

# 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 karanam 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 Bahyarthha 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 dwaidda 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 heenayana 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, Gowdapadha 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, Gowdapadha 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  
vadinaha.

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 vadinaha
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 vadinaha. 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 vadinaha. Soonya vadinaha.

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 advantin 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 dvaidia philosopher.

Advaidia philosopher's inability to  
accept any of the six theories, reflects fundamental fallacy  
in dvaidia 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 dvaidins, 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?

Gowdaphda 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 dwaيدا 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 previous karma but produces 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 gyana moksha? If knowledge gives moksha, then moksha has a beginning. But gyanam does not produce moksha; Gyana only reveals the fact that I am ever free. Gyana removes the misconception that I am ever bound. Gyana 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 begining-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.

---

## Mandukya Upanishad, Class 56

Moksha is our very nature. Samsara exist only in the form of misconception in the mind and has nothing to do with the external world.

Since the whole problem is in the form of misconception that I am bound, the freedom is only freedom from this misconception. Freedom from any misconception is possible only with the right knowledge. Vedanta helps us in dropping the idea that I am bound. Dropping of the notion is figuratively presented as attainment of freedom or moksha.

This was summarized in up to the 10<sup>th</sup> verse.

From 11 to 13 verses, Gowdapdha points out four defects of Sankya philosophy.

1. Prakrithi anithyatha dhosaha
2. Prbanja nithytha dosaha
3. Yukthi virodha dosaha: Argument against reasoning; unreasonable argument.
4. Anavastha Dosaha: Non finality or infinite regress

Verse 11 and 12 describe the first two dosaha. In verse number 13, third and fourth dosha are described. First line deals with third dosha and the second line deals with the fourth dosha

Third dosha is that sankya philosophers point out that prakrithi is the moola karanam or absolute cause of the universe. The prakrithi is the cause of everything and that prkirthi is anadhi or beginning less. It is not a product or karyam. It is a causeless cause. Gowdapadha says this is illogical. Because any logical analysis is based on experiential data; otherwise it will be speculative. When we look at the creation the data, we collect is that every cause is effect. Parents are cause but they are also effect; they have a beginning and ending; similarly seed, tree etc. We do not see any karanam without beginning. Every karanam is a kariyam with a beginning. Whatever karanam has a beginning. Sankya philosophers say prakrithi is karanam but

they also say  
it is anadhi – without beginning. This is illogical. To  
prove this,  
they must show at least one example which they can't.

To avoid the problem in the third dosha,  
let us say that they accept prakrithi as a product and has a  
beginning.

Then if prakrithi has a beginning then what is the cause of  
the

prakrithi. If there is a prakrithi before this prakrithi,  
then what is

the cause of this prakrithi. This will go on forever, and you  
will not be

able to arrive at the moola karanam. You will never be able  
to explain

the root cause of universe. If you can't establish the cause,  
then you

can't establish the effect; if you can't establish the effect,  
you can't

establish a product. If you can't establish a product, then  
you can't

establish creation. Creation implies cause and product. If  
you knock off creation, then it is

vedanta. There was, is and will be Brahman and that Brahman  
is you.

Creation is a notion and a misconception that should be  
dropped.

Verse 14

From this verse to 23rd verse,

Gowdapadha is refuting all forms of dwaيدا philosophy, where  
they accept

creation and take support from Veda. They are vaidhiga  
philosopher and

this philosophy is based on the vedas. They argue that there  
is a



creation. Gowdapadha wants to refute and establish there is no creation at all. Ignorance solidified is creation. They depend up on theory of karma to establish creation. In Vedanta, law of karma is provisional answer, temporary concept to satisfy beginning students. Once the student reaches maturity, it is replaced by no creation theory. Dwaidha philosophers offer law of karma as the ultimate answer. Gowdapadha suggests of six options for moola karanam for dwaidha philosophy and refutes every one them. They say because of the karma (punyam and pavam) alone all living beings are created. Karma is the reason for all jiva rasi or sareeram. For the word karma Gowdapadha uses the word hethuhu and for sareeram he uses the word palam. The six options by Gowdapadha are:

