

अद्वैत मकरन्द

श्री लक्ष्मीधर कवि

In this document, an attempt has been made to understand the beautiful and important text, Advaita Makaranda, through the lens of the five-fold logical syllogism (पञ्चाङ्ग न्याय). The five components are Pratijna, Hetu, Drshtanta, Darshtanta or Upanayana, and Nigamana. One subcomponent of Hetu is Vyapti. They will be explained below.

This is not a commentary or a translation, instead it aims to understand the thought process of the author, who wrote this text with an aim at clarifying the Upanishadic teaching through the use of logic.

श्लोक १ कटाक्षकिरणाचान्त-नमन्मोहाब्धये नमः।

अनन्तानन्दकृष्णाय जगन्मंगलमूर्तये ॥ १ ॥

The first shloka is a mangalacharana shloka – in which the author expresses his devotion toward his teacher – possibly named Swami Anantanandaji, and also to his Ishta Devata Lord Krishna.

श्लोक २ अहमस्मि सदा भामि कदाचिन्नाऽहमप्रियः।

ब्रह्मैवाहमतः सिद्धं सच्चदानन्दलक्षणम् ॥ २ ॥

प्रतिज्ञा (1) Pratijna - Proposition	I am Brahman.
हेतु (2) Hetu - Justification	समानलक्षणत्वात् Because my 'qualities' are the 'qualities' of brahman. (Here 'qualities' is not referring to attributes but to my three-fold nature of existence-consciousness-bliss.) अस्मि=सत्, भामि=चित्, प्रिय=आनन्द. As for the word “सदा” – I the witness remain ever the same throughout all different states, therefore also in the attainment of further bodies, as explained in Panchadashi1.6 and 1.7.

<p style="text-align: center;">व्याप्ति</p> <p>Vyapti – Invariable Concomitance, also called “Constant Conjunction”</p>	<p>लक्षणसामान्याद् वस्तुसाम्यम् – Identical attributes indicate identity between two seemingly different entities. In other words they are not two different entities, they are one.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">दृष्टान्त</p> <p>(3) Drshtanta - Illustration</p>	<p>For example – A person may know Brahmachari Paramesh only by his purvashram name, Ramesh. However, upon seeing that Br. Paramesh has the same qualities as Ramesh, the person realizes that they are one and the same.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">दार्ष्टान्त</p> <p>(4) Darstanta – Explanation of the illustration with regard to the justification.</p>	<p>The way that Ramesh and Br. Paramesh are known as one through their identical attributes, similarly both Brahman and I, the Self, are ever existent, ever consciousness, and most beloved, i.e. of the nature of bliss.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">निगमन</p> <p>(5) Nigamana - Conclusion</p>	<p>Therefore, brahman and I are not two; rather, I <i>am</i> brahman.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Notes</p>	<p>This shloka is the proposition for the whole text – which will be elaborated on with subpropositions and their justifications in subsequent shlokas. They are all connected to this – the central thrust of Advaita Makaranda.</p>

श्लोक ३

मय्येवोदेति चिद्योमि जगद्गन्धर्वपत्तनम्।

अतोऽहं न कथं ब्रह्म सर्वज्ञं सर्वकारणम्॥ ३ ॥

<p>प्रतिज्ञा</p>	<p>I am the material cause of the universe, and [therefore] omniscient.</p> <p>Note: This is the first sub-proposition. Remember that the author is trying to show that the Self is Brahman through indicating the identical nature of the Self and Brahman. Brahman is the material cause of the universe, and as all names and forms rise from consciousness, and the self being consciousness, the Self is the material cause of the universe, and none other than Brahman. This point won't be elaborated in each shloka, it should be understood that they all connect in this way to Shloka 2.</p>
<p>हेतु</p>	<p>Because the universe of names and forms, though illusory, depends on consciousness for its existence, and I am consciousness.</p>
<p>व्याप्ति</p>	<p>If A depends on B for its existence, then B is the material cause of A. For example a pot depends on clay for its existence; therefore clay is the material cause of the pot.</p>
<p>दृष्टान्त</p>	<p>For example, a castle in the sky depends on the sky for its existence, in that it is nothing other than sky. So the sky is the material cause of the castle appearing there.</p>

दार्ष्टान्त	The world of names and forms is appearing in the space of consciousness. The names and forms have no reality of their own, they are “वाचारम्भणम् विकारो न मधेयम्” (Chandogya ch.6).
निगमन	Therefore, I, consciousness, am the material cause of the world.

