

# Mandukya Upanishad Class 66

After negating all the other systems of philosophy, Gowdapadha is summarizing vedantic teachings of Mandukaya

Upanishad, from 29 to 46th verses. He summarized with the help of dream

example. From 47th verse to 56th verse, he is summarizing the same

teaching by changing the example.

Alantham means torch – a flaming

fire with a handle. For our study, we will take incense stick as

alantham, instead of the fire with a handle. The glowing fire tip is

compared to Brahma Chaithanyam. We are taking this incense stick with a

glowing tip in a dark room. You are moving in the dark room, creating

many patterns. These patterns are generated by the motion of the fire

tip. These patterns can be straight, circular – you can get any number of

patterns with the motion of fire tip. These pluralistic patterns are

compared to dwaida prabanja – objects of the world. So alandham is

compared to Brahman and the patterns are compared to dwaida prabanja.

1. Ekam and anekam: This incense stick has one glowing stick whereas the patterns are anekam or dwaidam. Similarly, Brahman is ekam and the dwaida prabanja is anekam.
2. Swayamparakasam and paratha prakasam: The glowing fire tip is self-effulgent or self-revealing or self-

evident; similarly

Brahman is also self-effulgent or self-evident or self-revealing..

Dwaida prabanja is paratha prakasm.

3. Karanam and kariyam: When this glowing tip is in motion because of its motion, varieties of pattern are generated. Therefore, the moving fire tip becomes the karanam or cause. The patterns are kariyam.
4. Sudandaram and parathantharam: This alantham or fire tip can exist independently in the dark room; whereas the patterns can't exist independently.

We can extend this that one fire tip in motion appears as many patterns; similarly, chaithanyam is responsible for the appearance of the prabanja. In jagrath and swapna, the chaithanyam is in motion because of thought and therefore there is the appearance of jagrath prabanja and swapna prabajna; in shusukthi, chaithanyam is not in motion, because thoughts are not in motion and we do not experience jagrath prabajanja or swapna prabanja. There is no dwaida prabanja other than chaithanyam.

1. In the case of fire tip, the motion is a real phenomenon; in the case of chaithanyam the motion is an apparent motion caused by thoughts or maya. When the maya ends, when there are no thoughts in sushukthi, there is no objects. Chaithanyam sathyam and jagath mithya. Chaithanyam doesn't have real motion

only seeming  
motion.

2. We do say that the fire tip is the karanam and the patterns are kariyam. We initially accept this karana kariya sambandha. But later we reject this karana kariya sambandha because sambandha requires two things; but alandham and abasa can't be counted as two because the patterns do not exist separate from the incense stick. They are together as one substance. We initially accept clay as the karanam and pot as the kariyam. Later we do not accept this because there is no substance called pot. They are two names for the same substance. Similarly, we do not accept karana kariya sambandha between Brahman and Jagath; they are both one and the same. Motionless consciousness is Brahman, moving consciousness is world; there is not kariya karana sambandha. Brahman is beyond kariyam and karanam

At micro level, this is caused by thought and at macro level is caused by maya. There is no world separate from consciousness in motion.

In the next sloka, the vethireka logic is discussed. When there is no fire tip, there is no pattern.

When consciousness is absent, the world doesn't exist. Therefore, there

is no world separate from the consciousness. Anvaya is co-present and vethireka is co-absent.

#### Verse 48

Patterns are no more created or generated when there is no fire tip. Only the motion of fire tip causes the pattern. If the patterns are not there, this fire tip can no longer be called the cause or akaranam. When there are no patterns, kariyams are not there and therefore there is no kariyam. In the same way, when the consciousness is without motion – when maya is not there in cosmic lever (pralayam) or when thoughts are not there (sushukthi) – there is no objective world. When it is without dwaيدا prabanja, consciousness is not even a karanam. Only when there is a prbanja then alone you can say it is a kariyam. Therefore, there is no jagat separate from chaithanyam.

#### Verse 49

When you try to analyze the nature of the appearance of those patterns, when the alantham is in motion, the patterns appear. Do the patterns come from outside and they are sticking to the alantham. Can you say the patterns come from inside out of the fire tip? Patterns do not come from inside or outside of the fire tip. Similarly, when the alantham comes to rest, then all the patterns

disappear. Where did they go? Do the patterns go outside the alantham or did they go inside the alantham? You can't say they come from outside; or inside; you can't say they go inside or outside. Similarly, when the world appears and disappears, you can't say the world come from inside or outside of Brahman. When the pralayam happens, you can't say it went inside or outside of Brahman. Because there is no substance called pattern; since there is no substance called pattern, you can't discuss its arrival or departure. Similarly, you can't discuss the arrival or departure of the world, because there is no substance called world.

#### Verse 50

1. Patterns do not come from inside the fire tip.  
The patterns do not emerge from the fire tip.
2. Patterns do not come from outside the fire tip.  
When the fire tip is in motion, you do see the pattern, but they do not come outside.
3. Patterns do not go outside the fire tip. When the fire tip is not in motion, the patterns disappear, but they do not go outside.
4. Patterns do not go inside the fire tip.

Why is it we are not able to logically explain the pattern? Because we assumed that the pattern is a substance similar to assuming bangle is a substance. We have made a similar assumption regarding the world also. All these problems are

because  
patterns are not substantial; it is a mere nama and roopa.  
When substance  
is not there, how can you talk about arrival or departure.  
World never  
comes, never goes because world never is. Pattern never  
comes; pattern  
never goes; because pattern never is. The patterns do not  
have an isness  
of their own and that isness belongs to fire tip. This is  
mithya.  
If you practice this method of thinking, you will understand  
that bangle, table  
etc. are nama roppa. Later you have to extend this to the  
whole universe.

With regards to Brahma chaithanyam,  
you have to extend the same argument also. Dwaida parbanja is  
also an  
appearance like the pattern. Consciousness in motion appear  
as akasa,  
vayu, agni, jalam, earth, sthula sareeram, sukshma sareeram,  
sthula parabanja,  
shukshma prabanja. This is difficult but the ultimate truth

Verse 51

Gowdapatha gives the same four statements  
for consciousness also. Verse 51 and 52 are similar to verse  
49 and 50.

When consciousness is in motion, the  
dwaida prabanja appears but you can't say it is real.

Because there is no substance called  
world. It is nothing but nama and roopa; consciousness itself  
in motion  
is mistaken is world.

1. Dwaidā prabāṅjā does not come from consciousness
2. Dwaidā prabāṅjā does not come from outside consciousness
3. dwaidā prabāṅjā does not go inside the consciousness
4. Dwaidā prabāṅjā does not go outside the consciousness.

Incense tip/Brahman	Patterns/Dwaidā Prabāṅjā
Ekam	Anekam
Swayamparakāsam – Self Effulgent	parathā prakāsam; effulgent is dependent.
Kāranam; cause	Kāriyam; effect
Superficially looking, firebrand seems to be kāranam and patterns seems to be kāriyam. On inquiry, you can't talk about kāriya kāraṅ sambandha. To talk about any relationship, we require two things. Patterns do not have substantiality of its own. The substantiality of the patterns belongs to the firebrand alone. Similarly, the world does not have its own substantiality; it is only non-substantiality nama-roopa; the seeming substantiality of the world belongs to one chaitanyam.	
Sudandāram – Independent existence	Parathanthāram – Dependent existence
The patterns do not exist separate from the incense stick. We initially accept this kāraṅ kāriya sambandha. But later we reject this kāraṅ kāriya sambandha because sambandha requires two things. We do not accept kāraṅ kāriya sambandha between Brahman and Jagat; they are both one and the same. Motionless consciousness is Brahman, moving consciousness is world; there is not kāriya kāraṅ sambandha.	
In jagat and swapna, the chaitanyam is in motion because of thought and therefore there is the appearance of jagat prabāṅjā and swapna prabāṅjā; in shushukthi, chaitanyam is not in motion, because thoughts are not in motion and we do not experience jagat prabāṅjā or swapna prabāṅjā.	
Incense Tip	Brahman
Real phenomenon	Motion is an apparent caused by thoughts or māya. When the māya ends, when there is no thoughts in shushukthi, there are no objects. Chaitanyam doesn't have real motion only seeming motion.
Patterns are no more created or generated when there is no fire tip. Only the motion of fire tip cause the pattern. If the patterns are not there, this fire tip can no longer be called the cause or kāranam. When there are no patterns, kāriyam are not there and therefore there is no kāriyam.	When the consciousness is without motion – when māya is not there in cosmic layer (pralaya) or when thoughts are not there (shushukthi) – there is no objective world. When it is without dwaidā prabāṅjā, consciousness is not even a kāranam. Only when there is a prabāṅjā then alone you can say it is a kāriyam. Therefore there is no jagat separate from chaitanyam.
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Patterns do not come from inside the fire tip. The patterns do not emerge from the fire tip.</li> <li>2. Patterns do not come from outside the fire tip. When the fire tip is in motion, you do see the pattern, but they do not come outside.</li> <li>3. Patterns do not go outside the fire tip. When the fire tip is not in motion, the patterns disappear, but they do not go outside.</li> <li>4. Patterns do not go inside the fire tip.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Dwaidā prabāṅjā does not come from consciousness; Pluralistic world does not come from consciousness</li> <li>2. Dwaidā prabāṅjā does not come from outside consciousness. Pluralistic world does not come from outside consciousness</li> <li>3. Dwaidā prabāṅjā does not go inside the consciousness. Pluralistic world does not go inside consciousness</li> <li>4. Dwaidā prabāṅjā does not go outside the consciousness. Pluralistic world does not go outside consciousness</li> </ol>

