in waking or in dream without forfeiting His true nature (आत्मस्वरूपापरित्यागेनैव व्याक्रियते). So, *Vishva* alone is the Self of all the beings and *Taijasa* alone is the Self of all the beings which have appeared in waking and dream respectively. By this discrimination

one gets rid of the wrong notion of multiplicity of the Self. This third type of negation of the multiplicity of the selves is called ANEKĀTMA-TVA NIRĀKARANA.

iv) *Vishvādi Sthāni dharma Nirākarana*
(विश्वादिस्थाणिधर्मप्रतिषेधः).

Due to the adjuncts of waking, dream and deep sleep states which are conjured up on the real nature of the Self by Avidyā—from the standpoint of these adjuncts, the real Self appears as if he has taken the form of *Vishva Taijasa* and *Prājna*. In these three appearances there is difference among one another as stated in the Shrutis: “He who is in the waking state of outward consciousness is Vaishvanara, experiencer of the Gross’ (Māndūkya Mantra—3); ‘He who is in the dream state, of inward consciousness is the Taijasa experiencer of the subtle’ (Māndūkya Mantra—4); He who is in the state of sound sleep, reduced to a single entity only, one mass of consciousness, is Prājna, experiencer of Bliss’ (Māndūkya Mantra—5). Though this is a fact, if we observe from the standpoint of the real nature of the Self which is the substratum of these false imaginations, He is ever devoid of all adjuncts. From this standpoint there is no difference among *Vishva, Taijasa*

and *Prājna* which manifest themselves in these three states and they cannot be regarded as pertaining to the essential nature of Ātman, because Ātman of the nature of Pure Consciousness alone remains there. All these seeming Selves are essentially identical with the Turīya. By realising this truth one can get rid of the dream of misunderstanding the Self as Vishva, Taijasa etc. This fourth type of negation is called **Vishvaadi Sthānidharma Niraakarna**. (‘अन्तःप्रज्ञत्वादिस्थानिधर्म-प्रतिषेधः कृतः...न वहिःप्रज्ञमिति विश्वप्रतिषेधः । नान्तःप्रज्ञमिति तैजसप्रतिषेधः । न प्रज्ञानघनमिति प्राज्ञप्रतिषेधः’—Māndūkya Mantra Bhāshya—7).

v) *Jāgradādi Sthānadharma Nirākarana*
(जाग्रदादिस्थानधर्म प्रतिषेधः).

In this way though from the standpoint of waking state we assume that there are three states and they are different from one another and that they are really existing in the Self etc., one should observe that the appearance of a particular state inevitably cancels the very existence of the other two. But the Ātman, who maintains his self-identity unaffected by the appearance or disappearance of the states, is clearly seen to be the only entity that is really Real.

(“ज्ञस्वरूपाविशेषेऽपि इतरेतरव्यभिचारात् असत्यत्वम्, रज्ज्वादाविव सर्पधारादिविकल्पितभेदवत् सर्वत्राव्यभिचारात् ज्ञस्वरूपस्य सत्यत्वम् ।” —Māndūkya Mantra Bhāshya—7).

Hence these are only false appearances such as the snake, garland, waterflow etc., superimposed on the rope. By determining this one can easily get rid of the belief that there are three states. And he will realise that the states—*waking, dream & deep sleep* have no independent existence apart from Self. By this the dream, that is the misconception of assuming the reality of the states will vanish. This fifth type of negation is called **Jaagradaadi Sthaanadharmā Niraakarana** (‘प्रपञ्चोपशमिति जाग्रदादि स्थानधर्माभाव उच्यते’—Māndūkya Mantra Bh.—7).

vi) *Sadvitīyatva Nirākarana* (सद्वितीयत्व प्रतिषेधः).

