

ADVAITA MAKARANDA

Commentary by Swami Paramarthananda

Transcribed by Sri V. L. N. Prasad

NOTE: Swami Paramarthananda has not verified the transcription of talks. The transcriptions have been done with Swamiji's blessings by his disciple.



Published by:



Arsha Avinash Foundation
104 Third Street, Tatabad, Coimbatore 641012, India
Phone: +91 9487373635
E mail: arshaavinash@gmail.com
www.arshaavinash.in

ADVAITA MAKARANDA

*SRI LAKSHMIDHARA KAVI
(SRI KRISHNENDRA GIRI)*



*TRANSCRIPTION ON LECTURES OF
H. H. SWAMI PARAMARTHANANDA SARASWATI
CHENNAI.*

ADVAITA MAKARANDA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TALK No.	SUBJECT	PAGE No.
<u>TALK - 01</u>	<u>VERSE No. 1</u>	<u>01 – 14</u>
<u>TALK - 02</u>	<u>VERSE No. 1 & 2</u>	<u>15 – 27</u>
<u>TALK - 03</u>	<u>VERSE No. 2 & 3</u>	<u>28 – 40</u>
<u>TALK - 04</u>	<u>VERSE No. 4 & 5</u>	<u>41 – 53</u>
<u>TALK - 05</u>	<u>VERSE No. 5 & 6</u>	<u>54 – 66</u>
<u>TALK - 06</u>	<u>VERSE No. 7 & 8</u>	<u>67 – 79</u>
<u>TALK - 07</u>	<u>VERSE No. 8 & 9</u>	<u>80 – 92</u>
<u>TALK - 08</u>	<u>VERSE No. 9 & 11</u>	<u>93 – 106</u>
<u>TALK - 09</u>	<u>VERSE No. 11 to 13</u>	<u>107 – 119</u>
<u>TALK - 10</u>	<u>VERSE No. 13 to 15</u>	<u>120 – 132</u>
<u>TALK - 11</u>	<u>VERSE No. 15 to 17</u>	<u>133 – 145</u>
<u>TALK - 12</u>	<u>VERSE No. 18 to 20</u>	<u>146 - 159</u>
<u>TALK - 13</u>	<u>VERSE No. 20 to 24</u>	<u>160 – 172</u>
<u>TALK - 14</u>	<u>VERSE No. 24 to 28</u>	<u>173 - 186</u>

Advaita Makaranda - Verse 01

*sadāsiva samārambhām sankarāchārya madhyamām
asmad āchārya paryantām vande guru paramparām*

If a spiritual seeker has to benefit from the study of Vēdāntic Scriptures, he or she should have discovered certain fundamental truths as revealed by the Scriptures. The first truth the scriptures point out is that lasting peace is possible only by the attainment of *Mōksha*.

All the other achievements may give peace and happiness, but lasting peace, enduring peace is possible only by attaining Mōksha. Therefore, the scriptures assume that whoever comes to Vēdānta is interested in lasting peace. From the observation of people also, we come to know that everyone is really interested in lasting peace and fulfillment only.

If there is *Sukha Iccha*, *Nitya Sukha Iccha*, then one should have *Mōksha Iccha*. The desire for lasting peace should be converted into desire for Mōksha because Mōksha alone is the means for lasting peace. Then, the scriptures point out that Mōksha is possible only through Self-Knowledge. There is no other means of attaining Mōksha.

Therefore, if you have a desire for Mōksha then, it should be converted into a desire for *Gnyānam*. If you have a desire for lasting peace, you convert that desire into a desire for Mōksha. If you have a desire for Mōksha, convert that into a desire for Gnyānam because Gnyānam alone gives Mōksha.

Thus, *Sukhēccha* must be converted into *Mōkshēccha*. Mokshēccha should be converted into *Gnyāna Iccha*. Thereafter, one should know that any knowledge is possible only by the operation of an appropriate instrument of Knowledge. Without a proper tool of Knowledge called *Pramānam* no Gnyānam can take place.

Whether it is Physics knowledge or Chemistry knowledge, whether it is English knowledge or Self-Knowledge, any Knowledge requires an

appropriate source or instrument of Knowledge. Therefore, desire for Knowledge must be converted into desire for Pramānam. It is like a person who wants to get any Knowledge.

Why should he seek an admission in a college or an educational institution? Afterall, he wants knowledge. Why can't he go to a departmental store and buy a few kilos of knowledge? Why should he struggle for admission which is very very difficult now? You want knowledge, why do you go to college?

Then, you will say that college is the means to get Knowledge. College represents the means of Knowledge because there is a teaching method which is called *Pramānam*. Therefore, *Sukhēccha* must get converted into *Mōkshēccha*, Mōkshēccha should get converted into *Gnyānēccha*, and Gnyānēccha should get converted into *Pramāna Iccha*.

In the case of Self-Knowledge, there is only one means of Knowledge and that is *Guru-Shāstra Upadēsha* - The teaching of the Guru and Shāstra. The *Upanishadic* words are the means. *Why do we insist upon the Upanishad Vichāra?* It is because of two reasons.

One reason is that all our sense organs, which are all instruments of Knowledge, are capable of revealing only Object and they are never capable of revealing the Subject, 'I'. All sense organs are turned outwards. They are all object revealing tools of Knowledge. None of them can reveal the Subject.

In fact, eyes cannot reveal themselves, what to talk of Ātma behind! So, sense organs are useless. All the other books in all the libraries of the world are also useless because they are all the books of material sciences. Whether it is Astronomy or Chemistry or Geology or Archeology, all the courses in all the universities;

And all the books in those libraries are all material sciences dealing with an Objective world. None of them can talk about the Subject whereas, we are interested in a means which reveals the Subject. Therefore,

worldly books are useless, sense organs are useless. Even our inference and Mathematics are useless because they are all very good in the material field.

Therefore, we are left with only one choice. We are left with a choiceless situation that is the *Vēdāntic Upanishads*. They alone embark upon the revelation of 'I', the observer, which is otherwise called the *Ātma*. In *Maitrēyi Brāhmanam*, Yāgnavalkya tells Maitrēyi - *ātmāvā arēdrashtavya shrōtavyō mantavyō nidhidhyāsityaha*.

He clearly says that this teaching deals with the observer. Therefore, *Pramāna Iccha* should be converted into *Shāstra Vichāra Iccha*. *Pramāna Iccha*, the desire for appropriate instrument should be converted into a desire for Shāstric enquiry. Because Shāstra is the only tool which reveals 'I', the *Ātma*, the observer.

Thus, every Vēdāntic student must have discovered these stages - I have got *Sukha Iccha* and therefore, I have got *Mōksha Iccha* therefore, I have got *Gnyāna Iccha* therefore, I have got *Pramāna Iccha* therefore, I have got desire for *Shāstra Vichāra*. This must be very very clear to every student.

Otherwise, he will not know what the purpose of attending Vēdāntic classes is. If he doesn't know the purpose, it will be a purpose-less time pass. Not only that, but there will not be an involvement in the teaching because I don't know what exactly I expect out of this project.

I should know what the outcome of this project is because spending hour after hour, week after week, month after month, year after year, decade after decade, if I am in Vēdānta, I should know that it is this conversion. We should know that the *Shāstra Vichāra* consists of three disciplines or exercises.

As said in the *Maitrēyi Brāhmanam* in *Brihadāranyaka - shrōtavyaha mantavyaha nidhidhyāsityaha*. *Shravanam*, *Mananam* and *Nidhidhyāsanam* put together is called *Shāstra Vichāra*, Scriptural

enquiry. Of these, we have repeatedly defined *Shravanam* as consistent and systematic study of Vēdāntic scriptures for a length of time under the guidance of a competent, live Āchārya.

Every word is important. Consistency is important and Systematic is important. If there are new students, you will understand that. New students will know what it is. So, systematic is important, for a length of time is important. Every word is important in that definition. If a person embarks upon *Shravanam* project for a length of time, he will clearly gain this *Ātma Gnyānam*.

What is that Ātma Gnyānam? Aham Brahma Asmi - I myself am the real source of lasting peace. There is no other external source. This knowledge he will gather - (*Aham Brahmāsmi*). I myself am, not only I myself am, I only am the lasting peace.

Then, whatever the peace that I discover from the world now and then - when I complete building a house, when I complete settling the children; whenever I complete certain jobs, I do discover a peace. *How can we say world doesn't give me peace?*

If you ask the question, we say whenever we are getting the peace from the world, actually it is not the world that is giving me the peace. But that particular event brings a calm mind in which my own peace manifests. It is like when you bring a mirror, mirror doesn't produce an image. Mirror provides a surface in which my own image is manifested.

Another example is a dogs' bone. When the dog bites the bone and gets blood, the bone only has helped in bringing out its own blood. Therefore, there is only one source of peace and that is, I myself. Therefore, even when worldly peace comes to me, I am not over attached to that peace because that coming peace also is my own reflection.

Even if the arriving peace goes away, then also I will not be disturbed because when that peace goes away, only the reflected peace has gone.

The original one, I am there. My image has gone but I am there. Therefore, let the worldly peace come and go, but the original source I am always there. This is called *Aham Brahma Asmi* discovery.

It is a clean Knowledge which has to take place in the intellect. Any Knowledge has to take place in the intellect. This *Aham Brahmāsmi* knowledge is also a clear knowledge that has to take place in the intellect. I know Aham Brahma Asmi. *What does Brahman mean?* Permanent source of peace or *Pūrnatvam*.

yōvai bhūmā tat sukham na alpē sukham asti - In *Chāndōgya Upanishad*, Sanath Kumara tells Nārada, the disciple, hey Nārada you note that infinite alone can be a source of peace because peace represents *Pūrnatvam*, fulfillment. So, peace or fulfillment presupposes infinitude, limitlessness and that is only *Brahman*.

No object in the world is infinite, no event is infinite, and no person is infinite. Therefore, *alpē sukham nāsti*. It is a delusion to think it will bring or it has brought peace. So, this knowledge I have to gain in the intellect. For that I have to gain qualifications. The 4D's - *Discrimination, Dispassion, Discipline* and *Desire*.

With those qualifications, I have to cognitively, intellectually understand *Aham Pūrnām Brahmāsmi*. And never say it is only intellectual understanding. Understanding is always intellectual. As Dayānanda Swāmiji says, there is no nasal understanding. It never takes place in nose.

Since it is a matter for Knowledge, I should know that any Knowledge is complete and it can give the benefit only when there is no doubt at all with regard to that Knowledge. Knowledge is complete and Knowledge is fruitful only when there is no doubt. I told you the example. *What is the example?*

Suppose there is a cable hanging and I want to pick it and put it aside. I didn't know whether it is live wire or not. I asked someone and he said

that it is not live wire. You can pick up. When I am about to pick up he says, I am 99% sure but 1% have doubt that there may be very very powerful electrocuting power.

Will we touch? Even 99% Knowledge is not enough if I have to handle a live wire. Therefore, any knowledge will bless me only when I have no doubt about its teaching. And Vēdāntic teaching is very very powerful. *brahma satyam, jagan mithyā, jīvō brahmaiva nāparaha*. All these are mind boggling.

Attribute-less Brahman is the only reality which we never see. This ever invisible Brahman is the only reality. Then, Vēdānta says this visible, tangible world - *Jagan Mithyā*. It is not absolutely real which is very very very difficult to swallow. Even philosophers are not able to swallow.

Sāṅkhya, Yōga, Nyāya, Vaisheshika, Pūrva Mīmāṃsa, Visishtādvaitam, Dvaitam - None of them agrees with this. Advaita very very boldly says that the whole universe is like a dream. It is *Mithyā*. So, the invisible *Brahman* is reality, the ever visible world is unreal. Then, the third mind boggling revelation is - *jīvō brahmaiva nāparaha*.

That *Paramātma*, the infinite is 'I'. *Aham Brahma Asmi*. All the three basic teachings are so revolutionary that however much we listen; we can always have doubt regarding any one of the three or all of the three. As I said, even if an iota of doubt is there, that will not bless me. Therefore, Knowledge has to be made doubtless Knowledge.

It has to be converted into conviction. This conversion process of Knowledge into conviction is called *Mananam*. Mananam is conversion of knowledge into conviction. Therefore, *Mananam* presupposes *Shravanam*. If Knowledge itself is not there, there is no question of converting into conviction.

Therefore, Mananam is a long process which comes after Shravanam. In Vēdānta Shāstra, we have got several *Manana Granthas* just as we have

got several *Shravana Granthas*. Shravana Granthas are those text books which will give us Knowledge from the scratch. We saw books like *Vivēka Chūdāmani*.

They are all wonderful Shravana Granthas. They give you the knowledge systematically. *What are the four qualifications? How to enquire into Jīva? How to enquire into Jagat? How to enquire into Ēshwara? How to discover the Aykyam?* It is a Shravana Grantha which gives Knowledge. We have got several such texts.

Panchadasi is one, Sarva Vēdānta Siddhānta Sāra Sangraha is one. We have got umpteen such texts. We have got several Manana Granthas also. Grantha means a text book. *Manana Granthas are addressed to whom?* Not to a beginner.

It is addressed to person who has done Shravanam for a length of time and he has got a comprehensive picture of Vēdāntic teaching. But there are certain disturbing loop holes. Disturbing doubts here and there will be resolved. We have got several minor Manana Granthas as well as several major Manana Granthas.

Brahma Sutra is a Manana Grantha. It is called *Nyāya Grantha*, logically defending the Advaitic teaching. Let a lay person question Vēdāntic teaching, let a philosopher question Vēdāntic teaching, let a scientist question Vēdāntic teaching. I should be able to defend. *Brahma Sutra* deals with that.

We have got several *Siddhi Granthas*. They are all *Manana Pradhāna*. *Naishkarmya Siddhi* is not meant for a beginner, but it is a Manana Grantha for one who has done Shravanam for a length of time. After conviction, *Nidhidhyāsanam* is prescribed for internalization, about which we saw in *Druk Drushya Vivēka*.

We talked about the six fold Samādhi. It is not meant for conviction. *Nidhidhyāsanam* is internalization of the conviction. So, *Shravanam* is Knowledge, *Mananam* is conviction, *Nidhidhyāsanam* is the

internalization of conviction. I said that there are many Manana Granthas. Major ones are called *Siddhi Granthas*.

Siddhi means defending the teaching, establishing *Advaitam*. I said that there are minor works also. *Advaita Makarandaha* which we propose to do in the following session happens to be a *Manana Grantham*. Therefore, the assumption of the teacher is that a student has studied Vēdānta to a great extent - consistent and systematic study for a length of time.

And he has got a fairly comprehensive picture of the teaching. This is a reinforcement of that to take care of certain intellectual obstacles. Because this text is addressing such students (in this class also), whoever has been attending the classes for a length of time, you will find that you are able to gather more out of that.

If there are any completely new students, they may find some patches of gaps. Certain points will be clear, then there will be certain things not clear (like dots and dashes). Therefore, you will require a little bit more patience to understand the full picture. This is a *Manana Grandha* establishing *Aham Brahma Asmi*.

Therefore, every Slōka will be giving certain reasoning and the conclusion will be – therefore, I am *Brahman*. *He goes one step further and asks how can I not be Brahman?* How can I be Brahman, is the present condition. *The author is saying at the end of this text we should say, how can I not be Brahman? How can I be Samsāri?*

So, this is a text. It is a beautiful but brief textbook consisting of 28 verses. The title of the book is *Advaita Makarandaha*. *Makaranda* means honey which is sweet and nourishing. Here, Makaranda refers to *Gnyānam*. *Advaita Gnyānam* which like honey is very sweet. In the sense, it gives *Ānanda*. Not only it gives *Ānanda*, it is healthy, energizing.

Sweet and energizing is honey physically, sweet and energizing is this teaching mentally. Local, honey is sweet and energizing the physical body. The Advaitic teaching is sweet and energizing to the mind. If the Knowledge is compared to the honey, naturally the question comes - *what is the flower out of which it is extracted?*

It says, the flower is these verses alone. All these verses are the flowers. There are 27 or 26 flowers because we have to omit the first and last verses. First one is introduction and the last one is conclusion. 26 (2nd verse to 27th verse) flowers are there. If you extract from these flowers (from the 27 verses), which is *Shabdha Pramānam*, we can extract *Advaita Gnyānam*.

The verse is *Pramānam*, *Gnyānam* is *Prama*. Honey Gnyānam can be extracted. Therefore, this textbook is called 26 flowered bouquet which will give you honey of Advaita Gnyānam which is sweet and energizing to the mind. *Who is the author of the textbook?* That name is referred to in the last verse.

The last verse says *lakshmīdhara kavēh sūkti sharadambhōja sambhrutaha*. In the last verse, each verse from 2-26 is compared to the autumnal lotus. *Sharadambhōja* means the lotus that blooms in the autumnal season which is beautiful. *And given out by whom?* *lakshmīdhara kavēh*. Lakshmīdhara Kavihi is the Pūrvāshrama name of the author.

Later, he became a Sanyāsi by name *Krishnendra Saraswati*. That was his later Sanyāsa name. But before that he was called Lakshmīdhara Kavi. He is the author who was there a few centuries before. Not as old as Sankarāchārya, but of relatively recent origin. Thus, we will enter into Lakshmīdhara Kavi's *Advaita Makaranda* text.

*katāksha kiranā chānta namanmōhābdhayē namaha
anantānanda krishnāya jagan mangala mūrtayē*

The first verse is invocatory verse in which Namaskāra is offered to the Lord by the author for the successful completion of the text. It is called *Mangalācharanam* or *Ēshwara Namaskāraha*. This Mangalācharanam is presented in a written form also so that when we read this Slōka, it will become Mangalācharanam for the student also. It becomes our Namaskāra.

So, the student prays to the Lord so that he can complete the text. The teacher also invokes the Lord so that he can also complete the teaching without obstacles. The author's *Ishta Dēvata* perhaps happens to be Lord Krishna. Therefore, he offers Krishna Namaskāra. *Ishta Dēvata* need not be uniform. From Achārya to Achārya the Ishta Dēvata varies.

Here, Lakshmīdhara Kavi's Ishta Devata is Krishna. Therefore, he says Krishnāya Namaha - my Namaskāra to Lord Krishna. *And who is that Lord?* Even though from Purānic angle, he is *Vāsudēvaha*, Vasudēva - Dēvaki Putraha with a date of birth and the date of departure. He says, the real Krishna is none other than *Anantānanda Krishnāya*.

Anantaha means limitless *Brahman*. As we see in the seventh chapter of the Gita and fifteenth chapter of the Gīta, Krishna says - I am not this physical body or changing matter. That is only my inferior *Aparā Prakruti*. My superior nature is *Parā Prakruti* which is *Nirgunam Brahma*. In the 15th chapter Krishna calls it *Purushōttamaha*.

*yasmāt kshara matītōham aksharā dapichōttamaha
atōsmi lōkē vēdēcha pratitah purushōttamaha*

I am Purushōttama which is *Nirgunam Brahma*. Therefore, the author says, I am worshipping my Ishta Devata, Krishna whose real nature is *Anantaha*. Antaha means limitation and Anantaha means free from limitations, limitless. Whenever we talk about limitation in Vēdānta, we should always remember the three fold limitations.

One is Spatial limitation and the Lord is free from spatial limitation. That means Lord is all pervading. *If somebody asks - is the Lord in*

Vaikunta? What should you say? We should not say yes or no. We should say the Lord is in Vaikunta also. If you say ‘Yes’ it appears that he is in Vaikunta and therefore not here.

If you say No, it means he is not in Vaikunta. We should neither say yes or no but we should add the word ‘also’. The second limitation is called Time wise limitation. Lord is limitless time wise also. That means the Lord is also eternal (here and now). The third one is called Attribute wise limitation.

We should never add any attribute to the Lord. Once you add a particular attribute to the Lord, you are excluding its opposite attribute. If you add any attribute, you are automatically excluding the opposite attribute. *Suppose you say Lord is good, what is the problem?* Anything bad will go outside the Lord.

That is one of the biggest philosophical conundrums. *Evil should be included in the God or excluded from the God?* - Because either way we are in trouble. *How? If you exclude from the Lord, what will be the problem?* Bhagawān will be limited because where evil is there, Bhagawān is not.

If you include evil in the Bhagawān what will be the problem? Bhagawān also has got evil. Therefore, you cannot add the attribute good then, evil will be excluded. You cannot add evil then, good will be excluded. You cannot say both because they are opposite they are opposite attributes which cannot coexist.

You cannot say Bhagawān is beautiful. Then, it will mean Bhagawān is not ugly. Therefore, if you add any attribute, you are limiting Bhagawān. Therefore, to be limitless means to be free from all attributes. *anyatra dharmāt, anyatra adharmāt, anytra asmat krutākrutāt.*

Therefore, *Ananta* means space-less, timeless, attribute-less Krishna. Therefore, only *Ānandaha*; Ānandaha means *Pūrnaha* or infinite. Here,

the word Ānanda, we should not translate into happiness. The conventional happiness we should not take. *Because once you put the conventional happiness as an attribute to the Lord, what will be the problem?*

You will automatically exclude the opposite attribute. *What is that?* Sorrow will go away. Therefore, you cannot even say happiness as an attribute because it cannot coexist with sorrow. Therefore, it will be limiting the Lord. Therefore, *Ānanda* is translated as *Pūrnām*, infinite.

So, *Ananta Ānanda Krishnāya Namaha. jagan mangala mūrtayē* - MangalaMūrti means embodiment of auspiciousness, embodiment of holiness, we can also say embodiment of happiness. *Embodiment of auspiciousness, for whom?* For *Jagat*, for the entire world. Therefore, wherever Krishna is there, there will be only *Mangalam*.

*pavitrānām pavitramyō mangalānām cha mangalam
daivatam devatānām cha bhūtānām yō vyayah pitā*

Manglāyatanam harihi etc. He is an embodiment of auspiciousness which means *Mōkshaha*. Because according to Vēdānta, there is only one auspiciousness, that is Mōksha. Anything other than that is inauspiciousness because it is *Samsāra* only. Therefore, *Mangala Mūrti* means *Mōksha Swarūpaha*.

Therefore, if you want Mōksha where should you go? Go to Krishna for *Mōksha Mangalam*. *How will Krishna give us Mōksha?* Namaskāra to Krishna who is the embodiment of auspiciousness for the whole universe. *Then, the question is how does he give auspiciousness or Mōksha?* The author says, by removing ignorance from all the devotees.

Because we have said before, *Mōksha* is possible only in one way. Mōksha is possible only through *Gnyānam*. That is why we said *Mōkshēccha* should be converted into *Gnyānēccha*. If Krishna has to give us Mōksha, he has to do it only in one way.

Don't imagine Krishna comes and touches the head then this fellow gets enlightened. No. Chinmayananda calls it 'spiriticution'. This Sparsha Dīksha, Nayana Dīksha etc - all these are possible to inspire a person to study Vēdānta. *Sparsha Dīksha is for what?* For inspiring the student. It cannot replace Vēdāntic studies.

All these are only for inspiration and purification. Knowledge alone can give Mōksha. I have often told you that if there is any shortcut for Knowledge or liberation, Krishna would have used it in the battle field. If there is any other method of liberation, he would have used it in battlefield.

You find that Krishna did not give Sparsha Dīksha, Nayana Dīksha, Kudalini rising Dīksha. I don't want to criticize or condemn them, but I want all of them to know that they cannot lead to *Gnyānam* or *Mōksha*. If they can lead to Gnyānam or Mōksha, Krishna would have done that. That is convenient. *But what did Krishna do?*

Consistent and systematic teaching chapter after chapter; Atleast in a simplified form he would have done. Therefore, Gnyānam is the only solution. *Which means what?* Removal of ignorance. Here, the author says, Krishna will remove the ignorance of devotee and he compares ignorance to a vast ocean – *Mōha Abdhi*.

Mōhaha means *Agnyānam* and *Abdhi* means Ocean. And *Mohābdhi* is *Agnyāna Sāgara*. Even though head is small; *Agnyāna Sāgara* which has to be dried up. Cerebral fluid which the doctors have to dry; we have another type of fluid accumulation. *What is that?* Ignorance fluid.

How to dry up? He says, Krishna will help you dry up. *For whom?* Not for all the people. *namanmōhābdhayē namaha* - for those who have surrendered to him. *Namat* means *Bhaktās*. *prapanna pārijātāya – nam dhātōhō shatru pratyayānta rūpam*.

For the prostrating people, the surrendering people, Lord Krishna will dry up the ignorance ocean. *How much effort he will take?* The author says effortlessly he will dry up. *How?* That we will see in the next class.

*Pūrnamadah Pūrnamidam Pūrnāth Pūrnām Udachyatē
Pūrnasya Pūrnāmādāya Pūrnāmēvā Vasishyatē*

Om shānti shānti shānti



Advaita Makaranda - Verses 1& 2

*sadāsiva samārambhām sankarāchārya madhyamām
asmad āchārya paryantām vande guru paramparām*

*katāksha kiranā chānta namanmōhābdhayē namaha
anantānanda krishnāya jagan mangala mūrtayē*

The author Laxmīdhara Kavi who gives the essence of Vēdāntic teaching (*Jīvātma Paramātma Aykyam*) in 26 verses is introducing his textbook with a *Mangalācharanam*, invoking the grace of his Ishta Devata namely, Lord Krishna. Therefore, the first verse happens to be *Krishna Namaskāraha*.

Therefore, he said *Krishnāya Namaha* - my Namaskāra to Lord Krishna who is *Ananta Ānandaha*, who is infinite *Ānanda*, the very *Ānanda Swarūpa* itself. *jagan mangala mūrtayē* - Therefore, the one who is an embodiment of all auspiciousness for the entire universe. Any auspiciousness is called *Mangalam*.

In Vēdānta, *Mōksha* alone is considered to be *Mangalam* because Mōksha alone is the ultimate well being for all. Any other Mangalam in the world is only relative auspiciousness but being time bound, they will become *Amangalam*. For example, birth which is supposed to be a Mangalam, will later becomes *janma mrutyu jarā vyādhi dukha dōsha anudarshanam*.

Union of two people which is considered to be Mangalam will end up in Amangalam when it becomes a separation. Thus, we have got *Āpēkshika Mangalams* in the world. *Dharma, Artha, Kāmas* are *Āpēkshika Mangalam*. *Shrēyas* or *Mōksha* alone is *Ātyantika Mangalam*.

That is why Ēshwara is called *pavitrānām pavitramyo mangalānām cha mangalam*. *mangalānām mangalam* means *āpēkshika mangalānām madhyē ātyantika mangala rupēna vardhate*. Therefore, Lord Krishna is

Mangalam for all. Which means, he is Mangalam in the form of Mōksha.

The word *Mūrthy* means embodiment. He is *Mangala Swarūpaha*. That Lord himself gives this *Mōksha Rūpa Mangalam*, by removing my ignorance. That is said in the first line which I was explaining in last class. The entire first line is one long Sanskrit compound. *Mōhābdhihi* means the ocean of ignorance. Mōhaha, I told in the last class.

In this context, Mōhaha means *Ātma Agnyānam*. And it is called an ocean because we are all submerged in the ocean. We are floating in the ocean of ignorance. Ignorance leads to several misconceptions regarding me. Every misconception is like a powerful wave lashing me. Thus, I am in the ocean of ignorance, lashed by the waves of self-misconception.

Therefore, it is called *Mōhābdhihi*. This ignorance ocean has been dried up by the Lord. *Āchānthaha* means sipped or swallowed or absorbed or sucked by the Lord. *Ācham* means to sip, to suck or to drink. That's why before rituals, we talk about *Āchamanam - achyutāya namaha, anantāya namaha*.

It is called Āchamanam because the word Āchamanam means sipping water. This Agnyānam Ocean, Bhagawān has sipped or sucked from me. *For drying up the ocean, Bhagawān has used what method?* The method of powerful light rays or heat rays. Just as all puddles of water are dried up by the powerful rays of the sun, similarly Bhagawān sends powerful heat rays, to dry up the Agnyāna water.

How does Bhagawān send that heat ray? He says *katāksha kiranam*. *Katākshaha* means corner of the eye. *Aksham* means eye. *Katāksham* means corner of the eye. The word *Kiranam* means a ray or a beam. And *kataksha kiranam* means beam or ray emerging out of the corner of the eye. *What comes from the eye corner?*

In this context, the beam of light indicates the glance or *Darshanam*. In Tamil they call *kadaikan paruvai*. It is the glance coming from the corner of the eye of the Lord. *When Krishna is looking at me through the corner of his eyes, the glance is compared to what?* The powerful sunlight and through that sunlight, the ocean of ignorance gets dried up.

The question is, who will Bhagawān look at? He says *namanmōhābdhayē namaha*. He cannot look at all the people because all the people don't go to him. There are some rare disciples, Bhaktās who go to the Lord and their *Agnyāna Sāgara*, he glances and sucks. Therefore, here the word *Namath* refers to the seekers, the surrendering people.

I explained that word in the last class. *Namath* is the present participle in Sanskrit grammar, the worshipping people - *naman namantau namantaha* which means the worshipping people. *Therefore, what is the final meaning of this long compound?*

I offer Namaskāra to Lord Krishna, who dries up the ignorance ocean of all the surrendering devotees by the glance coming out of the corner of his eyes. I offer Namaskāra to Lord Krishna, who dries up the ocean of ignorance of the surrendering people through the powerful light of the glance emerging out of the corner of his eyes.

In short, I worship ignorance destroying Krishna. Now, this is only a figurative expression. Bhagawān destroys devotee's ignorance by mere sight, should not be taken literally. *If you are going to take it literally, what will happen?* We will go to Bhagawān, let him destroy the ignorance through his sight (no need to go to the class).

He destroys by mere sight, indicates only the effortlessness. If Bhagawān decides to bless a devotee, it does not take much time for Bhagawān. Just as throwing sight is effortless similarly, Bhagawān can bless the devotee. *Then, the next question is how does Bhagawān actually destroy ignorance?*

If destroying through sight is only a figurative expression, like destroying ignorance through silence. This is another figurative expression which is taken literally by many people - teaching through silence. I explained that in *Dakshinā Mūrthy Stōtram*. Many people even now believe that knowledge can be transferred through silence.

Let it be clear that nothing can be transferred through silence. No Guru, including Dakshinā Mūrthy can transfer knowledge through silence. Giving knowledge through silence is only a figurative expression. *Then what is the actual meaning of that expression?* Actual meaning is that the Guru doesn't use direct word to communicate.

It is only through implied words, Guru communicates. And implication is never directly expressed. I was explaining in *Naishkarma Siddhi* class. Suppose a person says - I am thirsty. Then, I make a statement - there is water in the bottle. I have never said you drink water and quench your thirst.

Even though I have not asked him to drink water, I have communicated by saying that there is water. Therefore, how did I communicate the actual instruction (drink water)? Without using words. So, when I communicate through implication, it is a communication without words. That means, communication in silence.

Similarly, in Vēdānta also the actual truth is revealed only through implied words, not actual words. Therefore, silence does not literally mean silence. Lot of talking is done by *Dakshinā Mūrthy* also. Lot of talking is done by the Guru also. But the actual message is through implication. So, silence is equal to implication.

Similarly, here also through sight Bhagawān destroys ignorance means, through his grace Bhagawān gives Guru and Shāstra to his devotee. So, Bhagawān's glance is nothing but giving opportunity to study the Shāstra. And to that Krishna who has given me the teaching, who has given me the Guru, to that Krishna my Namaskāra.

So, for Sanskrit students, it is a *bahuvrihi compound* - *katāksha kirana dwāra āchāntaha, naman mōhābdhihi ēna saha. Tritīya bahuvrihi samāsa* and its Chaturthī Vibhakti, *naman mōhābdhaye namaha*. Dayānand Swāmiji loves this compound very much. It is a very very beautiful Sanskrit literary expression.

The author was also a Kavihi before becoming a Sanyāsi. After he became *Krishnānandendra Saraswati* or someone but before Sanyāsa he was Laxmīdhara Kavihi. That is why Advaita Makaranda is not only philosophically significant, but even the poetry is very very beautiful. The first sentence itself is a beautiful sentence - *katāksha kiranā chānta naman mōhābdhaye namaha*.

Here, Lord Krishna has been given two titles, *Ananta* and *Ānandaha*. By giving these two titles, the author is indirectly offering Namaskāra to Guru also. The name of his Guru is *Anantānandendra Saraswati*. So, *Anantānanda* is the description of Krishna also and indirectly, it refers to Guru's name also.

Why can't he directly say my Guru's name is Anantananda? Why does he say indirectly refer to his Guru? Because according to *Dharma Shāstra*, a Sishya is not supposed to utter the name of his Guru. Therefore, in all works they try to name the Guru without naming. *How does he name his Guru now?*

By way of adding two adjectives to Krishna, he indirectly refers to his Guru. So, prostrations to Anantānanda Krishna, the Lord and prostrations to Anantānanda, my teacher. Therefore, *Guru Namaskāra* and *Krishna Namaskāra*, both are combined in one *Mangala Slōka*.