श्लोक ४

न स्वतः प्रत्यभिज्ञानान्निरंशत्वान्नचाऽन्यतः।

न चाऽश्रयविनाशान्मे विनाशः स्यादनाश्रयात् ॥ ४ ॥

प्रतिज्ञा	I am indestructible (अविनाशी)
हेतु	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) I can't be destroyed by myself, because I am continuous, which is proved by the continuity of my experience, even through changing states. 2) I can't be destroyed by another entity, because I (consciousness) am partless, and to be destroyed by some other entity, that entity must destroy some part of mine by which I am destroyed. 3) I have no substratum, so I cannot die by the destruction of my substratum.
व्याप्ति	Wherever there is destruction of an entity, it must come only from itself, some other entity, or by the destruction of its support/substratum.
दृष्टान्त	<p>[Here the illustrations will be “व्यतिरेक”, or “opposite” examples].</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The destruction of ice comes from itself – as it is not continuous through different states like hot and cold. 2) The destruction of a human body can come from another entity; to destroy the body, the other entity must destroy a part of the body like the heart or the brain and the entire body will subsequently be destroyed. 3) The death of hair and nails comes from the death of the body on which they grow, i.e. the death of their substratum.
दार्ष्टान्त	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Unlike ice, consciousness is continuous (as “I”) in all states, so it can't have self-destruction. 2) Unlike a body, consciousness has no parts, so it can't be destroyed by another entity. (Note: Here the positive example of space may be used, as it is also indestructible due to its partlessness. The example is the premise for the next shloka.) 3) Unlike the hair on a dead body, consciousness has no substratum, so it can't be destroyed by the destruction of its substratum.
निगमन	I, consciousness, am indestructible.

श्लोक ५

न शोषलोषविक्लेदच्छेदाश्चिन्नभसो मम।

सत्यैरप्यनिलाग्र्यंभः शस्त्रैः किमुत कल्पितैः ॥ ५ ॥

प्रतिज्ञा	(continued from last verse) I am indestructible, specifically, my destruction cannot come from another entity.
हेतु	(reproduced from the previous verse) - I can't be destroyed by another entity, because I (consciousness) am partless, and to be destroyed by some other entity, that entity must destroy some part of mine by which I am destroyed.
व्याप्ति	Whenever object A is destroyed by object B, it is because object B destroyed some part of object A through which object A's total destruction is brought about.
दृष्टान्त	Space is partless, so it can't be dried, wet, burned, or cut by the other four elements – air, water, fire, and weapons (earth), respectively.
दार्ष्टान्त	Space is indestructible because it is partless, so I, consciousness, am also indestructible due to my partlessness. Also, space shares the same level of reality with the other four elements, but everything other than me depends on me for its reality. So if 'real' elements can't destroy space, what to talk of unreal objects destroying me. This second level of reasoning is known as कैमुतिक न्याय
निगमन	I, the self, am indestructible.
Note	To see the connection of this verse to the previous, see the parenthetical note in the दार्ष्टान्त section of Shloka 4.

श्लोक ६

अभारूपस्य विश्वस्य भानं भासन्निर्धेर्विना।

कदाचिन्नाऽवकल्पेत भा चाऽहं तेन सर्वगः ॥ ६ ॥

प्रतिज्ञा	I am all-pervading.
हेतु	Because the insentient universe cannot be illumined without consciousness, and yet it IS illumined.
व्याप्ति	Wherever there is a known object – there must be a knower.
दृष्टान्त	Like if there is any known website – then there must be an internet connection. The internet connection pervades all websites, which is the way they are all known.
दार्ष्टान्त	Like the internet connection, consciousness illumines all objects (the entire universe). It must be all-pervading because the universe is all 'seen' (दृश्य)
निगमन	Therefore, I, consciousness, am all-pervading.