1. Let us assume karma is the moola karanam of the universe.  
If punya pavam is the moola karanam from where did the punyam and pavam come? Punyam and pavam are generated out of karma and karma is generated by kartha. So, option 1 is wrong.
2. Is sareeram is the moola karanam? Bagawan gives bodies to everyone and with the body we produce karma. But if Baghawan to give bodies to all jivas, what type of body would Bagawan give? The type of body should be determined by karma. If

Bagawan gives good body to some and bad body to other then, that Bagavan is partial. So sareeram can't be moola karanam.

3. Karma and sareeram are mutually cause and effect.

Karma is the cause of sareeram and sareeram is the cause of karma.

If two things have mutual cause effect relationship it is 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. If they are mutually cause and

effect, then one must be earlier and then the other will be later.

It is like saying father has produced the son and the son has produced

father. This is not possible.

4. 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. For example, twins can't

have father son relationship. You will require some other cause for

karma and sareeram

5. It is in the form of cause effect chain. Karma 1 produces sareeram 1. Sareeram 1 produces karma 2. Karma 2

produces sareeram 2. Sareeram 2 produces karma 3. This is like

previous karma produced this body; and this body does not previous karma

but produces another set of karma. But this does not answer which

one is moola karanam. Whether the chain begins with karma or the

chain begins with sareeram.

6. This cause effect chain is anadhi. Creation is in the form of karma sareeram chain, which is anadhi. There are several defects in this theory.

1. When you say karma sareeram chain is anadhi, you are using the adjective anadhi – beginningless. Now there are three words: karma, sareeram and chain. When you add the adjective beginningless does this adjective qualify karma, sareeram or chain. Which one is beginningless? Karma, sareeram or chain. There is no answer to that. Adjective can't qualify karma because karma is produced by sareeram. Adjective can't qualify sareeram because every sareeram has a beginning. If you say karma-sareeram chain or flow is beginning less, there is no such thing called chain separate from the individual. Other than guru and sishya there is no prambara; it is only a concept. Similar to fruit salad. If you keep removing all the fruits from the fruit salad, there is no such thing called salad. It is a concept, not a thing. Family is a concept and not a thing; there is no society other than individual. Therefore the chain does not exist.

---

# Mandukya Upanishad, Class 55

In the first five verses, Gowdapadha offered namaskara to guru and talked about the glory of teaching. The glory being it is beyond argument or vivaharam. From the sixth verse to 10th, Gowdapadha summarizes the vedantic teaching. The essence being we are always free, and moksha is not a goal to be achieved. We are ever free brahman. Neither the jivatma nor jagat born out of Brahman. Therefore, we need not become free. Since we are all ever free, what is required is owning up of this fact. If it is an event in future, then it will be temporary because it is in time and space and it will be temporary. Our problem is the delusion born out of ignorance. The freedom we require is freedom from the delusion. Because our own conditioning we are away from our own nature and what is required is deconditioning.

## Verse 11

From the 11th verse onwards Gowdapadha negates other systems of philosophy.

- Asthika, accepting vedas
  - Sankya Dharshanam
  - Gyaya dharshanam
- Nasthika, not accepting vedas

Sankya and Gyaya philosophies propose different theories of creation; vedanta says there is no creation at all. these two philosophies quarrel among themselves and mutually cancel each other. Sankya dharshanam is a powerful philosophy and requires negation. In the chapter 2 of Baghawad Gita, vedanta is called sankya philosophy. This is a philosophy established by Kapila muni (not the one from Baghawatham). The verses 11, 12 and 13 negate sankya philosophy. Gowdapadha does not negate gyaya philosophy because it is fundamentally flawed: A nonexistent thing originated. This can be dismissed due to the two defects:

1. Grammatical: When you say nonexistent thing originated, originate is the verb and nonexistent is the subject which means there is no subject. With no subject, it does not grammatically correct
2. Fundamental: Origination of nonexistent thing is against the law of conservation which says matter cannot be created or destroyed. Energy also cannot be created or destroyed. So, a fresh thing cannot be created.