## Mandukya Upanishad, Class 65

After negating other systems of philosophy Gowdapatha is summarizing the teachings of Mandukya Upanishads in verse 29 onwards. He repeatedly asserted that Brahman alone is the ultimate reality and he is beyond time and space and therefore beyond cause and effect. Cause and effect are possible only within time. However, we experience dwaidā prabāṅjā and therefore we don't question or negate the experience of duality; we don't question or negate the utility

of the duality;  
we don't question the orderliness of the world. We question its absolute reality; it can never be absolute reality because the real world can't be born out of Brahman. The world is experienceable and useful but not absolute reality and that is called mithya. It is similar to dream, which is useful, experienced and orderly but it is not absolute reality. Even though the world is not absolutely real, in the beginning stages a seeker will find it extremely difficult to accept this fact. Veda recognizes this difficulty of the student; The students refuse to accept because the world is tangible, perceivable and orderly. Even though they intellectually convinced of the absolute reality, Brahman, but emotionally they have difficulty in negating dwaidam. Dwaidam is required for relationships.

Vedanta temporarily compromises with adwaidam and claim there is dwaida prabanja. Upanishad declares the panja poodham came from Brahman; from that shuksham sareeram and sthula sareeram came. This elaborate creation is mentioned in Upanishads as a compromise. Several devadas are introduced for Bakthi etc. Gowdapadha says this is temporary and not permanent. This temporary acceptance is called adhya rohapa. The later negation is called apavadhaha.

“Loneliness is samsara; Being alone is moksha”

#### Verse 43

The beginners continue to be afraid of advaidam and they argue against advaidam and in favor of dwaidam,. The reasoning is because dwaidam is experienced, tangible, orderly, is useful; it provides for scope for relationship which gives security. Vedanta compromises; any compromise will have dosham and teaching this dwaidam will have some dosha for the students; the students will get attached to those deities. The students were attached to the world, but now they are attached to a few deities and their forms. This disadvantage is there when dwaidam is first introduced. This very same dwaidam will gradually take him out of it to advaidam. Therefore, dwaidam is a necessary compromise in the initial stages for the sake of immature students. This is similar to doctors prescribing medicine even though there are side effects.

#### Verse 44

Even though the world appears to be real because of its experience, orderliness, tangibility, utility etc. it is not absolutely real. Gowdapadha gives another example of a magic show conducted by a magician. A magical elephant appears as a real elephant

even though there is no elephant at all. Ignorant people argue that the dwaida pranbanja exists similar to this elephant.

#### Verse 45

The appearance of origination of the world; the appearance of the substantiality of the world; the materiality of the world; the motions of the world, in the form of arrival and departure; these are all are nonfactual; the fact is only Brahman. Birthless Brahman alone appears as born universe; similarly, motionless brahman appears as the moving world; the non-material conscious alone appears as material universe. The wall is made up of atoms, which are 90% space; but the wall appears solid, even though it is 90% space; similarly, brahman appears as material objects in the universe.

#### Verse 46

Gowdapadha concludes this series of discussion that started from verse 29.

Chaithanyam is never a cause or an effect; since consciousness birthless, all jivas are birthless. If jivas are not born at all, there is no question of rebirth at all; there is no need to work to avoid puner jenma. We don't solve the problem of punar jenma, but we dissolve the problem; there is no problem requiring a solution; there is no punar jenmam to avoid. This is the teaching of the

Upanishad. Every  
seeker has to come to this knowledge that I the advaidam  
Brahman; jiva, jagat  
eeswara division is mithya; swami, dasa, peda is mithya;

- Soham: I am god (Advaidam)
- Dasoham: I am dasa of god (Dwaidam)
- Sadasoham: I am always god (Advaidam)
- Dasadasham: I am always dasa of god (Dwaidam)

This argument goes on forever.

Advaidam sees dwaidam as a means but  
not an end in itself. Only by advaida gyanam a person can  
save from  
himself from falling into samsara; punar jenma;

Verse 47

Up to 46 verse, Godapadha presented  
the summary of vedanta with the help of dream example and  
magic example.

From 47th verse, he is taking another example to convey  
vedantic

teaching: Alatha dhrishta vadha; this example is from verse  
47 to verse

56; This chapter got the name because of this example. In  
this

example, Brahman is compared to a small tip of fire, agni.

---

## Mandukya Upanishad, Class 64

Verses 40 - 46 – Vedantic negation of creation		
Karanam	Kariyam	Negation
Asat	Asat	A nonexistent thing can't produce a nonexistent things, because a nonexistent thing can't produce anything. A human horn produce a rabbit's horn
Asat	Sat	Asat vastu can't produce a sat vastu. A nonexistent thing can't produce an existent thing. From nothing, nothing can come.
Sat	Sat	An existent thing can't produce an existent thing. Clay and Pot example: Clay and pot are not two distinct substances to have a relationship. They are two different names given to the same substance. Previously it was called clay and now it is called pot because the shape has changed. Clay and pot are one and the same substance at different time.
Sat	Asat	A sat vastu can't product an asat vastu. An existent thing can't produce a non extent thing. A nonexistent thing can't be produced. Saying a nonexistent thing is born is grammatically wrong.
This mistake of taking Brahman as world is committed by all people in jagradh and swapna avastha. First, I take the rope as snake, you get closer and call it as garland. You have progressed from mistake 1 to mistake 2. Similarly we only progress from swapna to jagradh. This mistake is corrected only by gyanam. Nothing wrong in pursue the mithya world as husband, wife etc. as long as we realize it is mithya. Perceiving mithya is not wrong; but taking it as sathyam is tragedy; erroneous perception. Samsara continues in both swapna avastha and jagrah avastha. This is one reason for exhausting karma in swapna avastha. In dream, even though the sick person has not died, we dream as though that person is dying. That dream experience shakes a person so much, that exhausts karma.		
There is nothing other than Brahman. Majority of humanity is not prepared to accept this teaching. This is because we all feel we need relationship with people around to feel secure and comfortable. Relationship is possible only in dwaidam and not in advaidam. As a result, everyone considers dwaidam as security.		
Vedanta introduces dwaidam as a compromise. The students of dwaidam are attached to a few deities instead of the world. This dwaidam will take him out of it to advaidam. Therefore dwaidam is necessary compromise in the initial stages for the sake of immature students. This is similar to doctors prescribing medicine even though there are side effects.		
Chalthanyam is never cause or effect; since consciousness birthless, all jivas are birthless. If jivas are not born at all, there is no question of rebirth at all; there is no need to work to avoid puner jenna. We don't solve the problem of punar jenna but we dissolve the problem; there is no punar jennam to avoid		

Beginning from 29 verse, Gowdapadha is giving the teaching of vedanta as presented by Mandukya Upanishad. The experienced universe has to be extended to jagradh prabajna and swapna prabanja. Both worlds are experienced universe and anything experienced is mithya. Even though the jagradh and swapna prabanja are different, they are mithya. We are only negating the absolute reality of the experienced universe and not the relative reality. Relative reality means for its own time and for its own observer that will be real. In swapna all the objects will be real because there will be relative validity will be there. When you find out absolute reality, all of them will be negated. For the dreamer the waker's world is invalid and for the waker the dreamer's world is invalid. The only validity is the consciousness. The practical benefit of this knowledge is whatever happens in mithya field can't affect the sathyam, adhishtanam. The objects in this world, including time and space cannot affect

or limit

me. The freedom from this mithya world is the benefit.