श्लोक ७

न हि भानादृते सत्त्वं नर्ते भानं चितोऽचितः ।

चित्सम्बन्धोऽपि नाध्यासादृते तेनाऽहमद्वयः ॥ ७ ॥

प्रतिज्ञा	I am non-dual.
हेतु	Because there is nothing other than consciousness (anything other than consciousness must only be superimposed on consciousness).
व्याप्ति	Wherever there is an effect (that which depends on a cause for its existence), it is non-different from the cause. It is simply distinguished from the cause by words, not in reality.
दृष्टान्त	Without space, there can't be any "blueness of the sky." In other words, the blueness depends on space for its existence. And if there seems to be something 'in' the space (namely, the blueness), it can only be there by superimposition, as there is nothing really there other than space.
दार्ष्टान्त	Like space and blueness, consciousness is necessary for the perception of objects. However, if it seems as though there is something other than consciousness, it can only be a superimposition on consciousness. Here it must be understood that the existence of objects depends on experience. And experience of inert objects is not possible without consciousness. Therefore inert objects depend on consciousness for their existence. Thus the cause-effect relationship between consciousness and the inert universe is established. As the effect is non-different than the cause, and consciousness cannot possibly ever be inert, the appearance of inert objects is merely a superimposition on consciousness, and not a reality in itself.
निगमन	Therefore, though it seems there exist both consciousness and inert matter, it is proved that, because inert matter is merely a superimposition on consciousness, there is only consciousness – it is non dual.

श्लोक ८

न देहो नेन्द्रियं चाहं न प्राणो न मनो न धीः ।

ममता परिरब्धत्वादाक्रीडत्वादिदं धियः ॥ ८ ॥

प्रतिज्ञा	I am not body, mind, intellect, senses, or vital airs. i.e. I am not my limiting adjuncts.
हेतु	Because there is a sense of "my" in these limiting adjuncts, as is there a sense of "this."
व्याप्ति	If any object is identified as "my," it must necessarily be different than "I," because it connotes a relation between "I" and that object. Similarly, with the identification "this."

दृष्टान्त	Like a house or a pot. The house which is identified as “my” house must be different than me. The pot which I call “this pot,” must be different than me, otherwise I wouldn’t be able to indicate it as “this.”
दार्ष्टान्त	Like the house/pot, these senses, body, vital airs, mind, and intellect are all known as “my,” and “this,” therefore they must be different than me.
निगमन	Therefore I am not my limiting adjuncts (उपाधिस).

श्लोक ९

साक्षी सर्वान्वितः प्रेयानहं नाहं कदाचन्।

परिणामपरिच्छेदपरितापैरुपप्लवात् ॥ ९ ॥

प्रतिज्ञा	I, consciousness, am not the individual ‘ego’ (अहङ्कार)
हेतु	Because the attributes of the Self and the individual ego contradict each other; i.e. they are incompatible. (विरुद्धलक्षणत्वात्)
व्याप्ति	Wherever two objects have differing attributes, no claim of identity between them can be made.
दृष्टान्त	Like pot and cloth can’t be said to be one, as they have different qualities. Or, more relevantly, fire and an iron ball placed in the fire appear to be one red-hot fire ball. However, despite the fact that they <i>appear</i> as one, they are in reality two because their attributes are opposed to one another. E.g. the coldness, heaviness, hardness, and black colour of iron cannot possibly belong to fire, nor can the heat, weightlessness, and red colour possibly belong to iron.
दार्ष्टान्त	Similar to the red hot iron ball, the general conception of the self is a combination of consciousness and individual experiencer which appears as a singular entity. However, it is shown that matter is subject to modification, finite, and subject to sorrow and pain, which are all attributes contrary to those of consciousness – being free from modification, infinite, and happiness.
निगमन	Therefore, the Self, consciousness, is definitely NOT the individual ego (अहङ्कार) [though they <i>appear</i> to be one].