*ahamasmi sadā bhāmīm kadā chinnāha mapriyaha
bramhaivāha matasiddham sacchidānanda lakshanam*

So, the actual teaching begins from the second Slōka and it goes up to 27th Slōka. The 28th Slōka is the conclusion. Thus, the 1st Slōka is

prayer, 28th Slōka is conclusion. The actual teaching is from verses 2 to 27. 26 verses give the essence of Vēdānta.

In these verses beginning from verse 2, the author says I am *Brahman* is not true not because the scriptures reveal, but it is intellectually acceptable also. *Aham Brahmāsmi* is not something to be blindly believed because the Scriptures say. But we can happily accept that because it is intellectually convincing also.

Because wherever the question of belief comes, we have to suppress the intellect. Wherever the question of belief comes, the first step is that you have to switch off the intellect. That is why in all the belief systems, the role of the Guru is encouraging the disciple to stop thinking. Encouraging the disciple to stop thinking and promoting the stultification of intellect is the first job of Guru.

Promoting non-thinking is the first qualification required to enter a belief system. Vēdānta doesn't promote non-thinking, but it introduces *Tarka Shāstra*, *Mimāmsa Shāstra* and *Vyākaraṇa Shāstra* as a stepping stone. *Shāstra Trayam*, for promoting the thinking process.

*mēdhāvi purushō vidvān ūhā pōha vichakshanaha
adhikāri ātmavidyayā uktalakshana lakshitaha*

Sankarāchārya says in *Vivēka Chudāmani* that a student requires a very sharp intellect. Therefore, these verses point out that *Aham Brahmāsmi* is an intellectually acceptable teaching only. It is given by the Shāstra, but it is not illogical. *Why am I able to accept this Aham Brahmāsmi teaching?*

He says I can accept 'I' and *Brahman* are one because of following reason. *What is the reason?* My essential nature revealed through self-enquiry and Brahman's essential nature revealed through Shāstram, happens to be one and the same.

So, *Jīvātma Swarūpam* and *Paramātma Swarūpam* (essential nature) both being the same, both are to be accepted as the one and the same. In Sanskrit, we say *swarūpa ikyāt vastu Aykyam*. Two things are one and the same if their essential natures are one and the same.

Otherwise, we put in another expression - *lakshanaikyāt vastu Aykyam*. *Lakshanam* means the definition of the *Swarūpam*. *Swarūpam* means the essential nature and *Lakshanam* means the word which reveals the essential nature. Therefore, *lakshanaikyāt swarūpa ikyāt vastu Aykyam*.

And in each verse, the author takes one one essential nature of the Jīva, 'I'. And on enquiry I find that I am *Sadrūpaha* and *Brahman* is *Sadrūpaha*. I am Sath, Brahman is Sath. Therefore, I am Brahman. Sath means I am existence. *How do you prove?* I say, I am. So, I always use the expression 'I am'.

That am-ness is my essential nature and Brahman is Sath. Therefore, *sath swarūpa ikyāt brahma Aykyam*, *chit swarūpa Aykyam brahma Aykyam*, *ānanda swarūpa Aykyam*. Then later, *nitya swarūpa Aykyam*, *sarvagata swarūpam*, *sākshi swarūpam*. Thus, he is going to take up each *Swarūpam* and show that I have that *Swarūpam* and Brahman also has that *Swarūpam*.

Therefore, Brahman is another word for me. Brahman is another name for me. *Thus, what is going to be the development?* *swarūpa ikyāt jīva brahma Aykyam* - *Sath*, *Chit* and *Ānanda*. Now we will take up the first word *Sath*. Sath means Existence. We have seen this before also. And this idea we have to remember in this context. *What is that?*

When we recognize any object in the creation, whether it is subject, the first person, or the second person 'you' or the third person - he, she, it, we recognize everything as an existent thing. This existence is revealed through varieties of verbs. When it is first person I say, I am. When it is second person, I say - you are.

When it is third person I say, he or she or it is. Am-ness, are-ness and is-ness indicating existence is common to everything in the creation. You always say there is a table, there is a chair, you are so and so etc. Since, existence is invariably present and invariably recognized and at all times, all places and all conditions, we can say existence is intrinsic nature of everything.

Existence is the intrinsic nature of everything. Suppose there is a thing in the creation, which doesn't have existence. *What will happen?* It will not be existent. Therefore, you can never think of anything in the creation which exists without existence. Therefore, existence is the essential nature of everything. Therefore, we call it *Sath* in Sanskrit.

What is the nature of this existence? That we have seen the five points. You have to remember. *What are the five points of existence?*

1. *The existence is not a part, product or property of the object.*
2. *Existence is an independent entity which pervades and lends existence to every object.*
3. *Existence is not limited by the boundaries of the object.*
4. *Existence survives even when the object perishes.*
5. *Finally, the surviving existence is not accessible, not because it is non-existent but because there is no medium for recognition.*

This existence is the nature of everything in the creation. *What does that mean?* It must be the nature of me also. It must be the nature of myself also. *How does that essential nature existence express in me? In what way does it express?* The author says, it expresses as 'I am' - *Aham Asmi*.

When you say I am, that 'I am' refers to the existence principle. During *bālya avastha*, I am. During *yavvana avasta*, I am. *What does that mean?* Existence continues. *bālyādishvati jāgradādishu tathā sarvāsu avasthāsu*. As a waker, I am. Dreamer, I am. Sleeper I am. Thus, I am, I am, I am is the existence principle, my essential nature.

What is my non-essential nature? The medium through which I express. *Express what?* I am. The medium through which I express, that medium is variable. At five years old, the medium is babyish medium. Therefore, voice also is shrill. As even I grow old, 'I am' remains, but the voice becomes thicker and thicker.

It is not because existence has changed. *But what has changed?* The frequency of the statement has changed. Not because existence has changed, but the medium has changed. Suppose, because of throat problem there is a coarse voice. Even then, existence is the same but the medium changes.

In waking I say 'I am' through *Sthūla Sharīram*, in dream I say 'I am' through *Swapna Sharīram* and in the next birth I will say 'I am' through . . . (Don't know what Sharīram it would be). Thus, I am, I am, I am, always I am. Thus, I am *sadrūpaha sāda asmi*. What has been changing is only the medium through which I express.

There are times when the medium is unfit for expression. When I am a very very small baby, I don't say 'I am' (I don't know the language). But I am in an unexpressed way. *During sleep I am or not?* I am but without expression. Thus, *vyakta rūpēna* I am or *avyakta rūpēna* I am. Suppose I take an animal birth.

An animal can never say - I am an animal. So, in the animal also, 'I am' is there. *Is it vyakta or avyaktam? Avyakta Rūpēna*. Suppose, there is a gap between death and rebirth; even during the gap, I am. But only difference is that I don't have an appropriate medium to express 'I am'. That is why they compare death to a long sleep. That is why in *Dakshinā Mūrthy Stōtram* -

*rāhu grastha divākarēndu sadrushō māyā samācchādanāt
sanmātraha karana upasamharanataha ..*

In sleep, I don't say 'I am'. In sleep, I don't even think 'I am' - Thoughtless, wordless, expressionless. *But in sleep I am or not?* I am. Therefore,

the author says eternally, I am - Transacting or non-transacting, thoughtful or thoughtless, with words or without words, *Aham Sadā Asmi*.

Therefore, who am I? Sadrūpaha Aham. So, who am I? I am the existence principle expressing through this medium now. My medium is not permanent but I am permanent. Impermanence of the medium is not impermanence of me. Impermanence of transaction is not the impermanence of the transactor 'I'.

Therefore, when am I born? You can ask when the medium, body is born. *But when am I born?* The author says *Aham Sadā Asmi*. *Therefore, who am I? Sadrūpaha*. Later, he is going to say Brahman is also defined as Sadrūpaha. *Where is it defined as Sadrūpaha? Chāndōgya shastādhyāya -*

*sadēva sōumya idamagra āsīdēkamēva dvitīyam
tadaikshada bahusyām prajā yēyēti tattējō srujata*

So, in *Chāndōgya*, *Brahman* is said to be *Sadrūpa*. I am Sadrūpaha. *Since both of us have got the same nature, the author says, how can I not be Brahman?* So, this is the first lesson. With a bang he starts! So, *Aham Sadā Asmi* means *Aham Sadrūpaha*. *Then, what is my second nature? Sadā Bhāmi* - I am ever evident.

That means, I am ever experienced as a conscious being. I am ever experienced by myself as a conscious being. So, whether I am conscious of the external world or not, I am a self-conscious entity. That is why I give an example and you have to think about it. It is a subtle point to be noted.

For one hour, you are deliberately conscious of the Advaita Makaranda class (I suppose). So, right from the beginning you are conscious of my words, you are trying to understand my words, and you are never self-conscious deliberately. You are never self-conscious deliberately for one hour. *You are what conscious?* Class conscious or talk conscious.

But even though you are not deliberately self-conscious - I am attending the class, I am attending the class. *Suppose at the end of the class, I ask the question, for one hour were you there in the class or not?* You won't say - I am not very sure. You know that I was there in the class for one hour. Your self-existence in the class is never doubted.

What does that mean? You are self-conscious, whether deliberately you entertained the thought or not, self-consciousness is always there. Even during sleep, even though deliberately you are not entertaining the thought - I am sleeping, I am sleeping, I am sleeping. You don't entertain that thought.

But after waking up, you are able to say, I slept for one hour. *What does that mean?* You are aware of yourself as an existent one for so many hours as a sleeper. Therefore, the author says, not only I am ever existent, I am ever conscious of myself also. I am ever self-conscious, either deliberately as in *Jāgrat* and *Swapna* or non-deliberately as in *Sushupti*.

Therefore, *Aham Sāda Bhāmi*. Suppose a person says, for some time I existed as an inert principle. *I ask the question, how do you know?* I was conscious that I was inert. This is what the *Nayyayika* and *Pūrva Mimāmsakas* say. In sleep, Nayyayika says we are inert principle. Then, the Pūrva Mimāmsaka says no no no, in sleep we are partially inert and partially conscious because in sleep we are conscious of the fact that we were inert.

What does that mean? Again, you can never say I was inert at any time. I am ever a conscious principle. *Therefore, what is the second nature of mine?* I am a conscious principle. What I am conscious of varies. That I am conscious doesn't vary. As waker I am conscious of something, as dreamer I am conscious of something and as sleeper I am conscious of nothing.

What does that mean? I am conscious of nothing but I am conscious. *But what is the difference?* I am conscious not deliberately. We can be conscious in two ways - deliberately and non-deliberately. *What is the example of deliberately being conscious?* My talking. *And what is non-deliberately being conscious?* You are attending the class.

You are attending the class, without deliberately thinking I am attending the class. But you know you are attending the class. Understanding the class or not is different issue. I am not talking about understanding the class. You are non-deliberately conscious of the fact that you are attending the class, but deliberately you are conscious of the class.

Therefore, in *Kāraṇa Sharīram*, I am non-deliberately conscious. In *Sthūla, Sūkshma Sharīram*, I am deliberately conscious. But deliberately or non-deliberately, I am the ever the conscious principle. Therefore, he says *Sadā Bhāmi* - I am ever self-conscious or I am ever conscious principle or I am of the nature of consciousness.

The word *Sadā* must be added for both. *Aham Sadā Asmi* - I am ever existent. *Aham Sadā Bhāmi* - I am ever conscious or evident. That means - *Aham Sadrūpaha Asmi, Aham Chidrūpaha Asmi*. Joining that, I am *Sath Chidrūpaha Asmi*. *Now how does the consciousness express in my language?*

If consciousness is my essential nature, how does it express in my transaction? I said that existence expresses in what form? Am. I am coming, I am going, I am, I am, I am we say. *Just as 'am' is the expression is the expression of my Sadrūpaha, what is the expression of the Chidrūpaha?* The word 'I' is the expression of *Chidrūpaha*.

It is because, the self-conscious human being expresses always as 'I am'. And this 'I' is also changeless. 'Am' is also changeless. 'I' is referring to *Chidrūpaha*. 'Am' is referring to *Sadrūpaha*. 'I am' refers to *Sath Chit Rūpaha*. This 'I am' continues in *bālyāvastha, yavvanāvastha, vārdhakyāvastha*.

Not only, 'I am' is common for me, this 'I am' is common for everyone also. Language may differ, but I am I am I am. And that 'I am' alone is called the *Ātma*. And after the word 'I am', whatever you add, it belongs to the medium. Whatever bio data you add, it belongs to the medium of expression.

Since the medium changes, biodata also will change. Intellectual biodata, physical biodata will change because it belongs to the medium. *But what doesn't change?* I am I am I am. That 'I am' is *Brahma Asmi*. *Why can't you accept?* More in the next class;

*Pūrnamadah Pūrnamidam Pūrnāth Pūrnām Udachyatē
Pūrnasya Pūrnāmādāya Pūrnāmēvā Vasishyatē*

Om shānti shānti shāntihi



Advaita Makaranda - Verses 2 & 3

*sadāsiva samārambhām sankarāchārya madhyamām
asmad āchārya paryantām vande guru paramparām*

*katāksha kiranā chānta namanmōhābdhayē namaha
anantānanda krishnāya jagan mangala mūrtayē*

*ahamasmi sadā bhāmīm kadā chinnāha mapriyaha
bramhaivāha matasiddham sacchidānanda lakshanam*

After the *Mangala Slōka*, the author has started the teaching from the second verse onwards. The main aim of the teacher is to show that I can be none other than *Brahman* if I enquire into my real nature. We do not enquire into our nature at any time. We take ourselves for granted, right from the beginning of birth.

Later, when we enter the field of education also, in no place we question who we are. We assume that it is already a known fact. Therefore, we enquire into everything else except one thing that is, ourselves. The author says, if only we stop taking ourselves for granted and enquire into our real nature, to our utter surprise we will find that we are not what we think ourselves to be.

Instead of being the limited mortal 'I', we will discover the fact that we are the limitless immortal Brahman. To enter into this, first the author points out that I am of the nature of *Sath Chit Ātma*. That I am a conscious being is a fact obtaining in all the three states of experience. What I am conscious of varies. That I am conscious does not vary.

In *Jāgrad Avasthā* - time, space and world is of one nature. In *Swapna Avasthā*, we have a different time, different space and different world. And in *Sushupti Avasthā*, what I am conscious of is the absence of everything. That there is nothing, I am conscious of because after waking up, I report that I did not experience anything.

Thus, the lack of experience itself is a form of experience. The experience of the experience-lessness proves that I continue to be a conscious entity. And whatever is always with me, that is my intrinsic nature. Heat is the intrinsic nature of fire because heat never leaves the fire.

So, whatever is permanently there with a substance is the intrinsic nature - *Swābhāvika Dharmaha*. And consciousness is my Swābhāvika Dharmaha. Eternal consciousness is my Swābhāvika Dharmaha. Therefore, I am *Sath ChitĀtma*. And my physical features like, I am a male or female, I am young or old are features which are subject to arrival and departure.

In *Jāgrad Avasthā*, identified with this body, I temporarily experience the *Jāgrad* physical features. Those features are no more there when I enter the *Swapna* field. There, I have got totally different physical features. We may say it is a projected thing, but when we are in dream, we never look upon it as a temporary and imaginary feature.

In dream, we are that physical entity going through those pleasures and pains intensely. But we know that they are not my intrinsic features because the moment I wake up or the moment I go to deep sleep, I shake it off. In fact, *Chāndōgya Upanishad* gives the example - like a horse shaking the body and dropping the dust from the body or dropping the hair from the body.

ashwa iva rōmāni vidhūya pāpam - Just as the horse shakes off its hair similarly, all the dream physical features we shake off in a try either by waking up or by going to sleep. When we are in the waking state, we commit the same mistake as we committed in the dream. *What is that mistake?*

These physical features - I am husband, I am wife, father, mother, suffering, sick, old are all *Āguntuka Dharmāha* - incidental features belonging to *Jāgrad Avasthā* only which appears to be intrinsic when I

am in the waking state. Thus, waking state physical features are incidental. Dream state physical features are incidental.

Because in sleep, *ashwa iva rōmāni vidhūya pāpam* - I shake off all of them. *But even after shaking of those features, what feature continues even in Sushupti?* There is only one or we can say two features that continue in *Sushupti* also. *What are the two features?* I am a conscious being and I continue to exist in *Sushupti* also.

So, *Sath* continues, *Chit* continues. All other features are incidental. My mortality is incidental, my localization - I am in Anna Nagar. That sense of localization is only in *Jāgrad Avasthā* and *Swapna*. In *Sushupti*, I don't have localization. I don't have any transactions. Even transactions are my incidental features.

Therefore, all others being incidental, I should not take them as my real nature. *So, who am I?* I am the transaction free 'I', who doesn't have any time-wise, or space-wise localization or limitation. *Time wise localization means what?* Giving date of birth to, manufacturing date to expiry date. That is there for the body which is my incidental nature.

In sleep, just as I happily exist without transacting through the body similarly, after death also I can happily exist without transacting through the body. During *Pralayam* also, when the whole world is resolved, all the bodies are resolved, I happily continue to exist. This eternal and localized *Sath Chit Ātma*, I am.

Scriptures give special name for that and that name is *Brahman* - the infinite one. Therefore, the author says, how can I not be Brahman! *So how can I claim myself to be a Samsāra Jīva?* Now the author says, I find it difficult to look at me as a *Samsāri*. Usually people say, Swāmiji I find it difficult to claim I am Brahman when there are problems at home.

This is called *Nishta*. The author says, I find it difficult to look upon me as a *Samsāri*. To identify with the other people, to join the *Samsāri*

group, I want to act like Samsāri but I find it difficult because I know *Aham Brahmāsmi*. *Aham Asmi Sadā Bhāmi*. *Aham Asmi* means I am eternal existence, *Aham Bhāmi* means I am eternal consciousness.

Sadā must be joined with the both. *Aham Sadā Asmi*, *Aham Sadā Bhāmi*. Thus, through these two words, the author has established I am *Sath* and I am *Chit*. Still, we have not completed the first line of the verse. Now, he wants to establish, I am *Ānandaha*. That he establishes through the second part of the line - *kadāchit na aham apriyaha*.

He says, I must be *Ānanda Swarūpaha*. *Ānanda* must be my real nature. It is impossible to claim that I have *Dukham* (if we think). If you don't think, you can claim I am a Dukhi. But if you think a little bit, it is impossible to claim I have *Dukham*. I am *Ānanda Swarūpaha*. *Then the question is - what is the logic?*

He gives the logic. We have seen before elsewhere also. *What is that?* When we study our day to day life, we observe one important principle. *What is that?* Whatever we like in our life, whatever objects, whichever person, whatever situation we love or like, that happens to be a source of *Ānanda* for us.

If we study, our list of likes and dislikes is not uniform. The list varies from individual to individual. One person may add music in that list, another person might not add. Even if I add music in my list, one person will add North Indian music, another will add South Indian, and another may add Western music.

The list varies but whenever you study the list, we discover a very important principle. *What is that?* Any object of liking is a source of *Ānanda*. *Why do I like it?* Because that music gives me pleasure. Therefore, Shāstra gives the generalization - *yatra yatra priya vishayatvam tatra tatra ānanda hētutvam*.

Whatever object is an object of my like or love, that is a source of *Ānanda*. And not only that, the moment the object stops to be a source

of Ānanda, it has lost my favor. We scratch that from the list. After we scratch that, we begin to see that object as a burden. *And our aim is what?* How to get rid of that. Mentally we have rejected.

It may be even a family member. Mental rejection has taken place and if there is a facility, we work for physical rejection also. If there is no facility, mental rejection has taken place (though physically present). *What does that mean?* It has gone out of the Like list. Therefore, whatever is in the Like list, it is an object of *Ānanda* - Principle 1.

Extending this principle when we study, we see that there is one thing in every person's life that is always in the Like list. This is kaun banega crorepathi question. There is one thing in the Like list which is always in the like List and which never goes out of the like list. In-fact, it never comes under dislike list at any time. At all times, at all places, under all conditions, there is one thing.

What is that? Can we say husband or wife or father or mother or son? You study - if you are seeing what all things happening in the society, you will find that no blessed thing is in that list permanently. For the sake of decency, but the truth is as Yāgyavalkya says to Maitreyi in *Bṛihadāranyaka Upanishad* nothing exists in that list permanently, not even God.

People include God in that list and when problem after problem comes, even God is taken out of the list. Some people openly declare that, some people do not have the courage to declare but mentally taken out. *Then what is that blessed thing in that list?* The author says, 'I' the first person singular.

As somebody nicely said, the hero of my autobiography that is, I alone am permanently in the Like list. That is why I love myself all the time, I want to exist all the time and I want to do things for my own sake all the time. Therefore, the author says *aham kadāchit na apriyaha* - I am never disliked by me at any time, at any place, under any condition.

So, double negative - I am never disliked by me. *That means what?* I am ever liked by me. Then, naturally the question will come (I don't know whether it has come). And if it doesn't come, I will create that question. *What is that? How about the people who hate themselves and think of even committing suicide?*

Suicide cases are there. Every day we read in the paper, there are special counselors giving the number. All those things are there. If a person wants to kill himself or herself, it is not because of self Like, it is certainly because of self-dislike. *How do you say self is ever liked?*

For that we answer, even that person who wants to kill himself, commits suicide, he never wanted to commit suicide before. That thought was not there before. It was a thought that came later. So, naturally I ask him or her, the question - *how come how you never had this thought before and now you are thinking?*

Then you will get an answer. *What will be the answer?* Some problem or other he will enumerate. Either some incurable disease or it may be enormous debt or some other tight situation like Apamānam (dishonor). Like children committing suicide, because they failed in the exam. It may be Apamāna, it may be Runam, or it may be Rōga.

Because of these reasons, I am committing or I am trying to commit suicide. Then suppose I ask him or give a suggestion - I will remove this problem. Let us imagine. I say I will remove this problem, you are old and diseased. I will make you 16 years youth healthy. Or I will remove all your debt, I will pay off or I will remove this problem that you face.

Do you want if you ask, he will say I don't mind. *So, what does that mean?* When there are problems, I want to remove myself and when there are no problems, I never get that thought. *What does that mean?* What I hate is not myself, but what I hate is the problem that is tormenting me. This is called *Anvaya Vyatirēka* logic.

Suppose I love you when you are rich and I don't love you when your money is gone. *What do I love?* Your money, very simple. Similarly, when I hate myself during problem, I don't hate myself when there are no problems. It is very clear that hatred is not directed towards self. Self continues to be in the Like list all time.

Even a person who commits suicide doesn't dislike himself; he dislikes his disease, his problems, or his debt. Therefore, Vedānta says *ātma sarvadā priyatamaha*. It is unconditionally loved by everyone. *ātma nastu kāmāya sarvam priyam bhavati*. Whether it is a criminal or a saint or a Gnyāni or even Bhagawān, Ātma is in the like list.

If ātma is in the like list, what is the conclusion we make? You should remember the principle. *What is that? yatra yatra priya vishayatvam tatra tatra ānanda hetutvam ātma priya vishayaha tasmāt ānanda hētuhu*. Since Ātma is unconditionally liked, it is an unconditional source of Ānanda.

Since it is eternally liked, it is an eternal source of *Ānanda*. Therefore, Ānanda must be the very nature of Ātma. I don't know that. When Vedānta says that is the problem. When I don't know that only, I take a begging bowl and go from people to people. Thus, we have to go with a begging bowl and be enslaved by the world.

According to Vedānta, world cannot give happiness also because *Anātma* doesn't have *Ānanda* in itself. What maximum *Anātma* can do is serve temporarily as a mirror. That is the maximum it can do. Serve temporarily as a mirror, to show my own *Ānanda*. That alone the world can do. There is no other source of Ānanda.

Therefore, the author says *Aham Ānanda Swarūpaha Cha Asmi*. *Thus, what is the content of the first line? Aham Sath Chit Ānanda Swarūpaha Asmi. Therefore, what is the conclusion? Ataha* - *Ataha* means therefore. Therefore means since I am of the nature of *Sacchidānanda*, *Aham Brahma Eva* - I am *Brahman* and Brahman only.

Claiming I am a *Jīva* is a sacrilege. So, I am Brahman and Brahman only. *And what type of Brahman? SacchidānandaLakshanam*. Which Brahman is defined in the Vedas as *Sacchidānanda*. *What is the logic used here? Lakshana Ikyāt Vastu Aykyam*. My definition is Sacchidānanda, proved by analysis.

Brahman's definition is Sacchidānanda known from the Scriptures. I am also Sacchidānanda, Brahman is also Sacchidānanda. Therefore, *Aham Brahma Asmi, Sacchidānanda Lakshanam*. This definition of Brahman is called *Swarūpa Lakshanam*. And *Swarūpa Lakshana Ikyāt Brahma Aykyam*.

Thus, the author begins with a very big bang. That alone comes in *Taitrīya Upanishad* also. After introducing Brahman, the Upanishad says *Satyam Gnyānam Anantam Brahma*, which is synonymous of *Sath Chit Ānanda*.

*mayyēvō dēti chidvyōmnīm jagat gandharva pattanam
atōham na katham brahma sarvagnyam sarva kāranam*

Here, the author takes up the second technical definition of Brahman known as *Tatastha Lakshanam*. And that definition of Brahman is *Jagat Kāranam Brahma* which is called *Tatastha Lakshanam* because it is an indirect definition of Brahman given through the world. Introducing a person directly is called *Swarūpa Lakshanam*.

But if you introduce through another person, he is the father of that person, husband of that person; when you define indirectly through an extraneous object, it is called *Tatastha Lakshanam*. Directly you describe that person - is tall, lean and fair complexioned, bald headed or whatever it is. That is called *Swarūpa Lakshanam*.

The first verse gave the *Swarūpa Lakshanam* of *Brahmātma* as *Sath Chit Ānanda*. In the second verse, Brahman is defined indirectly through this world as the *Kāranam* of this world, Appa of the world or amma of

the world. So, *Jagat Kāranam Brahma* and the author says when I study myself, I find that I, the *Sacchidātma* am the *Jagat Kāranam*.

When I look at my own nature I, the *Sacchidātma*, am the *Jagat Kāranam*. And I have got two powers to create two types of world. One power is the *Nidrā Shakti*, the power of Nidrā or sleep. With the help of Nidrā Shakti, I have the power to create a dream world. So, with Nidrā Shakti which is micro power, I create a subjective world which is called *Swapna Prapancha*.

Then, I have got macro creative power called *Māyā Shakti*. With that, I create the *Jāgrat Prapancha*. Through Māyā power, I create the Jāgrat Prapancha, the waker's world. With *Nidrā Shakti* or *Avidyā Shakti* I create *Swapna Prapancha*. When I don't operate both of them, when Jāgrat is not there because Māyā I don't operate. Swapna is not there, Nidrā I don't operate.

In *Sushupti*, I don't have either of the universes. So, I alone am the creator of both Jāgrat and Swapna. *What do I do?* After creating either of these two worlds (only one at a time); If we are supposed to be in the Jāgrat Avasthā simultaneously, we don't have Swapna Avasthā. So, I operate Māyā and I have Jāgrat Avasthā, Nidrā and I have Swapna Avasthā.

Having operated and created one of these two worlds, what do I do? I identify with a body in this world. *In which world?* The *Jāgrat Prapancha* or *Swapna Prapancha*. Once I identify with the *Swapna Sharīram*, I forget the fact that I have created this world. The moment I identify with Swapna Sharīram, I never say I have created this world. *What do I say?* I am a creature in this world.

Why does it happen? That is the glory of *Nidrā Shakti*. Because of the *Vikshēpa Shakti* of Nidrā, I create this *Swapna Prapancha*, identify with *Swapna Sharīram*. And once I become an individual in dream, I never

look up the dream as my creation. I feel the creation is permanently there and I am an individual coming and going.

Vedānta says this story is the same in the *Jāgrat Prapancha* also. It is very difficult to swallow, but Vedānta says fortunately or unfortunately. In the *Jāgrat Avasthā*, with the matter macro *Māyā* power, I, the *Sacchidātma* with the help of *Māyā Shakti* (*māyā kalpita dēsha kāla kalanā vaichitra chitrīkrutam*) create this world, including time, space and a body also.

Then, identified with this body, I no more look upon myself as the creator of the world. I see myself as the creature in the world. And I never accept I am the *Jagat Kāranam*. I look upon myself as a miserable Samsāri, persecuted by, tormented by the world. Sanchita, Āgāmi, Prārabdha, what Dasha is coming, what Dasha is going etc.

All the time worried about what will be the next thing that will fall upon my head. This miserable condition has come to me. *Which me?* I, the *Jagat Kāranam*. And it is unbelievable just as for the dreamer it is unbelievable to accept that he himself is the creator of the dream. And the author says, with the help of Guru and Shāstram, I have now understood the fact that -

*mayyēva sakalam jātam mayi sarvam pratishritam
mayi sarvam layam yāti tad bramhādvaya masmyaham*

Where does it come? Kyvalya Upanishad. Now look at this. *Jagat Gandharva Pattanam* - This universe which is comparable to the Gandharva Pattanam. *Gandharva pattanam* means an apparent city which appears in the sky due to the patterns formed by the clouds. It is often used in the Shāstra.

In the evening, if we look at the sky (we don't have time for that now), there are clouds and these clouds take different shapes. If you have got imagination, it appears like an elephant, it appears like a man, it appears

like a street. That apparent thing appearing due to the pattern of cloud, appearing in the sky is called *Gandharva Pattanam*.

A city created by the Gandharvas (celestial). This word is used in Vedānta to indicate that it is not a real city. So, Gandharva Pattanam is used for *Mithyā Srushti*. Similarly, the author says the *Jāgrat Prapancha* is a *Mithyā Prapancha*, projected by my own *Māyā Shakti*. That is *Macro Gandharva Pattanam*.

And in Swapna, with *Avidyā Shakti* I create *Micro Gandharva Pattanam* called *Mithyā Swapna Prapancha*. Two Gandharva Pattanams - One is *Jāgrat Prapancha Rūpa Mithyā Gandharva Pattanam*. *So, what I vision?* We have got two Gandharva Pattanam. *Normally what do you say?* This is a real world and dream is a fake world.

But Vedāntin says that both are fake worlds only, one is through *Māyā* and another is through *Nidrā*. We are not able to believe it because we are actually in it. As I have often said, for the dreamer, the dream world appears not be a dream world. It doesn't appear to be the dream in dream. For the dreamer, the dream world doesn't appear to be a dream in dream.

Similarly, this dream world (Anna Nagar) does not appear to be a dream because we are dreamers, identified with this body-mind complex. When you wake up from this body and identify with - *nāntah pragnyam na bhahish pragnyam na ubhayata pragnyam prapancha upashamam*. *Prapancha* means *Jāgrat Gandharva Pattana Dwaya Upashamaha*.

shāntam sadvaitam chaturtham manyantē sa ātma. Therefore, he says *Jāgrat Gandharva Pattanam* - this unreal world, *udēti* - falsely emerges, unreally arises. *udēti* means *utpadyatē*. *In whom? Mayi*, in me only. *What type of me - Sthūla Sharīram, Sūkshma Sharīram or Kārana Sharīram?*

Therefore, he says *chidvyōmni* - in the *satchidātma*, the all-pervading existence, consciousness principle. And he gives a comparison *vyōmni* -

which is like the space. In me, the space-like consciousness; *why does he compare the ātma to space?* Because he has used the example of *Gandharva Pattanam*.

Since the Gandharva Pattanam appears only in the sky, the Ātma is compared to the sky in which the world rises and settles. Therefore, in *Nidhidhyāsanam*, Vedāntic meditation, we have to see all the galaxies as soap bubbles. All the galaxies should be seen as bubbles rising and bursting, in me, the all-pervading Chaitanyam.

Only then, the creature Bhāvana will go. Otherwise, we will be eternally nakapuchis only. We will never claim freedom. Therefore, *chidvyōmni; vyōma* means *Ākāshaha*. *chidēva vyōma – chidvyōma*. *Karmadhāraya samāsa, saptami ēkavachanam, nakārāntaha napumsaka lingaha chidvyōman shabdaha - saptami ēkavachanam*.

And it goes along with *mayi* - in me, the space like consciousness everything rises. *Therefore, what? - Ataha Aham Brahma*. Therefore, I am Brahman. *What type of Brahman? Sarva Kāranam* - the cause of both the *Jāgrat Prapancha* through *Māyā Shakti* and *Swapna Prapancha* through *Avidyā* or *Nidrā Shakti*.

Through macro and micro powers, I am the cause. Anything you name, it will fall under either *Jāgrat Prapancha* or *Swapna Prapancha*. Even time and space belong to either Jāgrat or Swapna. *What is the proof?* In Sushupti there is no time but we say that I slept for two hours, three hours. *When do we say that?* Not in sleep.