Sankya philosophy says a nonexistent effect can never originate therefore I do not propose a production of pot, tree etc. Sankya says no new matter is created when a pot is produced, but before the production of pot, the pot was not in pot form; it was in some other

form. Pot before production existed in some other form – in lump form; curd existed in the form of milk; tree existed in the form of seed; Therefore, a karanam is that which is kariyam itself in some other form. When you want to produce kariyam, the karanam itself is modified into a new shape or kariyam. Production is the process of converting something from karana avastha to kariya avastha. When you bring about this conversion, certain faculties which were there in dormant form in karana avastha will become manifested in kariya avastha. Every production is a transformation; e.g. gold into ring; tree from seed; etc. Sankya philosophers accept karnam and kariyam are essentially one and the same substance; the difference is only in the state or avasta or configuration. Gold and Ring, Milk and curd contain the same matter the difference is only configuration. Ice, water and vapor are all the same H<sub>2</sub>O. The difference is the state – solid, liquid and vapor. Vedanta agrees with this principle within limited scope. This theory will be in trouble when you apply to the cosmos. First principle is karanam equals kariyam

The next principles is cause of the universe is called prakrithi or pradhanam. This karanam is nithyam.

This karnam, prakrithi (cause) is nithyam

The third principle is the universe  
is born out of prakrithi and therefore it is called prabhanja  
is a product or  
kariyam. Therefore the kariyam is prabhanja; Prabhanja is  
anithyam,  
subject to beginning and end. Karanam is prakrithi and  
kariyam is  
prabhanja.

Four defects or doshas of sankhya  
philosophy:

1. Principle number 1 karanam =Kariyam
2. Karanam = prakrithi = nithya
3. Kariyam = prabhanna = anithyam.

According to principles 2 karanam is  
nithyam; according to principles 1 karanam = kariyam;  
therefore, kariyam must  
also be nithyam; but the third principles says kariyam is  
anithyam. This  
is the first defect.

Principle number 1 karanam =  
kariyam; principle 3 says kariyam is anithyam; therefore  
karanam must also be  
anithyam; but principle 2 says karanam is nithyam. This is  
the second  
defect. These two fallacies are mentioned in verses 11 and  
12.

Verse 12

Second line of this verse is same as  
the verse 11.

If you join principle 1 and 2, it  
will contradict third principle. If you equate prakrithi with  
prabhanja and

say one is nithyam and another is anithyam; either you must say both are nithyam or both are anithyam.

### Verse 13

One more principle of sankya philosophy: They arrive at prakrithi and its faculty with the help of reasoning. The prakrithi which is pradhanam or moola prakrithi or the original cause of the universe. That prakrithi is not perceptible.

I arrived at prakrithi with anumana pramadhanam and the other name is anumanam.

From prakthyasha we experience smoke and fire and we come to know that wherever there is smoke there is fire, From that we got the invariable co-existence of smoke and fire. If you see smoke alone in one place, you can conclude there is fire. This is inference arrived at by co-existence. Through inference Sankya philosopher talks about prakrithi and says prakrithi is the karanam for whole universe and it is nithyam. Vedantin says the perceptual data from our experience is that every cause we always see itself is a product. Parents are products of their cause. Seed is a product, but it is the cause of tree. Therefore, it is anithyam. Whatever is cause is anithyam. If go by that reasoning, that all karnams are anithyam, prakrithi is karanam it should be anithyam. Proper inference is prakrithi is anithya and karanam.



Sankya does not have any anumanam to show an eternal karanam. All data prove that all karanam are anithyam. That is why god will become non eternal if god is a cause.

---

## Mandukya Upanishad, Class 54

In the first five verses, Gowdapadha offered namaskara to guru and talked about the glory of teaching. From the sixth verse to 10th, Gowdapadha summarizes the vedantic teaching. Verses 6, 7 and 8 are repetition of the third chapter verses 20, 21 and 22.