श्लोक १०

सुप्तेऽहमि न दृश्यन्ते दुःखदोषप्रवृत्तयः।

अतस्तस्यैव संसारो न मे संसर्तृसाक्षिणः ॥ १० ॥

प्रतिज्ञा	I have no transmigration (संसार).
-----------	-----------------------------------

हेतु	Because I am present in deep sleep (as the witness of the ‘nothingness’ or ignorance), but in deep sleep there is an absence of the defects of transmigration.
व्याप्ति	This is a logical process called अन्वय-व्यतिरेक . If I’m trying to disprove a connection between object A and object B, I need only find a situation where object A is present and object B is absent.
दृष्टान्त	Like an actor who plays different character-roles. The qualities of those characters are not in him, because he remains consistent while the roles and their attributes change – therefore the attributes of the character roles are not in the actor.
दार्ष्टान्त	Like the actor, I, consciousness, appear as the waker, the dreamer, and the deep sleeper. Transmigration (संसार) or experiential movement from thought to thought, is present in waking and dream, but absent in deep sleep. However, I am present in deep sleep; therefore transmigration cannot belong to me. In fact, I am the witness of the transmigratory entity – the intellect with the reflection of consciousness.
निगमन	Therefore I, the witness-consciousness, have no transmigration.

श्लोक ११

सुप्तः सुप्तिं न जानाति नासुप्ते स्वप्नजागरौ।

जाग्रत्स्वप्नसुषुप्तीनां साक्ष्यतोऽहमतद्दशः ॥ ११ ॥

प्रतिज्ञा	I, the witness consciousness, have no states (अवस्था s).
हेतु	Because consciousness does not sleep, instead it illumines deep sleep; the one who is sleeping, the individual ego (अहङ्कार), alone can be the waker or the dreamer, and consciousness merely illumines those states of waking and dream – it does not ‘go through’ them.
व्याप्ति	The attributes of the witnessed object are never the attributes of the witness.
दृष्टान्त	Like the seer of the pot will not have the attributes of roundness and brownness just because he is witnessing the pot – in fact being the witness of those attributes distinguishes him from them.
दार्ष्टान्त	Similarly, the witness of the individual ego (अहङ्कार) will witness the ego’s attributes, including the states that it undergoes such as waking, dream, and deep sleep. The ego itself won’t be able to know sleep because it is sleeping.
निगमन	Therefore, I have no states, like waking, dream, and deep sleep. Instead I am their witness.

श्लोक १२

विज्ञानविरतिः सुप्तिस्तज्जन्म स्वप्नजागरौ।

तत्साक्षिणः कथं मे स्युर्नित्यज्ञानस्य ते त्रयः ॥ १२ ॥

प्रतिज्ञा	(continued from last verse) I have no changing states.
हेतु	The states (waking, dream, and deep sleep) are characterized by the coming and going of knowledge, whereas my unalienable nature is knowledge itself.
व्याप्ति	The nature (स्वरूप) of an object can never be separated from that object.
दृष्टान्त	Fire can never be without heat and light. Sugar can never be without sweetness. There can be no situation in which there IS fire but no heat.
दार्ढ्यन्त	The self is ever of the nature of knowledge. Knowledge of objects is present in waking and dream but not in deep sleep, so these states can't belong to the Self, consciousness, whose very nature (स्वरूप) is knowledge.
निगमन	I, the self, have no changing states.

श्लोक १३

षड्विकारवतां वेत्ता निर्विकारोऽहमन्यथा।

तद्विकारानुसन्धानं सर्वथा नावकल्पते ॥ १३ ॥

प्रतिज्ञा	I, consciousness, am not subject to modifications.
हेतु	Because I know the change, the change does not belong to me.
व्याप्ति	Wherever change is witnessed, it must be from a relatively unchanging standpoint.
दृष्टान्त	From the perspective of a gold ornament, it won't be able to know its own creation, change, and destruction, but from the perspective of the gold it can be known.
दार्ढ्यन्त	Similar to the gold – the Self, the witness consciousness, is able to perceive and remember the six modifications (birth, corporeality, growth, adolescence, decay, and death) only because it is different from that which has the modifications.
निगमन	I, the witness consciousness, have no changes or modifications.