From the standpoint of ego, i. e. Pramātr, it appears that the real nature of the Self is the witness of these three states. But as the Self is there so also the states are also there. Hence the Self is not *non-dual* one. This objection may be raised when one takes identification with the Pramātrtva of the waking state. Though this is

the thing, the appearance of the states are only false appearances due to ignorance and hence they have no existence at all. But the Self whose nature is pure, absolute consciousness is called as Turiya from the standpoint of those false appearances ('मायासंख्यातुरीयम्'—as stated in Mangala Slōkas by Bhāshyakāra in the beginning of Māndūkya Bhāshya). This Self is ever devoid of all special features and *non-dual* nature of consciousness alone. When the aspirant takes a stand in this true nature of his own Self, then there will be no complaint regarding the three states, because the complainer of the states is the Pramātṛ of the waking state, not the real nature of the Self. If this truth is realised then one will get awakened from the dream that there is a dualistic world apart from the Self. This last type of negation is called **Sadviteeyatva Niraa-karana**.

So it is correct to say that when one cognises the transcendental reality then he will get rid of the wrong notions regarding the real nature of the Self. This is called as attaining the *Turiyahood* ("तुरीयंपदमश्नुते"—G. K.—1/15). Strictly speaking it is not really attaining the Turiya newly, because he is already Turiya. It is only getting rid of the wrong notions i. e. to despel or

to cease one's identification with not-selves with the help of teachings of the Shāstra & the Guru. The reader is referred to the following Bhāshya portion regarding this :

“तस्मात् अविद्याध्यारोपणनिराकरणमात्रं ब्रह्मणि कर्तव्यं
न तु ब्रह्मज्ञाने यत्नः अत्यन्तप्रसिद्धत्वात्।” (Gītā
Bhāshya—19/50).

—“Therefore, we have only to eliminate what is falsely ascribed to Brahman by Avidyā ; we have to make no more effort to acquire a knowledge of Brahman as he is quite Self-evident.”

So through discrimination only one can get Turīya.

IV. Significance of the method of getting Turīya according to Bhaashya :

“तस्मात् प्रतिषेधविज्ञान-प्रमाणव्यापार समकाल एव
आत्मनि अध्यारोपितान्तःश्रद्धत्वाद्यनर्थनिवृत्तिरिति सिद्धम्।”

—“Therefore it is established that the cessation of such unreal attributes as *Antah-Prajna* etc., superimposed upon Ātman is simultaneous with the manifestation of the knowledge, which, in itself, is the means (*Pramāna*) for the negation of duality ”

Here *Pratishedha*' (प्रतिषेध) means negation

of attributions, '*Vijnāna*' (विज्ञान) means taking the standpoint of Witnessing principle of life which is beyond the ego and which is to be realised through the intuitional experience (one's own Anubhava). On this firm ground of the intuitional experience of the real nature of the Self one should negate all types of superimpositions which are conjured up through ignorance. To do this, '*Pramāna*' (प्रमाण) is required. *Pramāna* means the utterances of the Upanishads and the instructions of the Guru who has naturally established in his true nature of the Self. This is *Pramāna* by means of which we become aware of the negation of attributes superimposed on *Ātman*. This *pramāna* denotes that the Self is not a *Prameya* (प्रमेय) (i. e. an objectifiable one) and the aspirant is not a *Pramātṛ* (प्रमातृ). So it cancels the triple distinctions of knower, knowledge & knowable ("प्रमातृत्वादिभेदनिवृत्तेः"—*Māndūkya Mantra Bh.*—7). Simultaneously with this assurance, *Turīya* is realised. Shankara says :

“न हि शास्त्रम् इदंतया विषयभूतं ब्रह्म प्रतिपिपादयिषति.
किं तर्हि, प्रत्यगात्मत्वेन अविषयतया प्रतिपादयत् अविद्या-
कल्पित वेद्य-वेदितृवेदनादिभेदमपनयति ।”—(*Sūtra*
Bhāshya—1/1/4).

—“The scriptures do not indeed propose to teach Brahman positively by saying, ‘This is so & so’, but they teach Brahman as no object at all. On account of its being the inmost Self (of the knower) they remove all the distinctions created by Avidyā such as the ‘knowable’, the ‘knower’ and the ‘knowledge.’”