Verse 40

The entire prabanja are

mithya. The world is mithya, doesn't have absolute reality and therefore

an absolutely real world has not come out of Brahman. Similar to half the

cup is full or half cup is empty, you can say either unreal world is born, or a

real world is not born. Therefore, you can't discuss karana kariya

sambandha. Gowdapdha takes four types of possible kariya karana sambandha or

cause effect relationship and negates every one of them:

1. Asat vasthu Can't' produce an asat vasthu. A nonexistent thing can't produce a nonexistent thing, because a nonexistent thing can't produce anything. A human horn produces a rabbit's horn; A human horn can't produce anything let alone a nonexistent rabbit horn.
2. Asat vasthu can't produce a sat vasthu. A nonexistent thing can't produce an existent thing. From nothing, nothing can come.
3. A sat vasthu can't produce a sat vasthu. An existent thing can't produce an existent thing. From clay we are able to produce pot; so, sat seems to be produced. So superficially looking, there appears to be kariya karana sambandha between clay and pot. But there is no cause effect relationship between

clay and  
pot. Any relationship requires two entities. Without  
duality  
you can't talk about any relationship. Clay and pot are  
not two  
distinct substances to have a relationship. They are  
two different  
names given to the same substance. Previously it was  
called clay and  
now it is called pot because the shape has changed.  
Clay and pot are  
one and the same substance at different time.

4. A sat vasthu can't product an asat vasthu. An  
existent thing can't produce a non-existent thing. A  
nonexistent  
thing can't be produced. This is also grammatically  
wrong; saying a nonexistent  
thing is born is grammatically wrong.

Conclusion is nothing is born; there  
is no creation at all. The creation we talk about is a wrong  
name for  
Brahman because of ignorance. An ignorant people call snake,  
a wise  
person calls rope. There are only two dhrishti – agya dhrishi  
and vigya  
dhrishti. Mistaken Brahman is world. Mistaken consciousness  
is  
matter. There is no matter at all.

Verse 41

This mistake of taking Brahman as  
world is committed by all people in jagradh and swapna  
avastha. We commit  
the same mistake in both jagrath prabanja and swapna  
prabanja. First, I  
take the rope as snake, you get closer and call it as

garland. You have progressed from mistake 1 to mistake 2. Similarly, we only progress from swapna to jagradh. In sushukthi, we do not commit the error, but when you wake up, we continue to commit the error. We continue to commit this error in the next jiva and shrishty. This mistake is corrected only by gyanam.

Nothing wrong in pursuing a mithya object if one has the knowledge it is mithya. Nothing wrong in going to movie, with the understanding it is a movie. the moment the movie is over, you understand that it is only a movie. Nothing wrong in pursue the mithya world as husband, wife etc. as long as we realize it is mithya. Perceiving mithya is not wrong; but taking it as sathyam is tragedy; erroneous perception. We commit this mistake not only in jagradh avastha but continue in swapna avastha. In dream also we perceive unreal objects, when I am actually in dream, they appear very real. If you can see the dream with the knowledge that it is dream, then you can enjoy it. Samsara continues in both swapna avastha and jagrah avastha. This is one reason for exhausting karma in swapna avastha. In dream, even though the sick person has not died, we dream as though that person is dying. That dream experience shakes a person so much, that exhausts karma.

## Verse 42

Ultimate truth is there is no duality at all. Brahman alone was, Brahman alone is and Brahman alone will be. There is nothing other than Brahman. Majority of humanity is not prepared to accept this teaching. How can I accept this tangible world as unreal? The world is outside, it is tangible, and it has its own functions perfectly according to order.

1. First problem is majority can't accept the negation of the world.
2. Second problem is that we all feel we need relationship with people around to feel secure and comfortable. Relationship is possible only in dwaidam and not in advaidam. As a result, everyone considers dwaidam as security. They consider advaidam is insecurity because in advaidam no relationship is possible. If there is a person with no relationship, the world looks up on those people negatively. Advaidam is looked up on as a status of orphan. When there is such a well-entrenched notion, people do not accept advaidam. That is why, advaidam is not discussed in the beginning. In the beginning veda accepts dwaidam and talks about jivatma, paramatma and world. At that point, it also accepts creation also. Brahman is accepted as cause and world is accepted as result with a hope that the student will

gradually become an  
 uthama adhikari. Until then shrishti is accepted. They  
 say experience  
 is reality, but it is not a proof for reality e.g  
 dream. They also  
 say the world is in perfect order.

## Mandukya Upanishad, Class 63

Verse	Swapna Avastha	Jagrath Avastha
36	Experienced by vasana maya sareeram, dream body, mithya body projected by mind. Swapna sareeram appears real in swapna avastha.	Physical body is stationery and does not move with the dream body. Jagradh sareeram is real only in jagradh prabanja
	Anything experienced is mithya. Because the absolute reality is never an object of an experience. Not experienceable with any instrument. From this we get that whatever we experience is not reality. Just as the dream body is unreal, any object of consciousness is unreal. Consciousness alone is real, and that consciousness is you tat twam asi. I the observer alone is absolute reality and whatever I experience is relative reality or mithya.	
37	There is desa (space), kala (time) and thritupdi (subject, object, instrument).	There is desa (space), kala (time) and thritupdi (subject, object, instrument).
	If they are similar in all respects, then you can extend to mithaythvam as well. Swapna prabanja is mithya, therefore jagradh prabanha is also mithya. Each prabanja will appear real in that condition. Swapna prabanha will appear real for the swapna observer during swapna avastha; jagradh prabanja will appear real for jagradh observer during jagradh avastha.	
39	Experience a mithya jagradh prabanja which produces a mithya vasana which produces a mithya swapna prabanja. Similar to VCP. From the standpoint of Jagradh Prabanja, Swapna prabanja is mithya	Experience a mithya jagradh prabanja. Because of ignorance, I look up on it as sathyam. Similar to VCR. From thuriya dhrishti, jagradh prabanja is mithya. You should never try to negate jagradh prabanja from the standpoint of waker. When you become a gyani, the jagradh prabanja won't disappear; experiences will continue. It is like continuing the dream, knowing that it is a dream. Gyani will continue to see the world with the knowledge that it is another dream.
	We are only negating the absolute reality of the experienced universe and not the relative reality. Relative reality means for its own time and for its own observer that will be real.	

After negating the other dharshanam  
 up to verse 28, now Gowdapadha is summarizing the Vedantic  
 teaching, the  
 teaching given in Mandukya Upanishad. The essence of this  
 teaching is  
 Brahman is alone is sathyam; Sathya Brahman is none other than  
 jiva, I the  
 consciousness principle alone is the ultimate reality and  
 everything else is  
 mithya. This mithya jagat consists of jagradh prabanja and  
 swapna  
 prabanja. Unreal does not mean it is not real, but not  
 absolute reality  
 but only empirical or relative reality. Relative reality  
 means jagradh  
 prabanja is real from the standpoint of waker, but it is

unreal from other standpoint  
of taijasa or thiruyum. Similarly, swapna prabanja is very  
real from the  
stand point of dreamer, but it is not real from the stand  
point of waker let  
alone the stand point of thuriyum. Relative standpoint means  
the relative  
standpoint of the observer. Even when it doesn't have  
absolute reality, the jagradh  
and swapna prabanja are experienceable and it can be  
experienced.  
Experience of the world will continue even though it does not  
have absolute  
reality. In waking state jagradh prabanja will be  
experienced; in dream  
state the swapna prabanja will be experienced. Vedanta does  
not negate experience.  
The utility of the objects is also not negated. The dream  
water, food  
etc. will have their utility in dreams. Divisions are not  
negated.  
Vedanta only removes the absolute reality which we attach to  
this world.  
After that we continue to experience the world, but it does  
not get the  
absolute reality. The world will give samsara only when you  
attach  
absolute reality. Whatever is not absolutely real, cannot  
give  
security. Whatever only relative reality can't be relied up  
on. You  
can rely up on only sathya vasthu – it is none other than I  
the witnessing  
changing jagradh and swapna prabanja. For all practical  
purposes jagradh  
and swapna are the same.