श्लोक १४

तेन तेन हि रूपेण जायते लीयते मुहुः।

विकारि वस्तु तसैषाम् अनुसङ्घातृता कुतः ॥ १४ ॥

प्रतिज्ञा	(continued from last verse) I have no modifications.
हेतु	I, the witness, can remember the changes of this collection of limiting adjuncts (सङ्घात) which is constantly changing. Remembering the change would be impossible if I myself was changing.
व्याप्ति	(from last verse) Wherever change is witnessed, it must be from a relatively unchanging standpoint.
दृष्टान्त	Like the one sitting in a train cannot directly perceive the movement of an adjacent train moving at the same speed in the same direction. Only one standing on the ground can see the speed and movement of the train rolling past, for the reason that he is himself unmoving.
दार्ढ्यन्त	Similar to the person standing on the ground – the Self, the witness consciousness, is able to perceive and remember the six modifications (birth, corporeality, growth, adolescence, decay, and death) only because it itself does not have them. A person in a moving train, if he is staring at a seat, will not be able to recollect when the train sped up or slowed down, because he himself is constantly moving with the train. This collection of limiting adjuncts is constantly changing – it can be said that it is different every moment. So, the fact being that it is different every moment, it is impossible for it to remember any change from previous iterations. Only an unchanging witness, consciousness, could produce such a memory.
निगमन	Therefore I have no modifications.

श्लोक १५

न च स्वजन्म नाशं वा द्रष्टुमर्हति कश्चन।

तौ हि प्रागुत्तराभावचरमप्रथमक्षणौ ॥ १५ ॥

प्रतिज्ञा	(continued from last two verses) I have no birth (I have no modifications).
हेतु	No object can know its own birth or death, yet both the birth and death of this body are illumined by consciousness.
व्याप्ति	Any entity cannot know its own birth, as birth is defined as the last moment of its prior nonexistence. Nor can it know its own death, as death is the first moment of its posterior nonexistence. In other words at the very moment of an entity's birth and death, that entity is non-existent, therefore unable to know that moment.

दृष्टान्त	A lamp cannot illumine the moment that it is lit, nor the moment it is extinguished.
दार्ढान्त	This body cannot know the moment of its birth and death, yet those moments are known, in that they are illumined by consciousness. That fact proves that consciousness itself is not born, nor does it die.
निगमन	The self, आत्मा, consciousness, has no birth and no death, no modifications at all.

श्लोक १६

न प्रकाशेऽहमित्युक्तिः यत्प्रकाशनिबन्धना।

स्वप्रकाशं तमात्मानम् अप्रकाशः कथं स्पृशेत् ॥ १६ ॥

प्रतिज्ञा	I, consciousness, am untouched by ignorance.
हेतु	Even ignorance is known/illumined by consciousness.
व्याप्ति	Whatever thought one is conscious of, is an indicator of the presence of consciousness, as it is being known.
दृष्टान्त	The sun can never truly be covered by clouds. In fact the clouds themselves are known only by the light of the sun, even though it seems due to the perceiver's error that the sun is covered by the clouds.
दार्ढान्त	Like the sun, it may seem that consciousness is veiled by ignorance, but this is impossible as even the thought "I don't know," is illumined by consciousness; it is known. That knowledge of the experience of not knowing itself proves that consciousness is shining ever-uncovered.
निगमन	I, consciousness, am untouched by ignorance (because I am the illuminator even of ignorance).

श्लोक १७-१८

तथाप्याभाति कोऽप्येषः विचाराभावजीवनः।

अवश्यायश्चिदाकाशे विचारार्कादयावधिः ॥ १७ ॥

आत्माज्ञानमहानिद्रा जृम्भितेऽस्मिञ्जगन्मये।

दीर्घस्वप्ने स्फुरन्त्येते स्वर्गमोक्षादिविभ्रमाः ॥ १८ ॥

प्रतिज्ञा	The experience (प्रतीति) of ignorance does not prove the reality of ignorance.
-----------	--