Therefore, two hour sleep and three hour sleep are things we say in Jāgrat Avasthā. In sleep there is no time at all. Therefore, even time and space rise and set in me. I am free from time, I am free from space. Time and space are my own incidental properties. Time and space are my own incidental (not even intrinsic) properties.

And I use them when I want to have some fun. Like TV surfing, I surf the Jāgrat channel or the Swapna channel and get caught. I start to have fun and get caught. And not only I get caught, I don't know how to switch off. Author says, wake up.

*uttishtata jāgrata prāpyavarān nibōdhata
ataha aham sarva kārana brahma asmi*

*Pūrnamadah Pūrnamidam Pūrnāth Pūrnām Udachyatē
Pūrnasya Pūrnāmādāya Pūrnāmēvā Vasishyatē*

Om shānti shānti shāntihi



Advaita Makaranda – Verses 4 & 5

*sadāsiva samārambhām sankarāchārya madhyamām
asmad āchārya paryantām vande guru paramparām*

Verse No. 3

*mayyēvō dēti chidvyōmnīm Jagat gandharva pattanam
atōham na katham brahma sarvagnyam sarva kāranam*

The author Lakshmīdhara Kavi is establishing the *Jīva Brahma Aykyam*, by showing that the definition of *Jīva* from the stand point of his real nature and the definition of *Brahman*, both happen to be identical. Therefore, *Lakshana Ikyāt Vastu Aykyam*;

In the second verse, he talked about the *Swarūpa Lakshanam*, the essential nature. *Jīva* is of the nature of *Sath*, *Chit* and *Ānanda*. And *Brahman* is also defined as *Satyam*, *Gnyānam*, *Anantam*. Since the essential nature of both is one and the same, I am one with Brahman. *Swarūpa Lakshana Ikyāt Vastu Aykyam*.

Then, in the third verse which we saw in the last class, the author talked about the *Tatastha Lakshanam* or the indirect definition of Brahman. And that definition is, from the stand point of the world Brahman is defined as *Jagat Kāranam*. This definition is called indirect definition because we are revealing Brahman through the world as its cause.

Therefore, it is called *Tatastha Lakshanam*. The author says the *Tatastha Lakshanam* of Brahman is that it is *Jagat Kāranam* and the *Tatastha Lakshanam* of myself is also *Jagat Kāranam*. When I look at myself as consciousness, that I (the consciousness principle), alone has projected both the *Jāgrat Prapancha* as well as the *Swapna Prapancha*.

I, the original consciousness, through the *Māyā Shakti* have projected *Jāgrat Prapancha* as *Ēshwara*. I, the very same consciousness through the *Nidrā Shakti* (*Avidyā Shakti*), which is the micro power; Through *Avidyā Shakti*, I myself have projected the *Swapnam* also. When I am in

the *Swapna Prapancha*, I forget the fact that the Swapna is my projection.

Similarly, when I am in *Jāgrat Prapancha*, I forget the fact that it is my projection. So even though, I myself I project both Jāgrat and Swapna, I forget this fact. The fact is forgotten. The *Jāgrat Prapancha* fact is forgotten because of the *Āvarana Shakti* of *Māyā*. The *Swapna Prapancha* fact is forgotten because of the *Āvarana Shakti* of *Nidrā*.

But the fact is that both are my own projections (not my mind). My own means, both are Chaitanyam's projection. One is through *Māyā*, another is through *Nidrā*. *Macro Māyā* is reason for *Macro Jāgrat Prapancha* projection. *Micro Nidrā* is the cause for *Micro Swapna Prapancha* projection. But what is important is that both are my projection only.

Therefore, I am *Jagat Kāranam. māyā sahāyēna jāgrat prapancha kāranam, nidrā sahāyēna swapna prapancha kāranam aham asmi*. And then the author asks if I am Jagat Kāranam, I should be identical with Brahman because Scriptures define *Brahman* as *Jagat Kāranam - Janmādyasya yataha*.

Therefore, the author asked in the second line - *Ataha. Jagat kāranastva rūpa tatastha lakshana ikyāt. aham katham brahma na bhavāmi*. Instead of asking how can I be Brahman (that is what everybody is asking) here, he is asking how can I not be Brahman. That I am Brahman is - *hastha āmalakavat sputam. What type of Brahman? Sarvagnyam, Sarva Kāranam*.

Sarvagnyam means the Omniscient one and *Sarva Kāranam* means the Cause of all. The word *Sarvagnyam* is to indicate the *Nimitta Kāranam*. And the word *Sarva Kāranam* is to indicate the *Upādāna Kāranam*. Thus, the author says I am *Jagat Nimitta Upādāna Kāranam Asmi*. Of course, I am supposing that you know what *Nimitta Kāranam* and *Upādāna Kāranam* are. Continuing . .

Verse No. 4

*nasvatah pratyā bhignyānāt niramshatvā nachānyataha
nachāshraya vināshānmē vināshasyā danāshrayāt*

In these two verses (four and five), the author points out that *Jīva* is also *Nityaha* and *Brahman* is also *Nityam*. The *Nityatva Swarūpam* being identical, I am one with *Brahman*. Previously, *Swarūpa Lakshana Aykyam*, and *Tatastha Lakshana Aykyam* we said. Now he says, *Nityatva Rūpa Lakshana Ikyāt*.

Why am I Nityam? The author says because I cannot be destroyed. Being indestructible, being free from destruction I am *Nityam*. Then, the author says, destruction can happen due to three different reasons. Three types of destruction are possible. First one is called *Nirnimitta Nāshaha* - Natural destruction caused by time through wear and tear.

We call it *Nirnimitta Nāshaha*. Like time just flows by itself; nobody needs to do anything. 7'O clock comes, it is gone. 7:01 comes, it is gone. It will just naturally go. 7:02, 7:03, 7:04, the clock continuously shows that. This is called *Nirnimitta Nāshaha*.

The second one is *Anya Nimitta Nāshaha* - The destruction caused by some external force or external factor which the author himself will divide into four types. That we will see later. External factors like weapons, etc. People die because of floods, heat wave, cold wave etc. The causes differ but the effect is Destruction.

That is called *Anya Nimitta Nāshaha*. This is the second cause. The third one is called indirect destruction, caused by the disappearance of the support system. *Āshraya Nāsha Nimitta Nāshaha*. It is not directly destroyed. For example food is the *ahreya* for the survival of the body. If food is withdrawn, nobody need directly kill by weapons or anything.

After sometime the body dies. Nobody directly killed the body, they only withdrew the *Āshraya*. *What is the Āshraya?* - Food. So, this is

called *Āshraya Nāsha Nimitta Nāshaha*. So, *Nirnimitta Nāshaha*, *Anya Nimitta Nāshaha*, *Āshraya Nāsha Nimitta Nāshaha*.

The author says with regard to me, the *Ātma*, all these three types of destructions are impossible. All the three types of destructions are logically not possible with regard to 'I', the *Chētana Tatvam*, the *Ātma Tatvam*. Therefore, I am *Nāsha Rahitaha*. Therefore, I am *Nityaha* and therefore, I am *Brahma*. Therefore, I am *Nityam Brahma*.

So, look at the Slōka - *na swataha*. I do not have *Nirnimitta Nāshaha* - the natural destruction just as it happens for the time, which comes and goes. In fact, according to medical people, in our body, every minute several cells are born and several cells are getting destroyed. They have got only Kshana life, life for a Kshanam.

Nobody need do anything but because of their intrinsic nature, they appear and they disappear. Even now in our body cells are born and are dying. Like that *Ātma* is not being born and dying every second. On the other hand, I the *Ātma* exist continuously. They say and also give the details as to how long the cell, bone and the muscle live.

According to them, after every 12 years or so, we have really a new body. We really have a new body because we have nothing that was in the body 12 years before. Medically speaking, our body has changed, but even after that, there is one 'I' continuously claiming - I am, I am, I am. *The author asks the question, what is that 'I'?*

You cannot say body is that 'I', because that body doesn't exist after 12 years. The very color of the hair shows that the old hair is gone. And teeth of course, are gone. We have got removable and attachable teeth. *Therefore, what is that 'I' continuously remaining?* You cannot say a new 'I' is born after 12 years. *Why?*

If a new 'I' is born, that new 'I' cannot remember or cannot claim that I studied in this primary school; I had these games in my childhood, I will

never be able to say. That means, there is one constant and continuous 'I'. And that changeless 'I' principle, the *Chaitanyam* is *Nityam*.

dēhinōsmin yathā dēhē kaumāram yavvanam jarā - Body changes, mind changes, brain changes, thought changes but the word 'I' continues. It not only continues from childhood to boyhood to youth to old age, it continues in different Avasthās also - *Jāgrat*, *Swapna*, *Sushupti*. This is what we saw in Dakshināmurthy Stōtram – *bālyādishvapi jagradādishu tathā sarvāsu avasthāswapi vyāvruṭtāsu*.

All this have changed, there is one Nitya, changeless 'I'. *What is that I? Sākshi Chaitanyam* which is recognized at all stages. Therefore, the author says *pratyabhignyānāt* - That 'I', which is recognized as a continuous entity even when the body has changed, emotions have changed, brain cells have changed, the entire anatomy has changed, that changeless 'I' is eternal.

Therefore, Ātma doesn't have *Swataha*. *What does Swataha mean?* Natural death that is, *Nirnimitta Nāshaha Nāsti*. So, that Swataha should be connected with *vināshaha syāt* in the second line. So, in the sentence *me swatahavināshaha nasyāt*, I don't have *Nirnimitta Nāshaha*.

Whenever we are talking about our death, we are referring to the death of the body and we mistake the body's death as our death. That is our problem. But 'I', the real 'I', does not have natural death because of self-recognition. *Then, what is the second type of death? Anya Nimitta Nāshaha* - death caused by external factors.

That will be elaborated later in the next Slōka. Here, he is approaching slightly differently. *What is the phenomenon of destruction? When we talk about a destruction of a building, a chair or a table or anything, what are you talking?*

We know scientifically that matter cannot be created and therefore, only matter cannot be destroyed. This is a scientific truth. Shāstra need not

tell this. It is well known to all. When a candle burns, nothing is lost is a proverb, scientific proverb.

When you cannot destroy matter, how can you talk about the destruction of a pot? How can you talk about the destruction of a pot or anything for that matter, when scientifically speaking, it cannot be destroyed? What do we mean, when we talk about breaking a pot?

On analysis, science tells and *Tarka Shāstra* also has analyzed this. I don't know which B.C it is. Then itself they have analyzed what is creation and destruction. They explain - when you destroy something, what you are doing is you are only disintegrating the various components which are joined together for the formation of that object.

Every object is nothing but an assembly of various parts, various ingredients. In scientific language, we will say molecules. When you destroy them, it will become atoms. When you destroy them, it will become subatomic particles. Therefore, the so called destruction is only the disintegration of the parts which join together to produce an object.

Thus, both science as well as *Tarka Shāstra* say that everything in the creation is an assemblage. The building is made by adding bricks and in between cements. A room is nothing but an assemblage of the composite parts. Therefore, every object is a composite entity, an assemblage.

What is the ultimate basic building block? We will talk about brick, wood, etc. If you talk about ultimate building block, scientist will talk about atoms, *Tarka Shāstra* will talk about *Paramānu*. But the truth is that everything is an assemblage of parts. *And what is destruction?* Destruction is removing that assembly.

That's why in English we call it dis-integration. The author says any external factor which destroys something is only dis-integrating or separating the parts which constitute that object. Now the author says

destruction by other factors is caused by disintegration of the constituent parts of a thing.

In the case of Ātma, such destruction is not possible because Ātma is not a composite entity made up of parts. Ātma is not an assembly of atoms. Ātma is not an assembly of energy. Ātma is not an assembly of any constituent part. That is why we define Ātma as part-less principle - *Nishkala Tatvam, Niravayava Tatvam*.

Nobody can cause the disintegration of Ātma. That is why elsewhere, we talked about *Sajātīya Bhēdaha, Vijātīya Bhēdaha* and *Swagata Bhēdhaha*. Swagata Bhēdaha means internal parts of an object. Ātma doesn't have Swagata Bhēda. Therefore, the author says - *mē anyataha vināshaha nasyāt*.

So, the second sentence is *mē* – for me, *anyataha* - because of external factors, *vināshaha* - destruction is not possible. *What is the reason?* *Niramshatvāt* - because I don't have parts leading to my disintegration. I am not an integral whole. I am not a composite entity subject to decomposition. Decomposition, it is possible for a composite entity.

Then, how did they assemble the Ātma? Ātma is not assembled. *What is the nearest example for that?* Part-less entity which is not created by assembling; *what is that?* Tarka Shāstra analyses that. Tarka Shāstra says Pruthvi is an assembly, Jalam is an assembly, and everything is an assemblage.

There is one entity which is not an assemblage that is *Ākāshaha*. The space is *Niravayavam Vastu*. That is why space cannot get decomposed. You cannot cut apart the space also. Space cannot be subject to disintegration also because it is not a composite entity. Therefore, Ātma is like Ākāsha.

Therefore, I don't have natural death and I don't have death caused by external factors. *What is the logic?* *Niramshatvāt* - I am part-less. *Then, what is the next possibility?* I said *Āshraya Vināsha*. So, something can

be destroyed when the support system goes. Because of poverty, people can die because the support is not there.

What is that support? Money is a big support (Money Nashāt). Therefore, they die, they commit suicide also. As I said, food Nashāt, Āshraya is gone. Or oxygen is withdrawn from the room - Āshraya is gone. *Now, can Ātma be destroyed because of the withdrawal of the support system?*

The author says I don't have such destruction also. *What is the reason?* Because Ātma doesn't have anything else to support. Ātma is not supported by any factor. On the other hand, Ātma is support of everything. That's why Krishna said in the Bhagavad Gita, everything depends on me Arjuna but I don't depend on anything.

I am the Āshrayam of all, but I don't have any other Āshrayam. *natu aham tēshu tē mayi* - In the 7th chapter. I don't depend on anything, but they depend on me. Even time and space depend upon the Ātma. Therefore, being support-less, the destruction of support cannot be the cause of the destruction of Ātma.

mē - for me, *āshraya vināshāt nāshaha nasyāt* - destruction caused by the destruction of my support. Whenever we are talking about the world supporting us, brother is supporting or somebody else is supporting. Whenever we talk about the world or others supporting, we are only talking about the physical body.

The body has a support. When that support is withdrawn, the body can die. But here, the author is not talking about the body but 'I', the Ātma doesn't have any support. Therefore - *āshraya vināshāt mē vināshaha nasyāt*.

*pratyabhignyānāt swataha vināshaha nasyāt
niramshatvāt anyataha vināshaha nasyāt
anāshrayātāshreya vināshāt vināshaha nasyāt*

What does Anāshrayāt mean? Because I don't have any other support, the destruction of the support cannot be the cause of my destruction. In short, I am destruction-less - *Aham Nityaha*. Therefore, I am *Brahman*. Continuing. . .

Verse No. 5

*nashōsha plōsha viklēda chēdāschinna bhasōmama
satyairapya nilāgnyambhaha shastraih kimuta kalpitaihi*

This also is reinforcing the same idea. In the previous verse, the author negated three causes of destruction - *nir nimitta nāshaha*, *sannimitta nāshaha* or *anya nimitta nāshaha* and *āshraya nāsha nimitta nāshaha*. Of these three, the author is explaining the second one.

So, this Slōka is a commentary upon the second cause of destruction - *anya nimitta nāshaha*. Destruction caused by external factors I don't have. There, the author only generally mentioned external factors. And here he elaborates by analyzing what are the external causes of destruction.

If we are asked what will we do? We keep on enumerating all the objects in the creation right from auto rickshaw, either auto rickshaw or water-lorry or man-hole. *How many things we can enumerate?* But our tradition is glorious. They always know how to comprehensively present. *What is that?*

They say that the cause can be only four and they are *Chatur Mahābhūtāni*. Out of the five elements which constitute the creation, any one of the four elements can be the cause of destruction. Therefore, if flood is the cause of destruction or river or ocean, or anything, we will put all of them under one head - *Bhūmi*.

Even weapons like sword, knife, etc are all products born out of metal, which comes from the earth. *Therefore, what?* *Bhūlōka*. If it is an atom bomb and heat caused the destruction, it will come under *Agni Tatvam*.

If cyclone caused destruction, it will be called *Vāyu Tatvam*. Thus, *Pruthvi, Jalam, Agnihi, Vāyu*.

Other than these four, you cannot have any other cause of destruction. Even when you talk about the *Prārabdha Karma* causing destruction; remember that even Prārabdha Karma does not directly destroy. Remember that *Punyam* and *Pāpam* can never directly affect the people. They have to affect through some person or some object or the other.

What will that object be? One of the four elements. Therefore, four elements are the cause of destruction. *Why do you say only four elements?* Because fortunately or unfortunately, *Ākāsha* cannot harm us. Therefore, he says all these four elements cannot destroy me. *What is the reason?* The reason has to be collected from the previous Slōka.

The reason is all external factors destroy only by separating the component part. Since I don't have component parts, these four elements cannot disintegrate. In Sanskrit language, destruction through each element is given a special name. Even though destruction is one, but different names are given based on what the cause of destruction.

And he says *Shōshaha*. Shōshaha means destruction caused by the wind, when a thing dries up totally - Drying up of something because of the wind. *Sushdhātu, shushyati* means dry up. That is why when we have got too much sweat on the body, and it is disturbing and when we want to remove that water, we straightaway go and switch on the fan or AC.

What do we do by that? I am destroying the water particles, the sweat particles on my body by drying up. *Which is caused by what?* Fanning. *By fanning, how do you accomplish that?* *Vāyuhu. Vāyuna nāshaha* is called *Shōshaha*. Then, *Plōshaha*. Plōshaha means destruction caused by fire, incineration. So, incinerate, you destroy.

In fact, that is what in the medical field, by heating all the equipment, they destroy the bacteria. Even water when we purify, we destroy the germs by heating. There, fire destroys. *What it is called?* *Plōshaha*. The

root is *Plush Dhātu*. *Plush* - to burn down. *But in both, what is the process that is taking place?* The ingredient parts get disintegrated.

Then the third one is *Viklādaha*. Because of water, a thing gets disintegrated. When a thing gets soggy with water; In fact, many types of plants get destroyed because of water logging. Too much of rain, the crops get destroyed because of water logging. Again, water disintegrates.

What is it called? *Viklādaha* - Water caused decomposition or disintegration. Then the fourth one is *Vicchādaha*. The previous three you should remember that they are three elements. *Shōshaha* means *Vāyu Bhūtam*. *Plōshaha* means *AgniBhūtam*. *Bhūtam* means one of the five elements.

Then, *Viklāda* is *JalaBhūtam*. Then the next one is *chādaha*. *chādaha* means cut by varieties of weapons. With the help of knife, with the help of sword etc. , when the body gets destroyed; *chādaha* literally means cutting. This represents all the weapons. And all the weapons represent the *Bhūmi Tatvam*. It can even be natural.

When the earthquakes, things fall or because of rain also a house falls and people die. It is caused by *Bhūmi Tatvam*. Cooperative endeavor - *Jalam* weakened the foundation and then the *Bhūmi Tatvam*, the house collapses. Combined, this person dies. Therefore, *chādaha* is destruction caused by earth.

All these destructions are not there for me. *What type of me?* *Chinnabhasaha* - who is space like consciousness. So, *Chinnabhasaha* - *Chit Nabasaha*. *Chit* means *chaitanyam*, *nabhas* means *Ākāshaha*. *Shashti vibhakti*, *sakārāntaha*, *napunsaka lingaha*. *nabhas shabdaha*. *nabhaha* - *nabhasī* - *nabhāmsī*.

Why does the author give the space example? Because here, there is lot of similarity between Space and *Chaitanyam*. *What is the main similarity to be noted in this context?* *Niramshatvāt*, space also doesn't

have parts for disintegration. Consciousness also doesn't have parts for disintegration. Both are *Niravayavam*.

Therefore, space also cannot be burnt down; space also cannot be destroyed by water. Thus, water cannot wet, fire cannot burn, and weapons cannot cleave the space. Similarly, weapons cannot destroy the Chaitanyam.

When we see all this, we should remember the Bhagavad-Gita 2nd chapter -

*acchēdyōyamadāhyōyam acclēdyō sōshya ēvacha
nitya sarva gatasthānuhu achalōyam sanātanaha*

The same idea is given here. For me, the space like consciousness, destruction is not possible because I am part-less. Therefore, he says *anila agni ambha shastraihi*. *Anila* means wind or air, *Agni* means fire, *Ambhaha* means water, *Shastra* means weapons or the earth. You have to connect the first line with the second line.

Shōsha by *Anila*. That is, drying up through the wind. *Plōsha* should be connected with *Agni*. Therefore, burning down by fire; *Viklēda* should be connected with *Ambhaha*. That is, destruction caused by water. And *Chēdaha* should be connected with *Shastra*.

So, *anilēna shōshaha, anginā plōshaha, ambhasā viklēdaha, shastrēna chēdaha*. All these four forms of destruction are not possible for me, the space like Consciousness. Then, he adds one more dimension to this idea. He says 'I', the Chaitanyam is *Satyam, PārāmārdhikaSatyam*, real. *What about the four elements?*

They are unreal. Unreal or they are less real. Now he says, even if these four elements are *PārāmārdhikaSatyam*, they have the same order of reality (hypothetical argument). Even if they have the same order of reality, they cannot destroy me because I am part-less.

So, even if they are real, they cannot destroy me. *But what is the truth?* They are unreal. When the real elements cannot destroy me, what to talk of unreal elements! When the 'real' elements (even if they are real) cannot destroy me because I am part-less then, what to talk of the *kalpitai!* *Kalpitam* means unreal.

What to talk of the *Mithyā Bhūtāni!* They cannot touch me. Therefore, *Aham Nityam Brahma Asmi.* More in the next class.

*Pūrnamadah Pūrnamidam Pūrnāth Pūrnām Udachyatē
Pūrnasya Pūrnāmādāya Pūrnāmēvā Vasishyatē*

Om shānti shānti shāntihi



Advaita Makaranda Verses - 5 & 6

*sadāsiva samārambhām sankarāchārya madhyamām
asmad āchārya paryantām vande guru paramparām*

Verse No. 5

*nashōsha plōsha viklēda chēdāschinna bhasōmama
satyairapya nilāgnyambhaha shastraih kimuta kalpitaihi*

The author Laxmīdhara Kavi is establishing *Jīvātma Paramātma Aykyam*, by pointing out that the Lakshanam of *Jīvātma* and the Lakshanam of *Paramātma*, both are one and the same. By *Lakshanam* we mean the essential nature because we use essential nature alone to define a thing.

Therefore, the oneness of definition is the same as the oneness of the essential nature of a thing. Thus, *Lakshana Ikyāt Jīvātma Paramātma Aykyam* is the method that the author is using. First, he talked about the *Swarūpa Lakshanam* of both of them, *Jīvātma* and *Paramātma* as *Sath Chit Ānandaha*.

Jīvātma is also *Sacchidānanda*, *Paramātma* is also *Sacchidānanda*. Therefore, both are one and the same - *Swarūpa Lakshana Ikyāt*. Thereafter, he showed *Tatastha Lakshana Ikyāt*. The indirect definition also happens to be one and the same. *Jīvātma* is also *Jagat Kāranam*, *Paramātma* is also *Jagat Kāranam*.

Jagat kārana rūpa tatastha lakshana ikyāt jivātma paramātma Aykyam. Next, he has come to the third feature. *Nityatva rūpa lakshana rūpa ikyāt jivātma paramātma Aykyam*. That is *Jīvātma* is also *Nityam*, *Paramātma* is also *Nityam*. Both being *Nityam* or eternal, they are essentially one and the same.

That *Jīvātma* is *Nityam*, he is establishing in verse 4 and 5. In the 4th verse he pointed out that *Jīvātma* is eternal because it doesn't have destruction or death. So, it is eternal because it is deathless. Thereafter,

he said *Jīvātma* is deathless because the three causes of death are not there for *Jīvātma*.

Therefore, death is not there. *nāsha kārana abhāvāt nāsha abhāvaha* and *nāsha abhāvāt nityatvam*. *So, the next question is what are the three causes of destruction?* He said *nir nimitta nāshaha* - a thing can die naturally by itself, because of time, which is called *nir nimitta nāshaha*. Then, the second is *anya nimitta nāshaha* - destruction caused by an external agent.

And the third one is *kārana nāshanimitta nāshaha* - when the supporting cause is gone, a thing dies. Just as when food is withdrawn, a living being dies. He established in the 4th verse, all the three are not impossible. *pratyabhignyānāt swatahā nāshaha nāsti, avayava abhāvāt anya nimitta nāshaha nāsti, ashreya abhāvāt ashreya nimitta nāshaha nāsti*.

That he established in the 4th verse, which we completed in the last class. Therefore, I don't want to enter that again. Then, in the 5th verse the author said why *Ātma* cannot be destroyed by an external agent. *What are the possible external agents he mentioned?* The external agents can be only four.

Either any weapon which will come under *Pruthvi Tatvam* or it can be water, *Jala Tatvam* like flood, rain etc. Or wind in the form of cyclone etc - *Vāyu Tatvam*. Or it can be fire, *Agni Tatvam*. The four elements alone can cause destruction. *Ātma* cannot be destroyed by anyone because destruction is caused by the separation of the parts.

Any destruction is caused by the separation of constituent parts. *Ātma* doesn't have constituent parts. Therefore, it cannot be destroyed. And he gave the example also. *Ākāshaha*, space being part-less, space cannot be destroyed by anything. Similarly, *niravayavatvāt, nir amshatvāt*, it cannot be destroyed by element.

There he added a point. Even if the four elements are real (hypothetical); According to Vedānta, they are not real. The author says even if they are real, they cannot destroy the Ātma, because Ātma is part-less. When the real elements themselves cannot destroy, what to talk of the unreal elements!

There is not even a remote chance of the unreal elements destroying the real Ātma. It is like the unreal fire shown on the movie screen. If you see Mahābhāratam movie and scene comes where the lac (wax) house burns. The fire is shown on screen. The fire cannot destroy the screen because it is the Mithyā fire.

Just as it cannot destroy the real screen, the *Mithyā* elements cannot destroy the *Ātma*. Even if the elements are *Satyam*, they cannot destroy because Ātma is part-less. Therefore, the author said *satyaihi api anilāgnyambhashastraihi*. Here the word ‘*satyaihi*’ is only a hypothetical argument that is to be put within inverted commas.

Elements are not *Satyam*. Even if they were Satyam, they cannot destroy. For grammar students, *anilāgnyambhashastraihi* is one compound word. Therefore, we have to read as *ambhashastraihi*. *ambhaha* means water. *When the real elements themselves cannot destroy, kimuta kalpitaihi - how can the unreal elements destroy?*

Therefore, *ātma nityaha, brahma Nityam*; Therefore, *Ātma* and *Brahman* are one and the same. The word Nityam is presented in the Shāstram in a different language. *Nityam* means *kāla paricchēda rahitam*. Eternal means that which is not limited by time. In Vedānta, limitation is divided into three types - time wise limitation, space wise limitation, attribute wise limitation.

Dēsha, Kāla, Vastu paricchēda. The author wants to negate each one of them. Now he has negated *KālaParicchēda*. Later, he will negate *DēshaParicchēda*. Spatial limitation is not there. That will come in the next verse. We will see.

Verse No. 6

*abhārūpasya vishvasya bhānam bhāssanni dhērvinā
kadāchinnāva kalpēta bhāchāham tēna sarvagaha*

In this verse, the author establishes that *Ātma* is *Sarvagataha* - all pervading, which means that it doesn't have spatial limitation. It doesn't have spatial location. You should not ask the question where the *Ātma* is. The question comes because you want to spatially locate the *Ātma*.

In-fact, everything is located in the *Ātma*. *Ātma* is not located. In-fact, we go one step further. Even space is located in *Ātma*. *Ātma* is not located in space. It is a very difficult concept to assimilate. Even if somehow we understand it, we will say *Ātma* is without any location,

Ātma is all-pervading, but we will never have the courage to say that *Ātma* I am and therefore, I am all-pervading. The all-pervasiveness of *Ātma* is the toughest point to understand. In Vedānta, we establish all pervasiveness of *Ātma* in two different methods.

One method is used here by the author and there is a second method also. Second method is not said here. Therefore, I will tell it independently. The relatively easier method is, *Ātma* I am, *Chaitanya Rūpaha*, we have to arrive at.

I am the conscious entity; I am the *Sākshi Chaitanyam*, which we have to arrive at which is relatively simpler, because everyone will accept I am a conscious being. After arriving at consciousness we have to establish that consciousness is identical with existence *Sath*.

Chit has to be equated to *Sath* because wherever consciousness is, we have to say existence also is. Once we have equated consciousness with existence, our job is simple. Existence is everywhere and therefore, consciousness is everywhere and therefore, *Ātma* is everywhere.

Therefore, I am everywhere. Existence is everywhere and therefore, consciousness is and therefore, *Ātma* is therefore, I am. That existence

is everywhere can be easily understood, because always we use the expression - there is a man, there is a women, there is the Sun, there is the Star.

Whatever we refer to, we use the verb of being 'is' or 'or' (some verb or the other), which indicates Being or Existence. Therefore, existence is everywhere. So, this is one method of proving Ātma's all pervasiveness. Now, the author here is going to approach in a different way. Whichever you are impressed, you can take. One of them I should be convinced.

He says, if you have to talk about any object in the creation, you should be conscious of the object. If you have to talk about any object in the creation like Sun or Moon or even the farthest Star, you should be conscious of the object because you can never talk of something unless you are aware of it, unless you know it.

So, talking presupposes knowing. Knowing presupposes awareness of the object, consciousness of the object. That means, every object has to be associated with consciousness to be talked about. Every object has to be associated with consciousness to be talked about. If you are not conscious of a thing, you cannot talk about that thing.

Therefore, the author says, everything in the creation that you talk about, if not you, anyone talks about, it is because it is associated with *Chaitanyam*. So, *chaitanya sambandhāt vastu vyavahāraha*. Transaction with regard to or associated with object, presupposes *chaitanya sambandaha*.

Any transaction, you are taking it, you are talking about it, you are producing it etc. And the *Chaitanyam*, which is associated with the objects do not intrinsically belong to those objects because they are all *Jadam* in nature. So, if I am talking about the chair, the chair is associated with *Chaitanyam*.

That is why we call it chair knowledge. If the chair is associated with Chaitanyam, it is not its own Chaitanyam. *Why?* If it is its own

Chaitanyam, chair would have been *Chētanam* like me. It will also talk. If chair is associated with Chaitanyam, and chair doesn't have its own Chaitanyam, it must belong to the Ātma alone.

Therefore, that Chaitanyam for the chair must have come from Ātma. We have to dwell on and on to fully first understand, then to be convinced, then to be assimilated. You are talking about object therefore, you know therefore, it is associated with Chaitanyam. And it doesn't have its own Chaitanyam.

Therefore, the *Chaitanya Sambandha* comes because of *Ātma Sambandha* only. Therefore, Ātma is associated with every blessed thing in the creation. Because of *Ātma Sambandha*, there is *Chaitanya Sambandha*. Because of Chaitanya Sambandha (Sambandha means association, link), there is Knowledge, because of knowledge, it is within our transaction or *Vyvahāra*.

I will give you an example. Now I am seeing all of you, all your faces, your dress, etc. This is possible because eyes can perceive any object only when it is bathed in light. Eyes can never see any object if doesn't have *Prakāsha Sambandha*. *For eyes to perceive, what is the condition?* Every object must be bathed in light, coated with light.

Therefore, I am perceiving you because of light Sambandha. I know that you don't have your own light. *If you have your own light, what will happen?* Like radium your body will be glowing. That doesn't happen. *That means what?* You are bathed in light. *What is the proof?* I am seeing you.

You don't have your own light and from that, I know that there is something else which is lending light to you. *What is that?* Tube light Prakāsham or *Surya Prakāsham*. *Where is Surya Prakāsha?* Surya Prakāsha is not eight crore miles away. Surya Prakāsha pervades all the objects of earth.

Because of that, objects are shining, because of that eyes are perceiving and because of that I am able to transact with those objects. Exactly like Prakāsha, we should know that Chaitanyam also must spread all the objects of the creation. *What is the proof?* I am knowing those objects.

If consciousness were not there, we will not be able to talk about all these things. The very fact that we are talking about is because everything in the creation is bathed in the Chaitanyam. *Therefore, where is Chaitanyam?* The author says, where is the Chaitanyam not!

It is like asking Surya Prakāsham is on which part of the playground. It is spreading all over. *What is the proof?* I am talking about it. Therefore, very terse verse and very profound verse; *abhārūpam vishwam* - The universe doesn't have consciousness of its own, it is of inert nature.

bha means *chaitanyam*, *abhārūpam* means *Chaitanya Rahitam Rūpam*. *Chaitanyam Rahitam Rūpam* means *Achētanam Rūpam*. *Achētanma Rūpa* means *Jada Rūpam*. The whole universe doesn't have Chaitanyam of its own. And *bhāssannidhēr vinā bhānam na bhavati* -

This *Jada Prapancha* cannot be known without the association with consciousness. Cannot be known; *bhānam* means knowledge. The knowledge of the world is not possible or the world cannot be known. Both are same. *bhāssannidhēr vinā* - without association;

Sannidhi means proximity, association, contact. Without that, *vinā na avakalpēta* - is not possible. *What is the example?* Your knowledge, your perception is not possible, if light does not fall on you. Similarly, your knowledge is not possible without consciousness bathing you.