When the aspirant uses this Pramāna, in his Antahkarana a type of function takes place. This function is described here as *Vyāpāra* (‘व्यापार’). The function is as follows (when the aspirant turns inwardly in accordance with the guidance of the Shāstra & the Āchārya) :

i) Antahkarana stops to see outer things through the sense organs.

ii) It gives up the thinking regarding outer things through the mind.

iii) It rejects imaginings or inferring the matter through the intellect.

iv) It gives up the idea of ‘I am so & so, I am a doer of actions’, ‘I am happy’, ‘I am miserable’ and so on—the feelings which will arise by taking the identification with the ego.

v) Lastly he completely turns his attention towards the Witnessing principle of the ego through discrimination and concentration.

At this stage the aspirant himself remains as Turīya (witness) and the Antahkarana which follows this nature (i. e., which gives up its functions of conceiving or ideations and attains *Amanastām* (अमनस्ताम्)—a state of no-mind) also starts to appear in the form of Witnessing principle as it is completely pervaded and directly illuminated by the Self just like the sunshine that illumines and pervades the mirage.

(“तत्र तत्र स्थाने चिद्वशाप्तेन चिदाभास्यत्वेन च चिद्रूपात्मनोऽव्यतिरिक्तमिदं स्थानमिति निश्चयेनापि सूक्ष्मदृशां तत्तद्धानेन तुरीयतत्त्वनिर्धारणसंभवात् ।”—माण्डूक्यरहस्य-विवृतिः ।)

This correct reflection of the true nature of the Self is called *Ātmapratyaya* (आत्मप्रत्यय). When this *Ātmapratyaya* (i. e. *Nirvikalpa Vidyāṛtti*) arises one gets rid of this wrong notions of *Antahprajnatva* (अन्तःप्रज्ञत्वादि) etc., simultaneously. Then, all duality becomes sublated or falsified and their substrate of non-duality is realized. This is the true significance of the above sentence of the Bhāshya. An aspirant should observe the above described function through which he remains as non-dual one.

- V. EXAMINING THE NATURE OF THE INTUITIONAL EXPERIENCE OF THE PRESENT MOMENT ALSO LEADS TO THE DETERMINATION OF TURIYA WHICH IS THE REAL NATURE OF THE SELF :

Shri Shri Satchidānandendra Saraswatī Swāmiji has given in his Sanskrit introduction to Māndūkay Rahasya Vivṛiti, a process of discrimination of the intuitional experience of the present moment which is very subtle and crucial.

The intuitional experience which appears as if it is conditioned or circumscribed by the present moment appears as waking state as compared to the dream experience which had taken place in the past. The same experience appears to be equal to the dream if we take the standpoint of direct experience of each state as it appears during that period. When both these states are determined as similar and equal, then the waking itself becomes a dream. By this type of discrimination and seeing the equality between the two states we have sublated the waking state in the dream i. e. Vishva in Taijasa. That the whole phenomenon of the dream state including the outer and the inner phenomenon i. e. Macrococosm and Microcosm are both false appearances, is a fact acceptable to all. It is determined by the people

possessed of discriminating nature that the dream has no reality even though the Universe of the dream appears as if it is there during the dream time as it is a false appearance. The reality is only the Self who is the substratum of the dream (Here dream and waking are both considered as dream).

As in deep sleep state there is no dualistic world, similarly even at the time of appearance of the dream there is really no dualistic world or Universe. In this way dream has become equivalent to the deep sleep. The special feature of the dream state (i. e. waking & dream) is the misconception regarding the real nature of the Self and, of course, the non-apprehension of the reality of the Self is persisting there in the dream (both waking & dream)—this non-apprehension being the special feature of the deep sleep. From the standpoint of this non-apprehension also the dream and deep sleep are equal. In this way the waking has become dream and dream has become deep sleep.