हेतु	Because that experience itself is a product of ignorance, so it can't be used to prove the reality of ignorance.
व्याप्ति	An effect of a particular cause can never be used to establish the reality of the effect – only something outside of that particular cause-effect relationship can accurately determine reality of the cause.
दृष्टान्त	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) A man has eaten till he is full just before sleeping. But in his dream he may feel very hungry. The pangs of hunger, no matter how sharp, cannot prove the reality of the dream, because those pangs are themselves a product of the dream. 2) Mist may appear to 'cover' space, and subsequently the sun may dissipate the mist and in doing so, 'reveal' the space, but the truth is, both the covering mist and the revealing sun are appearing <i>in</i> the space. Despite the feeling that space was covered, it was never covered as it is of a greater degree of reality than the mist. Both the covering and the unveiling are delusions of perception.
दार्ढ्यन्त	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) We proved logically that I, consciousness, can have no ignorance. However, the feeling remains that "I am ignorant." Like the dream hunger which is produced by the dream, the feeling of "I am ignorant," or any feeling particular to the intellect, is a product of ignorance (because the intellect itself is a product of ignorance). In the same way that the experience of dream hunger can't prove the reality of that hunger, the experience of ignorance can't prove that in reality I, consciousness, have ignorance. 2) Like the perception of the apparent covering of space, the feeling of ignorance, and even the feeling of knowledge (removal of that ignorance), both occur in the intellect – an entity produced from ignorance. Therefore both experiences are themselves based in ignorance, and cannot be used to prove the reality of ignorance.
निगमन	The experience of ignorance does not prove the reality of ignorance. Despite the fact that I experience ignorance, I, consciousness, cannot have any ignorance.

श्लोक १९

जडाजडविभागोऽयम् अजडे मयि कल्पितः।

भित्तिभागे समे चित्र-चराचरविभागवत् ॥ १९ ॥

प्रतिज्ञा	In me, consciousness, there can be no differences (भेद) such as sentient and inert.
हेतु	Because of my nondual nature (कैवल्यत्वात्).
व्याप्ति	Differences of effects appearing on the cause have no reality – they are simply words (वाचारम्भणं विकारोनामधेयम्). They are nothing but the differenceless cause appearing as the effects with differences.

दृष्टान्त	Like a painting on a wall which contains birds (sentient) flying over a mountain (insentient/inert) – If you put your finger on the birds or the mountain, in reality you're just touching the wall. The difference between sentient and insentient is only appearing – it's reality is only in the way of words, the true reality belongs to the cause, i.e. the wall.
दार्ष्टान्त	Similar to the wall, consciousness alone exists, and is without any differences. The whole universe which appears full of differences is itself an appearance in consciousness. Even among the objects of the universe, there is nothing other than consciousness – the differences are merely an error of perception
निगमन	In me, consciousness, there are no differences.

श्लोक २०

चेत्योपरागरूपा मे साक्षितापि न तात्विकी।

उपलक्षणमेवेयं निस्तरङ्गचिदम्बुधेः ॥ २० ॥

प्रतिज्ञा	(continued from previous verse) there are no differences in me, consciousness, even to the extent of witnessed and witness.
हेतु	The title of witness is only with regard to one who gives reality to thoughts.
व्याप्ति	Something which is changeless cannot have any contingent roles.
दृष्टान्त	The sun is [relatively] changeless, yet on one summer day we may say, “The sun is so bright today, it is illumining everything!” Yet on a winter morning we might say “The sun is so weak today, it is unable to illumine even this building.” From the perspective of the sun, it doesn't choose to shine or illumine – that is merely its nature. Only from the perspective of the illumined world can we speak of the sun as an “illuminator.”
दार्ष्टान्त	Like the sun, consciousness is of the nature of illumination (knowledge) – so the creation superimposed on it is naturally illumined as a byproduct. From the perspective of the creation (thoughts) we may call consciousness as the illuminator, but from the perspective of consciousness there is no creation itself and therefore no scope of being labelled as an illuminator.
निगमन	There are no differences in me, consciousness, including that between witness and witnessed.