When you are in dream, you will not accept it is unreal. In dream, if someone asks about jagrath prabanja, they will state that there is no jagradh prabanja. If you wake up in one moment, everything in dream will all wake up. From Taijasa to viswa , swapna prabaja goes away. From viswa to thirium through wisdom, jagradh prabnaja will go away similar to swapna.

### Verse 36

When you are in dream, we experience a body in dream. With that dream body alone, I do all the transaction. This body is called vasana maya sareeram, because that physical body, I have protected with my own mind or thoughts. During dream I do not look up on them thoughts body, but as tangible body. With that body I travel, eat etc. But that body is mithya body projected by mind. Because on waking up, there is another non traveling body, lying on the bed. From that it is clear, that body alone relatively real, swapna body is mithya. That body is stationery and does not move with the dream body. After waking up, I commit the same mistake and say this body is real. But this body is also exactly like swapna sareeram. Swapna sareeram appears real in swapna avastha; similarly, jagradh sareeram is real only in jagradh prabanja.

Anything experienced is

mithya. Because the absolute reality is never an object of an experience. Not experienceable with any instrument. From this we get that whatever we experience is not reality. Just as the dream body is unreal, any object of consciousness is unreal. Consciousness alone is real, and that consciousness is you tat twam asi. I the observer alone is absolute reality and whatever I experience is relative reality or mithya.

### Verse 37

Generally, we accept that swapna prabanja is caused by jagradh prabanja. Because jagradh prabanja alone gives variety of experiences that registered in the mind, becomes vasana and those vasanas are activated in dream. We dream only what we experience in jagradh prabanja. Jagradh prabanja is karanam and swapna prabanja is kariyam. There is a kariya karana sambandha between jagradh prabanja and swapna prabanja. That is why the experiences in jagradh and swapna are similar. In jagradh prabanja also there is desa (space), kala (time) and thritupdi (subject, object, instrument). In swapna also we have these three. If they are similar in all respects, then you can extend to mithaythvam as well. Swapna prabanja is mithya, therefore jagradh prabanha is also mithya. Each prabanja will appear real in that

condition. Swapna prabhanha will appear real for the swapna observer during swapna avastha; Jagradh prabanja will appear real for jagradh observer during jagradh avastha.

Swapna prabanja is a product of jagradh prabanja. Since swapna and jagradh have karana kariya sambandham, jagradh prabanja is real only for jagradh observer, just as swapna prabanja is real only for swapna observer.

Verse 38

There is no real creation at all, and Brahman can't be a cause or karanam. Brahman is kariya karana vilakshanam. A real creation can never be proved logically. Therefore, there is no creation. Everything which you look up on as creation is not creation – it was Brahman, it is Brahman and it will ever be Brahman.

While discussing sankya and gyana philosophy, we asked does an existent pot originate or a nonexistent pot originate. The answer is neither because an existent pot can't originate as it already exists. A nonexistent product can't originate because it doesn't exist.

Verse 39

Karana jagradh prabanja and kariya swapna prabanja is also mithya. You experience a mithya jagradh prabajna which product a mithya vasana which produces a mithya swapna

prabanja. In jagradhavastha I experience a mithya jagradh prabanja. Because of ignorance, I look up on it as sathyam. Out of that experience I get the vasanas – it gets registered in the memory. Jagrath avastha is like VCR and swapna prabanja is like VCP. Certain vasanas are feeble; certain vasanas are strong. With those vasanas, the same events appear in swapna. When you watch the jagrath, you swear that jagrath is real; when you see the same in swapna you will swear that is real; but both are mithya. From the thuriya dhrishti, you can boldly say this prabanja is mithay. Now we are trying to negate the world from the standpoint of waker. You should never negate the world from the waker standpoint. When you wake up from dream, the dream experience will disappear. When you become a gyani, the jagradh prabanja won't disappear; experiences will continue. It is like continuing the dream, knowing that it is a dream. Gyani will continue to see the world with the knowledge that it is another dream.

---

# Mandukya Upanishad, Class 62

Class

62

Up to verse 28, Gowdabadha analyzed sankya dharshanam from asthika group and bowdhika dharshanam from nasthika group. From the analysis he stated that there is no independent world separate from the observer. The observer is I the Thuriua chaithanyam and not Viswa or Hiranyagarba or Pragma. We do not negate the experience of the world but only the reality. Similar to not negating the experience of dream but only the reality of dream. Experience cannot be proof for reality. In dream we see that law doesn't hold true. Dream is very well experienced but up on waking up we find out it is not real.

After refuting other dharshanam, Gowdabadha restates vedanta in verses 29 to 46. In the 29th verse, Gowdabdha mentions two important things:

1. Intrinsic nature of a thing can't undergo a change. Heat, which is the intrinsic nature of fire, will never change. Fire will always be hot under all circumstances.
2. The intrinsic nature of Brahman, nirvikaratvam – changelessness, beyond time and space. Whatever is subject to time is subject to onslaught of time. Brahman is not subject to

time. Brahman is always ajam. If Brahman is intrinsic nature is nirvakaratvam, it can never become karanam of anything. To be a cause it has to undergo change. Therefore, Brahman never produced a world and therefore there is never a thing called world. World is crystallized confusion.

### Verse 30

Gowdabadha wants to convey that moksha can't be an event happening in time. If you look upon yourself as a samsari and working towards moksha, you will get it. Even if you get moksha in time, it will not be a moksha. If moksha is something that happens in future, then it will have a beginning and then it should also have an end. Moksha should be understood as dropping the notion that I am bound. There is no moksha other than an intellectual event, dropping the notion that I am bound now. The dropping that misconception is figuratively called moksha.

Gowdabahda gives an assumption. Let us assume that there is an external world outside, then dwaidam will become reality – observed, observer. Then the question will be when did the dwaidam or the world come? Did karma come first, or body come first. You will have difficulty explaining when did the world come.

If creation or world or samsara is anadhi – beginning less.  
Will this  
beginning-less samsara end or not? If samsara is beginning  
less and therefore  
it is endless, then no moksha is possible. If moksha is  
impossible then  
why should I do all the sadhanas. If samsara is beginning  
less but it  
will end when you keep doing sadhanas, then the end of samsara  
will be  
beginning of moksha. A moksha which has a beginning will have  
an end  
also. The moksha will be anithya moksha – temporary. It is  
as good  
as no moksha, because by definition moksha is nithya.  
Therefore, you  
should never accept moksha. Working for moksha should be  
dropping the  
notion that I have samsara.

Let us assume that the  
beginning-less samsara ends, then moksha will have the  
beginning. It will  
be followed by an ending. There will not be permanence.  
Therefore,  
the correct approach is I am mukthaha, I was mukthaka and I  
will be mukthaha

Verse 31

Gowdabadha repeats ideas given in  
second and third chapter. Many verses are repeated from those  
chapters.

This verse is repetition of sixth verse of the second  
chapter.

Any product that you talk about  
which has a temporary duration does not have a real existence

at

all. If you take the example of a pot, before the manufacture the

pot was not there and after the destruction the pot was not there.

Between the two the pot appears to be there. When you inquire deeply, we

find that there is no pot all. Pot is a new name given to ever present

clay. Pot is not a new substance, but a new name and shape given to clay.

Every product only has a nominal verbal existence with no substance. When

you remove the clay, you will not find the pot. The creation as a whole,

it is a kariyam. The "Isness" of the world belong to

Brahman. Every product is a word initiated by your tongue.

The

product is nonexistent in the past and it is nonexistent in the present

also. It is considered as though real by ignorant people.

From wise

persons' perspective Brahman alone is permanent.

Verse 32

This verse is seventh verse of second chapter.