Thus, not only light must pervade you, the consciousness also should pervade you. Otherwise, I cannot be conscious of you. That is why Sankarāchārya said in *Dakshinā Murthy Stōtram* -

*nānā chidra gadōdhara stitha mahā deepa prabhā bhāsvaram
gnyānam yasyatu chakshurādi karanā dwārā bahispandatē*

When you switch on the torch light in the night, the light pervades the object. The light emerging from the torch falls on every object and therefore, the object is known or seen. Similarly, only when consciousness pervades the object you can be conscious of the object.

Therefore, *bhā* here means *Chaitanyam*. *Sannidhihi* means *Sambandha*. *bhāssannidhihi* means *Chaitanya Sambandha*. *vinā* means without. Without Chaitanya Sambandha, world cannot be known. *na avakalpēta* means is not possible. *When is it not possible? Kadāchit*, at any time the consciousness has to pervade.

Since all the world is known to someone or the other, even the heaven is known; if not for me, for Indra Varuna, Agni. Everything in the creation is known to someone or the other. That means everything in the creation is pervaded by Chaitanyam. *That means what?* Chaitanyam is all-pervading.

In-fact, we can say *yatra yatra sat asti tatra tatra chit api asti*. *Okay, so what?* He says, and that all pervading consciousness, I am. The author says don't think that you are the body. If you take yourself to be the body, you are located. If you take yourself to be the mind, you are located.

But if you take yourself as the *Chaitanyam* which is in the body also and which is in the farthest star also, that Chaitanyam, I am. I am the all-pervading consciousness. Therefore, *Aham Brahma Asmi*; But Swāmiji it is very tough. *Who said it is easy?* We never said Vedānta is easy. But it is still worth knowing because the benefits are high.

The greatest benefit is that fear of mortality goes away. As body, I have to be always afraid of old age and death. *Jarā pishāchi* - Sankarāchārya says, old age is always frightening. If you want to get rid of the fear of old age, insecurity and death, the only method is, don't identify with this dying bundle of flesh.

Claim, *aham chidānanda rūpaha shivōham shivōham*. So, *bhācha aham*; That is the next sentence. *bha means what?* Chaitanyam, the all-pervading Chaitanyam, I am. For Sanskrit students, the word is *bhāha*. That *visarga* is dropped because of sandhi rule.

The actual word is *bhāha*, *sakārāntaha*, *strī lingaha*, *bhās shabdha*. *bhāh* - *bhāsau* - *bhāsaha*; *bhāsam* - *bhāsau* - *bhāsaha* ; *bhāsa* - *bhābhyām* - *bhābhihi*; *iti rūpāni*. So, here *bhāha* means *Chaitanyam*. *Why he uses the word bhā and not Chaitanyam?* The advantage is that he will save several words.

This is the shortest word possible. Even *Chit* has got two words. So here *bhā*. *Bhā* means Chaitanyam. *Aham* - I am that all pervading consciousness. That is another sentence. Then, the next sentence, *tēna sarvagaha*; Therefore, I am everywhere. *So, if anybody asks where are you?* Our internal answer is, I am everywhere.

In our internal understanding is, I am everywhere. In me, the bodies come and go away. In the previous verse, I am eternal. In this verse, I am all-pervading. In the previous verse, time-wise limitation is removed and in this verse spatial limitation is removed. *dēsha kāla paricchēda shūnyaha aham asmi*. Therefore, *Aham Brahma Asmi*;

Continuing. .

Verse No. 7

*nahi bhānādrutē satvam nartē bhānam chitō chitaha
chitsambandhōpi nā dhyāsāt rutē tēnāha madvayaha*

Each verse is a huge leap in Vedāntic teaching. He has said I am eternal, one big leap because all the time we think we are going to die soon. So, that itself take time to assimilate. Before we could assimilate, he leapt another stage - I am all-pervading. Now, in this verse another very huge leap.

He wants to say I am second-less (without a second thing), I only exist. There is nothing existing other than me. I am *Advaita Swarūpaha*. *Advitīya Swarūpaha*, I am second-less which is still bigger and tougher jump. And this also is established in Vedānta by using different methods. Here one method is used.

There is another method also we use in Vedānta which is not said here. I will add it as a side note. One method used is *Kārya Kārana Prakriya* method. *What is that?* In this, we establish that *Ātma* is the *Kāranam* and everything else is the *Kāryam*.

As revealed in *Taitrīya Upanishad - tasmādvāētas mād ātmana ākāsha sambhūta ha ākāshād vāyuhu vāyur agnihi*. The *Pancha Bhūtas* as well as *Pānchabhoutika Prapancha*, everything is born out of *Ātma*. Therefore, everything else is *Kāryam*. And once you establish something is a product, finished.

Because any product is only name and form, it is not a substance at all. *What is the example?* Ornament is not a substance; it is only a name and form. *What is the substance?* Not the ornament, gold alone is the substance. Once I establish all ornaments are product, I have a big jump. Bangle is a product therefore, it is *Nāma-Rūpa*.

Therefore, it is not a substance. Chain is not a substance, ring is not a substance. Therefore, these are all not substances. There is only one substance and that is Gold. Like that, if you establish the entire creation is *Kāryam*; whole world is *vāchārambhanam vichārō nāma dhēyam*. There is only one substance - *Brahman* or *Ātma*.

That *Ātma*, I am. Therefore, I am the only substance in the creation. There is no second thing. *What about all the second things?* They are name and form. This is one method used in *Taitrīya Upanishad*. Here the author uses another method which is little bit subtle. *What is that?* He says - *nahi bhānādrutē satvam*.

First, he is restating what he has already established in the previous Slōka. From that he is going to go further. So, first he reminds us of what he established in previous Slōka. *What was established in previous Slōka?* If you are talking about any object, it has to be known. If it has to be known, it should be associated with *Chaitanyam*.

Therefore, every object should have *Chaitanya Sambandha*. That was what was established. Now, thereafter he will develop further. So, he says, *bhānādrutē satvam nahi*. No object can exist without being known. No object can exist if it is not known. In short, you can never talk about the existence of something if it is not knowable.

Therefore, what is the condition for existence? It should be knowable, for someone or the other, at some time or the other. Suppose, you say there is something which is not knowable to anyone at any time. Suppose there is a thing which is not knowable to anyone at any time, then you cannot talk about its existence at all.

Its existence is only imaginary. You can imagine that I have got 1 crore rupees. When asked where it is, you say it is not knowable. Ok, it is not knowable to me. *Will it be knowable to someone?* No, it will never be knowable to anyone at any time. What is the use of saying I have 1 crore rupees! We will never say I have 1 crore rupees.

If I have 1 crore rupees, which is not knowable to anyone at any time, the answer is I don't have 1 crore rupees. Therefore, for a thing to exist, it has to be knowable to someone at some time. Therefore, he says *bhānādrutē* - without knowability for someone at some time, *satvam nahi* - you cannot talk about the existence of a thing.

There are so many planets or so many asteroids which are not known to us. They do exist but the thing is that they will become or they can become knowable to some scientist at some time in future. If there is something which will never be knowable to anyone at any time in future, we call it non-existent.

Therefore, *satvam* means existence, *nahi* means is not possible. *bhānādrutē* - without knowledge. Then, the next statement is *achitaha bhānam*- the knowledge (*bhānam* means knowledge) of *achitaha* of an inert object. *achitaha* - *shashti vibhakti, takārānta strī lingaha, achit shabdaha, shashti ēka vachanam*.

chitaha rutē nabhavati - The knowledge of an inert object is never possible without association with consciousness. *rutē means what?* - Without the association. *nartē* has to be split as *na* plus *rutē*. *rutē* is an indeclinable word, which means without. In this context, without means without the contact with *chitaha*; *chitaha* means consciousness.

Without consciousness contact, an inert object will never be known. And if it is not known, you cannot talk about its existence. Therefore, you have to go in reverse order. If you are talking about its existence, it is known. If it is known, it has got contact with *Chaitanyam*.

Therefore, Chaitanyam is connected to everything in the creation. So, *sarva sambandhaha asti*. Up to this is restatement of previous Slōka. Hereafter, he is going to jump. Until now, he was on the run way and he is now going to takeoff, very powerful take off.

He asks the question, we have established that consciousness is connected to every object in the creation which is inert in nature which means, which is matter. That means consciousness is associated with matter everywhere.

So, we have until now understood that consciousness is associated with matter which is in the form of all material products. *And he asks the question, what is the relationship between the consciousness and matter? If consciousness is associated with every matter or matter everywhere, what is the relationship?*

In Sanskrit it is called *Sambandhaha*. *Because in Tarka Shāstra, whenever you talk about association or contact, they will ask the question, what type of contact?* It is because in *Tarka Shāstra* they have

divided in varieties of contacts. For example, the contact between my body and the dress is one type of contact called *Samyōga Sambandhaha*.

It is a temporary contact subject to arrival and departure. We are able to remove the dress; there is a contact. *What type of contact? Samyōga Sambandhaha*. This body has got a complexion or a height or a weight. So, there is a relationship between body and its properties. Varieties of properties it has got.

What type of Sambandha is it? Like a dress you cannot remove it. You cannot separate height, you cannot scratch color. That relationship between substance and properties is not separable. Therefore, they call it *Samavāya Sambandha*. Like that, in Tarka Shāstra varieties of relationships are talked about.

I am not entering into the details. Already head must be reeling! The author says you will find that no conventional relationship is possible between matter and consciousness. All conventional relationships will fail when you study matter and consciousness.

That is why scientists are even now bewildered; they are not able to talk about matter and consciousness relationship. Therefore, Vedānta solves that problem by introducing a unique relationship which we will see in the next class.

*Pūrnamadah Pūrnamidam Pūrnāth Pūrnām Udachyatē
Pūrnasya Pūrnāmādāya Pūrnāmēvā Vasishyatē*

Om shānti shānti shāntihi



Advaita Makaranda – Verses 7 & 8

*sadāsiva samārambhām sankarāchārya madhyamām
asmad āchārya paryantām vande guru paramparām*

Verse No. 7

*nahi bhānādrutē satvam nartē bhānam chitōchitaha
chitsambandhōpi nā dhyāsāt rutē tēnāha madvayaha*

In this profound Slōka, the author is establishing the non-dual nature of *Ātma*, the *Chaitanya Tatvam*. By way of that, the author shows that *Ātma* is also *Advaitam*, *Brahman* is also *Advaitam*. Therefore, *Ātma* and *Brahman* are one and the same. *advaita swarūpa lakshanasya ikyatvāt jeevātma paramātma Aykyam*. He derives that through a few steps.

Each step is a solid step. In the first, we saw in the last class, the author says that you can never talk of the existence of anything unless you are aware, you know that particular thing. If there is a thing which can never be known by anyone at any time, such a thing does not exist.

In-fact, you cannot talk of its existence. Therefore, if something exists, it should be knowable to someone at some time. Therefore, awareness of an object, knowledge of an object is the precondition for the existence of the object. Therefore, the first step is every object is associated with *Chaitanyam*, awareness.

So, *nahi bhānāt rutē satvam* - without knowledge of an object, you cannot talk of the existence of an object. Therefore only, *chitaha rutē achitaha bhānam na sambhavati. chitaha - panchami vibhakti. achitaha - shashti vibhakti*. Without the association with consciousness, the knowledge of an inert object is never possible.

chitaha rutē means, without the association of Chaitanyam, *achitaha bhānam* (*bhānam* means knowledge), the knowledge of an *achid vastu*, (*achid* means inert object) is not possible. *What is the example, you should remember?*

The knowledge of this book or letters which you are reading, the knowledge of those letters is never possible unless the light pervades the book. So, the very perception of the book is the proof for the light principle spreading over the book. I am not talking about the tube which is far away, but I am talking about the *Prakāsha* which spreads over the book.

But our problem is we are aware of the book, we are aware of the perception of the book, but we don't note that the perception is possible because of the spreading of the light over the book. Similarly, unless the *Chaitanya Prakāsha* spreads over the whole world, you can never talk about the knowledge or the existence of the world.

Both the existence and knowledge of the world presupposes like the light spreading, Chaitanyam spreading over the whole world. Therefore, *chitaha rutē achitaha bhānam na sambhavati*. Therefore, we have come to the conclusion that every inert object is associated with Chaitanyam. So, every inert object has got association with, relation with, contact with *Chaitanyam*.

In Sanskrit we call it *Chit Sambandhaha*. Every *Jada Vastu* has *Chit Sambandhaha*. Without that, we won't talk about its very existence. *Now, the main question is what is the relationship between the Chaitanyam and the inert objects?* We say there is contact, we say there is relation.

If Sambandha is there, tell me what type of Sambandha it is because in Tarka Shāstra, you can never talk of Sambandha without specification. Like when a person says, this person is my relative, immediately curiosity comes to the mind. *We ask what relation?*

I told you somebody introduced brother-in-law's brother-in-law's brother-in-law which I still have not understood. Anyway he understands, fine. So Sambandha is *Sāmānyam*. Every general

relationship involves a specific relationship - cousin, father, father in-law, or husband.

Similarly, in Tarka Shāstra they talk about *Samyōga Sambandha*, *Samavāya Sambandha*, *Tadātmya Sambandha*. Three main relationships they talk about. I gave you the example. I am not going to the details. The Sambandha between the body and the dress is called *Samyōga Sambandha*, which has come temporarily and which can be separated.

My book and the desk here have got Samyōga Sambandha which started when I placed the book on the desk and which will end when I remove the book. Your hand and watch has got Samyōga Sambandha. My face and spectacle have got Samyōga Sambandha. It is a temporary relationship.

Then, they talk about *Samavāya Sambandha* - The relationship between a substance and its properties which can never be physically separated. You height, weight, complexion, etc. , are all associated with your body which cannot be separated. You cannot leave your weight at home. If you can leave the weight at home you can climb the staircase very quickly.

So, what is the relationship between substance and its properties? Samavāya Sambandha. Like that, in Tarka Shāstra they talk about Sambandha. *Now we ask the question, what is the Sambandha between matter or any material and Chaitanyam?* That is the biggest mystery in the creation.

As I have often said, the scientists are struggling to understand what consciousness is and how does consciousness arise in matter, how long it remains, when does it die etc. All these things they want to understand. They have not yet understood. *Now, what does Vedānta say?*

Vedānta says consciousness and the world can never have any regular relationship. It can never have any regular relationship because the

moment there is a regular relationship, consciousness also will become one of the relative objects in the creation. Once a regular relationship comes then, it becomes a one of the related objects in the creation.

And once consciousness is also one of the things in the creation, it will also be subject to time, space, changes, birth, death etc. All of them will affect the Chaitanyam. Just as the body gets affected by the natural forces, the physical forces, the chemical forces. The food affects, the weather affects, the temperature affects.

Just as everything affects the body, *Chaitanyam* also will be subject to the influence of all of them. But from our experience we find Chaitanyam is not at all influenced by, affected by all these physical and chemical laws. The scientists themselves admit that.

If the Chaitanyam is not affected by any one of these worldly changes, Chaitanyam cannot be one of the things within the creation. Therefore, the Shāstra says Chaitanyam is of a higher order of reality and the world is of a lower order of reality. Therefore, no regular relationship is possible.

Therefore, the relationship is called *Adhyāsa Sambandha*. Adhyāsa Sambandhaha is an irregular relationship in which one of them belongs to the lower order of reality and the other belongs to the higher order of reality. It is like the sand and mirage water. *What is the relationship?* They are very close.

What are close? The sand and the mirage water. *But what is the peculiarity?* Mirage water cannot wet the sand. *Therefore, what is the relationship?* Irregular relationship called Adhyāsa Sambandhaha, where the mirage water is unreal and sand is real. Similarly, we have got the movie and the screen.

Both of them are very close but what is the relationship, if you ask? We will say that the relationship is *Adhyāsa Sambandhaha*. The events of

the movie belong to unreal order of existence, reality. The screen belongs to the higher order.

Therefore, the fire in the movie cannot burn the screen. Water in the movie cannot wet the screen; the knife in the movie cannot cut the screen. The slum area in the movie cannot sully the screen. *So, what is the relationship?* They are together all right, but the relation is called Adhyāsa Sambandhaha.

Similarly, are the dream and the waker. Both of them are very intimate. Dream is in me. If I am in Madras, my dream cannot be in Calcutta. It cannot be even in the next street. *Dream and the waker are together, but what is the relationship, if you ask? Adhyāsa Sambandha.* Dream is of a lower order and waker is of a higher order.

That is why the son of the waker cannot marry the girl in the dream. I have told you the example - this person has been looking for a daughter-in-law and he saw a nice girl in dream. *Can he fix up an alliance between the dream girl and the waker son?* Regular relationship is not possible because one is of lower order and the other is of higher order.

Therefore, whatever events happen in dream, the dream fire cannot burn, dream water cannot wet. Therefore, the author says *Chit-JadaSambandha* is *Adhyāsa Sambandha*. Therefore, he says *adhyāsād rutē* - other than the Adhyāsa Sambandha. *What do you mean by that?*

One belonging to higher order of reality, another belonging to lower order of reality, otherwise called *Mithyā*. In-fact, this is how Sankarāchārya starts his *Brahma Sūtra* commentary. The famous *Adhyāsa Bhāshyam* introduces this unique relationship between consciousness and matter.

Sankarāchārya calls it *Satyānruta Sambandhaha* - *satyānrutē mithunīkrutya ahamidam mamēdamiti naisargikōyam lōka vyavahāraha*. Therefore, he says *adhyāsād rutē* - other than Adhyāsa

Sambandha, *na asti* - no other relationship is possible. *For what? - Chit Sambandhaha*, between *Chit*, the *Chaitanyam* and the *Jada Prapancha*.

jada prapanchēna chit sambandhaha adhyāsād rutē na bhavati. It is double negative. No relationship other than *Adhyāsa* is possible. It means, *Adhyāsa* alone is the relationship. Therefore, the author has made a very big jump now. Intellectual jump, not physical jump. Intellectual jump he has made.

What is that? I am the *Chaitanya Tatvam*, *Sākshi*. The whole universe is *Jada Tatvam*. And our relationship is - I am of the higher order, the world is *Mithyā*, the lower order. Therefore, the *Mithyā* can never touch me. *vishwam darpana drushya māna nagari tulyam nija antargatam*.

The whole world like a dream is existing in me, is of a lower order. Therefore, even time and space cannot affect me. *When I say the world cannot affect me, what is the meaning of the word 'me'?* Because you ask the question - Swāmiji you say the world doesn't affect me but in summer I am sweating, humidity is disturbing.

The problem is, quietly we slide down to the body. Remember, the meaning of the word 'I' is not the body. Body is also included in the world. Similarly, mind is also included in the world. Therefore, world + body + mind cannot affect me, their *Sākshi*. Therefore, *nitya mukta sākshi*, I am.

Not only that, the author derives one more conclusion. *What is that?* Since, the world is of a lower order of reality called *Mithyā* or *Adhyāsa* or unreal, it cannot be counted because what is unreal cannot be counted along with the real. So, if I am sitting here and my reflection is on the mirror, I cannot count two people.

You cannot count the *Pratibimba*. Even though I experience it, even though that also smiles, even though it frowns, I clearly, solidly experience it, but I cannot count it. Similarly, Swapna money I count in

Swapna (1 million rupees) and after waking up, I cannot include that one million even though it is tangibly experienced.

Therefore, the author says *Mithyā Prapancha* cannot be counted with *Satya Ātma*. *Therefore, only countable thing is what? Ātma* alone. *How many Ātma's are there? Ēkaha*. Therefore, the author concludes *tēna* - since nothing else is countable therefore, I am the non-dual reality. *advaya aham asmi*.

I cannot be limited by anything. Therefore, *Kāla Paricchēda* is negated. *Dēsha Paricchēda* is negated. *Vastu Paricchēda* is negated. *dēshakālavastuparicchēdashūnyaha*. Time wise limitation is not there because time is unreal. Space wise limitation is not there because space is unreal. Object wise limitation is not there because objects are unreal.

Therefore, *dēshakālavastuparicchēdashūnyaha*; All these three put together is called *Anantaha*. So, I am Satyam *Gnyānam Anantam Brahma Asmi*. That is why *Taitrīya Upanishad* said - *satyam gnyānam anantam brahma yōvēda nihitam guhāyām paramēvyōman*.

One who understands that *Brahman* as the *Sākshi* behind every thought, that person attains *Mōksha*. Thus, I am non-dual.

Verse No. 8

*nadēhō nēndriyam chāham naprānō namanō nadhīh
mamatā parirabdhatvāt ākrīdatvādidam dhiyaha*

Up to the 7th verse, by dealing with several features of 'I', the *Ātma* the author established that I cannot be none other than *Brahma*. He started with *sath chit ānanda swarūpaha aham*. Then, *aham jagat kāranam asmi*, *aham nityaha asmi*, *aham sarva gataha asmi*, *aham advayaha asmi*.

Because of these reasons, I have to be Brahman and nothing else. Now, the author wonders when this is so clear and evident, how come most of

the seekers find it very difficult to accept this teaching. There seems to be a tremendous resistance.

Therefore, either the students don't accept the teaching or even if the teaching is accepted, there is no assimilation of the teaching. Therefore, it exists only in the class. The moment we go out, the teaching also goes out. So, there seems to be some powerful obstacle to receive the teaching and retain the teaching.

To accept the teaching and assimilate the teaching, there seems to be some powerful obstacle. And as long as that obstacle is not removed; As we see in Ramayana, when *Ānjanēya* was flying across the ocean, suddenly he felt something was dragging him down. One *rākshasi* by name *Chāya Grāhini*.

Therefore, the speed of his travel is obstructed. Similarly, there seems to be some invisible obstacle, resistance. Therefore the author wants to address that. *What is that?* He says, the resistance is our own preconceived notion about ourselves. We have already concluded.

Even before coming to the Shāstra, we have already made a conclusion that about ourselves. And not only we have made a conclusion, that conclusion has been the basis for all our activities in life. Every single activity in my life has been based on that conclusion. *That means what?* Every moment I have been reinforcing that conclusion.

What is that? I am this body. I am this physical body. And when the body is born, I am born. When the body is growing I am growing. When the body is going I am going and when the body is gone I am gone. This *Dēhātma Buddhi* that I am the body has been my conclusion ever since I became self-conscious.

As a baby I didn't know how to tell that. As even as I developed self-awareness, I made the conclusion I am the body. And my education also has been for getting admission in the engineering college and getting a

job which will bring five figure salaries so that I can cloth the body, feed the body.

Not only I look upon myself as the body, the bodily relationship I took as my extended family. The family is also based on my conclusion, I am the body. *Because my relationship with every family member is based on what conclusion?* I am the body. Somebody is my mother because I am the body.

Because mother has given birth to the body, not the Ātma, not even the mind. I have often told no mother gives birth to the mind. Mind was there in the previous Janma itself. So, brother-brother relationship, brother-sister relationship, son-father relationship, the whole family is based on, I am the body.

And because of my family identity, umpteen *Vyavahārās* are there. They are all based on I am the body. Therefore, every Vyavahara has reinforced my conclusion that I am the body. *Even when I am listening to Vedānta, the Tambura Shruti behind is what?* I am the wife of so and so, husband of so and so, son of so and so, daughter in law of so and so.

So the basic 'I' is the *Dēhātma* 'I'. And it is this I which is well reinforced, which is loosely listening to the Vedānta. Therefore, there is a loose knowledge which is listened to one hour a week. *Now, when the real 'I' comes one hour a week and the fake I is dominating the life 24x7, how can we accept Aham Brahmāsmi?*

Therefore, *Pancha Kōsha Ātma Bhāvaha* is too powerful to accept the teaching. Therefore, it requires an equally powerful exercise to negate that. And the negation is not that easy. *As somebody nicely said, to pull a nail from a wooden block how much effort is required? Is it easy or difficult?*

It depends on how many times you have driven the nail by banging. If it is only one banging, it is simple. If it is two banging's it is slightly

difficult. If three banging's, it is more difficult. If I have done thousands of times and I want to remove it casually, it will not work.

And if Vedānta doesn't work, it is natural because we have nailed the notion, hammered the notion repeatedly from birth and we are not willing to pull it out. Without pulling out the notion, upon the false notion, we are putting the idea *Aham Brahmāsmi*.

Therefore, one has to take time and pains to negate *DēhātmaBhāva* - both *Ahamkāra* and *Mamakāra*. So, every time I am introducing someone very proudly, we are reinforcing Mamakāra. Therefore, one has to do meditation of *Aham Mama Nishēdha Dhyānam* is required before *Aham Brahmāsmi Dhyānam*.

Just like before painting what do they do? They spend lot of time preparing the surface for the paint to stick. *If surface preparation is not done and he gives coating, what will happen?* It will not stick, it will fall off. In-fact, surface preparation takes as much time as painting. Similarly, we have got a wrong coating. *What is that coating?*

I am the body and all these are my Parivārams. That *Aham Mama* coating is there upon me and we are refusing to rub it off. And over that *Aham* and *Mama* we are painting - poor Guru is painting. Therefore, in the 8th Slōka, the author says you have to negate the *Ahamkāra* and *Mamakāra*.

It is often painful because we are attached emotionally to most of the things. That becomes another problem. Intellectual negation maybe relatively easier, emotional negation is called Sanyāsa. Emotional negation of *Aham* and *Mama* is *Sanyāsa*. Without that, *Aham Brahmāsmi* cannot stick.

There are people who are so much attached to the body and the family so strongly, that if I say emotional negation, they will say we don't want Vedāntam because the attachment is so strong. Then, the Vedānta says ok now you continue with your Aham and Mama, prepare your mind.

Sādhana Chatushtaya Sampatti is the preparation for emotional negation. Without that, Vedānta will be an academic exercise. That is why they call intellectual knowledge. Therefore, the author enters into sand paper. These are all sand paper Slōkās, surface preparation Slōkās, *Anātma Nishēdha*.

That is why in *Chin Mudra* also you will find the index finger which is the 'I', the *Jīvātma* can join the *Paramātma*, the thumb only if it gets detached from these three fingers. The three fingers represent *Dēhābhimāna - Sthūla, Sūkshma, and Kārana Dēha Abhimāna*. As long as the finger is associated with *Dēha*, the finger is away from the thumb.

What is the thumb? The *Ātma, Sākshi Brahman - Angushta Mātrah Purushaha*. If the second finger has to meet the thumb then it has to detach from the other three fingers. Therefore, *Pancha Kōsha Anātma Nishēdha*. That is why, in Taitrīya Upanishad also - *anyōntara ātma prānamayaha, anyōntara ātma manōmayaha*.

Correspondingly, emotionally also I should get detached. If I do that, *ānanda ātma brahma puccham pratishtā*; it is possible. Therefore, the 8th Slōka is *Anātma Nishēdha Slōka*. Now look at the Slōka. *Dēhaha* means physical body. *Na* - I am not.

Therefore, I have to meditate for days and weeks looking at my own body as part of this world and say, I don't have any claim over this body. It belongs to Bhagawān's Srushti. Bhagawān has created *Pancha Bhūtās*. And out of the Pancha Bhūtās the body has come and back to the Pancha Bhūtās the body will have to go.

I cannot cling on to the body. Bhagawān can take it away at any time, even without 3 months notice. Without any notice he has the right to take away because Bhagawān is the owner of this body. Therefore, I see the body's arrival and I see the body's departure and I see myself as accepting it as a fact without any resistance.

I apply the very same principle to all the other bodies in the family also. Just because somebody is near and dear, I cannot hold onto it permanently. Arjuna cried in the first chapter of the Gīta. Krishna said, crying will not solve the problem. *jātasyahi dhruvō mrutyuhu, dhruvam janma mrutasyacha*.

How many hours you meditated on this truth? And only then we can accept death or separation or old age. Therefore, meditate on this truth. *What is that?* Body belongs to changing *Anātma Prapancha*. So, *Dēhaha* is *Annamaya Kōsha. na aham* - I am not. *aham na prānaha*.

So, *Dēhaha* refers to *Annamaya*, the anatomy and *Prānaha* refers to *Prānamaya*, the physiological system, like the breathing, the circulation, etc. The *Prāna* also I am not. I am breathing in and breathing out and the *Prāna* goes out and we hope that it will again come back.

But a day comes when we say he breathed the last. No advance notice is given. Note this fact and meditate for hours days and weeks. We say Vedānta doesn't work, but we are not preparing. We have to meditate. This meditation is also is *Vedānta Dhyānam* only. Even looking at the body as an object is also Vedānta Dhyānam.

Then, *na manaha* - I am not the *ManōmayaKōsha* also. That is also made up of *Pancha Bhūta*. The only difference is that one is *Pancha Sūkshma Bhūta* and the other is *Pancha Sthūla Bhūta*. One is gross matter, another is subtle matter. So, *Annamaya* negated, *Prānamaya* negated, *Manōmaya* negated.

nadhīh-dhīh means *Vignyānamya*. *Manōmaya* can represent the psychological personality. *Vignyānamya* represents the rational thinking, intellectual personality. One is emotional, another is rational. So, all the *Kōshas* I am not, including *Indriyam* - the sense organs which are the instruments belonging to the three *Kōshas*.

Karmēndriyas belong to *Prānamaya Kōsha*, *Gnyānēndriyams* belong to *Manōmaya* and *Vignyānamya Kōsha*. I am assuming that you are

remembering *Tatva Bōdha*. Hoping that you remember and if you don't know the details go through Tatva Bōdha, you will get them. In short, I am none of them.

What is the reason? Because *Mamatā Parirabdhatvāt*. *What is the reason?* Because I claim all of them as my body, my sense organs, my mind, my intellect, etc. And whatever I claim as mine, I am not. This is my clip. *Therefore, what?* I am not clip. This is my house. Therefore, I am not the house.

Therefore, what is the logic? What is mine is not me. So, *Parirabdha* literally means embraced. In this context it means associated with *Mamakāra*, the mine conclusion. *Which one?* All the four *Kōshas*. The body is also associated with *Mamakāra* as my body.

Similarly, senses and Prānās; This is what we saw in Tatva Bōdha also. *yathā kundalavat* - that example was given which you have to remember. *Mamatā Parirabdhatvāt* - More we will see in the next class.

*Pūrnamadah Pūrnamidam Pūrnāth Pūrnām Udachyatē
Pūrnasya Pūrnāmādāya Pūrnāmēvā Vasishyatē*

Om shānti shānti shāntihi



Advaita Makaranda Verses - 8 & 9

*sadāsiva samārambhām sankarāchārya madhyamām
asmad āchārya paryantām vande guru paramparām*

Verse No. 8

*nadēhō nēndriyam chāham naprānō namanō nadhīh
mamatā parirabdhatvāt ākrīdatvādidam dhiyaha*

The author Lakshmīdhara Kavi is establishing the principle teaching of Vedānta namely *Jīvātma Paramātma Aykya*m. After introduction in the 1st Slōka, from the 2nd Slōka up to the 7th Slōka, the author pointed out that *Jīvātma* and *Paramātma* have to be essentially one only because their essential nature happens to be one and the same.

We do accept that there are superficial differences caused by *Nāma* and *Rūpa*. But what we are claiming is that essentially *Jīvātma* and *Paramātma* are one. This he established by showing that the *Swarūpa Lakshanam* of both of them is one and the same. The *Tatastha Lakshanam* of *Brahman* applies to *Jīvātma Chaitanyam*.

Not only that, but both of them are *Nityaha*, free from time wise limitation. Both of them are *Sarvagataha*, free from spatial limitation. And both of them are free from attribute-wise limitation also. Thus, because of these reasons, one has to accept I am *Brahman*, the *Paramātma*. This was the topic from verse 2 to verse 7.

From the 8th verse up to the 17th verse, the author is entering the next topic. *What is that?* Even though the Upanishadic teaching is very clear and undisputable, many of the students are not able to receive the teaching, accept the teaching, and swallow the teaching. There seems to be a powerful obstacle, a powerful intellectual resistance to receive this teaching.

The *Shāstra* itself has analyzed why the student is not able to accept. And the *Shāstra* itself comes to the conclusion - it is because the student

or for that matter, every human being has got strong identification with the body, the *Anātma*. This identification alone expresses as *Ahankāra* and *Mamakāra*.

As long as the strong *Aham*, *Mama* exists, *Paramātma* can never join the *Jīvātma*. This will stand in between. Remember the example, if you have to give a new coating of paint upon the surface of the wall, the surface will have to be prepared. Only then the paint will stick. Surface preparation is an elaborate task.