श्लोक २१

अमृताब्देर्न मे जीर्णिः मृषाडिण्डीरजन्मभिः ।

स्फटिकादेर्न मे रागः स्वाप्नसन्ध्याभ्रविभ्रमैः ॥ २१ ॥

प्रतिज्ञा	I am unattached (असङ्ग).
हेतु	Because any apparent relations are false (सम्बन्धमिथ्यत्वात्).
व्याप्ति	Unreal relations cannot cause attachment or modifications.
दृष्टान्त	1) The way an explosion in a movie projected on a wall can't harm the wall at all, because it has no real relation to the wall. 2) The way a colourless crystal doesn't become coloured because of the proximity with a coloured object, although it may appear to do so.
दार्ष्टान्त	1) Like the wall, consciousness is the substratum and the only reality of this universe. So the movements and changes of the universe can't affect consciousness, as they are only appearing on consciousness. 2) Like the crystal, changes only appear in consciousness, but are not really there.
निगमन	Therefore I am unattached.

श्लोक २२

स्वरूपमेव मे सत्त्वं न तु धर्मो न भस्त्ववत् ।

मदन्यस्य सतोऽभावात् न हि सा जातिरिष्यते ॥ २२ ॥

प्रतिज्ञा	Existence is my nature (सत्स्वरूप); it is not an attribute.
हेतु	Because there is no existence other than me.
व्याप्ति	If there is 100% concomitance between an object and a phenomenon, that phenomenon must be the nature of the object, and not a variable instance or attribute.
दृष्टान्त	There is no dimensionality without space. If there is any dimension, direction, or depth, there must be space. Therefore dimensionality is the very nature of space, not an attribute of space. Or to put it another way, there is only ONE space, so 'spaceness' cannot be a <i>quality</i> of space. That would only make sense if there were many objects which shared this same quality, space being one of those many objects. Instead, space is of the very <i>nature</i> of spaceness.
दार्ष्टान्त	Like dimensionality ("spaceness") and space, there is no existence apart from the Self. Existence is not a quality shared by many objects, it is the singular substratum of all

	existent objects, because of which they are known as existent. Being singular, it must be the very nature of the Self, not an attribute.
निगमन	I, consciousness, am of the nature of Existence.

श्लोक २३

स्वरूपमेव मे ज्ञानं न गुणः स गुणो यदि।

अनात्मत्वमसत्त्वं वा ज्ञेयाज्ञेयत्वयोः पतेत् ॥ २३ ॥

प्रतिज्ञा	Consciousness is not a quality of mine; instead it is my very nature.
हेतु	If it were a quality, it would become the not-self, and it may be considered non-existent also. (अनात्मप्रसगात् असत्त्वप्रसङ्गाच्च)
व्याप्ति	1) Anything which has attributes is subject to change. 2) Anything which is known cannot be the Self. (यत्र यत्र दृश्यत्वम् तत्र तत्र अनात्मत्वम्, or as Vidyaranya Swamiji famously says – “दृगेव न तु दृश्यते”)
दृष्टान्त	NOTE: Both examples used here are contrary examples, known as “व्यतिरेकी दृष्टान्तः” 1) Like a blue lotus. The lotus has attributes such as blueness, freshness, etc. As those attributes are fleeting, the substance itself – here, lotus – will perish. 2) Like a tall person. The person being the substance, which is the substratum of the quality “tallness,” can remain constant despite the coming and going of such attributes. As a baby that attribute was not there, nor will be in extreme old age, yet the substance remained the same. The implication is that the substance is different from the attribute.
दार्ष्टान्त	1) Unlike the blue lotus, consciousness and the self are not connected by an attribute-substance relationship. My eternal expression of consciousness (as “I”) indicates that it cannot be an attribute, but rather it is my nature. 2) Unlike tallness, consciousness cannot be an attribute of mine for a number of reasons. First of all, it is never absent from me, the way tallness is from a person, or freshness is from a lotus, as explained above in point #1. Second, it cannot be different than me, because if consciousness was different from the Self, the self would become inert/insentient. Another thing is that the Self would become an object of knowledge, known by the [different entity] attribute consciousness. Anything which is known as an object must be different than the subject, i.e. it must be the not-self. The Self can never be the not-self, therefore...
निगमन	...Therefore consciousness is not an attribute of mine, but rather it is my nature.