Previously we said experience is not

the proof of reality. Here he says, even the utility is not the proof of

reality. Vedanta accepts the utility of the world for eating, drinking

etc. Vedanta never negates the utility of the world, similar to not negating

the experience of the world. But vedanta says I accept the utility of the

world, but it is not proof for reality, it is still mithya. Similar to dream where dream food alone is useful in dream. But on waking up, in spite of its utility we find out that dream world is mithya. Even the utility of the world is relative utility and not absolute utility. Because this jagrath prabanja is useful only for the waker, viswa only during jagradh avastha. When jagrath is changed to swapna this jagrath prabanja is utterly useless.

Verse 33

This is similar to verse 1 of the second chapter.

Previously we said experience is not the proof of reality. We generally take experience as proof for reality. Here vedanta goes one step further. Experience is the proof for unreality. Experience is the proof for mithya. Whatever experienced is mithya. Because sathyam is never an object of experience. There is sathyam but it is not an object of experience. It is ever the experiencer the subject. It is never the seen, but ever the seer. Never the heard, but ever the hearer. Experience is the proof for mithya. Swapna is the example. It is experienced but it is mithya. Extending this, jagrath prabanja is experience but it is mithya. All the objects in dream are mithya because they are

experienced  
within limited time and space.

In verses 33 to 36, Gowdapadha says  
dream is mithya; with that example, he says jagradh prabanja  
is also mithya  
because they both are experienced.

Verse 34

Reminder of verse 2 of Second  
chapter.

Dream objects are unreal because  
they don't have sufficient space for unreality; When you wake  
up in the middle  
of a dream, you wake up where you went to sleep and not where  
you were in  
dream. By this we prove swapna is unreal. Gowdapadha goes out  
of way  
to prove dream unreal, when we already have the knowledge that  
dream as  
unreal. Many philosophers don't agree that dreams are mental  
projection  
but created by god specifically for you. Vishishta dwaidam  
argue that  
dream is also real. The swapna prabanja is as real as  
jagradh.

Verse 35

Our own experinece will prove that  
swapna is mithya. Suppose in dream, you go to your friends  
house for an  
important opinion. After waking up, you want to know if the  
opinion is  
real or not. But friend will say they did not meet. Whatever  
you  
receive in dream, one doesn't see after waking up. All this

prove swapna  
is mithya. Similarly jagradh is also mithya

---

# Mandukya Upanishad, Class 61

In the five verses 24 to 28,  
Gowdapadha Chariya is refuting Buddhist system of philosophy.  
The four  
systems are:

1. Sowthranthika madham: This philosopher says that there is an external world different from the observer, the subject.  
The external world is different from the observer and is real; this real distinct external world is proved by prathyaksha pramanam; therefore, this philosophy presented in a nutshell as bahya prathyaksha vadhinaha
2. Vaibashika madham: Close to first one and they also say there is an external world; it exists separate from the observer; the external world is real; This distinct real external world is proved by inference or reasoning. bahyana anumana vadhinaha
3. Yogachara madham: There is no independent real external world at all separate from the subject. Just there is no real dream world, separate from the observer, individual. This philosopher can be defined as Bahyartha abava vadhinaha. External is only an

appearance

4. Madhyamika madham: This is similar to the third one; they also so there is no external at all; There is no subject observer also. Sarvartha abava vadhinaha. Soonya vadhinaha.

The first two systems are refuted by the third system. The first two systems claim there is a real external world whereas the third system says there is no external world separate from consciousness. This is close to advaidam, in establishing mithyatvam of the world, and therefore Gowdapadha chariya joined this system to refute the first two system. The first two systems quote the experiences as proof for the existence of an external world. This was refuted in verses 26 to 29 by saying that experience does not prove reality. The best example being the dream. In dream we have clear experiences with corresponding external objects. During the dream we are very sure of experiences and corresponding objects, but when we wake up, we find out there is no external objects at all separate from the dreamer. Similarly, there is no external world separate from the observer. When we look at the pot, we see a pot with weight etc. But up on inquiry you find out there is no substance called pot, the weight, attributes etc. belong to clay. When you are touching a pot, you really are touching clay. Because of lack of inquiry

it appears as a substance. Similarly, the whole world looks real.

In the first stage, we dismiss the object and retain the word. Once you dismiss the object, the word should also be dismissed. Because without an object there is no validity for the word. All the padham and padhartham are resolved into the the ahdishtanam, the chaithanyam. Similar to akaram, ukaram, and makaram getting resolved in silence.

Then how will you explain the erroneous perception. If you are talking about error, there should be a right perception. If you want to talk about wrong perception, there should be a correct perception. If there is a correct perception, then there must be an external object. Without an external object, the concept of error can't be there at all. There is no right perception at all because there is no world for perception at all.

Verse 28

First, we will take the second part. Because of the reasons given in the previous three verses, the external world is not at all born and therefore there is no such thing called external world or an object of an external experience. If it is unreal world, why does it feel real? Feeling is not a valid knowledge – you may feel like a prime minister, but you are not. In dream, you feel the dream

world is real, but it is not.

The first part of the sentence is addressing yogachara. Common features for both are that there is no object separate from consciousness. The difference is in arriving at the nature of consciousness. The yogachara philosopher says consciousness is a fleeting, flickering, temporary, momentary entity. Therefore, the meaning of the word I, the subject is this temporary consciousness. How am I momentary entity? I have been continually existing for my life. Yogachara will say that you are not one momentary consciousness but many momentary consciousness. Momentary consciousness are constantly replaced by another momentary consciousness. Because of the continuous flow, it looks as though there is a permanent atma. There is no permanent atma, but only a flow of temporary series of atma. He gives two examples:

1. Perennial river: If you look at Ganges, there is no permanent Ganges because the river is in constant flow. You feel that the Ganges you saw last year is same the Ganges this year. The water of Ganges you touch this moment is not the same water for the next moment. Ganges is only a flow of temporary flow of water. Similarly, atma. There is no permanent consciousness at all.
2. Flame: You feel that there is a permanent flame,

but on inquiry you will find that the same flame does not continually exists. If the flame exists permanently, the oil will be there permanent, but oil is getting depleted. The flame is constantly getting renewed by oil. The flame of first moment and flame of the second moment are not the same; they are only similar.

Permanent river and flame are brama;  
Yogachara bowdha says the permanent consciousness and chaithanyam are brama. Chaithanyam is born, gone, born, gone; there is a constant flow of chaithanyam. Gowdapadha refutes this philosophy in three words.

Consciousness is not born at all, it is eternal; you can't talk about temporary consciousness. Sankarachariya elaborately argues for this concept:

Sankarachariya asks the question, if you are talking about the flow of fleeting consciousness and according to you this is atma. Consciousness number 1 appears and disappears; then Consciousness 2 comes and disappears; then 3 comes and disappears and so on. Who is talking about this arrival and departure? Is it the first one or second one or third one? Number 1 can never talk about the arrival of number 2. Because when number 1 is there number 2 is not there. Similarly, number 2 cannot talk about number 1 or number 3. Therefore,

no single member can talk about the flow of chanika  
vigyanam, If somebody  
has to talk about arrival and departure, there must be  
somebody other than the  
flow who is there permanently. So, the one who talks about,  
who is the  
witness of, who is aware of arrival and departure must not  
arrive and  
depart. Yogchara committed the mistake of taking  
consciousness as the  
thoughts of mind. These arriving and departing thoughts are  
witnessed by  
this nithya chaithanyam and this nithya chaithanyam does not  
come and go.  
Anithya vigyanam is the reality for yogachara. Nithhya  
vigyanam is the  
reality for us. Thoughts arrive and depart, what is permanent  
is I the  
witness principle. They are seeing the footprints of flying  
birds in the  
sky; they are seeing something that is not there; they are  
seeing the  
origination of consciousness; this is a wrong perception.

The fourth madhyamika says that  
there is nothing in creation (soonyavadha); this means you are  
not there which  
means your philosophy is not there also.