If the nature of paramatma is not clearly understood, it will create several misconceptions and the idea of moksha itself will be long; converting moksha to a future event, which is logically not possible. If our sadhana is in proper direction, the nature of paramatma should be very clear. People commit two mistakes:

1. First mistake is thinking that Paramatma now has becomes jivatma due to maya or avidya. One day we will become paramatma. Parmatma becoming jivatma is samsara and jivatma becoming paramatma is moksha. However, paramatma can never become jivatma therefore there is no question of jivatma becoming paramatma. Paramatma is

not subject to modification, therefore he can't become anything. Paramatma misunderstood is jivatma and jivatma properly understood is paramatma.

2. Second mistake is thinking Jivatma was with paramatma before and that jivatma was separated from paramatma. Jivatma has to trek and toil and gradually go nearer and nearer to paramatma. This implies some kind of merger with jivatma and paramatma and that is moksha. This is blunder number 2 because there is no question of anything coming from paramata because paramatma is all pervading principle. In the field of two finite things, separation and unit is possible; but in the case of infinite all pervading paramatma there is no separation and unity. Separation is not a physical event, but a misconception.

First point is there is no question of becoming paramatma; second point is there is no question of joining paramatma.

#### Verse 7

Immortal paramatma can never become mortal jivatma. Mortal jivatma can never become immortal paramatma. Finite can't become infinite through a process; infinite can't become finite. When we say I want to become liberated means "become" immortal. Does immortal want to become mortal or mortal wants to become immortal. Very attempt for liberation is misconception. Liberation is from the idea that I need to get liberated. That idea itself is wrong and understanding that idea is wrong is moksham. The essential nature of a thing can never undergo a change. If mortality is my essential nature, I will remain mortal; if immortality is my real nature, I need not work for immortality.

#### Verse 8

Gowdapdha makes a supposition to satisfy others: For the sake of argument, let us assume that paramatma has become jivatma. By doing sadhanas, struggling jivatma trying to become paramatma. Immortal paramatma has becomes mortal jivatma; If immortal paramatma can becomes mortal jivatma once, what is the guarantee that the immortal paramatma will not become mortal jivatma.

The same argument holds true for merger also; If you join the paramatma by joining, what is guarantee that you will be with paramatma all the time. If you separated once, what is the guarantee you will not be separated again?

There is no question of becoming or joining paramatmas; Moksha is not becoming or joining paramatma. It is knowing that I was paramatma, I am paramatma and I will ever be paramatma. It is pure ignorance and error. What we need to do is correct the error. Gyanam is the only solution. Vedanta does not fulfill your expectation; it says your expectation is wrong.

## Verse 9

Here Gowdapadha defines essential nature. Paramatma's essential nature is immortality. He gives four examples for essential nature:

1. Extraordinary powers accomplished by sidha purusha, which he accomplished through many sadhanas in previous

births. When

a person practices those sadhanas in the previous jenma, they get

miraculous powers. Those powers are his own intrinsic nature.

2. Intrinsic properties of certain materials like heat of the fire. Similarly paramatma's intrinsic nature is immortality
3. Inborn faculties of certain living being. Like flying capacity of birds; swimming capacity of fish;
4. Certain natural traits of certain objects in the creation. Like water flowing downwards. These traits will never disappear.

Similarly, paramatma's intrinsic nature is immortality.

#### Verse 10

Gowdapadja concludes the summary of

vedanta. Whatever is natural, I will be comfortable with that. If anything,

unnatural enters the system, then the system struggles.

Mortality is not

my nature, but immortality is my nature. But I have conditioned myself to

the thought that I am mortal. Ignorance is a unique principle which does

not have a beginning but can have an end. Because of the beginning-less

ignorance, there is the mistake that I am mortal, and you eliminate that

mistake. Understanding that there is no samsara to remove, is

figuratively called removing samsara.

---

# Mandukya Upanishdad, Class 53

Advaidam is beyond all disputes. In verses 3, 4 and 5 Gowdapadha shows how advaidam doesn't have any disputes with other systems of philosophies. The difference of opinions is primarily was the creation. No system of philosophy is able to agree with other system and they form rival groups.