If we don't do that, and keep on giving fresh coating, it will not stick. Even if it sticks, it will not stay for long time. Therefore, we should give as much attention to the surface preparation as much we give to the actual painting. Therefore, the *Dēha Abhimāna* is the obstacle.

Therefore, one has to first detach from *Anātma*, which belongs to the material world. Thereafter, when a person looks at himself from the *Ātma* standpoint, then *Jīvātma Paramātma Aykyam* is a fact which cannot be challenged at all. Therefore, from 8th to 17th verses, the author establishes that I am not the *Anātma*.

In *Tatva Bōdha*, *Anātma* is divided as *Sharīra Trayam*, the three fold body or *Pancha Kōsha*, the fivefold Kōsha. This I am not, we have to establish. We do this by several methods and here, author is using a particular argument. But we have already discussed this topic by giving some other argument which we will remember here.

That popular method is known as *Druk Drushya Vivēkaha*, which is employed by using two important principles. The first principle is - I am different from whatever I experience. I, the experiencer Subject am different from whatever I experience which is an Object. This is principle one.

Then the second principle is all experienced attributes belong to experienced Object and never to experiencer Subject. I am different from whatever I experience, is principle one. And all experienced

attributes belong to experienced objects and never to the experiencer Subject, I.

And by applying the principle, first we negate the external world because the world is experienced and it is an object. I am different. All the attributes like blue color, which I experience on the wall, that blue color which is an object of experience belong to the wall which is also an object.

Similarly, apply to everything and negate. This we will easily do, we have no problem. After preparing the mind, we have to apply the principle to the body also and clearly appreciate that the body is also an object of experience. Therefore, I am different from the experienced body.

Then, apply this principle to the mind also. Mind is also an object of experience. Then, apply to even *Kāraṇa Sharīram*, ignorance. Even ignorance, the *Kāraṇa Sharīram* is an object of experience. Thus, *Sthūla*, *Sūkshma*, *Kāraṇa Sharīra*, otherwise seen as the *Pancha Kōsha*, are all the objects and I am the *Sākshi Chaitanyam*, the witness consciousness.

This is the application of the principle One. Then I have to apply the second principle. *What is that?* All the experienced attributes belong to the experienced object and never to the subject. So, take all the physical attributes like height, weight, complexion, age all of them. And I have to see that these physical attributes belong to the physical body.

And I don't have a height, I don't have weight, I don't have complexion, I don't have age. *yathā koumāram yovvanam jarā* etc, I am free from. Thereafter, take the emotional attributes like anger, depression frustration, fear, jealousy etc. And I say they are all experienced attributes.

Therefore, they belong to the experienced Mind. I don't have *Rāga*, *Dvēsha*, *Kāma*, *Asūya*, *Bhayam* - *namē dvēsha rāgav, namē lōbhā mōhav, madōnēva mēnaiva mātsarya bhāvaha*. Meditate upon this

aspect that I am free from emotional attributes because I am not the mind.

Emotional attributes belong to the mind, which is a material object made up of the five elements. Mind is also a product of five elements. Then, you come to the intellectual attributes of Knowledge, of ignorance, of doubt. All these are intellectual attributes. They are also experienced by me.

I know my ignorance, I know the knowledge and I know the doubt also. Therefore, doubt is also known to me, ignorance is also known to me. They are all known. Therefore, they don't belong to the knower, I. They belong to the known, intellect. Thus, dismiss all the attributes. *nirguna sākshi chaitanyam ahamasmi*.

Thereafter, the author is going to specialize on one particular attribute and that is the *Avasthā Trayam*. And he wants to point out that these three Avasthās - waking, dream and sleep are nothing but properties of the mind, the Anātma. When the mind is fully active, it is called *Jāgrat*.

When the mind functions only on *Vāsanās* (memory); when the mind is partially functioning, it is called *Swapna*. When the mind is totally passive, it is called *Sushupti*. Therefore, the three Avasthās also are attributes of the mind. Therefore, I the consciousness, illumine the Avasthā Traya property belonging to the objective mind.

Which means, *Avasthā Trayam* does not belong to me. I am not *Avasthā Traya Yuktaha*, but I am *Avasthā Traya Rahitaha*. The three *Avasthā* do not belong to me. If the *Avasthās* do not belong to me, the problems of the Avasthās; When I wake up, the *Jāgrat* problems wake up and when I go to bed, the dream problems wake up.

The *Jāgrat* problems and *Swapna* problems belong to the mind which is the locus. I am free from *Avasthā Trayam*. Therefore, *aham asamsāri asmi*; Thus, he is going to concentrate on *Avasthā Traya*. Lastly he wants to establish one more thing.

He wants to establish that time and space belong to the *Avasthās* only. The *Jāgrat* time and space belong to the *Jāgrat Avasthā*. Both of them disappear when I go to sleep. And when Swapna comes then, there is time and space belonging to *Swapna Avasthā - jāgrat avasthēla jāgrat dēsha kāla, swapna avasthēla swapna dēsha kāla*.

Desha-Kāla belong to Avasthā. In deep sleep state, when both the Avasthās (*Jāgrat* and *Swapna*) resolve, *Desha-Kāla* also resolve. *Therefore, what is the conclusion? Desha-Kāla* belong to Avasthā only. *And who am I?* I am free from the *Avasthā Trayam*. Therefore, I am free from *desha-kāla* influence.

I am outside the field of time and space. Therefore, both cannot touch me. Therefore, the author concludes - *aham nirvikāra chaitanyam asmi*. *Nirvikāra* means not influenced by time, age, seasons, movements of the planets, Rāhu's movement, Kētu's movement etc. *They are all what?* - Belonging to time and space.

I don't have a Jātakam at all. Jātakam belongs to the *Anātma Sharīram*. Thus in short, I am free from *Anātma* and the properties of Anātma. This I have to establish - *Anātma Vilakshanaha, Anātma Dharma Vilakshanaha*. *This becomes what?* Surface preparation. Once I separate, *Aham Brahmāsmi* will stick very easily.

If Anātma and its Dharma are sticking to me and upon that, if I put Brahmāsmi painting, it will not stick at all. Maximum it will stay up to 8 am because the moment the class is over, the Anātma and the Anātma Dharmās - husband, wife, father, mother etc loom large and Brahmāsmi paint falls off.

And we feel that Vedānta is ineffective. For our mistake, we blame the poor Vedānta. Lakshmīdhara Kavi says, don't blame Vedānta. The problem is that you have *Ahankāra, Mamakāra* problem. Clean the surface first. For that only elaborate *Karma Yōga, Upāsana Yōga* are prescribed.

They are all what? Cleaning processes only. This is going to be the development from the 8th verse up to the 17th verse. But here the author is using a different logic. I used the logic of *Druk Drushya Vivēkaha*, consisting of two principles.

Here, author uses another logic. *What is that?* He said - *mamatā parirabdhatvāt ākrīdatvāt idam dhiyaha*. Body, mind, etc, I am not. *What is the reason?* He says, because we refer to them as my body, my mind, etc. As in *Tatva Bōdha* -

madīyam sharīram madīyāh pranāha madīyam manaha madīyam agnyānamiti madīyāttēna gnyātam kataka kundala gruhādikam

That is what we saw in *Tatva Bōdha*. Same argument he says and whatever is mine, I am not. *Like what?* The book is mine, I am not the book. If you say I am book, you are booked in *Samsāra*. And if you have got any doubt, apply the donkey example. If you say, this is my donkey - thank God I am not the donkey.

Therefore, he says *mamatā parirabdhatvāt*. *Parirabdha* literally means embraced. Here it means associated with. The body etc are associated with 'My' notion - the notion that it is mine or my. Not only it is associated with the notion mine, *idam dhiyahaākrīdatvāt*. *Ākrīda* means the playground.

Here in this context, again you have to take it as - associated with. The body is the playground of the notion *idam*. *Idam* means this. *idam dhiyaha* - *dhiyaha* means notion. *idam dhiyaha* means, this notion. And it is a playground of this notion means, it is associated with the notion, this.

What do you mean by that? Whatever you refer to as this, has to be different from 'I'. *In this Sharīram means what?* The body is an object of the third person singular. Whatever is the object of the third person is not the object of the first person. It is simple grammar. Whatever is the object of the third person is not the object of the first person.

Idam is third person or second person or first person? First person means I, second person means you, and third person means anything other than 'I' and you. *So, this comes under what?* Third person. This body we refer to. Therefore, as Krishna says in the 13th chapter - *idam sharīram kountēya kshētramityabhidhīyate*.

The body which is an object of this is called *kshētram* and you are not the *kshētram*. You are the *kshētragnyaha*, the witness of the body. You are in the body but you are not the body. Therefore, *idamdhiyaha*. There is a small printing mistake. For *idam dhiyaha*, there should not be gap in between.

It should be a compound word, *idamdhiyaha*. *Karmadhāraya Samāsa - idam iti dhīhi, idamdhīhi*. And its *Shashti Vibhakti* is *idamdhiyaha*. Since it is an object of 'my' notion and 'this' notion, the body is not me. And having applied to the body, you have to extend the logic to others also.

What are they? You have to look at the first line - *Indriyam*. Apply the same principle to the sense organs. Sense organ also is associated with 'my' notion and 'this' notion. My ears, my eyes, my nose, etc. is my notion. This eye, this ear, etc. is this notion. Then apply this to *Prāna*. So, my Prāna, my Apāna, my digestion is weak, my circulation is weak, etc.

Then you have to apply to *Manaha*, the mind. Thereafter, you have to apply to *Dhīhi*, intellect. In short, all the *Kōshās* are indicated. Heart is *Manōmaya Kōsha*. *Dhīhi* is *Vignyānamaya Kōsha*. *Indriyam* is - don't say *Ānandamaya Kōsha*. *Ānandamaya Kōsha* is not said here.

It has to be supplied by us. Indriya is part of *Manōmaya* and *Vignyānamaya Kōsha*. Therefore, I am Pancha *Kōsha Vilakshanaha Asmi*. Continuing . .

Verse No. 9

*sākshī sarvān vitah prēyān aham nāham kadāchana
parināma paricchēda paritāpai rupa plavāt*

Having negated the four *Kōshās* now, the author comes to the *Chidā Bhāsa*, the reflected consciousness obtaining in them; which is an object of confusion because *Chidā Bhāsa* resembles the *Chit*. Therefore, we get confused between the *Chidā Bhāsa*, ‘I’ and the *Chit* ‘I’. Just as reflection in the mirror and I who am standing here, there is a resemblance.

Bimbam and *Pratibimbam* are very similar but at-least in the case of face, there is a physical distance. The original face is here, and the reflected face is there upon the mirror. We don’t get too much confused. *But there also, when I see a dot there on the face and I want to remove that dot, where do I wipe?* I wipe here.

What does that mean? I am equating the reflection and the original. In the case of *Chit* and the *Chidā Bhāsa*, not only they are very much similar; *Because both of them are what? Chaitanya Swarūpaha*. One is *Ādhāra Chaitanyam*, another is *Ābhāsa Chaitanyam*. One is *Bimba Chaitanyam*, another is *Pratibimba Chaitanyam*.

Not only similarity is there, another greater problem is that there is not physical distance between them. In the case of face and the reflection, there is a gap. But here, *Chidā Bhāsa* exists where the *chit* is there. *Chidā Bhāsa* is never physically away from the *Chit*. And *Chit* can never be physically away from *Chidā Bhāsa*.

Why the original consciousness cannot be away? Can you guess? It is because the original consciousness is all-pervading. It can never be physically away from any object in the creation. It is all-pervading. *Whereas, where does Chidā Bhāsa exist?* It is not all-pervading. *Chidā Bhāsa* is a reflection which is only where the body-mind complex is.

Therefore, when I use the word 'I', it is referring to a mixture of *Chit*, *Chidā Bhāsa*. So, when I say I am a conscious being, it is a mixture of both Chit and Chidā Bhāsa. *Now, the author asks the question, which 'I' is the real 'I', the Ābhāsa Chaitanyam or the Ādhāra Chaitanyam? Which one we should be claiming?*

The author says, we should claim the original *Ādhāra Chaitanyam*. *And if I claim I am the original consciousness, where am I? What is the locus?* I should not refer to a location -

*nityah sarvagatah sthānuhu achalōyam sanātanaha
avyaktōha achintyōham, avikāryōha muchyate*

nityah sarvagatah sthānuhu - I should claim I am *Sarvagata Chaitanyam*. *But what blunder we create?* Instead of claiming I am the all-pervading conscious being, I claim that I am localized conscious being. I claim I am conscious being but I think that I am now in Anna Nagar.

And thereafter, I will go to my home and thereafter, I will go to my office. I talk about localization and I talk about travel. Not only travel in this life, I talk about my travel after death also. For 13 days my children will do ritual, big hope. Then, I will go from *Lōka* to *Lōka* and I will go to *Swarga Lōka*. *This is all because of what reason?*

I mistake myself to be the travelling Chidā Bhāsa. And the author says this *Chidā Bhāsa*, he refers to in this context as the *Ahankāra*. So, the word Ahankāra in different context will have different connotations. In these following verses, the Ahankāra is referring to the *Pratibimba Chaitanyam*, which is localized and which I claim as myself.

And the author says this Ahankāra is invariably associated with what? You have to use simple logic. *Any reflected thing will be associated with what?* The reflecting medium. It will be inseparably associated with the mirror. It can never be Asangam. It becomes Sasangam. *Sasangam means what?* Relation, connection.

Connection with what? The reflecting medium. Once it is associated with reflecting medium, then the conditions of the reflecting medium will influence the reflection. If the mirror travels, reflection also will travel. If the mirror is dull, reflection is also dull. Similarly, *Chidābhāsa* *Ahankāra* is associated with *Anātma*.

Therefore, *Ahankāra* will have all the problems of *Anātma* because it is associated with the *Anātma*, which is the reflecting medium. Therefore, the author says *Ahankāra* is *Samsāri*. *Ahankāra* has changes. *Ahankāra* has localization. *Ahankāra* has travel. *Ahankāra* has *Avasthā Trayam*. *Why Ahankāra has Avasthā Trayam?*

Previously, I said, *Avasthā Trayam* belongs to the mind. Now we have added that *Ahankāra* is associated with *Anātma*. *Ahankāra means what?* *Chidābhāsa*. *Chidābhāsa* is associated with mind. Mind is associated with *Avasthā Trayam*. Therefore, *Chidābhāsa* cannot escape *Avasthā Trayam*.

Once you get associated with *Chidābhāsa*, finished. You are going to be in trouble. Even *Bhagawān* cannot rescue you. In-fact, the entire *Karma Kānda* of the Veda is only an attempt to improve the lot of *Ahankāra* by giving *Prāyaschitta Karmas*. *These are all what?* Trying to improve the *Ahankāra*.

This person does all the *Parihārams* and he finds one problem goes. It is like our roads. They make one way or draw some lines or put some barricades. *What happens?* One set of problems go, the basic problem is not solved. There are too many vehicles and the roads are not sufficient. Basic problem is not addressed.

Therefore, whatever road changes you bring about, what is it? Only changing one problem into another. Similarly, we are trying to improve the un-improvable *Ahankāra*, which is eternally tied to *Sanchita*, *Agāmi* and *Prārabdha*. Even that is not going to be solution because *Punar Janma* will come, *Ahankāra* will come.

Even going to Swarga will not solve the problem. *Why? tētam bhuktvā swarga lōkam vishālam kshīne punye Anna Nagar waterless lōkam. Therefore, what is the only solution?* Come to the *Bimba Chaitanyam, Sākshi*. So, may you learn to differentiate *Chidābhāsa* and *Chit*, which is the toughest and subtlest topic of Vedānta - *Chidābhāsa Chit Vivēka*.

Chidābhāsa is called *Ahankāra*. *Chit* is called *Sākshi*. So when I say 'I', both of them are there. I should learn to claim the *Sākshi*, rather than the *Chidābhāsa*. For that purpose, the author talks about the differences in the attributes of them. *What are the features of Chidābhāsa and what are the features of Sākshi?*

We won't call it attributes because *Sākshi* doesn't have attributes. So, we will call features. *He says what is the Chit, the original consciousness?* He gives three features - *Sākshi Sarvānvitaha Prēyān*. The real 'I' which is referred to by the word *Aham* in the *Mahāvākyam*; so the real 'I' which is referred to by the word *Aham* in *AhamBrahmāsmi*;

What is that Aham? Sākshi. It refers to the *Sākshi Chaitanyam*, the original consciousness. *Where is that Sākshi located? Sarva Anvitaha*. It is the *Chaitanyam* which is associated with or which pervades everything, all-pervading. *Anvitaha* means pervading, *Sarva* means all. *Sarva Anvitaha* means all-pervading.

I am the OC (Original Consciousness), I am all-pervading (AP). AP means all-pervading. Not only that, the third one is very important, *Prēyān* - I am the real source of all happiness. World doesn't have even an iota of happiness. *If I enjoy happiness in the world, do you remember the example?*

It is not the happiness of the world, but the happiness manifest reflected in the world. Remember the mirror example. In the mirror I see the frame, I see the glass, I see a face also (beautiful face). When I see three

things in the mirror, the frame, the glass and the face, the frame belongs to the mirror, the glass belongs to the mirror.

But the beautiful face doesn't belong the mirror. I have loaned that face. Similarly, when I am eating a beautiful dish or listening to beautiful music, the Swara belongs to the music, the pitch belongs to the music, the *Rāga* belongs to the music, the *Tāla* belongs to the music, and the *Ānanda* which I appreciate in the music is my *Ānanda*.

That is why it is said in English, the word used is 'Enjoy'. Enjoy as in 'en'joy. Therefore, *Prēyān* literally means the object of love. That is the literal meaning. The object of love means the real source of happiness. *Why should the author say the object of love?* He could have said the real source of happiness.

Why should he put it in an indirect language? By putting in this language, the author wants to reveal another important truth. The truth is that we all have only one object of love and that is *Ānandaha*. We never love any person in the world, we don't love any object in the world, we all love only *Ānanda*.

What is the proof for that? As long as that person is the source of *Ānanda*, I love the person. The moment that person stops to be a source of *Ānanda*, I become practical. My love slowly comes down. If he or she is a family member, as a duty I may take care of them. As a duty I may take care of.

In many families they forget the duty also. You will find that it is no more a source of love. When a person doesn't contribute anything to me, he is alive and he is a burden to me financially, physically, mentally, that person is no more a source of or an object of love. There is a silent prayer but we will have a diplomatic prayer.

We will say, relieve that person out of pain. *What does it mean?* Oh Lord, relieve me of that burden. *ātmanastu kāmāya sarvam priyam bhavati*. It is a bitter truth but it is truth. Therefore, everyone loves only

Ānanda. And there is only one source of Ānanda and that is 'I'. *Which I?* Not *Chidābhāsa* 'I', but the *Chit* 'I'. Therefore, *Prēyān*;

Whereas, what about the Chidābhāsa I? It has got opposite attributes. He says, *Parināma*, *Praicchēda* and *Paritāpa*. *Chidābhāsa* I, the Ahankāra is associated with Parināma. *Parināma means what?* Change, modification. So I am a boy, I am youth, I am middle aged person, I am old, I am dilapidated. Change is there. Then, *Praicchēdaha*.

Can you understand Praicchēda? - Limitation. As Chidābhāsa, I am never all-pervading. That is why often there is conflict. There is some important function elsewhere. *Should I attend the class or function?* If *Chit* is attending the class, there is no problem. We can simultaneously do all of them but Chidābhāsa has to do that.

What is third feature? Paritāpa. It is never the source of real Ānanda because Chidābhāsa, any reflection will have ups and downs in keeping with the ups and downs of the reflecting medium. So, the lot of the RC will be same as the same as the lot of RM. Therefore, all these three are *Upaplavāt*. Upaplava means all these three afflict the *Chidābhāsa Ahankāra*.

Upaplava means affliction, affecting. Thus, if you study the three features of *Chit*, that is the real 'I' and the three features of the ego 'I', you will know that real I alone is *Nitya Mukta Swarūpaha*. Therefore, learn to separate the real 'I' from the fake 'I', the real self from the ego.

*Pūrnamadah Pūrnamidam Pūrnāth Pūrnām Udachyatē
Pūrnasya Pūrnāmādāya Pūrnāmēvā Vasishyatē*

Om shānti shānti shāntihi



Advaita Makaranda Verses - 9 to 11

*sadāsiva samārambhām sankarāchārya madhyamām
asmad āchārya paryantām vande guru paramparām*

Verse No. 9

*sākshī sarvān vitah prēyān aham nāham kadāchana
parināma paricchēda paritāpai rupa plavāt*

In the first part of this text Advaita Makaranda, the author Lakshmīdhara Kavi established that 'I', the real self have to be identical with *Brahman* as revealed in the Shāstra. *Aham Brahmāsmi* must be a fact only. By talking about the nature of the real 'I' and also the nature of Brahman, the author established that since the nature of both is one and the same, both of them should be only one.

Having established Aham Brahmāsmi in the first part from verse 2 to verse 7, now the author has entered into the next topic from the 8th verse up to the 17th verse. Here, he is answering a possible problem. *That problem is, even though the scriptures clearly reveal Aham Brahma Asmi, how come we are not able to accept the fact?*

How come, we are not able to swallow this? How come, it appears too much for a Vedāntic student? There seems to be an invisible obstacle in receiving the knowledge and assimilating the knowledge. Maximum, we are able to nod our head in the class, but we are not able to travel further than simple sympathetic nodding, sympathetic to the poor teacher. *So, where is the snag?*

The author says the snag is, I, the self can claim oneness with Brahman only under one important condition. We do not observe that condition or we forget that condition. Before coming to the scriptures, we have developed a strong identification and attachment to the body-mind complex, the *Pancha Kōsha*, the container which has served as our residence, which has served as a medium of interaction.

With this body-mind complex, we have a very strong identification, which has generated *Ahankāra* and *Mamakāra*. This attachment is not only with the body-mind complex, through that it has gone to the house and family members. In-fact, it has taken root all over the world. As Krishna talks about the Ashvattha Vruksha, the primary and secondary roots have spread all over.

In whichever part our relatives are settled, mind is attached. In the newspaper, the name of that country comes, immediately my attention is drawn. Some unknown country News item comes, we don't even look in that direction but certain countries attract our attention. *Why?* Because my brother-in-law stays there.

Thus, through the body I have gone to the relation and through the relation to the country. Thus, the attachment has spread all over. *Ahankāra-Mamakāra* has spread all over and with that *Aham Brahmāsmi* claiming becomes impossible.

Therefore, the author says the important condition for *Aham Brahmāsmi* reception is detachment or dis-identification from the *Pancha Kōsha*. I should learn to see them as part of this world, part of this material world. Only after that, I can claim the *Aykyam*. When I am identified with the body-mind complex, it is called *Aham Pada Vāchyārthaha*.

Aykyam with *Vāchyārtha* is never possible. *Aykyam* with *Lakshyārtha* alone is possible. It is only a technical word. *Lakshyārtham* means I should separate myself from the body-mind complex. As long as you don't do that, Vedānta simply won't work. That is guaranteed. Whether I can give guarantee for working or not, I can guarantee for not working.

What is that? As long as *Dēha Abhimāna* is there, Vedānta won't work. Therefore from 8th to 17th verse, the author is negating the *Kōsha*. In the 8th verse, four Kōshas were negated. *Dēhaha* referring to *Annamaya Kōsha*, *Prānaha* referring to *Prānamaya Kōsha*, *Manaha* referring to *Manōmaya Kōsha*, *dhīhi* referring to *Vignyanamaya Kōsha*.

All of them are negated. *Ānandamaya* is not mentioned now. That will come later. After negating the four Kōshas, the author is taking a small detour. And that is, he says not only I am different from the four Kōshas, I am different from the consciousness reflected in those Kōshas which is called *Chidābhāsa*, which is called *Chit Pratibimbaha*, which is called *Pratibimba Chaitanyam*.

If you want an example - Suppose there is a mirror in front of me. There are two things that I experience. One is the mirror and the other is the reflected face. When I say I am different from the mirror, I should include another statement. 'I' the original face am different from the reflected face also.

So, I should negate the mirror also, I should negate the mirror *Pratibimbita Mukham* also. Similarly, the author says I am the original consciousness. I am neither the body nor the reflection of consciousness which is formed there. When the mirror goes, the reflected face goes but the original face doesn't go away.

Similarly, when body-mind complex goes, *Chidābhāsa* will go away, but 'I' the OC will continue. This Chidābhāsa is referred to by the word *Ahankāra* in this context. The author is referring to the Ahankāra in verse 9. Here in this verse, the author is differentiating *Ahankāra* the *Chidābhāsa* and *Aham* the *Sākshi*, the *Chit*, the original consciousness.

Differentiating *Chidābhāsa* and *Chit* is the toughest task because both of them are not physically away. Both of them are intimately together. Therefore, I have to intellectually differentiate. The author differentiates by pointing that *Chidābhāsa* and *Chit* have got opposite *Svabhāva*. The nature of Chidābhāsa and the nature of Chit are different.

Therefore I, the *Chit* am different from Chidābhāsa. To differentiate these two, the author talks about three features of Chit and three features of Chidābhāsa. *What are they?* We were seeing in the last class. The first feature is *Sākshi*. The original consciousness is called Sākshi.

Sarva Anvitaha - The original consciousness is not limited by the boundaries of the body. The original consciousness is all-pervading. Sarva Anvitaha means all- pervading. And *Prēyān* - it is the dearest one loved by all which means, the source of *Ānanda*. I explained this in the last class. I don't want to go into that topic.

Preyān means *Ānanda Swarūpaha*. So, original consciousness 'I' is *Sākshi* or witness, all-pervading and *Ānanda Swarūpaha*. *Then what about Chidābhāsa?* The author says, it has got the opposite feature. *What is that?* *Parināma*, *Paricchēda*, *Paritāpa*. *Parināma* means modification. While *Sākshi* is changeless, *Chidābhāsa* changes all the time.

It becomes brighter in *Jāgrat Avasthā* and it becomes duller in *Swapna Avasthā*. For some people, it is duller in *Jāgrat Avasthā*. Generally, it is brighter in *Jāgrat Avasthā*, duller in *Swapna Avasthā*, totally passive in *Sushupti Avasthā*. Therefore, *Chidābhāsa* becomes brighter and duller in keeping with the condition of the mind, the reflecting medium.

When the mirror is bright, the reflection is bright. When the mirror is dusty, the reflection is dull. Thus, *Chidābhāsa* has *Parināma*, ups and down. Then, *Paricchēdaha*; *Chidābhāsa* has limitation. *Why it has limitation?* Reflection will be located only where the reflecting medium is there.

Reflection cannot go beyond the medium whereas the original is not limited by the medium. *Therefore, what is the second feature of Chidābhāsa?* *Paricchēdaha*. *Paricchēda* means limitation. Not only that, *Paritāpaihi*. *Chidābhāsa* is associated with all problems. *Why is it associated with problems?* Any reflection is associated with reflecting medium.

Therefore, *Chidābhāsa* is associated with the mind because mind is reflecting medium. And through the mind it is associated with the body. Because it is associated with the body-mind complex, all the problems

of the body-mind complex - Rāga, Dvēsha, Kāma, Krōdha, depression, anxiety, fear, jealousy, anger.

All problems of the mind are associated with *Chidābhāsa*. Whenever you say I am sorrowful, I am depressed, I am angry, etc. I refer to conscious being. *Which conscious being?* It refers to Chidābhāsa only because Chidābhāsa alone is associated with Rāga, Dvēsha, Kāma, and Krōdha.

Like a person, until he gets married to a particular person, that person had his own/ her own problems. But until marriage he never noted. That person was growing somewhere, that girl was growing somewhere, she had several problems. He never knew or he was never bothered. *But the moment the knot is tied (it is a knotty tie), what happens?*

Thereafter, because of *Sambandha*, every problem of the girl is not girl's problem but the husband's problem. Similarly, vice versa also. Every problem of the husband is wife's problem. Not only the association connects with the problem, the wife's parents, if they have the problem, they also will flow into this problem.

So, Sambandha leads to problems. Chidābhāsa is *Sasangaha*. It has got *Sanga* with the mind and through that with the body, through that with the parents, through that with the children, through that with the in-laws. The problems are innumerable. Therefore, *Paritāpaihi*. *Chidābhāsa*, the *Ahankāra* is never free from problems.

Whereas the *Chit*, the original consciousness need not get freedom from problems. It is ever free from problems. One is never free, the other is ever free. Which *one you want to claim?* The choice is yours. So, when you say 'I' and claim problems, you are claiming the Chidābhāsa as 'I'. When you say I am free, which every Gnyāni claims, meaning of the 'I' is the OC, the Chit.

Therefore, the author says *Aham*. Aham means the real I, the OC. *Na Aham*, I am not I. *'I am not I' - what does it mean?* First I am means,

the real I, the OC I am not the fake I, the RC. I hope it is not complicating. I am the real I, the OC. I am never the fake reflected I, the RC. I, the *Sākshi* am not *Ahankāra*.

What is the reason? The reason is I, the OC am all-pervading and *Ānanda Swarūpaha* whereas Ahankāra the RC is localized and full of problems. I, the OC am all-pervading and Ānanda, whereas RC is localized and is full of problems. Therefore, I am not Ahankāra. *From when onwards I am not Ahankāra?*

We will think after *Mōksha*. The author says don't say that - *Kadāchana*. Even when I mistake myself to be RC, even at the time of mistake, I am free from problems. It is like when I am suffering in dream. Even during the dream suffering, I am free from the sufferings of dream.

Not that I become free from dream sufferings after waking. No. Even during dream, I am free from dream's suffering because they are all Mithyā. Nothing touches me, the Waker. Therefore, *Kadāchana* is very important. I am ever the *Sākshi*. I am the Sākshi, *Ānanda Swarūpaha*. Continuing . .

Verse No. 10

*suptēhami na drushyantē dukha dōsha pravrutayaha
atastasyaiva samsāraha na mē samsartru sākshinaha*

This verse is a reinforcement of the previous Slōka. I am the problem free *Sākshi*, *Chit*. I am not the *Chidābhāsa*, full of problem. I am not the problem riddled Chidābhāsa but I am the problem free Chit. All the problems belong to Chidābhāsa only. They don't belong to I, the Chit. *Now, the question is what is the proof?*

How do you prove that the original 'I' doesn't have problems and only Chidābhāsa has problems? It is very difficult to differentiate because both of them are co-existing. *When both are together, how do I know*

the problems belong to Chit or Chidābhāsa? I experience problems, all right and 'I' is a mixture of both, all right.

But how to know to which constituent of the mixture the problem belongs to? It is like while consuming some salad, vegetable salad or fruit salad, you get a peculiar taste or smell. You know that it belongs to the salad. *But which constituent gives that funny taste, how do you know?* You have no way of knowing.

Therefore, the author says, I will give you a method to convince you. We have solution to all problems. You should only have the patience to listen. *In the salad, if you don't know which one has got that taste, how to find out?* You have to taste each one separately. Separate it and you can find out. Now, here how to separate is the question.

The author says, the *Chidābhāsa*, the reflected consciousness is alive and active only during *Jāgrat* and *Swapna*. *Jāgrat means what?* Waking state. *Jāgrat* means waking, *Swapna* means dream. What a diffident teacher I am, you may think. You are all good students, you remember. Because I was a dull student therefore, I superimpose on you.

Jāgrat means waking and *Swapna* means dream. *Now, the question is why do you say Chidābhāsa is alive and active only in waking and dream?* The reason is that *Chidābhāsa* is a reflection formed in the mind. Mind is the reflecting medium in which *Chidābhāsa* is formed. We know that mind is active only in *Jāgrat* and *Swapna*.

The mind is active, *Manō*, *Buddhi*, *Chitta*, *Ahankāra* all of them are active in the *Jāgrat*. It is active in *Swapna* because it is memory which gets thrown out in *Swapna*. Thus, the mind is active in *Jāgrat* and *Swapna*. Since the reflecting medium is active, the reflection also is alive and active in *Jāgrat*, *Swapna*.

Whereas, in Sushupti what happens? The mind folds down. In deep sleep state, memories are folded, thinking is folded, emotional mind is

folded, and rational mind is resolved. Even I am, that mind (I am, I am, I am), even that 'I' thought is folded. Thus, the mind becomes passive in sleep, which means the reflecting medium becomes dissolved or becomes passive.

When? In Sushupti. *If in Sushupti, the reflecting medium is dissolved or dormant, what happens to Chidābhāsa?* Chidābhāsa also must be folded, resolved, dissolved or dormant, inactive or passive. Therefore, Chidābhāsa is active in waking, Chidābhāsa is passive in sleep. Chidābhāsa is active in waking and dream.

I am not including both, I am referring to waking. As a sample I am taking. Now the author says you make an enquiry. *What is that enquiry?* All the problems that you talk about - I have got problems at family front or I have got problem at my business front; you analyze various problems that you refer to.