Verse 29

For the sake of refutation, we  
discussed all other systems. From verse 29 to 46, Gowdapadha  
summarizes  
the vedanta chidhantha; Consciousness alone is real and  
eternal; the world  
obtained in jagradha avastha and swapna avastha are both  
mithya; I am not

matter but that eternal consciousness in which the mithya matter appears and disappears. Mithya includes body matter, mind matter and world matter. Consciousness does not produce a real world. Other system claim that eternal Brahman produce the external world. that assume the Brahman is subject to change. To be a karanam or a cause it should be subject to change – savikaram. The truth is Brahman is changeless; therefore, it is not a kranam at all and can't produce any real creation. that is the very nature of Brahman. Changelessness is the very nature of Brahman. This changeless nature of Brahman will ever be the same. World was not born; world is not born; world will not be born; What was, what is and will be is all Brahman. This nature of Brahman will never change. If you accept that a world is born out of Brahman, you will never get out of samsara. Acceptance of real world is invitation for permanent bondage; therefore, you should not accept it if you want moksha.

---

## **Mandukya Upanishd, Class 60**

Suppose I want to become chess champion in the world, I only have to defeat the number one person.

Similarly, among various ashtika dharsahanams, which accept creation, the most prominent one is the Sankya philosophy and by refuting Sankya philosophy, then we would have refuted all asthika philosophers.

From verse 24 to 28, Gowdapadha refutes all nasthiaka dharshanam, mainly bowdha madham or Buddhism.

1. Buddhism has four branches. Sowthranthika madham:  
This philosopher says that there is an external world different from the observer, the subject. The external world is different from the observer and is real; this real distinct external world is proved by prathyaksha pramanam; therefore, this philosophy presented in a nutshell presented as bahya prathyaksha vadhinaha.
2. Vaibashika madham: Close to first one and they also say there is an external world; it exists separate from the observer; the external world is real; This distinct real external world is proved by inference or reasoning. This philosophy presented in a nutshell presented as bahyana anumana vadhinaha
3. Yogachara madham: There is no independent real external world at all separate from the subject. Just there is no real dream world, separate from the observer, individual. This philosopher can be defined as Bahyartha abava vadhinaha. External is only an appearance
4. Madhyamika madham: This is similar to the third

one; they also so there is no external at all; There is no subject observer also. Sarvartha abava vadhinaha. Soonya vadhinaha.

Of these four, the first two are refuted by the third one. The first two accept that there is a real creation separate from the observer. Third, yogachara, refutes both of them and establishes that there is no observed world separate from the observer. Since he negates the matter, the external world, and establishes that the observer consciousness alone is real, yogachara is very close to advaidham. With regard to negation of the world, advaidam and yogachara are same and call the world as mithya. Both also say consciousness alone is Sathyam and agree on refuting external world. Refuting yogachara comes in verse 28.

24th verse presents the first two branches of Buddhism and assert that there is an external world.

First argument is if there is a variety of experiences, then there must be variety of objects outside.

Internal variety proves external plurality. If external plurality is dismissed, you will not be able to explain the plurality of experiences.

To explain internal plurality, you must accept external world. Every experience must have a corresponding external object.

The second argument is that if there is a pain feeling there must be an external object which causes the pain; same thing is true for pleasure also. This also proves an external world. So, one has to accept the existence of an external world accepted by heenayana madham and all other systems of dwaيدا philosophies – philosophies accepting real world.

In the next three verses heenayana is refuted by yogachara; it should be taken as refutation by Gowdapadha.

#### Verse 25

Superficially looking, what heenyana is saying is correct. Because every cognition, every experience and every knowledge must have a corresponding object. But when I look into the detail, I find the external object disappears. For example, bangle, chain and ring. We have three different words, corresponding to that plurality of thoughts. With each word, the understanding of object is different. There is plurality of words, cognition and there must be plurality of object. There is a bangle, there is a chain and there is a ring. There are three different words; three different knowledge and three different objects. But those three objects, really speaking, are non existent. There is no substance called bangle or chain or ring.

There is only one substance called gold. There are no three substance. Bangle, chain and ring are three words for which

there are no corresponding substance at all. There is only one word with a corresponding substance: gold. What is the meaning of using different words when there is no substance? When you negate substance, bangle, chain and ring and then you negate the corresponding words. Padhams and padhartham are both mithya. As you keep probing deeper and deeper, all the padhams and all the padharthas will go away; only adhistanam will remain – the observer, the consciousness.

If you inquire into reality, is there a thing called bangle? The so-called external substance will become non substantial. Bangle does not have any weight. The weight belongs only to gold. Bangle is only a word. Similarly, world is only a word. There is no such thing called world other than the observer.

Another example is dream experience. For every dream experience, the dreamer sees a corresponding an external object. After waking up, we find that there is no external object. Experience disappears, experienced objects disappear when you wake up. Similarly, the corresponding worldly objects also disappear.

Verse 26

There is no external matter at all. There is only consciousness which does not experience any external

objects at all. Because there is no object for the consciousness to contact. The consciousness does not contact any real object because there are no real objects. Similar to not contacting an elephant in dream because there is no elephant. Can we say that consciousness contacts an unreal object? Consciousness does not contact with an unreal object also because an unreal object does not exist separate from consciousness. If there is no unreal object separately, how can it contact? Contact requires a separate object. For example, gold does not contact unreal bangle because there is no unreal bangle separate from gold. If gold has to touch the bangle, there must be two things – gold and bangle. Gold and bangle are only two names for only one substance. Then where is the question of contacting each other. Matter is not a substance; it is a name given to consciousness. Matter and consciousness are only two names for one and the same absolute reality. One who understood gold, calls it gold; one who misses the gold, calls it bangle. Two different people call it by two different names; but the substance is only one. From wise person's angle chaithanyam is called the truth; from an ignorant person it is called world. There is no object separate from consciousness; a real object is nonexistent; an apparent object does not exist separate from

consciousness. There is no mithya padharthaha separate from sathyam. Only when there are two independent things contact is possible.

## Verse 27

Consciousness does not come in contact with any object at all in all the three periods of time – in the past, present or future. You do not come in contact with the dream elephant before dream, after dream or even during dream. Because there is no elephant even during dream because the elephant is only in your mind and it is only a feeling and feelings are not facts. The question is (this question is not in the sloka, but the answer is in the sloka) if you don't accept an external world, how do you differentiate right knowledge and wrong knowledge/error. Normally, we do use the expression right knowledge or wrong knowledge or error. Rope knowledge is right knowledge; snake knowledge is error. How do you say which is right knowledge and which is wrong knowledge? You differentiate what is right and what is wrong based on outside object. When the object and knowledge is in concurrence, then it is right knowledge. When the knowledge I have and the object do not concur, then it is wrong knowledge or error. When the perception and object tally, it is right knowledge. When they do not, it is

wrong  
knowledge. That means you need an external object to tally.  
But if  
you don't accept an external object at all, then you can't  
explain an  
error. The question is how do you explain an error? The  
yogachara  
says I do not accept right knowledge or wrong knowledge; there  
is no right/wrong  
division at all. In dream rope perception or snake perception  
is  
correct? There is no question of rope perception being  
correct or snake  
perception being correct because they both are projection;  
there is no snake  
outside. How can you talk about error when there is no object  
at all  
outside? There is no question of explaining the error. Since  
there  
is no external object and there is no question of explaining  
an error.

---

## **Mandukya Upanishad, Class 59**

In these verses, Gowdapadha refutes  
dvaidha vadhi who is explaining the creation with the law of  
karma. He  
says karma and sareeram are cause and effect. Gowdapadha took  
six  
different options and showed that none of them will work. So,  
with the  
theory of karma, the creation can't be explained. In Vedanta  
we only

accept the law of karma temporarily to explain creation and once the person is ready to accept higher level, we negate this theory.

Having refuted the six options, Gowdadhya comes to another topic in 22nd verse where he pointed out, not only the creation of the whole universe can't be logically explained, but also any single object's creation can't be explained. Any ordinary object in the world, even the creation of that object can't be explained. Taking the pot, you can't prove the origination of the pot.

1. Pot can't be created out of pot
2. Pot can't be created out of non-pot (any other object)
3. Pot can't be created out of a mixture of pot and non-pot
4. An existent pot can't originate
5. A nonexistent pot can't originate
6. A mixture of existent and nonexistent pot can't originate.

Whether you take the macro cosmic creation or the micro cosmic creation, no creation can be proven.

In the 23rd verse, Gowdadhya considers three more options:

1. From beginning-less karma, a body can't be born because there is no beginning-less karma
2. From beginning-less body, a karma can't be born because there is no beginning-less sareeram
3. Without a cause, body and karma can't be born naturally born. That which does not have aadhi does not have aadhi; meaning that which does not have karanam does not have

origination.