The two theories of creation discussed later are:

1. Sath kariya vadhaha: This is sankya philosopher founded by Kapila Muni.
2. Asath kariya vadhaha: Founded by gyaya philosopher or vaisheshika philosopher.

They argue whether there is an existent world originated or nonexistent world originated. Advaidin can't join either one as he will be attacked by the other. Advaidin do not join any particular theory of creation. We don't hold any theory of creation at all. What is the advadic theory of creation? In advaidam, there is no theory of creation because there is no creation at all. If I accept creation, I have to explain the method of creation. What is in front of us is not a world, but Brahman. What was there was Brahman; and what will

be there is Brahman. Therefore, there is no creation, no theory of creation.

Sankya philosophers say an existent product originated. Gyaya philosophers say that an existent product need not originate at all, therefore a non-existent product originates.

#### Verse 4

Vaisheshika philosopher refutes sankya philosopher by saying an existent product can never originate because it is already existent. Sankya philosophers refute vaisheshika philosophers by saying a nonexistent pot can not originate and existent pot need not originate. Matter can never be created. A nonexistent pot originates, is grammatically wrong. Action can never exist by itself. A grammatical sentence requires a verb and subject. In this sentence the verb is originates. What is the subject of this verb? According vaisheshika, the subject is nonexistent pot, which means there is no subject. By refuting each other, they indirectly refuting the origination of the world. One group refutes the origination of existent pot another group refutes the origination of nonexistent pot; with the result there is no question of arrival of pot. This is biggest confusion of human intellect. Pot has not arrived at all because there is no substance called pot. The substance is only clay. Pot is not a

substance; it  
is a word. World is not a substance; it is only a word.  
There is no  
origination of anything other than a new name called world.  
Any product  
is not a substance, it is a new word initiated by your  
tongue. When  
jivatma are not born, where is the question of rebirth? The  
biggest  
samsara is the desire for moksha. I was the paramatma, I am  
the pramatma  
and I ever will be paramatma. There is no coming and joining  
of  
jivatma. It is all confusion and it is Maya.

#### Verse 5

The non origination of the world is  
indirectly supported by both the sankya and gyaya philosophers  
by refuting each  
other. The refuting of creation is the teaching of vedantic  
philosophy. We acknowledge their contribution to advaidam.  
We never  
argue with them. The glory of advaida is it is argument free  
teaching.

#### Verse 6

The word avivadhah means the advadic  
teaching is beyond dispute. This was explained in the verses  
3, 4 and  
5. From verse 6 to 10, Gowdapadha gives the essence of  
advaidic perspective.  
Advaidin has freed himself from the basic mistake all the  
philosophers  
commit. Freedom from this basic mistake is moksha. Verses 6,  
7 and  
8 are repetition of the third chapter verses 20, 21 and 22.

The mistake people commit that there is a paramatma which is the cause of this universe. Paramatma is the karanam and the universe is kariyam. The world has come from god and we jivas have also come from god. This jivatma is caught up in the world of samsara which is full of suffering until the jivatma goes back and merges into paramatma. Most of the seekers pray only for that "I have come away from god, at the time of moksha I go back to him". The fundamental concept is I have to join god. The day I merge into that Lord, I will be eternally free or muktha. All these views are entertained without taking into account, the nature of paramatma. "Eternal paramatma is the cause of the world" is a logical contradiction. Cause means modification, eternal means modification free. If the god is the cause, he can't be eternal. If God is eternal, he can't be cause. This is the fundamental mistake. Jivatma is not a product of paramatma, but jivatma is none other than paramatma. Making paramatma a cause is not a glorification of god; it is an insult to god because how can the changeless paramata ever become the changing cause of the universe.