In the waking state, when the *Chidābhāsa* is active, all the problems are experienced. In the waking state, when the Chidābhāsa is alive and active, I refer to varieties of problem. In sleep when Chidābhāsa is folded, the problems also are folded. Chidābhāsa is active, problems are present. Chidābhāsa is folded, problems also are folded.

This is called *Anvaya Vyatirēka* logic. Chidābhāsa is alive, problems are alive. Chidābhāsa is asleep, problems are asleep. So, first one is *Anvaya*, the second one is *Vyatirēka*. *Therefore what is the conclusion?* With Chidābhāsa, the problems come, with Chidābhāsa, the problems go. Therefore, the problems belong to the Chidābhāsa only.

The problems belong to the Ahankāra only. This we employ all the time. *If a person has got some kind of allergy and he wants to find out what the cause of allergy is, what is the method used?* You start observing all the things that you are eating and whenever that allergy is there, you see what you ate and start giving up one by one.

You discover that when one thing is removed, that day allergic reactions are not there. *To confirm it what do you do?* Deliberately eat it (with medicine ready). And allergic reaction comes. One Swāmiji was telling me - Swāmiji, I was continuously sneezing certain days. I didn't know what the cause of the problem is.

Later, I had a suspicion that green banana might be the cause. This green banana causes varieties of problems for varieties of people. Then, he thought it might be that and he gave up the green banana. He used to love it. He gave that up and he did not experience sneezing. Then, one day deliberately he ate it and that day sneezing returned.

Then green banana *Satvē* sneezing *Satvam*, green banana *Abhāvē* sneezing *Abhāvaha*. *Tasmāt* green banana *ēva* sneezing *asya Kāranam*; Now, he has left it and he has never experienced it. We all sneeze, but this continuous sneezing we never experience. Like that, *Chidābhāsa Satvē* problems *Satvam*.

In which Avasthā? Jāgrat Avasthā. In *Sushupti Avasthā*, *Chidābhāsa Abhāvē*; *Abhāva means what?* When it is dissolved, dormant, problems *Abhāvaha*. There, *Chidābhāsa ēva samsāra kāranam*. Now look at the Slōka. *Ahami suptēsati* - *Ahami* means *Ahankāre*. *Ahankāre* means *Chidābhāse*.

Ahami - all peculiar declensions. The very word *Aham* is declined. Normally the *Aham Shabdha* is *aham*, *āvāmvayammāmma* *āvānnouasmānnaha* and *saptami vibhakti* is *mayi āvayōhoasamāsu*. This is regular. But here author takes a special declension. *aham*, *ahamou* and *ahamaha*.

And *Saptami* is here taken as *ahami*, *ahamōho*, *ahamsu*. This is a peculiar method to indicate the *Ahankāra*. Therefore, *Ahami* is a special grammar usage to refer to the *Ahankāra*. Like in English also, when the 'I' arrives, you use the word 'the' and write 'I' within quotations.

And you use plural also - when I arrive. But when you say when the 'I' arrives, it is *ahami*. So, when 'the I' Ahankāra. *Suptēsati* – sati, saptami; when it goes to sleep in Sushupti Avasthā, *dukha dōsha pravrutayaha-dukha dōsham* means the problems of grief. *pravrutayaha* - varieties of activities or struggles to eliminate the grief.

Running to astrologer, running to vāstu, running to numerologist, running to Swamis, running to so many places, that is *pravrutayaha*. Or we can take *dukham* and *dōsham* separately also. Sorrow, *dōsha* means problems and *pravrutti* means struggles. *dukha dōsha pravrutti* you can split into two or three but all of them *na drushyantē*.

In sleep, everybody is liberated. I don't feel localization, I never say I am in Anna Nagar, I never have any relationship. All relationships are gone, all localizations are gone, and all struggles are gone. *Aham Pūrnaha Asmi, Aham Ānandaha Asmi*. Even the person with all problems during sleep, he is an embodiment of *Ānanda*.

That Ānanda belongs to the *Chit* only. The problems belong to *Chidābhāsa*. When I go to sleep, Chidābhāsa is dissolved, problem is also gone. Therefore, *dukha dōsha pravrutayahanadrushyantē* - They are not experienced. This is called *Vyatirēka*. *Vyatirēka* means co-absence. *What is the Anvaya?*

For *Anvaya* we have to come to the *Jāgrat Avasthā*. In the waking state, when the *Ahankāra* arises, as even as I wake up, all the thoughts of problems come. There are many problems. First, the driver has taken leave. So, Ahankāra wakes up with problem. That the author doesn't say but we have to supply that.

Because of this Vyatirēka and Anvaya, what is the conclusion? tasya ēva samsāraha. Tasya means what? ahankārasya ēva chidābhāsasya ēva samsāraha. Samsāraha means what? dukha dōsha pravrutayaha - all the struggles in life. And the problem is when the problems become too much, even sleep doesn't come.

When we go to sleep, atleast the Ahankāra goes, we can enjoy *Ātmānanda*. So, in *Sushupti* we are all *Muktās*. Bhagawān gives us the taste of Mōksha. The sample experience of *Mōksha*, Bhagawān gives. Atleast, I go to sleep and enjoy *Mukti*, wonderful. *But when the problems are too much, what happens?* Even sleep doesn't come.

That is why people try other methods, artificial methods of creating sleep like experience where the mind is stoned or dulled like drugs or drinks etc. *What is the aim?* Making the *Ahankāra* inactive. When natural method fails, artificial method we try to use. *Why?* A drunkard does not feel the Ahankāra deliberately. There is no feeling.

That is why he loses the sense of shame and he also talks all kinds of things. *Why?* That *Ahankāra* is gone. Anyway, what I want to say is that problems belong to Ahankāra. *Then, what is my condition? mē nāsti* - the Samsāra is not there to the real 'I' the *Sākshi*. *Here, what does mē refer to?* The real I, the OC, the *Bimba Chaitanyam*, the *Sākshi* which is very much present during *Sushupti*.

Only Chidābhāsa goes to sleep, because the mind is resolved. The *Chit* never goes to sleep. *So, for the non-sleeping 'I', the OC, what is the title given? samsartru sākshinaha* - who is the *Sākshi* of that *Ahankāra*. The word *samsartru* means the Ahankāra. *Samsartru Sākshi* means the witness of the Ahankāra and its Samsāra.

For me, who am the witness of the Ahankāra and its Samsāra, and the Ahankāra's dissolution, all of them I am witnessing. The arrival of Ahankāra I am witnessing, even the dissolution of Ahankāra I am witnessing. For that witness 'I', *Samsāraha Nāsti*. So, *mēna asti*, the verb you have to supply, *na asti* - Samsāra is not there. Continuing. .

Verse No. 11

*supta suptim najānātīm nā suptē swapna jāgarou
jāgrat swapna sushuptīnām sākshya tōha mata dashaha*

So, another subtle verse, all are subtle verses. Advaita Makaranda is subtle only. In the previous two Slōkās the author said I am the *Sākshi*, the *Chit*, different from *Ahankāra*. In the following verses, he wants to say, not only I am different from the four *Kōshas* and the *Chidābhāsa*, the *Ahankāra*, I am different from their properties also.

Not only I am different from the *Anātma*, I am different from and free from the properties or conditions of *Anātma* also. *anātma vilakshanaha* until now, from now onwards, *anātma dharma vilakshanaha*. *Dharma* means conditions, properties. Based on the principle, I have said long before, two principles I used to say -

- *The first principle is - I am different from any object I experience is the first principle.*
- *The second principle is - all experienced properties belong to the experienced Object. They do not belong to the experiencer Subject.*

Those principles he is establishing, I am free from the conditions of *Anātma*. Now, here he says one of the conditions of *Anātma* or the *Ahankāra* is *Avasthā Trayam* - the three fold *Avasthās*, states of experience or conditions of experience which come and go, which appear and disappear like the conditions of water.

Water has got three conditions - The solid state, the liquid condition and the vapour state. In Sanskrit, *Khara Avasthā*, *Drava Avasthā* and *Bhāshpa Avasthā*; *Khara Avasthā* means solid state, *Drava Avasthā* means liquid state and *Bhāshpa Avasthā* means vapor state. These are different states belonging to H₂O.

Similarly, the conditions of *Jāgrat*, *Swapna* and *Sushupti* belong to *Ahankāra* only. They don't belong to *Sākshi* the real 'I'. Therefore, I am *Avasthā Traya Sākshi*, *Avasthā Traya Vilakshanaha*. 'I' the *Sākshi*, the *Ātma* am the *Avasthā Traya Sākshi*, *Avasthā Traya Vilakshanaha*.

Vilakshanaha means, free from. The three states do not belong to me. They belong to the Ahankāra only. Ahankāra is awake, Ahankāra is dreaming, and Ahankāra is asleep. *Sākshi* illumines all the three. Sākshi is not awake, Sākshi is not dreaming, Sākshi is not asleep.

Now, how to show this? How to understand this? For that, the author gives an ingenious argument, a subtle argument. We have to try to understand. We require a subtle intellect to grasp these subtle arguments. Let us see. I will try my best to communicate.

The author says, *suptaha suptim na jānāti*. The sleeper does not deliberately know I am asleep. A sleeper at the time of sleep doesn't know or declare that I am asleep. If a person says I am asleep, the one who says I am asleep is not asleep. The first point is - *the sleeper doesn't deliberately know or think or say I am asleep*.

Even though the sleeper doesn't say that at the time of sleep, we say that the knowledge 'I am asleep' should have taken place. The second point is - *Even though the sleeper doesn't deliberately know or think or declare that 'I am asleep', I am asleep knowledge must have taken place in sleep, non-deliberately*.

Non-deliberately without the active involvement of sleeper; *why active involvement is not there?* Because sleeper is passive. So, the knowledge I am asleep should have taken place. *Why do we say that the knowledge must have taken place? Can you guess the reason?*

If I am asleep knowledge doesn't take place in sleep, after waking I was asleep recollection is not possible. Recollection is possible only if there is collection. I experienced Badrinath last month. You can say that now only if you had experienced Badrinath last month.

Therefore, 'I am asleep' knowledge has to take place in sleep. And if it doesn't take place, I was asleep *Smruti*, recollection cannot come in waking. This is the second point. *What is the first point?* Sleeper doesn't

deliberately know, think or declare I am asleep because sleeper is asleep.

What is the second point? Even if there is no deliberate cognition taking place, there is the knowledge I am asleep. *What is the proof for that knowledge?* After waking we say that. Then we have to go to the third principle. *What is that third principle?* That we will see in the next class.

*Pūrnamadah Pūrnamidam Pūrnāth Pūrnām Udachyatē
Pūrnasya Pūrnāmādāya Pūrnāmēvā Vasishyatē*

Om shānti shānti shāntihi



Advaita Makaranda Verses - 11 to 13

*sadāsiva samārambhām sankarāchārya madhyamām
asmad āchārya paryantām vande guru paramparām*

Verse No. 11

*supta suptim najānātīm nā suptē swapna jāgarou
jāgrat swapna sushuptinām sākshya tōha mata dashaha*

In the first part of the teaching from verse 2 to verse 7, the author established that I, the *Ātma* am identical with *Brahman* because the nature of Brahman as described in the scriptures and the nature of myself are both identical. Therefore, *Aham Brahmāsmi* is the fact.

Now, he has come to the second part of the teaching, to find out why we are finding it difficult to accept this fact and assimilate this fact. *What is the obstacle?* He said that the obstacle is I am associating myself with the medium through which I am transacting. We do require a transacting medium.

I, the consciousness cannot even say 'I', if there is no body-mind complex. Remember that the pure consciousness can never declare I am pure consciousness. Why that much, it cannot declare 'I'. Therefore I, the pure consciousness do require a medium to transact with the world. Even self-awareness requires the presence of this medium.

So, nothing wrong in having the medium, but I associate myself with the medium. I connect myself with the medium and I include all the properties and limitations of the medium with myself which is called *Adhyāsaha*. Once I connect the properties and limitations, then I have become a localized individual.

And as an individual, I can never claim *Aham Brahmāsmi*. Therefore, the author said that you have to learn to deliberately disassociate from the medium. Even the disassociation process happens with the help of the medium only. I should use my mind to say I am not the mind.

I should use my mouth to say I am not the mouth. I have to use a thought to say I am not the thought. Because even saying I am not the thought is another form of thought only. Therefore, using the *Anātma*, I have to deliberately claim that I am not the Anātma. This disassociation process is presented in various stages in the Shāstra.

One method is called *Pancha Kōsha Vivēkaha*. The author negated in one verse *Annamaya*, *Prānamaya*, *Manōmaya* and *Vignyānamaya Kōshās*. Four Kōshās were negated in verse 8. After negating the four Kōshās, the author negated *Chidābhāsa*, the consciousness reflected in the Kōsha also as *Anātma*.

Chidābhāsa is a peculiar *Anātma*, because it is Anātma different from me but it is a *Chētana Anātma*. Normally Anātma is *Achētanaha*, but *Chidābhāsa* is a peculiar *Chētana Anātma*, because it is sentient. The author said, I am not the *Chidābhāsa* also which is fluctuating, which arrives and departs, which is associated with the conditions of the reflecting medium.

And he called the *Chidābhāsa* by the name *Ahankāra* and said that I am not the *Ahankāra* also. So, four Kōshās negated, *Ahankāra* negated and the fifth Kōsha will be negated later, but there is a small diversion. In this diversion the author says, not only I am different from the four Kōshās, I am also free from the properties and conditions of the Kōshās.

So, not only *Anātma Vilakshanaha Aham*, *Anātma Dharma Vilakshanaha*; *what does Dharma mean in this context?* Conditions, properties, etc. And he wants to take two sample Dharmas of Anātma. And one is the *Avasthā Trayam*, the three states known as *Jāgrat*, *Swapna* and *Sushupti*. They are conditions of the mind.

Fully awake mind is in *Jāgrat Avasthā*, partially awake mind is in *Swapna Avasthā*, and fully passive mind is in *Sushupti Avasthā*. Therefore, the *Avasthās* are nothing but the conditions of the mind. Therefore, *Avasthās* belong to the *Anātma*.

‘I’, the *Sākshi*, the illuminator of them do not have these Avasthās. Therefore, I am not *Avasthā Trayavān*. *Vān* means possessor. I am not Avasthā Trayavān. I am not the possessor of three states. I am *Avasthā Traya Sākshi*. Sākshi means the illuminator of the changing Avasthās.

I am not the possessor of the changing Avasthās which means, while the Avasthās arrive and depart, I do not arrive and depart. I continue to be the same. *Avasthā Trayavān* is defined as *Ahankāra*, and *Avasthā Traya Sākshi* is defined as *Ātma*. Avasthā Trayavān is Ahankāra, Avasthā Traya Sākshi is Ātma.

The author says learn to use the word ‘I’ with the *Ātma* rather than *Ahankāra*. As *Avasthā Trayavān Ahankāraha*, I can never claim oneness with Brahman, but as *Avasthā Traya Sākshi Ātma*, I can boldly claim *Aham Brahma Asmi*. Therefore, where you place the ‘I’ determines whether you are *Brahma* or *Bhrama*.

Brahman category or Bhrama category depends upon where you place the word *Aham*. And this the author is presenting in a specific form in the verse No. 11 which we were seeing in the last class. It is a very brief and profound Slōka. First he says - *suptaha suptim na jānāti*. The sleeper does not willfully and deliberately know I am asleep.

The sleeper does not deliberately, willfully know and claim I am asleep. If the sleeper claims I am asleep, then he is not asleep. Even though the sleeper does not deliberately know and claim I am asleep, the knowledge that I am asleep must have taken place in sleep. *How do you know that I am asleep knowledge should have taken place?*

The logic is, only if ‘I am asleep’ knowledge takes place in sleep, only then after waking up, I can claim I was asleep. I ate the food knowledge is possible only if you had ‘I ate the food knowledge’. What knowledge did not take place in the past is never available for recollection because recollection presupposes collection. *Smṛiti* presupposes *Anubhava*.

Therefore, 'I am asleep' knowledge is taking place because of some principle. During sleep, 'I am asleep' knowledge is taking place. Without my deliberate will or effort that knowledge is taking place. Now, you cannot say that it is the knowledge taking place because of the sleeper because the sleeper is not deliberately knowing.

Therefore, knowledge is taking place and it is not because of the deliberate effort of the sleeper. If the sleeper is putting forth deliberate effort, he won't be a sleeper. Therefore, the sleeper's knowledge of 'I am asleep' at the time of sleep, (I hope it is not confusing) must be taking place because of some other principle.

Some other principle must be responsible for the knowledge, 'I am asleep'. *When I say some other principle, other than whom?* The sleeper because the sleeper is not responsible for that. Then, the author says that principle is called the *Sākshi* and this Sākshi has to be different from the sleeper.

The Sākshi has to be different from the sleeper and that Sākshi cannot be the sleeper because if Sākshi himself is the sleeper, Sākshi cannot be responsible for this knowledge. Therefore, Sākshi cannot be the sleeper. Therefore, the author uses the word *Aseptaha*. *Sākshi is what? Aseptaha. Then who is the sleeper? Ahankāra* is the sleeper.

Who is Ahankāra? The deliberate knower, the will is the sleeper. Therefore, Sākshi must be the non-sleeper at the time of the sleep of the sleeper. If Sākshi is a non-sleeper at the time of the sleep of the sleeper, the sleep does not belong to the non-sleeper Sākshi. The sleep does not belong to the non-sleeper Sākshi.

The sleep belongs to the sleeper only. So, *asuptaha sākshi sushupti avasthā rahitaha bhavati. Aseptaha Sākshi*, the non-sleeper Sākshi is *Sushupti Avasthā Rahitaha* - is free from Sushupti Avasthā. This is the first lesson. Then, from this the author derives another important corollary.

If the non-sleeper Sākshi does not have sleep, the non-sleeper Sākshi cannot have waking also because waking is for the sleeper. If non-sleeper Sākshi is not connected with sleep, then the non-sleeper Sākshi cannot be connected with the waking also because waking is possible only for a sleeper.

Sleeper can wake, the non-sleeper cannot wake, need not wake. Therefore, *Asuptaha Sākshi* doesn't have *Jāgrat*, *Swapna Avasthā* also. Now, look at the second part. *Asuptē* - for non-sleeper Sākshi which is not associated with sleep state, *na swapna jāgarou* - there cannot be the state of waking and dream also.

Whoever doesn't have sleep state, cannot have waking, dream state also. Therefore, Sākshi is free from *swapna jāgara* also. Therefore, adding both the sentences; *how is the development?* The sleeper does not know the sleep. Therefore, *Sākshi* alone is responsible for the knowledge of the sleep.

Therefore, Sākshi is not sleeping. Therefore, Sākshi is non-sleeper. Therefore, Sākshi is not associated with sleep state. Therefore, Sākshi doesn't have *Jāgrat*, *Swapna* also. And therefore, Sākshi is free from all the three *Avasthās*. Therefore, he says *ataha*. Therefore, I am Sākshi, the witness of *Jāgrat*, *Swapna*, and *Sushupti*.

What type of witness? Ever awake witness. *So, who are you singing Suprabhāta to?* Not *Sākshi*. I am the ever awake witness of *Jāgrat*, *Swapna* and *Sushupti*. And for me *ata dashaha* - who am free from all those three *dasha*; *Dasha* means state or *Avasthā*. So, *tad dashaha* means possessing those three states.

tāha dashāha yasya saha tad dashaha (bahuvrihi). *Tad dashaha* means endowed with those three states. Then, *na tad dashaha* - not endowed with those three states. That means *avasthā traya rahitaha aham asmi*. Thus, the author has presented in this particular way. We can arrive at the same conclusion by applying our own original two principles also.

If you remember the two principles of Vedānta, I said that the knower is different from the known and then I said that all the known properties belong to the known Object. They do not belong to knower Subject. Applying that law we can come to the same conclusion. I am the experiencer of the three Avasthās.

Therefore, all the known three Avasthās should belong to the known *Anātma*. By applying the second law, we can arrive at the conclusion that the three Avasthās cannot belong to me. But the author is applying in this particular manner. In short, I am *Avasthā Rahitaha Asmi*. When I associate myself with *Jāgrat Avasthā*, I falsely associate and I take the attribute of Jāgrat Avasthā.

A false 'I' is created which is called *Vishvaha*. Then, I falsely associate with myself with *Swapna Avasthā*, and another false 'I' is created called *Taijasaha*. And when I associate with *Sushupti Avasthā*, the third false 'I' is created which is called *Prāgnyaha*. When I deliberately disassociate from the three Avasthās, I am -

nāntah pragnyam, na bhahish pragnyam, na pragnyāna ghanam, adhrushtam avyavahārya agrāhyam alakshana machintyam avyapadēshyam shāntam shivam advaitam chaturtham manyantē sa ātma savignyēyaha

You associate with them you will become *Vishwa*, *Taijasa*, *Prāgnya*. You disassociate from them, you claim you are *Turīyam*. Therefore, I am the *Turīya Sākshi Ātma Asmi*. Then, we have to add the corollary. *What is that?* As *Vishwa*, the waker I can never claim *Brahma Aykyam*. As *Taijasa*, Brahma Aykyam is not possible.

As *Prāgnya*, Brahma Aykyam is not possible. Only as *Turīyam* I can claim *Brahma Aykyam*. That is why when people say, I know I am *Brahman* but my wife is not alright, they are quietly slipping from *Turīyam* to *Vishwa*.

Therefore, unknowingly we slip to Vishwaha and we try to associate with Brahman because the 'I' is not clarified before saying *Aham Brahmāsmi*. Therefore, pay attention to the word Aham before saying Brahmāsmi.

Verse No. 12

*vignyāna virachit suptihi tat janma swapna jāgarou
tat sākshinah katham mē syuhu nitya gnyānasya tē trayaha*

This is the reinforcement of the same idea that I am *Avasthā Traya Sākshi*. Therefore, *Avasthā Traya Rahitaha*. For this purpose, he is defining the three Avasthās. *What are the three Avasthās?* Jāgrat Avasthā is a state in which there are specific cognitions of objects - *Visēsha Gnyāna Avasthā*.

Visēsha Gnyāna means what? Shabdha Gnyānam, Sparsha Gnyānam, Rūpa Gnyānam, Rasa Gnyānam etc. That *Visēsha Gnyānam* in English, Specific Cognition is called *Vignyānam*. In this particular Slōka, the word Vignyānam refers to the specific cognition. *Jāgrat Avasthā* is a state where there are specific cognitions.

So many varieties such as this is man, this is woman, this is coffee, this is shoe, this is book etc. Right from the waking moment, every stage you have got one specific knowledge or the other. *Then what about Swapna Avasthā?* The author says, *Swapna Avasthā* is also a state of Specific Cognitions only.

That is, *Visēsha Gnyānam* or *Vignyānam* is there continuously. There is a flow of Vignyānam. So, *Vignyāna Santatihi* is *Jāgrat Avasthā*. *Santatihi* means Continuous flow. The only difference between Jāgrat and Swapna is that in Jāgrat Avasthā, the specific knowledge is of external object.

In the *Swapna Avasthā*, it is specific knowledge of internal objects projected within the mind as the dream man, dream woman, dream tiger

etc. But there also there is man knowledge, woman knowledge, tiger knowledge, ghost knowledge, so many things. *But what is important?* Specific knowledge is there.

So, *Vignyāna Santatihi* is *Jāgrat Avasthā*, *Vignyāna Santatihi* is *Swapna Avasthā*. *What is the Sushupti Avasthā?* He says Vignyāna Santatihi comes to a stop. There is a cessation or end of all specific knowledge. All the objects are also gone and all the specific knowledge or cognitions are also gone. There is neither external object, there is neither internal object.

Therefore, there cannot be objective knowledge such as this is man, this is woman, etc. Therefore, the flow of Specific Cognitions stops. The author calls it *Vignyāna Viratihi*. *Viratihi means what?* Cessation, end, stoppage of the flow of *Vignyāna Santatihi*. Thus, Vignyāna Santati is there, Jāgrat - Swapna are there.

Vignyāna Virati is there, *Sushupti* is there. Thus Vignyānam arrives, Vignyānam departs. Now, the author asks the question - *are you aware of the flow of Vignyānam as well as the cessation of Vignyānam? Are you aware of the flow of Vignyānam in Jāgrat and Swapna?*

I am aware that at 7'o clock the first sentence started, Sadāshiva Samārambhām started. 11th Slōka, 12th Slōka; the Vignyāna Santatihi I am aware. At the time of sleep all the Vignyānams have ended, but there is a Gnyānam which is aware of the end of Vignyānam, which cannot be one of the Vignyānams. *Why?* Because then it will be *Vignyāna Santatihi*.

Therefore, we are talking about the end of Vignyānam. That end of *Vignyānam* is awared by one *Gnyānam*. And that Gnyānam, which is the Sākshi, does not end. The witness of the end of the Vignyānam is different from Vignyānam, different from the Special Cognition but it is *Sāmānya Chaitanyam*, it is a *Sāmānya Gnyānam* which is called *Sākshi Chaitanyam*.

That Sākshi Chaitanyam does not, Vignyanam Santati also does not come under Vignyāna Viratihi also. This arriving and departing Vignyanam cannot belong to the Sākshi. *It cannot belong to the Sākshi because if the Vignyanam belongs to the Sākshi, then what will be the problem?*

Since the *Sākshi* continuously exists in all the three states, if Vignyanam belongs to the Sākshi and Since the Sākshi is continuously existing, Vignyanam also will continuously exist. *If Vignyanam continuously exists, what will happen? Vignyāna Virati* cannot take place. *If Vignyāna Virati cannot take place, what will happen?* We should not sleep.

So, *Vignyāna Virati* takes place that means I, the Sākshi am different from the arriving, departing Vignyanam and free from them. Therefore, he says, *Vignyāna Viratihi Suptihi* - the cessation of Specific Experiences. Previously, I said Vignyanam means Specific Cognitions. Now, I am using the expression Specific Experiences.

Technically it is called *Vrutti Gnyanam*. That is called *Sushuptihi*. It is called sleep state. And *tat janma - tat janma* means *Vignyanasya Janma*. The rise of specific experiences is called *Swapna Jāgarou*, is known as Swapna Avasthā and Jāgrat Avasthā. Both are nothing but flow of Specific Experiences.

Then, what is the difference between Jāgrat and Swapna? Even though both are flow of experiences in one, Specific Experiences are caused by external objects or sense organs and in the other one (dream) specific experiences are caused not because of sense organs but because of memory.

Sense organ based specific experiences is called *Jāgrat Avasthā*. *Vāsana* based specific experiences is called *Swapna Avasthā*. What is common to both is Specific Experiences. *And who am I? tat sākshinaha.*

I am the consciousness principle, who am the witness of their arrival and departure and I am not linked to them.

If I am linked to them, what will happen? When they depart, I also depart. *Suppose if a person is tied to a running horse, what will happen?* When the horse runs that person also will move. Similarly, if I am associated with those Avasthās, then I will also come and go, but I don't.

Therefore, I am free from the Avasthā Trayam. Therefore, he asks - *nitya gnyānasya tē trayaha katham syuhu. tē trayaha* means those three conditions *trayaha* means *Supti, Swapna, Jāgarāha (tē trayaha)*. *katham mē syuhu - how can they belong to me? What is the meaning of the word me?*

Not Vignyanam, I am not Visēsha Gnyānam, but I am *Sāmānya Gnyānam*. *What is my name? Nitya Gnyānam*. I am the general consciousness, un-located consciousness. I am not located spatially also, not located time wise also. When I am associating myself with a class experience, then I am associating with Vignyanam.

Once I associate with class experience, I become a localized individual. I am in Anna Nagar - spatial location comes. I am between 7 am and 8 am, time wise location. If I know that I am the Chaitanyam, I am not in Anna Nagar; I am not between 7 and 8. I am *Nityaha, Sarvagataha, Sthānuhu*.

So, *Nitya Gnyānasya* is adjective to *mē*, which is shashti vibhakti and *tē* is there and that is not shashti vibhakti. *tē* is *prathama bahuvachanam, dakārānta pumlingaha tat shabdaha prathamā bahuvachanam*. *So, how can those three Avasthās be in me?* Here, that is not a question. It is *ākshēpārthe katham*. How can they be in me means, they cannot be in me. Continuing. . .

Verse No. 13

*shad vikāravatām vēttām nirvikārōha manyathā
tad vikārānusandhānam sarvathānāva kalpatē*

In the previous two verses, the author said that I am free from the *Avasthā Trayam* which is the property of *Anātma* of course, with *Chidābhāsa*. Remember that mere inert *Anātma* cannot have waking etc. *Avasthā Trayam* belongs to *Anātma* with *Chidābhāsa*. And this can be arrived at by applying the second law.

What is the second law? All the known properties belong to the known Object. It can never belong to the knower Subject. We can apply this principle with regard to any property. We have applied this with regard to property of *Avasthā Trayam*. *Avasthā Trayam* is only one of the properties of *Anātma*.

Now, the author wants to apply the same principle with regard to another important property. *Avasthā Trayam* is one *Anātma Dharma*. There are innumerable *Anātma Dharmas*. But now he wants to apply it another important *Anātma Dharma* and that is change or *Vikāraha* because this will have a deep influence upon our own self-perception.

Remember that all the struggle of Vedānta is only to modify the way we look at our self. In fact, the whole Samsāra is based on the way we look at our self. One of the ways that we look at ourselves is that we are mortal, growing, graying, going individuals. If you see, 90% of our life time is only activities triggered by this self-perception.

Therefore, I am subject to six fold modification, is our self-perception. Shad *Vikārāha* we saw in *Tatva Bōdha*. *What are the six modifications?* - *asti*, *jāyatē*, *vardhatē*, *viparinamatē*, *apakshīyatē*, *vinashyati*. *asti* means existing potentially in the womb of the mother. *jāyatē* means birth. *vardhatē* means growing.

viparinamatē means transforming. *apakshīyatē* means declining, decaying. And *vinashyati* means death or dying. These are the six fold changes in everything of the creation. *Now the question is, do I fall in*

that list? Because we are seeing that happening in every object. Because every object is going through these.

And I have without enquiry concluded that I am also one of those arriving, departing entities. I live for years but I never question that conclusion. I should be questioning that conclusion because I have never objectified myself. *When I have not objectified myself, what is the proof for the changing I?*

Because I, the subject is never subject to objectification. When I have never objectified myself, I have never experienced a changing 'I'. *Because when I itself is not an object of experience, how can I talk about a change in that 'I'?* That means I have no *Pratyaksha Pramāna*. Therefore, there is no *Anumāna Pramāna*.

Without any proof, I have blindly concluded that I am also like one of the objects in the world. This self conclusion has created havoc in life because every moment of my life is based on that conclusion. Preparation for old age, preparation for retirement, preparation for insurance, preparation for medical claims, preparation for everything.

In fact, every moment of my life is based on that conclusion. *The author asks the question, have you questioned that conclusion?* The author says, if you question that conclusion you will know that it is *Mithyā Gnyānam*. Remember Sureshvarāchāryā's expression, all our struggles in life are based on self false conclusion.

If it is Mithyā Gnyānam, then what is Samyak Gnyānam? The author says, 'I', the knower of the changes can never be the changing entity because the knower of changes must be changelessly present to talk about the changes or the changing conditions arriving and departing.

The knower of changes must be changelessly present to be aware of the arrival and departure of the changing condition. Therefore, the awarer is arriving and departing. The awaring Sākshi is changelessly present. Therefore, I am the only changeless, conscious principle in the creation.

And that is being said in this important Slōka. The principle applied is that the knower of changes is free from changes. Knower of arrivals and departures is not arriving and departing. Details in the next class. .

*Pūrnamadah Pūrnamidam Pūrnāth Pūrnām Udachyatē
Pūrnasya Pūrnāmādāya Pūrnāmēvā Vasishyatē*

Om shānti shānti shāntihi



Advaita Makaranda Verses - 13 to 15

*sadāsiva samārambhām sankarāchārya madhyamā
asmad āchārya paryantām vande guru paramparām*

Verse No. 13

*shad vikāravatām vēttām nirvikārōha manyathā
tad vikārānusandhānam sarvathānāva kalpatē*

In these verses, beginning from the 8th verse up to the 17th verse, the author is establishing that I, the *Ātma* am different from the *Anātma* consisting of the *Pancha Kōshās* like the body, the sense organs, the mind etc. Only when I separate myself from the Pancha Kōshās, then alone I can accept my identity with *Brahman*.

As long as I am going to identify myself with the body-mind complex, I am going to take myself as a limited entity. And as a limited one, I can never claim oneness with the limitless one, Brahman. Therefore, *Pancha Kōsha Vivēka* is a prerequisite, a necessary condition for *Jīva Brahma Aykyam*.

First, he differentiated from the four *Kōshās* - *Annamaya*, *Prānamaya*, *Manōmaya* and *Vignyānamaya*. Then, he separated from the *Chidābhāsa* also, the consciousness reflected in them also. Now, he has entered a new topic that not only I am different from the *Anātma*, I am different from or free from the properties of *Anātma* also.