Now we have to take the standpoint of the direct intuitional experience of the deep sleep. From this standpoint there is nothing but the Self whose nature is pure consciousness, Absolute, Non-dual and this is called as **Nirvikalpa Chai-**

tanyamaatram (निर्विकल्प चैतन्यमात्रम्). By determining this, all the wrong notions such as deep sleep, having the non-apprehension of the Self and having the seed-form of the waking etc., are all cognised to be attributed from the standpoint of the waking world. So the deep sleep itself has remained here as *Turiya*. This is said by Shri Gaudapāda as “when the two errors of these two (i. e. misconception and non-apprehension) are removed, one attains the state of *Turiya*” (M. K.— 1/15).

According to this teaching, the true nature of the present moment is only the *Turiya*. To attain this conclusion one should sublimate the states one by one, the present state in the previous state through discrimination. By this, at the end of the discrimination one remains in natural state of his own Self which is called as *Turiya* and is ever devoid of the ‘Knower’, the ‘Knowledge’ and the ‘Known’ and as unborn Absolute Consciousness.

All these are taught by the Grand Preceptor Shri Gaudapāda through his lucid teachings. It being so we do not know how this grand preceptor could be equalised with the Idealism (i. e. Vijnānavāda) or Nihilism (Shūnyavāda).

VI. Turiya Vedane kramaha (तुरीय वेदनेक्रमः) :

(*To determine the nature of Turiya what type of process could be applied ?*)

“When the knowledge of Laukika (Waking), Suddhalaukika (Dream) and Lōkōttara (Deep Sleep) is attained and when the threefold knowable is realized by a gradual process & the Turiya (the fourth)—the non-dual, unborn fearless entity is intuited, the aspirant has taken his stand in his own Self—his true nature”—G. K. Bh.—4/89.

It is said as follows : At first, we have to take Laukika (लौकिक), meaning the Self to whom the whole waking world is the *upādhi*. Due to this adjunct of waking he is called as Vaishvānara. The innermost Self who is the substratum of the whole waking state including macrocosm (cosmic-consciousness) and microcosm (individual.—I consciousness) is called as Vaishvānara. Here an aspirant should not give any predominance to the waking state but to the Self who is the substratum. Then he intuits that, “the whole waking state appears and disappears in me”. By this cognition, he loses his identification with his individuality. Knowing of this is called as the knowledge of Laukika.

Observing the experience of the dream state, he has to cognise the absence of waking in that state. Though from the standpoint of waking there is difference between waking and dream, observing the direct experience of the particular state as it is shown in वैतथ्यप्रकरणम् of Māndūkya Kārikā (see the fourth standpoint of dream state in chapter—II) one has to discern that both the states are false appearances from the standpoint of the real nature of the Self. In Brahma Sūtra—2/2/29 (वैधर्म्याच्च न स्वप्नादिवत्) it is said that there is difference between waking and dream and hence they are not equal. It has to be noted here that this statement is not used to teach the transcendental reality of the Self, but to contradict or negate or refute the Nihilists (—*Shūnyavādins*) and the Idealists (*Vijnānavādins*) who hold the view that the perception may occur without the real things, which are inside. To prove this, they use the illustrations of the dream. To refute their view-point this Sūtra is made use of. According to vedānta, if one accepts the consciousness of empirical state, then inevitably one has to accept the existence of outer things and vice versa (see G. K.—4/67). Thus by the above Sūtra, there is no harm to the present subject matter. So there is no Laukika i. e. waking state

because both are dreams. Hence, the self who is called as *Taijasa* meaning the substratum of the dream, is the only reality. Cognising this, one will intuit that "As I am the witness of these two states, I myself am the *Taijasa*". Knowing of this is called as the knowledge of *Suddhalaukika* (शुद्धलौकिक).