Causeless origination is not possible. All the three options are ruled. Ultimately the conclusion is you can't logically establish a creation. Therefore, there is no creation; there is no world. There is only Brahman. The real meaning of advaidam is kariya karana vilakshanam.

Verse

24

In previous verses Gowdapadha refuted the Sankya philosophers and dvaيدا philosophers; both of the philosophers are asthika philosophers – accepting veda pramanam. Until now Gowdapadha refuted asthika philosophers; from now on he takes on nasthika philosophers; these philosophers don't believe veda pramanam; they accept experience.

1. Charuvaka Madham; materialistic
2. Jaina madhama; founded by Rishaba Devaha; later revived by Varthamana Mahaveera and others; jinaha meaning conquering sense organs. The one who follows this philosophy are called jains
3. A group of four madhams which are budhism or bowdha madham originated by Buddha. Lord Ashoka asked the scholars to compile the Buddhist teaching

Here Gowdabdha takes up on refuting Buddhism from verse 24 to verse 28. The four branches are:

1. Sowthranthika madham: This philosopher says that there is an external world different from the observer,

the subject.

The external world is different from the observer and is real; this real distinct external world is proved by prathyaksha pramanam; therefore, this philosophy presented in a nutshell presented as bahya prathyaksha vadhinaha.

2. Vaibashika madham: Close to first one and they also say there is an external world; it exists separate from the observer; the external world is real; This distinct real external world is proved by inference or reasoning. This philosophy presented in a nutshell presented as bahyana anumana vadhinaha
3. Yogachara madham: There is no independent real external world at all separate from the subject. Just there is no real dream world, separate from the observer, individual. This philosopher can be defined as Bahyartha abava vadhinaha. External is only an appearance
4. Madhyamika madham: This is similar to the third one; they also so there is no external at all; There is no subject observer also. Sarvartha abava vadhinaha. Soonya vadhinaha.

The first two are called hinayana bowdha madham and the last two are called mahayana bowdha madham.

Of the four, the third on yogachara madham is closer to vedanta. He also says that there is a subject which

is real, the object is unreal. We also say the subject, the observer is also real. This subject is the observer the consciousness principle or vigyana swaroopam; we also say that the subject, the observer is consciousness principle.

Similarities between yogachara and vedantins:

Both say world is mithya; observer alone is sathyam; sathyam the observer is chaithanyam;

The difference is yogachara says that the consciousness is the temporary one having a fleeting existence and this consciousness comes and goes as a flow. For him the subject is not a single eternal consciousness, the subject is a flow of temporary consciousness; In advaitam there is no flow of consciousness, but it is one and eternal.

Gowdapada will talk about the similarities and thereafter he will discuss the differences. First, he joins yogachara madham to refute the first two; later on, he refutes yogachara madham.

The first two, heenayana madham, are refuted by yogachara madham. 24th verse is the presentation of heenayana madham which consists of 1 and 2 or sowthranthika and vaibashika madham.

Every experience or knowledge we get, should have a corresponding external object. In the absence

of external object, you can't have variety of experiences. In dream, you don't have varieties of knowledge. In waking you do have varieties of knowledge. Every knowledge, therefore, presupposes an external world. Every knowledge proves an existence of external object. Every cognition is associated with corresponding, relevant external object. Different knowledge is not possible without external objects. If you don't accept plurality of external objects, you can't explain plurality of our experiences.

Second reasoning he gives, that we have varieties of emotions like pleasure, pain etc. If I should have these emotions, every one of them must be caused by some external objects. If the body feels heat that heat experience must have been caused by some external cause. Therefore, external world is there, it is different from me and it is real.

---

## **Mandukya Upanishad, Class 58**

Beginning from 14 to 21st verse, Gowdapdha is discussing theory of creation as per dwaidam. They try to explain creation with the theory of karma. In Advaidam also

accepts

theory of karma as a temporary steppingstone, but not ultimate truth.

Once the mind is ready to accept the final teaching, then creation is

negated. When the creation itself is negated, there is no reason to look

for a cause of creation. If a philosopher accepts theory of karma as reality,

he is called dvaidya philosopher.

Dvaidya philosopher's inability to

accept any of the six theories, reflects fundamental fallacy in dvaidya system

of philosophy. Whenever people say I don't believe in free will

everything is predetermined, we should ask predetermined by whom? If it

is god predetermining different experiences for different people, then that god

will be a partial god. If it is world, the inert world can't predetermine

your experience. You can't say, it is random, in a world of fully of

orderliness, there is no scope for accident. Accident is an incident, whose

cause we are not able to determine. Predetermined by me with my own

karma. Then the question comes, what preceded that karma.

There

will be no answer to this. From this, we can conclude there is no

creation.

Verse 20

Here the dvaidyas, may give a suggestion.

We will try to explain creation with an example. The creation

of the world has to be explained like the tree creation from the seed. The seed-tree example will not solve the problem, because the confusion regarding world creation is also there with regard to the seed-tree example also. The six options elaborated will not work for seed and tree also. To solve one problem, you are giving another problem. This example as confusing as the original confusion regarding karma sareeram flow.

Verse 21

Whether you take karma-sareeram case or the seed-tree case, we have the inability and ignorance to comprehend the order – which one came first? Tree or seed? Karma or Sareeram? According to vedanta, the very concept cause effect is ignorance. You will get freedom only when you transcend the cause effect idea. If not, you will be worried about the past (effect) or the future (cause). Only when you negate cause effect theory, you will be free. Get out of the obsession with cause and effect. This whole concept is avidya and moksha is kariya karana vilakshanam. If you have to transcend cause and effect, you have to transcend time. Whether today is cause or effect is due to time. Today is the cause of future and the effect of past. If you really believe in cause and effect, then what is born?

If it is the origination, then tell me what is the cause of that origination?

How is it you are not able to talk about cause which proceeds an effect which originates according to you.

Verse 22

In this verse, Godwapadha concludes arguments against dwaidam. You can't explain the origination of creation;

within creation, any simple object, you cannot talk about its origination. You cannot even prove the origination of a pot.

Here

Gowdapadha suggests six options:

1. If you talk about a birth of a pot, I will ask 3 questions:
  1. What is the cause of the pot? Is the pot born out of pot?
  2. Do you say that a pot is born out of a cloth (something else)?
  3. Does a pot come out of a mixture of these two – pot and cloth?

Gowdapatha says all three options are wrong and not possible.

1. A pot cannot be born out of itself
2. A pot cannot be born out of a cloth also. If something cannot be born out of something else.
3. There is no such thing called pot and cloth.

Therefore, you can never prove the creation of a pot. How would you prove the creation of the universe?

Pot can be born out of clay.

Why can't you accept this origination of pot? Sankarachariyar

answers

this question. You can never talk about origination of pot out of clay,

because really speaking there is no such thing called pot.

Previously

there was clay, there is clay now. There is no substance called

pot. Scientifically, matter cannot be created. You only introduced the name pot. Since

there is no substance called pot, there is only one substance called clay, now

there are two words for clay. But there is only one substance. When

there is only one substance, how can you talk about kariya karana sambandha?

The word kariya karana sambandhi or cause effect relationship is delusion; confusion;

When the confusion or delusion is universal, it becomes normal.

No object can be born out of itself or something else or a mixture of two.

When you talk about a birth of a pot or desk or anything else, I will ask three question:

1. Is an existent thing born?
2. Is a nonexistent thing born?
3. Or a mixture born?

Gowdapdha says none of the three will work.

1. An existent thing originates is a logical fallacy because it already exists.
2. A nonexistent thing originates is fallacy because the subject for this sentence is nonexistent thing, which means subject doesn't exist. Grammatically it doesn't

hold.

3. A mixture is impossible because opposite things can't be mixed. Sat and asat can't be mixed. It is like mixing light and darkness.

Based on these six options our conclusion is there is no creation.

Law of conservation of matter:

matter can never be created. Then where is the question of creation. With this Gowdapadha concludes the creation based on the theory of karma,

Verse 23

This verse also is dvaidā vada condemnation. In this verse, he suggests some more argument and refutes them.