---



# Mandukya Upanishad, Class 52

In the first verse of this chapter, Gowdapadhachariyar is performing namaskara to Lord Narayana. Lord has all forms of knowledge. Lord also has jivatma paramatma aikya gyanam, which alone is the subject matter of vedanta and that gyanam alone he gives to his students. When we say jivatma paramatma aikyam, Jivatma is the subject, paramatma is the object and the knowledge is aikyam. But for the lord all the three are same.

This knowledge is a unique knowledge different from all other forms of knowledge. In all the other forms of knowledge (para vidya), there are three factors, subject, object and instrument. In this para vidya, the subject, object and the instrument are one and the same. Paramatma the subject of the knowledge, jivatma the object of the knowledge and the instrument of knowledge are all one and the same. Jivatma, paramatma and instrument are chaithanyam, the nature of conscience. Lord has such a unique aikya knowledge. This chaithanyam is like all pervading space. Space like consciousness knows space like consciousness through space like consciousness.

## Verse 2

In the second verse, Gowdapadha offers namaskara to this gyanam. He talks about the glory of self knowledge.

First glory is asparsa yogaha because one gains knowlege of thiriya atma, which is asparsaga. It is timeless, space less infinite nondual realty. Asparsagaha means relationless. The infinite atma does not have a second thing. It can't have relationship with the world and its people because from Thuiryum standpoint, they lower order of realty. Just like waker can't have a relationship with a dream individual. I am the relation less thuriyum is this knowledge.

Second glory is sarva sattva sukaha;  
for every human being this atma gives ananda. Everything in the world gives ananda, but it also gives dhukkam. Example: Rama is the source of Ananda for Kowsalya, but Rama was also source of dhukkam when he has to go to forest. If an object gives ananda now, it will give sorrow when it goes away. If an object gives sorrow now, it will give ananda when it leaves. Glory of atma is it gives ananda only.

Third glory hithaha; it is also good for us; it contributes to our well being. There are many worldly things that gives pleasure for us, but they are not good for us; e.g. liquor, sweets etc.

Fourth glory is avivadhaha; beyond all arguments. This will be explained later. It is beyond arguments because it is beyond logic.

Fifth glory is aviruddhaha; it does not contradict any philosophy.

Every system of philosophy has a particular theory of creation. Every theory criticize another theory. Vedanta doesn't contradict other

theories of creation because vedanta doesn't have any theory of creation.

Because vedanta doesn't believe in creation. Brahman is ultimate reality,

where there is no creation; no cause, no result and no time.

It is

timeless reality. Vedanta accepts any theory of creation only temporarily; Every other theory is talk about vyavakarika sathyam;

Vedanta is talking about paramarthika sathyam.

Sixth glory is desitaha: that this teaching can only be gained from a

guru. It can't be independently gathered by self or independent study or meditation.

Gowdapadha talks about advaidam all

the time, but here he is offering namaskara; who is doing namaskara to

whom? How is that possible? He is

talking from vyavakarika dhrishti where there is only dwaidam;

Verse 3

In verses 3 and 4, Gowdapadhachariyar

explains the word avivadhaha. Why do we

say vedanta is beyond argument? I need not argue with any other philosopher

because they all quarrel among themselves and mutually cancel each other; I,

standing as a witness prevail. When all the theories of creation are

cancelled then what is left is no theory or vedanta.

The two theories of creation

discussed later are:

1. Sath kariya vadhaha: This is sankya philosophy founded

by Kapila Muni.

2. Asath kariya vadhaha: Founded by gnyaya philosopher or vaisheshika philosopher.

Example: Creation of a pot out of clay: out of clay the creator creates pot. Fundamental question is, now the pot is created, before the creation of the pot, did the pot exist in the clay or not. Pot is the product or kariyam; clay is the karanam; Before the creation of kariyam, did the kariyam already exist in the karanam or not. Does an existent pot originate or does a non existent pot originate? Sankya philosophers say only an existent pot originate; this is sath kariya vadhaha. Gnyaya philosophers say, non existent pot originate. This is asath kariya vadhaha. In reality, there is no creation; the word creation confuses everyone. According science matter can not be created or destroyed; consciousness can't be created or destroyed. Then where is the question of creation.