After this, one has to reflect with rapt attention towards the deep sleep state, which is called as *Lōkōttara* (लोकोत्तर), when the appearance of waking and dream are falsified then this determination alone, the Self will remain as he is in deep sleep state. So the Revered Swāmīji has said here that "when *Suddhalaukika* gets falsified then the Self remains as *Lōkōttara* because in deep sleep there is nothing other than the Self." While the appearance and disappearance of the previous states have not affected the true nature of the Self then it is equal to the "Being" of the deep sleep. In deep sleep state, the other two states cancel their existence. Though this is the thing, the absence of these two states has been determined by intuition. From this standpoint one should know that the name which is kept as 'Lōkōttara' to deep sleep state is mere attribution. Strictly speaking it is not a deep sleep but it is the Self alone. So, the *Lōkōttara* or deep sleep is

merely a name. The Self who is called as Prājna (Sthāni of Sushupti), apart from him, there is nothing. Imagining anything other than the Ātman is as absurd as imagining the sixth sense. The meaning of the word Lōkōttara denotes that principle which is ever devoid of Lōka.

The seed-form of the world and Vāsanās (latent impressions) and the causal ignorance (seed-form of ignorance) are imagined on the Self from the standpoint of the false appearances of waking and dream. So it is only an attribution from the standpoint of superimposition. This is said here as Sāmvrītikam (सांवृतिकम्). Just as the difference between waking and dream and the causation between the two are accepted from the standpoint of empirical view, but through the keen observation of the direct experience of both the states all the relationships between them have been cancelled by the impartial scrutiny, so also this seed-form etc., regarding the deep sleep is equally mere attributions.

In this way, in *Shuddhalaukika* there is a no *Laukika*, in *Lōkōttara* there is no *Suddhalaukika*, and the notion of *Lōkōttara* is only an attribution. By observing this gradual process, one should dissolve the present state in the previous one and this is called here as the "Knowing of

Laukika, Suddhalaukika and Lōkōttara” (“ज्ञाने च त्रिविधे ज्ञेये क्रमेण विदिते स्वयम् — G. K.—4/89). Here knowing the Laukika (waking), Suddhalaukika (dream) and Lōkōttara (deep sleep) means nothing else than to intuit the reality underlying them all and thus to reduce them into that Reality which is known as ‘the Fourth’ (*Turiya*). There is no other way than this process of discrimination.

All these are called as *Sthāna* (स्थान). When a particular state appears, inevitably it cancels the very existence of the other two states. Though these are of this nature, the Self who is the substratum of these false appearances, is a constant factor. It is impossible to imagine the absence of the Self and also impossible to either know the or doubt it. So it is proved that the *Sthānas* like Laukika etc., are mutually exclusive but they are in their true nature of the Self which is Absolute Consciousness. This nature of the Self is a constant one. It being so, this Self is untainted by the *Sthānas* which are merely false appearances conjured up by *Avidyā*. By determining this, the *Sthānitva* (स्थानित्व) of the *Ātman* also is automatically cancelled, because he is ever a non-dual one. So also in the Self there is no *Sthānhood*.

In this way, when all the three states or

Sthānas have been falsified, the nature of the Self remains as transcendental reality, Turīya, Non-dual one, birthless, fearless and ever devoid of causation. This truth is to be known by the aspirant as his own true nature through the previous teachings of Āgama Prakarana etc. At the end of this discrimination he himself remains as a non-dual Self.¹

VII Steps to initiation of the Self-knowledge (ज्ञानाङ्गोपदेशः).

“Three types of knowables when known successively” (ज्ञाने च त्रिविधे ज्ञेये क्रमेण विदिते स्वयम्—G. K.—4/89)—by this it is said here that the three states like Laukika (लौकिक), Suddhalaukika (शुद्ध-लौकिक) and Lōkōttara (लोकोत्तर) are to be known or to be objectified by the aspirant.² By saying

¹ “ज्ञाने च लौकिकादिविषये ज्ञेये च लौकिकादौत्रिविधे—
पूर्वं लौकिकं स्थितम्, तदभावेन पश्चात् शुद्धं लौकिकम्
तदभावेन लोकोत्तरम् इत्येवं क्रमेण स्थानत्रयाभावेन
परमार्थसत्ये तुर्ये अद्वये अजे अभये विदिते स्वयमेव
आत्मस्वरूपमेव।”

(G. K. Bh.—4/89).