श्लोक २४

अहमेव सुखं नान्यद् अन्यच्चेन्नैव तत्सुखम्।

अमदर्थं न हि प्रेयः मदर्थं न स्वतः प्रियम् ॥ २४ ॥

प्रतिज्ञा	My true nature is Happiness. (सुखस्वरूपोऽहम्)
हेतु	Because I only love anything for my own sake. (परमप्रेमास्पदत्वात्)
व्याप्ति	Wherever there is pursuit of any object, the ultimate pursuit is for the sake of the pursuer, nor for the sake of the object in itself. The object is only dear to the pursuer for the pursuer's sake.
दृष्टान्त	Like a wise man, a fool, a sinner, and a spiritual seeker, all walk their respective paths for their own happiness, not for the sake of the paths themselves.
दार्ष्टान्त	Everyone only acts for their own sake – and this never changes, because I am dearest to myself. Therefore I am the greatest [read: only real] source of happiness.
निगमन	Therefore happiness is my true nature.

श्लोक २५

न हि नानास्वरूपं स्याद् एकं वस्तु कदाचन।

तस्मादखण्ड एवास्मि विजहज्जागतीं भिदाम् ॥ २५ ॥

प्रतिज्ञा	I am undivided, unbroken, partless (अखण्डोऽहम्).
हेतु	The Self, the Reality, though indicated as having the nature of Existence, Consciousness, and Happiness, has only one nature – they are all one – and oneness itself is the nature of the Self.
व्याप्ति	One entity never can have many natures.
दृष्टान्त	Fire cannot have multiple natures such as heat and cold. It can only be one, in this case heat.
दार्ष्टान्त	Like fire, the Self cannot have multiple natures – consciousness itself is existence which itself is Happiness. Its true nature is non-difference, oneness, attributelessness. All these words are merely indicators to an indescribable truth.
निगमन	Therefore I, the Self, am undivided.

श्लोक २६

परोक्षतापरिच्छेद-शाबल्यापोहनिर्मलम्।

तदसीति गिरा लक्ष्यम् अहमेकरसं महः ॥ २६ ॥

This verse is not part of a logical syllogism, like the rest of the text, but it is invoking the true means of knowledge for Brahma Vidya – Upanishads. All logic is only to remove any doubts we may have about the knowledge produced by Upanishad statements. But there should be no doubt that the knowledge itself comes only from the Upanishad, and not from logic. Here, the author references the famous statement of Chandogya Upanishad – Tat Tvam Asi, which reveals that the true nature of the Self is Brahman. This Mahavakya, which is the archetypal source of Brahma Vidya eliminates the reality I give to the experience of my finitude, and reveals my nature as infinite, which is the means of removing all my sorrow caused by the sense of finitude.

श्लोक २७

उपशान्तजगज्जीव-शिष्याचार्येश्वरभ्रमम्।

स्वतः सिद्धमनाद्यन्तं परिपूर्णमहं महः ॥ २७ ॥

This verse indicates the nature of the knowledge gained through understanding of the Mahavakya. Upon gaining knowledge, I know that I am not the one who is experiencing, so I no longer give any reality to the experience which is illumined by me, consciousness, through the intellect. Instead I firmly and continuously abide in the understanding that I am infinite consciousness, and there is really nothing other than me, including the worlds, the individual, the disciple, the teacher, and even a greater God.

श्लोक २८

लक्ष्मीधरकवेः सूक्ति-शरदम्भजसम्भृतः।

अद्वैतमकरन्दोऽयं विद्वद्भ्रङ्गैर्निपीयताम् ॥ २८ ॥

In the last verse, the author establishes his authorship and endorses the teaching given in the work, which he humbly doesn't claim as his own. His endorsement is in the form of a metaphor, comparing the teaching of the nondual Self to honey, which is drunk by wise men, represented by bees. The honey is found in autumnal lotuses – the most fragrant and beautiful of all flowers, which represent the verses of this text. It must be understood that a seer such as śrī Lakṣmīdhara Kavi would not write for any personal gain; instead, he writes out of boundless compassion to help spiritual seekers such as ourselves along the path toward liberation through a clear understanding of the Upanishadic truth. Further, let it be ever-remembered that it is only by the unending grace of our Pujya Guruji and Pujya Acharyaji that the highest teaching can be grasped even by undeserving students such as myself. Infinite prostrations to their lotus feet.

हरिः ॐ