First, he took up the *Avasthā Trayam*, the three states of experience as the property of *Anātma* and pointed out that I, the *Ātma* am free from the *Avasthā Trayam*. I am not the *Avasthā Trayavān*, but I am *Avasthā Traya Sākshi*.

Now, in these Slōkās beginning from the 13th which I introduced in the last class, the author has taken up another important attribute. And that attribute is modification or change. He points out that all the changes

belong to the Anātma only and I, the knower of the changing *Anātma* am free from those changes.

So, I the knower of the changing *Anātma* or the changing objects am free from the changes. When we talk about the changing objects, it includes three things. The changing world is object number one. The changing body is object number two and the changing mind is object number three.

I know the changing world, I know the changing body and I know the changing mind. Therefore, the changes belong to the world, body and mind. None of those changes belong to me, the knower. For that, different reasons can be given. Three reasons can be given. The author is going to give one of these three reasons.

What are the possible reasons? The first reason is that we have to apply our fundamental principle. *What is that?* All known attributes belong to known Objects. They never belong to the knower Subject. Change is also a known attribute. Therefore, it can belong to known objects only, either the world or the body or the mind.

The change can never belong to the knower Subject. This is reason one. The second reason is that we have observed that anything that changes is inert matter. From our observation, we can arrive at a principle that every changing thing happens to be inert matter. The world is changing, it is matter.

The body is changing, it is matter. The mind is changing, it is matter. Therefore, *yatra yatra vikāraha tatra tatra achētanatvam or jadatvam; Is the knower of the changes jadam or chētanam?* The knower of the *chētanam* is *chētana vastu* and therefore, it is not subject to change. Therefore, if *Ātma* is also subject to change, *Ātma* also would have been *Jadam - ātma jadaha savikāratvāt ghatavat*.

Ātma would have been *jadam* if *Ātma* is also subject to change. But we find otherwise. Therefore, *Ātma* is not subject to change. This is the

second argument. The author does not give both these arguments but it is given elsewhere. Then, the author gives the third argument. *What is that?*

The knower of the changes must not be changing, must be changeless. *What is the reason?* He says change is nothing but a difference between previous condition and present condition. Suppose, I tell that you have changed. *Then, what does that mean?* Your present condition is different from the previous condition.

If I have to talk about the difference between the present condition and previous condition, I must be the knower of the previous condition and present condition. *Without knowing the previous condition and present condition, how can I talk about the difference between them?*

Therefore, to talk about the difference between the previous and present condition, the knower must have known the previous condition and the same knower must know the present condition also. *What does that mean?* - Condition has changed, the knower is the same.

Therefore, only if the knower is the same with regard to the previous condition and the present condition, then and then alone the knower can talk about the difference between them. Therefore, he must be the same knower. That means the knower must not have changed.

If the previous knower has known the previous condition, the present knower knows the present condition then the present knower cannot talk about a change because the present knower will not know the previous condition. The previous knower cannot talk about the change because the previous knower cannot know the present condition.

Only when there is a common knower between the previous and present conditions, that same knower alone can talk about the change in that and this condition. Therefore, the author says the knower of changes must continuously exist to remember the past and the present and talk about the difference.

The knower of changes must continuously exist to remember the previous condition and the present condition and to talk about the differences in those conditions. Therefore, the knower is changeless. That is said here. Look at the Slōka - *shad vikāravatām vēttām. vēttām* means the knower of the *shad vikāravatām*.

The knower of the changing objects. Or to be precise, knower of the objects with six fold changes. *Knower is referring to whom?* - Knower Subject. The knower Subject who knows the objects with six fold changes. That knower *aham*- I, *nirvikāraha* - have to be free from the six fold changes.

I, the knower Subject, who am the experiencer of the objects with six fold changes, must be free from the six fold changes. *anyathā -anyathā means what?* Suppose we don't agree with this. *What do you mean by that?* Suppose the knower is also changing.

That is, when I was a boy, there was a different knower, when I am a youth, there is another 'I' and when the person is old, there is a third 'I'. The boy 'I', the youth 'I' and the old 'I' are different I's. I means, first person singular I. *Then, what will happen?*

Nobody can talk about the boyhood, the youth and the old age because the old man will not know the boyhood state and youth, the youth will not know about the *koumāram* and *jara*, and the boy will not know the youth and *jara*.

The 'I' which talks about the boyhood condition, the youth condition and the old age condition, that 'I' must be a continuous, changeless thread of consciousness. That alone Sankarāchārya said - *bālyādishwapi jagradādishu tathā sarvā swavasthā swapi vyāvruṭtāsu anu vartamānam*.

There is one constant changeless 'I'. I cannot be subject to change. Therefore *anyathā* means if I am also changing. *anusandhānam*, remembering or recollecting. *tadvikāra* - the changed condition or the

changing conditions, *anusandhānam* – recollection. *na avakalpate* - is never possible.

So *sarvathā* - by any means, the recollection or reference of these changes I can never do. But my experience is there is one common ‘I’ continuously as a thread. Therefore, that ‘I’ must be *nirvikāra Chaitanyam*; Therefore, *Ātma Nirvikāraha*; Continuing . . .

Verse No. 14

*tēnatē nahi rūpēna jāyatē līyatē muhuhu
vikāri vastu nastēshām anusandhātrutā kutaha*

The same idea is reinforced in the following two verses also (14th and 15th). *Nirvikāratvam* is reinforced. Now the author says, for arguments’ sake let us assume that the knower Subject is also changing. For argument sake, let us have a hypothetical condition that the knower ‘I’, the subject is also changing.

Then, what does it mean? If the knower ‘I’ is also changing, along with every changing condition a new knower also must be coming. Because if along with the changing condition, the knower is the same old knower, then it will mean that knower is not changing. Suppose you assume that the knower is changing.

It means along with the new changing condition, the old knower is changing. That means he is replaced and along with the new condition, a new knower is also coming. Therefore, condition number one - there is knower number one. And there is a change in condition. Condition number two - knower also has changed. That means, knower number two has come.

Thus, for the third condition - knower number three. That means if knower is also changing, it means there are many knowers also along with the changing condition. That means we have got a series of knowers sequentially coming and going. If you are talking about the

change of knower, it will mean that there is a series of knowers, sequentially coming and going.

Thus, you will have moment to moment arriving departing knowers. This is called the *kshanika vinyāna vāda* of Buddhism which claims not only the objective world is changing, but the subject 'I' also is constantly replaced. 'I' number one will know 7'o clock. Another 'I' knows the 7:01, another 'I' knows 7:02.

As even the time is changing, the world is changing. The knower I also is coming and going. And the author says suppose this is happening. *What is happening?* There is not one continues knower, but there is a series of knowers, sequentially coming and going. *Then, what will be the problem?* That is what is being discussed in this Slōka.

Now, look at the Slōka. He says *vikāri vastu* - (we have to supply) A changing entity, that is the knower also must be born and gone along with the changing condition. If the knower is also changing, then along with the changing conditions, the knower entity also must be born and gone.

Just as, when bangle *Nāma-Rūpa* comes, the bangle comes. The bangle *Nāma-Rūpa* goes, you cannot say bangle continues. Bangle also goes. Chain *Nāma-Rūpa* comes, chain comes. Chain *Nāma-Rūpa* goes, the chain also goes. *Similarly, what will happen?* The knower also will be *jāyatē līyatē*. *jāyatē* means, is born. *līyatē* means, is gone.

Every moment a new 'I' arrives and departs. This will be the condition if the knower is also changing. Ok, let us assume like that. *What is wrong?* Because afterall, science also says that everything is changing every moment. The brain cells are changing, the body cells are changing and the body is also changing every moment.

Thoughts are also changing every moment. Cells are also changing every moment. *If everything changes, why can't we take 'I', the subject also is changing every moment? Then the author asks, if there is a*

continuous flow of knowers, tell me who talks about the flow of knowers?

You are talking about the constant flow of knowers. Knower number 1 comes and then that goes. Knower number 2 comes, knower number 3 come. Thus, there is a flow of knowers. *You tell me who talks about the flow of knowers? Does knower number one talk about the flow of knowers? Does knower number two talk about the flow of knowers?*

Does knower number three talk about the flow of knowers? Who talks?

Knower number one cannot talk about the flow. *Why?* Because when knower number two comes, knower number one is no more there to know about two, three and four. Knower number two cannot know about knower one or three.

Knower number three cannot know about one, two, or four. No knower can talk about the previous knowers or the later knowers. *When no knower knows about the other knowers, who will be there to talk about the flow of knowers?* Suppose, you say there is a *Sākshi*. Then, that *Sākshi* must be constantly witnessing the flow of knowers.

Then, that *Sākshi* must be *Nirvikāraha*, changelessly there. Therefore, if the knower is a series, there will not be anyone to talk about the series whereas you are talking about the series. *What does that mean?* There is someone different from that. Therefore, he says *Vikāri Vastunaha*. For the arriving and departing knower, *tēshām anusandhātrutā*.

How can there be the recollection of the other knowers' arriving and departing? How can the arriving, departing knower recollect the arrivals and departures of other knowers? Imagine that you are not all coming at the same time. One student comes at 7'o clock and he goes away. Another student comes at 7:01 and goes away. Another comes at 7:02 and goes away.

Who can talk about coming and going students? Arriving departing students can never talk about the event of the march past of the students.

Therefore, he says *Vikāri Vastunaha Ātmanaha*. *How can the changing, arriving, departing knower talk about the flow of knowers?* It is never possible. Continuing...

Verse No. 15

*na cha swajanma nā shamvādrashtu marhati kaschana
touhi prāguttarābhāva charamapratha makshanau*

What is the argument? Knower cannot be changing. If the knower is changing, it will mean that there is a series of knowers coming and going. If there is a series of knowers coming and going, no single member of the series can talk about the series because no single member knows about the previous members of the series or later members of the series.

How can he talk about the series? Now the next question is - ok, let us assume that I am a temporary knower, who comes for a short while experience and disappear. I cannot talk about previous knowers, because I was not there at that time and I cannot talk about later knowers, understood.

But why can't I say I can know about my own arrival and departure? That is, my appearance or birth and my disappearance or death, I know. Once I know of my birth and death, then by inference I can say that since I am subject to birth and death, before me there must have been another short living knower.

And before that, there must be another short living knower. Thus, I can infer the series. I cannot experience the series but I can infer the series.

Based on what? My temporary arrival and departure. That means, by knowing my birth and death, I can infer the presence of previous and later knowers. This is the question.

By knowing my birth and death, that is, as a knower I come to know my birth and death. From that, I know my temporary nature. From that, I

can infer the series of previous and later knowers. *Why can't we take like that?* Whether we will ask such questions or not, author is imagining such possible questions.

That is why the advantage of studying Vedānta for long time is that you would have covered almost all possible questions, almost all possible questions coming from the entire humanity. Because they imagine possible questions which we will never imagine. The author says no knower can know his own birth and death.

No knower can ever know his own birth and death. *How do you say so?* I thought all the time that I know I am mortal. Author says that is your confusion. That is not your knowledge. That is what you have taken for granted. But if you choose to think, there is no proof, no evidence to prove your birth and death.

It is Because no knower can know his own birth and death. *Why?* It is a very interesting Slōka. If you understand the definition of birth and death, then you will understand the logic. *What is the definition of birth and death?* This also we will never think. We only say child is born, table is born, this is born, that is born.

What do you mean by birth? Similarly, we say something is dead. *What do you mean by death?* He gives the definition of birth and death. It is very beautiful. When you say something is born, a baby is born at 7:01. 7'o clock first minute or first second the baby is born. *What does it mean?* Before that, the baby is non-existent.

Whenever you talk about a product, before the date of birth or manufacture, that product did not exist. And when you talk about the date of birth, from that moment you accept the existence of that object. *What does that mean?* Whenever you talk about the birth of something, it means, before its birth it was non-existent.

So, when you say child is born at 7'o clock, it means child was non-existent at 6'o clock, at 6:15, at 6:30, at 6:50, at 6:58, at 6:59 and at 7'o

clock the child is born. That means, previously the child was non-existent which is technically called prior non-existent. The baby was non-existent before 7'o clock.

And at 7'o clock at the time of birth, what is happening? The previous non-existence of the baby, the prior non-existence of the baby comes to an end at 7'o clock. *What is the definition of birth?* The definition of birth is the end of the prior non-existence. The last moment of prior non-existence is the birth of baby.

What is the last moment? 7'o clock is the last moment when the prior non-existence ends then the existence of the baby begins. *Then, what do you mean by the death of a person? Can you understand?* After the death, the person becomes non-existent. That is what is called by the word death.

That non-existence after death is called posterior non-existence. *What is the definition of death?* The first moment of the posterior non-existence is called death. *What is the definition of birth?* The last moment of prior non-existence. *What is the definition of death?* The first moment of posterior non-existence. Let us put it in Sanskrit.

The last moment of prior non-existence is called *prāgabhāva charama kshanaha*. Last means *charama*. *prāgabhāva* means prior non-existence. *Charama* means final. *kshanaha* means moment. *I have seen the birth of a child means what?* I have seen the birth of child means, I have experienced the last moment of the child's prior non-existence.

Now, I cannot say I have seen your birth because I have not experienced your prior non-existence. I should experience the prior non-existence and I should experience the last moment of the prior non-existence. Then and then alone I can talk about the birth of that baby. We cannot talk about the birth of space.

Why? We have not experienced the prior non-existence of space. We have never experienced the prior non-existence of the space and the last

moment of its prior non-existence. Only if we have experienced the prior non-existence and its last moment, then alone we can talk about the birth of space. Otherwise, for us space is eternal only.

Similarly, what is the Sanskrit word for definition of death? It is the first moment of the posterior non-existence. *What is the Sanskrit word? - pradvamsa abhāva prathama kshanaha.* *What does pradvamsa abhāva mean?* Posterior - that is later non-existence. *prathama kshanaha* means first moment.

Thus, to talk about the birth of something I should know the *prāgabhāva charama kshanaha* and to know the death, I should know the *pradvamsābhāva prathama kshanaha*. Now, suppose I want to talk about my birth. *What is my birth?* By definition, my birth is the last moment of my own previous non-existence.

Now the question is - can I experience the last moment of my own previous non-existence? Any way, you can go home and think. These are all very interesting things. At least, Vedānta makes us think because we have lost the habit of thinking at all. At least, we will start using our thinking faculty.

I can never experience my own prior non-existence because how can I experience my non-existence. *How can I experience my non-existence?* To experience my non-existence, I must be there and if I am there, I won't be non-existent. Therefore, I can experience the non-existence of everything. I can never experience the non-existence of myself.

Therefore, I can never experience my own prior non-existence. If I cannot experience my own prior non-existence, how can I talk about the last moment of prior non-existence. A baby can never experience its own last moment of prior non-existence.

Baby's mother experiences the last moment of baby's non-existence and the first moment of baby's existence. The baby itself cannot. Therefore, I cannot experience my birth. I can never experience my birth.

Similarly, what about my death? Can I experience? To experience my death I should know the first moment of my posterior non-existence.

You will never read your name in the obituary column. Only others can do that. Therefore, I can never experience my death. To experience my death, I should experience the first moment of my posterior non-existence. *How can I experience my own non-existence?* Therefore, Vedānta says my death is my assumption.

That I am mortal is only an assumption which we have accepted without questioning. There is no proof for my death. *People ask, what is the proof for my immortality?* Vedānta says first you prove your mortality. *Why should I prove my immortality?* You are saying I am mortal. First I want you to prove that I am mortal.

When you try to prove your own mortality, it is only an assumption or it is based on wrong inference. Either it is an assumption or it is based on wrong inference, because we are seeing the death of matter. And based on the death of matter, we have inferred the death of consciousness. Scientists who can prove death or end of the brain, they have inferred the end of consciousness.

They have proved the destruction or the disintegration of the brain and from that they infer the disintegration or death of consciousness. Vedānta says that is wrong inference. *How can you infer the end of consciousness based on the change of matter?* If you say no, no, no I have seen the end of consciousness.

You don't see the consciousness itself, how do you see the end of consciousness? I am not seeing your consciousness. I am seeing only your body. *Nobody has seen consciousness, what is the proof for its end?* Nobody can talk about the mortality of the conscious Subject. I am the conscious Subject and I am immortal. *Who says?* Lakshmīdhara Kavi.

Now, look at the Slōka. He says, *swajanma nā shamvā* - once own birth or death. *kaschana drashtum arhati* - no experiencer or knower can experience one's own or his own birth and death. *What is the logic?* Because *touhi* - because birth and death are by definition, *prāguttarābhāva charama prathama kshanau*. You have to split the compound word into two words.

prāgabhāva charama kshanaha is one word. And the second word is *uttara abhāva prathama kshanaha*. *What is the translation?* The last moment of prior non-existence is birth and the first moment of later non-existence is death. That means, I have to witness my own non-existence to prove my birth and my death which is never possible.

Therefore, I can never experience my birth and death. If there is a proof for my birth and death, I can infer that there are other knowers coming and going. Then, I can talk about a series of knowers which is never logically provable. *Therefore, what is the conclusion?* There is only one continuous consciousness which never changes. All the changes belong to matter continuously is born and gone.

Brain changes, cells change, neurons change, thoughts change, everything in the creation changes. Electrons change, protons change, neutrons change, energy changes. But behind all the changes, there is one changeless consciousness. You have no proof to establish the change in consciousness. And that consciousness I am - *Aham Brahma Asmi*.

*Pūrnamadah Pūrnamidam Pūrnāth Pūrnam Udachyatē
Pūrnasya Pūrnamādāya Pūrnamēvā Vasishyatē*

Om shānti shānti shāntihi



Advaita Makaranda Verses - 15 to 17

*sadāsiva samārambhām sankarāchārya madhyamām
asmad āchārya paryantām vande guru paramparām*

Verse No. 15

*na cha swajanma nā shamvādrashtu marhati kaschana
touhi prāguttarābhāva charamapratha makshanau*

In the first part of this text from verse 2 up to verse 7, the author established *Jīvātma Paramātma Aykya - Aham Brahma Asmi*. Then, in the second part which we are seeing now and which is from the 8th verse up to the 17th verse, the author points out that I can equate myself with *Brahman* only under one condition.

It is a very important condition. That is, I should separate myself totally from the *Anātma*. Only when I recognize myself as the pure existence and consciousness principle different from the material body and the material Anātma, then alone I can equate myself with the all pervading, formless Brahman.

The moment I identify with Anātma, two things happen. First, I get a localized and a finite entity. Localization is the instantaneous consequence of body identification or mind identification. The second consequence is that I will be associated with various attributes which belong to the body-mind complex.

Once I am an attributed individual with properties, with individuality, I can never equate myself with the infinite *Brahman* which has to be free from properties. Therefore, I have to intellectually separate (not physically) myself from the *Pancha Kōshās* as well as the attributes. First, the author separated the four Kōshās - *Annamaya, Prānamaya, Manōmaya, Vignyānamaya*.

Then, the author separated the *Ātma* from *Chidābhāsaha*, the *Ahankāra*, the reflected consciousness. Then, the author separated from the

attributes of *Anātmā*. He pointed out that even the *Avasthā Trayam*, the three fold states of experience belong to the mind only. Ātma doesn't have the three states.

Ātma is *Avasthā Traya Sākshi*. Therefore, *Vilakshanaha*. Thereafter, in these three verses (13, 14 and 15), the author says I, the Ātma am free from all the modifications or changes. Any change should belong to matter. Matter is subject to change and any material is subject to change because it is a product of matter.

But the spirit, the consciousness am not subject to change and he gave the reason also. I, the knower of changes am free from all the changes. *He said, if I, the knower also is subject to change, what will happen?* The present knower will be different from the past knower.

If the past knower and the present knower are different, the present knower can never talk about the past experiences. Therefore, I, the knower should be changeless. This argument can create certain doubts. That also must be taken care of.

Suppose a person asks, why should you say the knower of the changes must be changeless? Why can't we assume that the knower is also changing? The past knower is different, the present knower is different because it has undergone change. Naturally, the question will come.

If the present knower is different, how can the present knower talk about the past experiences? For that, we can answer. It is very simple. Past knower had the past experiences and those experiences are stored in memory. Past knower had the past experiences and there is a mental computer, mental slab which can keep the imprint of the experiences.

Those memories are there and the present knower (who is different from the past knower) is talking about the past experiences by tapping the memory part. Thus, the knower has changed and the present knower is different from the past knower, and the present knower talks about the past experiences based on memory which is stored in the mind.

So, why can't you say that? Why should you say that the knower should be the same? We will examine this suggestion. Suppose a person says that the past knower is different and the present knower is different. Past knower had the experiences, present knower has the memories. Suppose that is the argument then, we will imagine a situation.

Imagine somebody comes and tells me - Swāmiji, I have wonderful memories of Badrināth and Kedārnāth. A person says that I have wonderful memories of beautiful mountains, snow clad peaks, winding Ganga etc. *Then, I ask the question, when did you visit Badrināth? What should be his answer?*

I did not visit Badrināth because the past experiencer who is different, the past knower experienced Badrināth and that past knower left the memories in the mind. And 'I', the present knower am only talking about the memories. I have not experienced Badrināth must be the answer. *But what is the answer given by him?*

He doesn't say some past experiencer experienced and I am recollecting. He says, I experienced Badrināth 20 years before and I am recollecting the experience now. That means, he is talking about some common changeless component of the past experiencer and the present experiencer.

Whenever there is a self recognition in which I am equating the past experiencer and the present experiencer, the equation is only from the standpoint of some common component between the past experiencer and the present experiencer. This is called *Pratyabhignyā Vākyam*. In Vedānta, it is a very important topic for analysis.

In all Pratyabhignyā Vākyams, I am equating the past experiencer 'I' and the present experiencer 'I' referring to as *Sōham*. *Pratyabhignyā Vākyam* is called *SōhamVākyam*. In these Pratyabhignyā Vākyams or SōhamVākyams, I am equating the past experiencer and the present experiencer.

This equation is possible only when there is a common component in both of them. Now the question is - *what is the common component in the past experiencer and the present experiencer?* It cannot be the body because the body 20 years before and the body now is totally different. In-fact, even medically, every cell has been replaced and even brain cells have been replaced.

Body is different, mind is different, brain is different, everything is different between the past 'I' and the present 'I'. But still, I am equating them by saying that 'I' who experienced Badrināth 20 years before am the present 'I'. *What is the common component in both of them?*

That common component can never be *Anātma* because Anātma is not common. It cannot even be the *Chidābhāsa* because even Chidābhāsa varies depending upon the condition of Anātma. It is either dull or bright etc. That 'I' can refer to only the *Chit*. In all *Sōham Vākyams*, the meaning of the word *Aham* is the changeless *Ātma*.

The statement is made by the present knower (very careful) but meaning of the word 'I' is not referring to the present knower or the past knower but it is referring to the common component. Because if you are referring to the uncommon component, equation can never tally. Therefore, *saha vāchyārtham* is a different knower and *aham vāchyārtham* is a different knower.

In the *Sōham* equation, we are referring to the *Lakshyārtha*. That is the common component in the past knower and the present knower. That is neither *Sharīram* nor *Chidābhāsa* but the *Sākshi* only. That is what Sankarāchārya says in the *Dakshināmūrti Slōka*.

*rāhu grastha diwākarēndu sadrushō māyā samācchādanāt
sanmātrah karanōpasamharanatō yōbhūt sushuptah pumān
prāgaswāpsamiti prabōdha samayē yah pratyabhignyāyatē. .*

What is a Pratyabhignyā Vākyam? A statement where the past knower and the present knower are equated. In all these equations, the past

knower and the present knower have got a different *Vāchyārtham* but the equation refers to the *Lakshyārtha* which is the common component in the past knower and the present knower.

What is that? It is not the *Sharīra Trayam*, it is not the *Ābhāsa Chaitanyam* but the original consciousness only. And that is the knower 'I' in this context. The knower 'I' refers to the changeless component, the original consciousness. Therefore, the knower of changes is the changeless consciousness only.

Even though the one who makes this statement is *Ahankāra* but the meaning of the word *Aham* in that context is the *Sākshi* only. Therefore, by the *Pratyabhignyā Vākyam*, we come to know of the changeless component. That is *Sharīra Vilakshana*, *Chidābhāsa Vilakshana Chidrūpa Ātma*. Up to this we saw in the last class. Continuing . .

Verse No. 16

*na prakāshēhamityuktihi yatprakāsha nibandhana
swaprakāsham tamātmānam aprakāshah katham sprushēt*

So, there is a correction in the Chinmaya Mission books. *yat prakāsha nibandhana* is the correct reading. *yat prakāshaika* is there. That 'ka' is not required and the 'i' after 'sha' is also not required. If it is *eka nibandhana*, there is no problem meaning wise.

In-fact you will get a nice meaning but Slōka wise, one letter will be extra. Then the chanting cannot come properly. Therefore, it should be *yat prakāsha nibandhana*. Otherwise, we have to remove the word 'yat'. *prakāshaika nibandhana* also will be ok.

na prakāshēhamityuktihi prakāshaika nibandhana, that also will be ok but between these two readings, it is better to retain the word 'yat'. Now, the author is negating the fifth and the final *Kōsha* namely, *Ānandamaya Kōsha* or *Karana Sharīram* which obtains in *Sushupti*.

In the deep sleep state, we are not operating the *Sthūla Sharīram*. It is not functioning as a medium for our transaction. Even though the body is alive, we are not using the body. That is why, in sleep we don't experience a physical personality. That is why, we don't experience even a localization or limitation.

Similarly in deep sleep state, the mind is also resolved, is not functioning. All the four types of mind are not functioning. The emotional mind is not functioning, the rational mind (thinking mind) is not functioning, the memory mind is not functioning.

Even the ego mind which talks about 'I' as an individual, that individuality invoking ego is also not functioning in sleep. Therefore, *Sthūla Sharīram* is resolved, *Sūkshma Sharīram* is resolved. We are in *Kāraṇa Sharīram* in which all these are dormant, un-manifest.

And because there is no individuality and because there is no division also, I don't feel any limitation or want. When I don't feel any limitation, it is an experience of *Ānanda*. Therefore, the *Kāraṇa Sharīram* is called *Ānandamaya Kōsha*. I am blissful because *Dvaitam* is not there.

Therefore, *Rāga* is not there. Therefore, *Dwēsha* is not there. Since time is absent, future is not there. Future belongs to time. Since future is not there, you don't think of your responsibilities. All the future concerns are gone. And past is not there. Therefore, all past regrets are gone.

What I want to say is, I am blissful. That bliss is called *Ānandamaya Kōsha* or *Kāraṇa Sharīram*. And the author says, in the *Sushupti*, I am not only blissful but there is another thing also. *What is that?* I am blissfully ignorant of everything, including my problems.

Therefore, in *Ānandamaya Kōsha*, bliss is there and also ignorance is there. Therefore, in the Shāstra, *Kāraṇa Sharīram* is equated to ignorance. *Ānandamaya Kōsha* is equated to ignorance. Here, the author says that ignorance is a powerful entity which can conceal or cover the existence of everything.

That is why in sleep when the ignorance is there, it has covered everything. The whole world is covered. My knowledge, my emotions, my individuality, my past, the possible future, everything it covers including time and space.

Ignorance covers everything but ignorance does not and cannot cover one thing. Ignorance is extremely powerful but it cannot conceal one thing in the entire creation and it is 'I' the *Ātma*, the *Chaitanya Tatvam* or the consciousness. Ignorance cannot cover that. *Why do you say so?*

It is very simple. Ignorance is never capable of covering consciousness because you are talking about ignorance! You are talking about ignorance and you are talking about the concealing power of ignorance. If you are talking about ignorance, you must be aware of ignorance.

If you are talking about ignorance, you must be knower or aware of ignorance because what you are not aware of, you cannot talk about. If you are aware of ignorance, that means the consciousness is not covered by ignorance. Therefore, consciousness is capable of illumining the presence of ignorance.

That is why I am aware of ignorance and I am talking about it. Suppose, the ignorance has covered consciousness also. *What will happen if the consciousness is totally covered by ignorance?* The covered consciousness will not be able to illumine anything because it is covered.

If the covered consciousness will not be able to illumine anything, it will not be able to illumine ignorance also. If it cannot illumine ignorance, you can never say ignorance has covered consciousness because to talk about the ignorance covering consciousness, you must be conscious of ignorance.

For example, suppose in a dark room there is a bright bulb and it is covered by a thin cloth. When it is covered by a thin cloth and the room is partially bright, you are able to clearly say that there is a bulb but the

bulb is covered by a thin cloth. Therefore, the bulb has become dull and it is not very bright.

Let us now imagine that you use a very powerful thick and dark cloth and the cloth has covered the bulb totally that the brightness of the bulb, the illumining power of the bulb is totally covered. *Then, what will happen?* When you enter the room, you will not even know the existence of the bulb because the bulb's illumining power is covered.

Therefore, you cannot talk about a bright bulb. Not only you cannot talk about the bulb, you will not be able to talk about the thick cloth also which covers the bulb. Nobody can enter the room and say that the room is totally dark because there is a bright bulb and the bright bulb is covered by a thick cloth.

You cannot say that because the existence of the cloth itself you will not know. To talk about the covering cloth, you require the bulb and the light. Therefore, if ignorance covers the Ātma, not only Ātma would have lost the illumining power, the very existence of ignorance we will never know.

The fact that we are able to talk about ignorance, ignorance of everything including self ignorance indicates that ignorance can conceal everything but not the consciousness which is illumining ignorance. Therefore, the author says that consciousness is not covered by ignorance.

It is not affected by ignorance, it is not touched by ignorance. It is totally different from and unaffected by *Ānandamaya Kōsha* also. Now, look at the Slōka. *na prakāshē - prakāshē* is a verb. *pra + kāshdhātu ātmane padi lat uttama purushaha eka vachanam. prakāshatē, prakāshētē, prakāshantē.* In *Uttama Purusha - prakāshē, prakāshāvahē, prakāshāmahē.*

So, *na prakāshē* means I don't know anything. I am totally ignorant of everything. *In which state?* In the *Sushupti Avasthā*, in *Kārana*

Sharīram, in *Ānandamaya Kōsha* when there is total ignorance of everything, *na prakāshē* - I am able to say that I don't know anything or I didn't know anything.

So, "*ahamna prakāshē*" is within inverted commas. *iti uktihi* - this statement (that I don't/didn't know anything) regarding the presence of ignorance, existence of ignorance is *prakāsha nibandhana* - dependent on an unconcealed consciousness which illumines, which reveals the presence of ignorance.

So, this statement is *nibandhana* - *nibandhana* means based on, because of, caused by *prakāshaha*. Here the word *prakāsha* means the consciousness principle, *Ātma Tatvam*. *What type of Ātma Tatvam?* An Ātma which is not concealed by ignorance but an Ātma which reveals the presence of ignorance.

Then, what does ignorance conceal? It conceals everything other than 'I', the *Chaitanyam*. So, it is *Prakāsha Kārya* caused by *Prakāsha*. That *Prakāsha*, the *Chaitanyam* is *swaprakāsham ātmānam* - that *Chaitanyam* is called *Swaprakāsha Ātma* - self evident, self revealing, ever revealing Ātma.

And because of the self revealing Ātma, *Chaitanyam* alone, everything else is revealed. Therefore, what he says here is, Ātma reveals knowledge also and Ātma reveals ignorance also. Knowledge belongs to the mind, ignorance belongs to the *Anātma*. Knowledge also belongs to *Anātma*.

Ātma reveals both the knowledge of the *Anātma* (*Buddhi*). Ātma reveals the ignorance of the *Buddhi*. Ātma is not contaminated by, affected by the knowledge or ignorance. It is distinct and unaffected *Sākshi*. That Ātma (*swaprakāsham ātmānam*) *tam*. The word '*tam*' is correlative because in the previous sentence '*yat*' relative pronoun is there.

So, whichever consciousness reveals the ignorance, that consciousness is unaffected by ignorance. That is the statement. Therefore, *tam*

ātmānam aprakāshaha - *aparakāshaha* means ignorance which is the illumined ignorance, revealed ignorance which is the object of revelation.

That ignorance *katham sprushēt* - *how can it contaminate, pollute, cover that Ātma? Therefore, what is the essence of this Slōka? Ātma* is the revealer of ignorance, Ātma is the subject, ignorance is the object. Ātma not only is the revealer but it is not affected by or concealed by ignorance also.

nasprushēt means not contaminated. Therefore, I am *Ānandamaya Kōsha Vilakshanaha* because here, ignorance means Ānandamaya Kōsha. Thus, I am *Pancha Kōsha Vilakshana Chaitanyam*. This Chaitanyam is ever one with Brahman. Continuing. .

Verse No. 17

*tathāpyābhāti kōpyēshaha vichārābhāva jīvanaha
avashyāyaschidākāshē vichārārkōdayā vadhihi*

Here, the author talks about the nature of that ignorance. The ignorance should not be covering the Ātma. Ignorance is incapable of covering the Ātma. *If the ignorance covers the Ātma, what will be the consequence?* Consciousness which is covered will not be able to reveal the ignorance. I will not be able to talk about the ignorance itself.