² This karika elaborates the Advaita method of realising the Self (Turiya) which consists in the analysis and co-ordination of the experience of the three states.

this, one would mistake that all these three states are there really. To remove this misunderstanding, this slōka—G. K.—4/90 is told, which is :

“हेय-ज्ञेयाप्य-पाक्यानि विज्ञेयान्यप्रषाणतः ।
तेषामन्यत्र विज्ञेयादुपलम्भस्त्रिषु स्मृतः ॥”

In this Slōka, it is said that

- i) to be rejected (हेयानि),
- ii) to be realised (विज्ञेयानि),
- iii) to be accepted (आप्यानि) &
- iv) to be made ineffective (पाक्यानि).

These four types of Sādhanas are initiated here to get the final consummation i. e. Parājnāna Nishthā (पराज्ञाननिष्ठा). These are to practised in the beginning as a means alone, but they are not real. After getting established in the true nature of the Self he will realise that the Self is the only reality and everything else are the means alone.

i) Here the three states meaning Lōukika, Suddhalōukika & Lōkōttara as they are called as Waking, Dream and Deep sleep respectively, are to be rejected. The methodology of rejecting these states is said here. These three notions of the states are conjured up on the Self through ignorance just as snake etc., on the rope. According to Man. Bh.--7 :

“कथं पुनः अन्तःप्रज्ञत्वादीनामात्मनि गम्यमानानां रज्ज्वादौ सर्पादिवत् प्रतिषेधात् असत्त्वं गम्यत इति ? उच्यते ज्ञस्वरूपाविशेषेऽपि इतरेतरव्यभिचारात् असत्यत्वं रज्ज्वादाविव सर्पधारादिविकल्पभेदवत् ; सर्वत्र अव्यभिचारात् ज्ञस्वरूपस्य सत्यत्वम् ।”

—The significance of this sentence is that whenever a particular state appears on the Self it cancels the existence of other two inevitably. So these are false appearances just as the serpent etc., on the rope. But one should realise that the nature of consciousness which is one's own Being is a constant factor of these appearances. So one should discern that the Self is the only reality and the states are false appearances. This is the process of rejecting the states. This is the first of the above four points.

Here also the word is used as successively (क्रमेण), known. Strictly speaking there is no emphasis on the process of successive knowing meaning first, one has to take waking state, it should be merged in the dream state, and that should be merged in deep sleep etc. But this discipline is not intended to be stressed here, because when a brilliant student starts to determine the nature of any particular state and if he observes (a) that the whole state is pervaded by

the nature of consciousness ; (b) the whole phenomenon of the state has been illumined by the nature of consciousness ; and at last (c) the state has no independent existence apart from the nature consciousness just as cinema pictures not having any independent existence apart from arc lamp, then by this minute observation the aspirant can falsify the statehood and realise that the Self is ever devoid of these states and hence he is *Turiya*. For example, the Vaishvānara—the real nature of the Self when appears as if it is conditioned or circumscribed by the waking state, one can observe that the whole waking state is pervaded and illumined by the Self whose nature is pure consciousness and that there is no independent existence to this waking apart from the consciousness and so it is a false appearance and the Self is the only reality. In this way when the waking state itself has been falsified where are the ideas of regarding dream or deep sleep ?

Initially the complainant of the three states is lodged by this waking ego. The waking ego assumes that this is the true waking state and apart from this there are two other states such as dream and deep sleep. The same is the case with the dream ego also. So, where there is a 'Mention', it holds that particular state is the true

waking and apart from that there are two other states. When the waking state is falsified, then there will be no question of other two states. So one can determine that Vaishvānara himself is *Turiya*. So for him there will be no other state to discriminate. Only by this practice also one will stay in the true nature of *Turiya*. Hence there is no stress or emphasis on the successive-discipline or successive thinking. Though this is true for the brilliant student, for others who have no such brilliancy and fall under middle order or lower order in their capacity, for them the Shruti kindly initiates the way of successive thinking regarding the Avasthās, sublating the latter state (avasthā) in the former such as waking in dream and dream in deep sleep. Hence the word *Kramena* (क्रमेण) should be known as it is taught in general.

