

# 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. Jagrath sareeram is real only in jagrath 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 jagrath prabanha is also mithya. Each prabanja will appear real in that condition. Swapna prabanha will appear real for the swapna observer during swapna avastha; Jagrath prabanja will appear real for jagrath observer during jagrath avastha.	
39	Experience a mithya jagrath prabanja which produces a mithya vasana which produces a mithya swapna prabanja. Similar to VCP. From the standpoint of Jagrath Prabanja, Swapna prabanja is mithya	Experience a mithya jagrath prabanja. Because of ignorance, I look up on it as sathyam. Similar to VCR. From thuriya dhrishty, jagrath prabanja is mithya. You should never try to negate jagrath prabanja from the standpoint of waker. When you become a gyani, the jagrath 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 jagrath 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 jagrath 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 jagrath 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 jagradh 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 prabanha will appear real for the swapna observer during swapna avastha; Jagrath 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 Pragya. 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 at 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. Gowdapdha 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 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. 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 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  
dvaidā 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 dvaida 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 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 syas 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 advaidam there is no flow of consciousness, but it is one and eternal.

Gowdapdha 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 dvaida philosopher.

Advaida philosopher's inability to accept any of the six theories, reflects fundamental fallacy in dvaida 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 dwaidins, 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 questions:

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

Gowdapadha 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 dvaidha 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 sareeram; 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 producing next karma. This will not solve the problem because which one is the first in this link? Karma or sareeram. 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.

Advaita 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; 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 parambara does not exist.
2. If there is no end for parambara, 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 dhasaha
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 dwaida 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.  
Dwaida

philosophers offer law of karma as the ultimate answer. Gowdapadha suggests of six options for moola karanam for dwaida 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 unvierse  
is born out of prakrithi and therefore it is called prabanja  
is a product or  
kariyam. Therefore the kariyam is prabanja; Prabanja is  
anithyam,  
subject to beginning and end. Karanam is prakrithi and  
kariyam is  
prabanja.

Four defects or doshas of sankya

philosophy:

1. Principle number 1 karanam =Kariyam
2. Karanam = prakrith = nithya
3. Kariyam = prabanna = 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 karnam = kariyam; principle 3 says kariyam is anithyam; therefore karnam 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 prakarthi with prbanja 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 become jivatma due to maya or avidya. One day we will become paramatma. Paramatma 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 paramtama 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 paramtams; Moksha is not becoming or joining paramatma. It is knowing that I was paramtma, 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 an 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.