When we say sareeram is born out of karma, then the question is where the karma came from. To avoid this problem, the options are:

1. Can we take that the sareeram is born out of beginning-less karma? From anadhi karma sareeram is born
2. You can say that from anadhi sareeram, karma is born.
3. Both of them are simultaneously born.

Gowdapadha says all these three options are also illogical.

1. From the beginning-less body, you cannot talk about creation of karma. Karma can't be born out of beginning less body.
2. Body cannot be born out beginning-less karma
3. Both can't be together born by themselves without a

cause.

Every cause is an effect.

Beginning-less cause is not logical because it says beginning-less cause

produces effect. For this there is no example or reasoning.

Every

cause itself is an effect. This, we see in everyday life.

For example, father is the cause of his son,

but father is also effect of his parents. So, the first two options are negated.

If you say that the sareeram and karma happened without a cause, then

after attaining moksha also you don't have any guarantee of its

permanence. With no cause, you may become a samsari. Then why should I

struggle to attain moksha?

---

## Mandukya Upanishad, Class 57

Gowdapadha refuted Sankya theory of

creation from verses 11 to 13. From 14 to 23rd verse he is refuting the

theory of creation by dwaida philosophers who believe in a real creation.

They explain the creation with the karma theory. They explain that karma

is the cause for sareeram (punya pavam palam or dharma adharma palam); sareeram

is responsible for karma. Gowdapadha suggest six possibilities and

refutes everyone them and concludes that there is no legitimate theory of creation.

1. Karma as the original fundamental cause of creation. This is not possible because there is no karma without a sareeram; Baghawan can't give karma.
2. Sareeram is the original cause. A body can't exist without preceding karma. Bagawan can't determine the type of the body. Body can't accidentally come.
3. Both karma and sareeram originate simultaneously. This is not possible because they can't be mutually cause and effect; they will require some other cause.
4. Karma and sareeram being mutually cause and effect. Karma produces sareeream; sareeram produces karma; this is not possible because cause exist previous to effect; effect has to be later. Later one can never be cause of the previous one.
5. Karma sareeram chain. Karma producing sareeram; sareeram producing karma; karma producing next sareeram; next sareeram prodcing next karma. This will not solve the problem because which one is the first in this link? Karma or sarreram. Which one came first?
6. Karma sareeram chain is anadhi. There is no first one in this beginningless chain.

1. The adjective qualifies karma or sareeram or the chain? Which one is beginning-less? Karma can't

be

beginningless because it starts with sareeram;

Sareeram can't be

beginningless because it always start with karma.

You can't

attribute the adjective to the chain because chain is a concept and not

an object. You can't call the concept of chain as anadhi.

Other than the karma and sareeram, there is no substance. Chain is not a substance.

2. If there is a beginning less chain of karma sareeram,

does that beginning less chain have an end or not? If there is

no beginning or end, then there will be no moksha. Puranabi jananam

puranabi maranam will endlessly continue and there will be no possibility

of moksha.

3. If there is no beginning but there is an end, then the

end of the chain will be the beginning of moksha.

Whatever has a

beginning will have an end. Moksha will be subject to beginning and

end; moksha will be temporary.

Advaida Moola Karanam			
1. Verse 14: Karma	Karma is the cause of creation	Karma is created by sareeram or kartha.; Kartha or sareeram can't be the moola karanam	Example: Egg or chicken? Which one came first?
2. Verse 14: Sareeram	Sareeram is the moola karanam	A body can't exist without preceding karma. Bagawan can't determine the body. If Bagawan gives good body to some and bad body to other then, that Bagawan is partial.	If Bagawan gives the same body to everyone, there will only be male or female; there won't be any future generations.
3. Verse 15: Mutual	Karma is the cause of sareeram and sareeram is the cause of karma. Karma and sareeram are mutually cause and effect	Illogical because if one is the cause it must be earlier in time and if two is the effect, then it must be later in time. Later one can never be cause of the previous one.	
4. Verse 16: Simultaneous	Karma and sareeram are simultaneous products from which the whole creation started	If Karma and sareeram are simultaneous, they can't have cause effect relationship.. Some other cause for karma and sareeram will be required	Example: Two horns of an animal can't be mutually cause and effect.
5. Verse 18: It is in the form of cause effect chain	Previous karma produced this body; and this body does not produce another set of karma.	This does not answer which one is moola karanam. Which one is the first in this link? Karma or sareeram.	Example: Seed or tree? Which one came first?
6. This cause effect chain is anadhi (discussed later in Verse 30)	Creation is in the form of karma sareeram chain, which is anadhi. There is no first one in this chain.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There is no question of parambara; The adjective anadhi qualifies karma or sareeram or the chain? Karma can't be beginningless because it starts with sareeram; Sareeram can't be beginningless because it always start with karma. You can't attribute the adjective to the chain because chain is a concept and not an object.</li> <li>2. If there is no end for parambara, then there is no moksha. If there is no beginning or end, then there will be no moksha.</li> <li>3. If there is an end for parambara, then that will be the beginning of moksha which will have an ending. Moksha will be temporary.</li> <li>4. If there is moksha with a beginning and an end, how do you explain gyan moksha? If knowledge gives moksha, then moksha has a beginning. But gyanam does not produce moksha; Gyanam only reveals the fact that I am ever free. Gyanam removes the misconception that I am ever bound. Gyanam does not produce moksha.</li> </ol>	

Therefore, the theory of karma creation can't be logically explained. Therefore, there is no creation. There was Brahman, there is Brahman and there will be Brahman.

If you say there is no creation at all, then why are you talking about creation in scriptures – tatwa bodha and all the Upanishads? We don't accept creation at all, but a student in the beginning is not prepared to absorb the teaching of no creation. This is temporary acceptance of creation. Creation is not the real teaching but only a stepping stone.

14th verse considers options 1 and 2. Karma or sareeram can't be beginning-less cause. For those dwaida philosophers, sareeram is born out of karma; karma is the cause of sareeram; they also say sareeram is the cause of karma; but karma can't be beginning less cause; sareeram also can't be beginning less cause; both of them are born out of the other.

Verse 15

This verse considers fourth option above. Karma and sareeram are mutually produced. If cause

produces the effect, how can the effect can produce the cause. Effect is later; cause is former.

Later can never produce former. If karma and sareeram are mutually produced, then there will be a possibility of a son producing the father.

#### Verse 16

This verse considers third option above. Karma and sareeram originate simultaneously, then they will never have cause effect relationship. In an animal when two horns are simultaneously produced, one horn can't be the cause of the other. Similarly, karma and sareeram can't be born simultaneously. They will require some other cause for their birth. If you say they were born one after another, then which one is born first?

#### Verse 17

This is consolidation arguments for the first four options. Anadhi karma can't be cause of creation because any karma has to be produced by a sareeram. You can't say Bagawan gave a initial bundle of karma, because if Bagawan gives different bundles of karma, Bagawan will be partial. If he gives uniform karma, all will be males or females only and there won't be a next generation. If he makes some male and some female, then Bagawan is partial. Bagawan and world can't give karma. If Jiva has to produce karma, then sareeram is required. Karma can't be beginning-less karma. If beginning-less karma is not logically proved, how can that beginning-less karma produce jiva or the universe? It is not possible.

## Verse 18

Fifth option of cause effect chain

is considered. Body 1 produces Karma 1; karma 1 produces body 2; body 2

produces karma 2; and so on. This does not answer the first member of the

chain. Is it karma or sareeram? Where does the chain begin?

Gowdapadha does not discuss the

sixth option here (it is discussed in verse 30).

Sankarachariya discusses the sixth

option. The sixth option is chain is anadhi.

1. There is no question of parambara; it is only a concept; beginning less parabamaba does not exist.
2. If there is no end for prambara, then there is no moksha.
3. If there is an end for parambara, then that will be the beginning of moksha which will have an ending
4. If there is moksha with a beginning and an end, how do you explain moksha attained through knowledge? If knowledge gives moksha, then moksha has a beginning. But we do not say gyanam produces moksha; moksha is never produced. Gyanam only reveals the fact that I am ever free. Gyanam removes the misconception that I am ever bound. Gyanam does not produce moksha.

## Verse 19

If you say there is a creation, what is the cause? If you give an answer, that karma or sareeram is karanam, you will not be able to talk about the order of cause and effect.