ii) Jneya (ज्ञेय) means the four types of assumptions—that it exists, does not exist, both existence and non-existence and totally non-existent i. e. void. One should discern that the transcendental reality which is the real nature of the Self and which is called as *Turiya*, is beyond all the above said assumptions. This is intended here by the word Jneya as in Shvetāshvatara it is said एतद् ज्ञेयम् नित्यमेव आत्मसंस्थम् (1/2).

iii) To be acquired i. e. *Āpya* (आप्य) are three—*Pānditya* (पाण्डित्य), *Bālyā* (बाल्य) and *Mauna* (मौन). The mendicant who have renounced the three types of desires (पुत्रैषणा, लोकैषणा, वित्तैषणा) should acquire the above said three qualities viz, *Pānditya* etc. “Therefore the Brāhmin having completed *Pānditya* has to stay on the strength of *Bālyā*, acquiring these two, he will become Muni” (Bṛha—3/5/1). Here *Pānditya* means getting the *Ātmapratya* (आत्मप्रत्यय) i. e. *Ātma Vijnāna* through the teachings of Shāstra and Guru. The word *Bālyā* has got two meanings—(i) according to Bṛhadāraṇyaka: on the strength of *Ātmapratyaya* one should falsify the whole appearance of Anātman, the not-self and (ii) according to Sūtra Bhāshya—3/4/50: he should be free from pride, conceit etc., like a child and so this word denotes that he should not display his knowledge and other virtues unnecessarily. And the word *Mauna* denotes the effortless awareness regarding the real nature of the Self which is called as **Atmachintana Nisthaa**. These three should be acquired by a Sādhaaka. This is *Āpya*.

iv) The fourth is *Pākya* meaning “made ineffective”. For eg., when the grains like rice etc., are boiled and used, they become ineffective to

render resistance for digestion. So also the habits of Antahkarana such as blemishes i. e. attraction (Rāga), Repulsion (Dvesha), Delusion (Mōha), etc., which are called passions (Kashāya)—all these are to be made ineffective relying on Prati-pakshabhāvanā (प्रतिपक्षभावना) meaning subduing these Kashāyas (कषाय) through the contradictory (opposing) thoughts like Vairāgya etc., in his mind. This Sādhanā should be observed by a mendicant or Sādhaka.

So these four (i) to the rejected (avasthās) ; (ii) to be known that the transcendental reality is beyond all concepts such as 'existence' etc., (चतुष्कोटि वर्जितं परमार्थतत्त्वम्) ; (iii) to be achieved (Pānditya, Bālya etc.) and (iv) to be made ineffective as described above—these four should be observed at first by a Sādhaka. This is hinted by the word *Agrashānataha* (अग्रषाणतः), but one should not misunderstand that all these are real things, because except *Vijneya* (विज्ञेय) i. e., the true nature of the Self i. e., the non-dual unborn, fearless *Turiya Ātman*, all the above said things are only the means to realise the non-duality. This is said in this kārīkā by the word *Upalambhaha* (उपलम्भः). The reality is the Brahman alone.

AUM TAT SAT

“अलुप्तदृष्टिरात्माऽयं यथोक्तः स्वप्नबोधयोः ।
प्राज्ञेऽपि च तथैवायं यद्वै तदिति वाक्यतः ॥
अतिकारहेतुश्च यथात्मायं सुषुप्तिगः ।
कूटस्थदृष्टिमात्रत्वात् तथा स्वप्नबोधयोः ॥”

[*Bṛhadāranyaka Vārtika—4/3/1907, 1908*]

“Just as this Ātman is held to be possessed of an imperishable, self-luminous vision (consciousness) during dream and waking, so is he in the *Prājna* state of sleep. And just as this Ātman, on account of its imperishable, eternal, changeless vision, transcends all motives and factors of action in sound sleep, so does he in dream and waking too.” That is to say, Ātman is, by nature, ever the same Pure Consciousness in all the three states of waking, dream and deep sleep.”