Therefore, ignorance should not be capable of covering the Ātma. But the author says that even though this is the fact, the ignorance seems to cover the Ātma. Logically it should not be, factually it should not be because Ātma is so powerful and Ātma is infinite also.

And anything cannot cover the infinite because to cover the infinite, you require something bigger than the infinite. What covers must have more pervasion than the covered object. That is why when you want to cover your body, the blanket must be bigger than you.

Therefore, logically Ātma should not be covered by ignorance but some peculiar thing happens. *What is that?* He says, ignorance seemingly covers the Ātma because people are ignorant of this Ātma. *What is the proof for self ignorance?* Nobody says *Aham Brahmāsmi*.

What better proof do you want! Otherwise, everybody should come and say I am Brahman, you are also Brahman. Nobody claims I am Brahman. Not only that, even after 25 years of Vedāntic teaching they don't claim. The ignorance seems to be so powerful that people are not bold enough to claim *Aham Brahmāsmi*.

Even if they claim, it is a feeble claim and it is invariably followed by a 'but'. *What does that mean?* Self ignorance should not exist. Self should not be covered but there seems to be an *Āvarana Shakti* which peculiarly covers my infinite nature, my *Ānanda Swarūpam*, my *Asanga Swarūpam*.

Nobody says I am *Asangaha*. Everybody introduces the people - this is my wife, this is my husband, this is my child, this is so and so etc. Every time I introduce, I am only revealing my *Sambandha*. Nobody says I am *Asanga Ātma*. *What does that mean?* My ignorance seems to be covering.

And he says, it is this self ignorance which cannot be logically explained, which is a mysterious entity with mysterious powers. It is this ignorance which is the cause of problems. *Annamaya Kōsha* is not the problem, *Prānamaya Kōsha* is not the problem, *Manōmaya*, *Vignyānamaya* are not the problem.

It is the *Ānandamaya Kōsha* which has got ignorance as the component. That too, the *Āvarana Shakti* of ignorance which illogically covers my *Nitya Mukta Swarūpam*. That is the cause of the problem. Therefore, he says *tathāpi* - still.

Still means even though logically the self cannot be covered, *eshaha ābhāti* - *eshaha* means this powerful ignorance appears in front of me.

eshaha refers to the *Aprakāsha* of the previous Slōka. *Aprakāsha* means ignorance which is comparable to *avashyāyaha* - like the mist in the sky. *avashyāyaha* means mist.

Why does he give the example of the mist? Because I am the Ātma which is like the sky. So, I am the space like consciousness and in me, the space like consciousness, there appears a misty ignorance. And the mist always covers things. Early in the morning we are not able to see the things clearly because of mist.

People are not clearly recognized and because of this peculiar mist (*avashyāyaha*) appearing in *chidākāshē*- me the space like consciousness; *chidākāsham* is the Chidambaram, all pervading consciousness. This mist appears and this mist should not cover my nature.

Logically, it is not possible but still, that ignorance seems to be successful in making me disown my *Brahma Swarūpam*. Not only I disown my Brahma Swarūpam, but in that place a *Samsāri*, struggling 'I', the *Jīvātma* has come which continues to struggle even now. In-fact, every day is a struggle.

Life is a dragging existence even though the scriptures say that I am *Swatantraha*, *Nityaha*, *Muktaha*. But the actual ground situation, the ground reality seems to be different. On the first floor, things are fine. It is all caused by the *Āvarana Shakti* of *Ānandamaya Kōsha*, the *Agnyānam*. This Agnyānam is surviving and it even seems to grow also.

It seems to grow because problems are increasing. We always feel that during our boyhood stage we were carefree and happy. *So, what is the nourishing factor? What preserves and nourishes this ignorance? Why should the author talk about that?* Once we know the nourishing factor, we can starve it to that.

He says, the nourishing factor is *vichāra abhāva jīvanaha* - lack of enquiry. Lack of enquiry because we never enquire into the root cause

of our problems. We want only the temporary, superficial patch up solution which seems to be easier and less time consuming.

We never want to go to the root cause. *Who am I who seems to have the problem?* We refuse to make the self enquiry. Therefore, *vichāra abhāvahameans* lack of self enquiry. It is the *jīvanam*. *jīvanam* means the food, the nourishing factor for ignorance.

By avoiding enquiry, we are nourishing the ignorance, preserving the ignorance in safe deposit vault. Once you starve that ignorance by removing the lack of enquiry; because lack of enquiry is the nourishment. *How do you remove the lack of enquiry?* Enquire.

So, the moment enquiry starts; The author compares the enquiry to the Sunrise. *How long the mist will continue in the sky?* The mist will continue as long as the Sun does not rise. The moment the Sun rises, the mist will go away. Similarly, when the enquiry Sun rises, mist of ignorance will go away.

Therefore, *vichāra arka udaya - vichārārka* means the enquiry Sun, *udaya* means rises. *avadhi* means until. Until the rise of the enquiry Sun, the mist of ignorance will be there in me who am the all pervading space like consciousness. The moment I bring enquiry, the mist will go away.

When the mist goes, I claim *Aham Brahma Asmi*. Therefore, *vichārārkkōdayā vadhi*. The ignorance continues. *What type of ignorance?* Mysterious ignorance. So, this mysterious mist of ignorance continues. The more you enquire, it disappears. More in the next class.

*Pūrnamadah Pūrnamidam Pūrnāth Pūrnām Udachyatē
Pūrnasya Pūrnāmādāya Pūrnāmēvā Vasishyatē*

Om shānti shānti shāntihi



Advaita Makaranda Verses - 18 to 20

*sadāsiva samārambhām sankarāchārya madhyamām
asmad āchārya paryantām vande guru paramparām*

Verse No. 17

*tathāpyābhāti kōpyēshaha vichārābhāva jīvanaha
avashyāyashchidākāshē vichārārkōdayā vadhihi*

From the 8th verse up to this 17th verse, the author did *Pancha Kōsha Vivēka* showing that 'I', the *Ātma* am different from all the Pancha Kōshās, as well as their attributes. Only when I separate myself from the Pancha Kōshās the *Anātma*, then alone I am entitled to claim oneness with Brahman.

As long as I identify with *Anātma*, I cannot avoid localization and attributes. Therefore, *Pancha Kōsha Vivēka* becomes important. Therefore, the author did that from 8th verse to 17th verse. Finally, he dealt with *Ānandamaya Kōsha* or *Kārana Sharīram* which we experience in deep sleep state in the form of total ignorance or *Agnyānam*.

And the author said that I, the consciousness am different from this ignorance also. And ignorance has a unique power of *Āvaranam*, covering and ignorance can cover everything else but it cannot cover one thing. That is *Ātma*, the consciousness.

Because if consciousness itself is covered, then there will not be a consciousness to illumine the ignorance. Then, we will not be able to talk about ignorance itself. But the very fact that we are talking about ignorance shows that ignorance is illumined by consciousness.

Which means that ignorance cannot cover consciousness. Not only that, the consciousness, *Ātma* being infinite, nothing including ignorance can cover the infinite. Because to cover the infinite, you require something bigger than the infinite.

Therefore, the author said in the 16th verse that 'I', the Ātma am not affected by ignorance. It cannot be logically affected. Then, in the 17th verse he said that even though, logically ignorance cannot cover the Ātma, but mysteriously, peculiarly ignorance seems to cover the Ātma.

It cannot be logically explained how but because of its mysterious power, it seemingly covers the Ātma. That is why people do not claim that I am the *Ātma Swarūpam*. If people are not able to claim, it is because the ignorance is seemingly covering. Therefore, this mysterious ignorance becomes the cause of all problems.

That was said in the 17th verse which we completed. And he gave beautiful metaphor here - I am the consciousness which is like space and the mysterious ignorance exists in this Ātma (that is the space) like the early morning mist. So, it is a mysterious mist like thing which covers everything.

The mist will continue as long as the Sun does not rise. The mist will disappear when the Sun rises. Similarly, ignorance is nourished because of lack of enquiry, *Vichāra Abhāva*. When the Sun arises, then the ignorance disappears.

Therefore, *avashyāyaha chidākāshē. avashyāyaha* means mist. *chidākāshē* means in the space like consciousness, the ignorance continues. *How long? vichāra arka udaya avadhihi. avadhihi* means until. *arka udaya* means *Sūryōdayaha*. *What is the Sūrya here? vichāra.*

vichāra is not worry. *vichāra* means enquiry. Enquiry represents *Gnyānam* here. Therefore, until enquiry and knowledge arises, ignorance continues. This ignorance alone is the cause of all *Samsāra*. With this, the *Pancha Kōsha Vivēka* topic is over. Continuing . .

Verse No. 18

*ātmā gnyāna mahā nidrā jrumbhitēsmin jaganmayē
dīrgha swapnē spurantyētē swarga mōkshādi vibhrama*

In these two verses (18th and 19th verses), the author establishes that the entire creation, as well as all the transactions in the creation are born out of this ignorance only. Therefore, they are all *Mithyā*, unreal. So, *Jagan Mithyātvam* is briefly presented in two verses (18 and 19).

To convey this idea, the author compares the world and its transactions to a dream caused by self ignorance. This example we have seen very often. Self ignorance is compared to a form of *Nidrā* or sleep, a spiritual sleep. Self ignorance is compared to spiritual sleep because in our regular sleep also, our problem is ignorance of myself as a waker.

When I go to sleep, what happens to me? I lose consciousness of myself as an individual who is lying on the bed. So, I forget myself as a waker, I forget the bed, I forget the house, I forget the surroundings. *Therefore, what does sleep do to me?* Sleep covers myself from myself.

Therefore, sleep is an ignorance of myself as a waker. This sleep has got two powers - *Āvarana Shakti* and *Vikshēpa Shakti*. The *Āvarana Shakti* covers myself as a waker. The moment I forget myself as a waker, I project a dream world out of myself which is caused by the *Vikshēpa Shakti* of the sleep.

Even though the dream world is a projection, once I enter this dream world and start experiencing the dream world, I don't know the dream as dream. This also I have said often. The dreamer does not understand the dream as dream in dream. The dream is *Mahā* real. Therefore, all the transactions, *Karma*, *Karma Phalam* etc are also real.

This dream and the dream's sufferings end only when the *Nidrā* ends. Which means, when I wake up. *What is waking up?* It is nothing but again recognizing myself as a waker. When I get back to myself as a waker who am just sleeping on the bed comfortably, no problems at all, in the AC room, cool water is nearby and nothing is amiss.

Therefore, self ignorance is a form of sleep and self knowledge is a form of waking. Here, the author says that this *Jāgrat Prapancha* is also

caused by another higher sleep. This higher sleep is ignorance of myself, not as a waker, but ignorance of myself as the *Turīya Ātma*.

When I am the *Turīya Nirguna Sacchidānanda Ātma*, this higher nature is not known, two things happen. The *Āvarana Shakti* has covered my *Turīya* nature and *Vikshēpa Shakti* has generated this *Jāgrat Prapancha* which is a longer dream. Waker ignorance generates a shorter dream, Turīyam ignorance creates a longer dream.

Therefore, the author says *Turīya Agnyānam* is *Mahā Nidrā*. Now, look at the Slōka. *ātma agnyāna mahā nidrā* - So, we are all in a very big sleep. Don't say that we are awake. Remember that the dreamer also in dream, claims I am awake only.

The dreamer also, in dream claims I am awake even though the dream has come because he has gone to sleep. But the dreamer doesn't claim. Similarly, we claim that we are awake but the author says that we are in a *Mahā Nidrā* called *Ātma Agnyānam*. Here *Ātma* means *Turīya Chaitanyam*.

This Mahā Nidrā has two fold jobs - one is *Āvarana Shakti* covering my real nature and the *Vikshēpa Shakti*, the projecting nature. This sleep has *jrumbhitē* - *jrumbhitē* means projected or created. *What has self ignorance created? jaganmayē* - this cosmos, this universe consisting of me as an individual, wife, children, all other relations.

In whom? Advaitam. na pitā na bandhur na mitram na gurur na sishyaha - That is my higher *Advaita Swarūpam*. That Advaita Swarūpam is forgotten and I have become an individual related to umpteen things and facing problems from all over.

Therefore, *jaganmayē* - this world of plurality. And *dīrgha swapnē* - the local dream will last only for one and half minute according to the dream researchers. Every dream can last only one and half minute whereas, this self ignorance sleep we can never say when it started - *anādi māyā suptaha*.

Janma after Janma we have been sleeping to our nature. Srushti after Srushti have taken place. Still, we have managed to continue to sleep. Therefore, because of the sleep there is *dīrgha swapnaha* - long drawn dream in the form of *Jagat*. Here the word Jagat means *Jāgrat Prapanchaha*.

If somebody claims that I don't look upon this world as a dream, I don't recognize it as a dream. Dream is unreal but this world is very real. *How can I swallow that this is dream?* Then, the author says, this is the same argument you give when you are in the other dream also.

When I am in dream chased by a tiger, I never know that I am comfortably sleeping, tiger is my projection, the running body is also my projection. The chasing tiger, the chased body, both are my projections. They are nothing but thoughts only. Nothing is happening in me who am comfortable on the bed.

As I said, a dreamer doesn't know the dream to be dream in dream. Similarly, we will swear that this is not a dream. And the dream will become a dream when you wake up to your higher nature. Similarly, this also will be reduced to dream only when I wake up to my *Turīyam* nature.

ya sākshāt kurutē prabōdha samayē swātmāna nēvādvayam - Therefore, in this long dream, *yētē spuranti* - all these transactions are appearing and disappearing. He says the entire Veda also belongs to dream only. And the entire *Karma Kānda* is part of this dream. All our *Punya-Pāpa Karmās* are part of the dream

All travels from one *Lōka* to another is part of the dream, *Swarga* is also part of that dream. The *Gnyāna Kāndam* of the Veda is part of this dream. *Guru, Sishya* and *Shāstra* are part of this dream. *What about Mōksha? So, what is the definition of Mōksha?* Definition of *Mōksha* is *Samsāra Nivruttihi*, freedom from problem.

If all problems belong to dream and they are unreal, the removal of problems also will come under the same *Swapna* alone. If the rope snake is unreal, through rope knowledge, the disappearance also is as real as the snake only. Therefore, Mōkshaha which is *Samsāra Nivrutti* is also *Mithyā*.

That is why, after waking up from dream, the thief that I dreamt is also unreal, the thief going away is also unreal. It belongs to the same order of reality. *Therefore, if somebody asks Mōksha is real or unreal, what should be your answer?* You should not answer. You should ask the question - *from what stand point?*

From *Vyāvahārika Drushti*, from the relative plane *Samsāra* is also real and *Samsāra Nivrutti* is also real. Just as dream hunger is also real and dream food is also real. Dream eating is also real, dream hunger removal is also real. *From whose stand point?* From dreamer's stand point.

Similarly, *Mōksha*, *Samsāra* are all real from the *Vyāvahārika Jīva Drushti* whereas, from *Pāramārthika Ātma Drushti*, *Samsāra* and *Mōksha*, both of them are *Mithyā* only. Therefore, he says *swarga mōkshādayaha* - all of them are *vibhramāha*. *vibhramāha* means *Mithyā*, projection. *vibhramāha* means *adhyāsaha*.

Continuing . .

Verse No. 19

*jadā jada vibhāgōyam ajadē mayi kalpitaha
bhitti bhāgē samēchitrē charāchara vibhāgavat*

They are two readings. In the second line, *chitrē charāchara vibhāgavat* or there is an alternate reading *chitra charāchara vibhāgavat*. Both readings are ok. *chitra charāchara vibhāgavat* reading is slightly better. Here, he says that in this *Ātma* which is the consciousness principle,

because of self ignorance, there is the projection of both the *Jada Prapancha* as well as the *Chētana Jīva*.

Both the sentient experiencer as well as the insentient experienced world, both of them are projected out of the same ignorance and both of them are resting on myself, the Ātma. Naturally, the question will come, how can the *Jada Prapancha* be created out of the *Chētana Ātma*. *How can the Jadam come out of Chētanam?*

The author says it is not at all difficult. We have got several examples. The previous dream itself is an example. I got to dream as a sentient living being and out of sleep, I project a world which has the division of the *Chētana* living being as well as the *Achētana* mountains etc. I create both of them.

The author gives another example of a painting of both the sentient and insentient beings upon a canvas which is *Jadam*. We see the same thing in the movie also. The screen is inert and upon that non-moving screen, we have got the projection of both moving and the non-moving object.

So, the car will be running and the running car is seen upon a screen which is a non-moving object. In the same way, upon the *Chētanam Brahma*, both *Chētana-Achētana Prapancha* is projected. Look at the Slōka. *mayi kalpitaha* - *mayi* means 'I', the *Ātma*, the *Turīyam* now associated with *Ātma Agnyāna Mahā Nidrā*.

Why do we call it Mahā Nidrā? Because we have got *Alpa Nidrā*. *Alpa Nidrā* projects the dream world and *Mahā Nidrā* projects the waker's world. Therefore, in me who is associated with *Mahā Nidrā*, ignorance *kalpitaha* - is projected, *ayam jada ajada vibhāgaha*.

This division of the sentient (*ajadam, chētanam*) experiencer or subject and insentient (*jada, achētanam*), both of them are superimposed on me. *By whom?* By me. Just as I superimpose a *Swapna Prapancha* upon myself similarly, I have done. *What is my nature?* *ajadē mayi kalpitaha* - who am of the nature of *Chaitanyam (ajada chaitnyam)*.

If you really analyze, the truth is that the so called sentient living being and the insentient object, both of them are nothing but matter, *jadam* only. The body which is called sentient is also inert matter only. The clip is also inert matter made of chemicals.

The body is also matter only but this is called sentient and the clip is called insentient because of what? This matter, the body is more sensitive matter. Therefore, it is capable of reflecting consciousness. This has got *Chidābhāsa*. That is the only difference.

Really speaking, the entire universe is inert Prapancha only. But one part has got *Chidābhāsa* and the other part doesn't have *Chidābhāsa*. Matter with *Chidābhāsa* is called sentient. Matter without *Chidābhāsa* is called insentient. Both of them are superimposed upon me. *And who am I, matter or Chidābhāsa?*

I am neither the matter nor the *Chidābhāsa*. I am the *Chit*, the *Adhishtānam* in whom the entire world, with and without *Chidābhāsa* is projected. *If the Chidābhāsa is not there, can you imagine what will happen?* Suppose, the entire world is material world. The body is also matter, the class is also matter.

There will no transaction at all. Therefore, even in madness there is a method. So, even in this unreal projection, there is some order. *What is that order?* Part of the creation is with *Chidābhāsa* and another part is without. *Suppose, this desk also has got Chidābhāsa, what will happen?* It will go for a walk!

Therefore, there is some order that one part should be inert without *Chidābhāsa* and another part must be sentient. This *Chētana Achētana Vibhāga* is projected in me for the purpose of enjoying this drama. This drama is never possible in pure *Ātma*, the *Chētana Tatvam*.

In *Ātma*, *Jada Ajada Vibhāga* is not there. There will be no transaction. Therefore, we should be thankful to *Agnyānam*. Because of *Agnyānam* alone, all this drama is possible. The entire dream is possible because of

Nidrā alone. *But what is the problem?* As long as we understand the drama as drama, there is no problem.

Only when drama become serious and the actors forget that I am only playing a role, then it becomes a problem. Therefore, we can allow this *Swapna* to continue. We need not complain. Let it continue as long as *Prārabdha* is there. What Vedānta says is, understand the dream as a dream.

Show that we will not seriously react to the ups and downs of this drama. Let not the serial become serious. Therefore, let the dream continue as long as *Prārabdha* is there. Let it not overwhelm you. So, he gives the example, *samē bhitti bhāgē* - on the side of a wall.

samē - which is motionless like the screen of a movie. *charāchara vibhāgaha* - we experience the *Charam* and the *Acharam*. There are the moving horses, the running people as well as the stationary mountains. Both we experience upon the wall which is stationary.

That is, the relative is super imposed upon the stationary. Relative means opposites. *What is the opposite?* Moving and non-moving, sentient and insentient. This entire world of relativity is superimposed upon the absolute.

In which absolute, there is no *Chētana Achētana Vibhāga*, *Chara Achara Vibhāga*, *Pramātru Pramēya Vibhāga*. Where that duality is absent, in that *Chara Achara Vibhāgavat*, the whole universe is superimposed. Therefore, *Brahma Satyam*, *Jagan Mithyā*, *Jīvō Brahmaiva Nā Paraha*.

So, here the word *sama* refers to motionless. In the motionless *Ātma*, both the moving and the non-moving are superimposed. Upon the absolute motionlessness, the relative motion and relative motionlessness are superimposed. Continuing . .

Verse No. 20

*chētyō parāga rūpāmē sākshi tāpina tātvikī
upalakshana mēvēyam nistaranga chidambudhēh*

With these two verses (18th and 19th), *Jagan Mithyātvam* topic is over. This is to show that I, the Ātma belong to the higher order of reality. And the world which is comparable to the dream belongs to a lower order of reality. *Once I know this difference in the order of reality, what is the advantage?*

Whatever happens in the lower order, cannot affect me (not the waker me but the *Turīyam* me). The *Turīyam* me is not affected by whatever happens in the world. Just as the dream water or the rain cannot wet the waker similarly, these events cannot affect 'I', the Ātma.

Therefore, I come to understand that the relative I, the *Ahankāra* is never free. And the absolute I, the *Sākshi* am ever free. The relative I, the *Ahankāra* is never free because *Ahankāra* is always associated with *Karma*. *Prārabdha Karma* is there for the *Ahankāra*. Even a *Gnyāni* cannot escape.

Therefore, once I know that *Ahankāra* can never be free and Ātma is ever free, I will understand that struggling for freedom is meaningless. Struggling for freedom is meaningless because you cannot struggle for the freedom of *Ahankāra* because it is impossible.

Therefore, working for the freedom of *Ahankāra* is meaningless because *Ahankāra* can't be free. *Ok, why can't I work for freedom of Ātma? Ātma* need not get freedom. *Therefore, what is Mōksha? Mōksha* is accepting the non-freedom of *Ahankāra* as a fact and claiming the freedom of I, the *Sākshi* as an eternal fact also.

Therefore, claim the freedom of *Sākshi* and accept the non-freedom of *Ahankāra*. Once that is accepted, bondage is a bondage only when I resist it. As I have often said, only when I chose to close the door and remain in room during Shivarātri or Ekādashi day; I close the door and I don't want to be disturbed by anyone.

I want to do Japa or Pārāyanam for the whole day. I enjoy it even though I remained in the locked room. I do not call it bondage because I have wanted it and there is no resistance. Suppose, I was locked by someone. The situation remaining the same, since I did not want it and I resist it.

That one or two hours will become terrible. whether a situation is a problem or not will depend upon my attitude. Similarly, I have given the example of starving and fasting. During starvation also there is discomfort. In fasting also there is discomfort.

In starvation, I complain but in fasting I don't complain because I don't resist that experience. In one there is suffering and in the other, there is joy. Similarly, Ahankāra's bondage is bondage only when you resist it. When Ahankāra's bondage is accepted as a fact, as Krishna says - *jātasyahi dhruvō mrutyuhu*.

Body is born, body will grow, body will grey and it will go. This is the fact about Ahankāra. *Prārabdha Karma* is a fact about Ahankāra. When it is understood as *aparīhāryē arthē natvam shōchitu marhasi*. Don't complain over a fact. Ahankāra's ups and downs is a fact.

Learn to change your attitude. Don't try to change your *Ahankāra*. Even if you change one problem, it will be replaced by another. Ok, we can create a working condition. There is no ideal situation for Ahankāra. If you want, interview all the people. Each one will have Rāmāyanam and Mahābhāratam.

What does it mean? You ask Rama and Krishna, they have got bigger stories. That means *Ahankāra* is never free and *Sākshi* is ever free. Therefore, claim the freedom of *Sākshi*. The bondage of *Ahankāra* will become insignificant. I have given you the example.

When the Sun rises, what happens to all the stars in bright light? Stars are there in the sky but they are as though nonexistent because in the

brighter light, they are overshadowed. Similarly, when I claim the Sākshi's freedom, the Ahankāra problem will continue.

But in the light of that, they will become as though nonexistent, which means insignificant. Therefore, in these verses (from 20 to 27), the author talks about the absolute nature of 'I', the Ātma. And he said previously that 'I', the Ātma am free from all attributes such as *Nirguna*, *Nirvikāra* etc.

Now, he says that even the attribute of *Sākshi* is not an intrinsic attribute of mine. I am totally free from all attributes including the witness hood. *What is the reason and why should we negate that?* If I take myself to be a Sākshi in the real sense of the term, then there will be a duality.

Can you guess what will be the duality? If I claim myself to be a witness, then I am called a witness from the stand point of various things which are witnesses. Once I accept that there is a *Sākshyam* (the object of witness), there will be the duality of *Sākshi Sākshya Vibhāga*.

If *Dvaitam* comes, limitation also will come. If limitation comes; time, space, change, mortality etc all problems come. Therefore, the author says that I am not even a Sākshi. *Then, why did you call yourself a Sākshi?* He said, from the stand point of the unreal world, I am called a Sākshi.

Therefore, my Sākshi's status also is from the stand point of the unreal world. Therefore, that status also is unreal only. All this we have seen before. Suppose, I get a bumper lottery prize of 10 crores in dream. So, with this 10 crore rupees acquired in dream, I got a new status.

When I went to sleep, I was a pauper and the dream 10 crore bumper lottery prize gave me a new status of a rich man. *How real is the richness status?* It is only as real as the dream money. The moment I wake up, keeping that dream money, if I keep on ordering things like car etc, it won't work because that cannot add anything to the real 'I'.

Therefore, Sākshītvam from the stand point of Mithyā world is also a Mithyā status. *Therefore, who am I?* I am not *Sākshi* also. *Why?* Because there is really no *Sākshyam*. *If I am not Sākshi also, then can I be called consciousness?*

Sankarāchārya tells elsewhere, even the word consciousness is only from the stand point of the inert world. Once I have negated the inert world as unreal, I cannot be called consciousness also. *Can I be called Sath, the existence?*

The word existence also is a name from the stand point of nonexistence. Any word is a relative word. *Then who are you? mouna vyākhyā.* I cannot be named - *yathō vāchō nivartantē aprāpya manasā saha.* Therefore, the author says - *sākshi ta api na tātvikī* - my Sākshi status is also only *Vyāvahārika Satyam*.

na tātvikī - not *Pāramārthika Satyam*. *Why?* Because this Sākshi status is caused by my relationship with the witnessed world - *chētya uparāga rūpā*. There *chaityam* is printed. It should not be *chaityam*, it should be *chētyam*. *chētyam* means object of the witness which means *Sākshyam*.

uparāgaha means *Sambandhaha*. So, my Sākshi status is based on my relationship with the Sākshyam, object. *How far it will be real?* It will be as real as the object and the relationship. If the object is unreal and the relationship is unreal then the status based on that will also be *Vyāvahārika Satyam* only.

Therefore, it is *na tātvikam*. *Then, why are you called Sākshi?* He says, it is only a temporary name used for the sake of teaching. *upa lakshanam ēva* - it is only a temporary indicator, *tatastha lakshanam*. It is only a temporary, relative indicator of *nistaranga chidambudhēh* - the pure consciousness.

chit means consciousness. *nistarangam* - which is free from the waves of creation. *ambudhihi* means ocean. I am the wave-less ocean of consciousness. The waves of the world is not there. It is unreal. From

the stand point of that unreal world, I am temporarily called Sākshi.
More, we will see in the next class.

*Pūrnamadah Pūrnamidam Pūrnāth Pūrnām Udachyatē
Pūrnasya Pūrnāmādāya Pūrnāmēvā Vasishyatē*

Om shānti shānti shāntihi



Advaita Makaranda Verses - 20 to 24

*sadāsiva samārambhām sankarāchārya madhyamām
asmad āchārya paryantām vande guru paramparām*

Verse No. 20

*chētyō parāga rūpāmē sākshi tāpina tātvikī
upalakshana mēvēyam nistaranga chidambudhēh*

The author started with the main topic of *Jīvātma Paramātma Aykyam* from verse 2 up to verse 7. After talking about the Aykyam, then he dealt with the obstacles with regard to the knowledge of this Aykyam by showing that I can never claim that I am *Brahman* as long as I am identified with any one of the *Pancha Kōshās*.

Therefore, before receiving the *Aykyam* knowledge, one has to make sure that one has dis-identified from the Pancha Kōshā. Once I dis-identify from my body-mind complex, then I can claim that I am the *Sākshi Chaitanyam*. And as Sākshi Chaitanyam, *Brahma Aykyam* can never be disputed. It can be easily received.

Thus, he dealt with the obstacle of *Dēha Abhimāna* and after that, he is coming back to the main topic once again to conclude the text. Therefore, from verses 20 to 27, the topic is the same as before. That is, *Jīvātma Paramātma Aykyam* is now accepted because there are no obstacles.

Because the author assumes that now we have dis-identified from the *Pancha Kōsha*. Therefore, I am *Nirgunam Brahma Asmi*. Then, the question may come - *Brahman* is said to be *Nirgunam* (without attributes), but I am considered to be the *Sākshi* of the *Pancha Kōshās*. *Doesn't that mean that I have a property called Sākshitvam?*

Once I accept that I have the Sākshitvam status, again limitation comes because the witness is different from the witnessed object. Therefore, in the 20th verse, the author said that even the status of witness is not my

real status because it is a temporary status from the stand point of the unreal world.

It is like the richness status that I get from the dream earnings. That richness status will be there as long as the dream lasts. When I wake up and negate the dream wealth, the richness status also goes. Thus, accepting a world, I am said to be the witness of the world.

Once the world is negated as unreal, then I don't have the status of witness. Therefore, the author said *upalakshanam ēva* - it is only an incidental definition from the stand point of the unreal world. *And what is my real nature? nistaranga chidambudhihi*. I am the ocean of consciousness which does not have the waves of creation.

tarangam means waves. Here, waves represent the creation. *nistaranga* means free from the creation waves. I am the ocean of consciousness and free from the creation waves is significant. *Why am I free from the waves of creation?* Because the creation is *Mithyā*, I am free from that. Since there is no creation in me, I cannot be called a witness also.

nistaranga here is a crucial word. There are no waves. Therefore, there are no creations and therefore, I cannot be called a witness of the creation also. Therefore, I am *Nirgunam Brahma*. We saw up to this. Continuing . .

Verse No. 21

*amrutābdhērnāmē jīrnihi mrushādindīra janmabhihi
sphatikādrērnāmē rāgaha swāpna sandhyābhra vibhramaih*

So, a correction in the first line. *mrushādindīra janmabhihi* and not *mūshā*. And above the letter 'sha' that 'r' should not be there. In some books 'mrsha' is there. That has to be removed. *Now, the next question is, if there are no creations at all, then what is it that I am experiencing in front of me?*

Shabdha, *Sparsha*, *Rūpa*, *Rasa* - nobody can deny those experiences. For that the author says, I am not denying the fact of experience but they are not separate substances different from me. they are all nothing but *Nāma* and *Rūpa*.

Just as bubbles and waves are there in the ocean, bubble is not a separate substance and waves are not separate substances. There is only one substance called water. Bubble is a name given to a form, wave is a name given to a form. Similarly, I am like that water and the whole world is *Nāma* and *Rūpa* superimposed on me.

Because of the rise and fall of these waves and bubbles, nothing happens to the ocean or water. Similarly, because of the rise and fall of the creation *Nāma-Rūpa*, nothing will happen to me. *So, who am I? amrutābdhē* - I am an ocean of immortality, ever changeless, indestructible.

And creation is like bubbles rising in the ocean. So, *dindīram* means small bubbles like spray. Mini bubbles are called *dindīram*. *janma* means the rise and falls of mini bubbles. Nothing happens to the ocean. Ocean is not even aware of these events. *What type of waves or bubbles are they? mrushā*.

mrushā means unreal. They are non-substantial because they are nothing but *Nāma-Rūpa*. So, because of rise and fall of bubbles which are mere *Nāma-Rūpa*, nothing happens to the ocean. Similarly, I am the ocean of consciousness. *The galaxies and solar systems are what?* What a comparison! Galaxies are like bubbles.

Not even bubbles, they are mini bubbles. So, how vast and infinite I must be! Even let Galaxies disappear, nothing happens to me. Let the Solar System disappear, nothing happens to me. Let the Earth disappear, nothing happens to me. And let a few bodies around disappear, nothing can happen.

Ultimately, let this very physical body disappear, nothing happens to me. *For whom can I cry?* Therefore, I have nothing to lose. I am immortal. Therefore, *mrushādindīra janmabhihi amrutābdhē* - for me the ocean of consciousness, *jīrnihi nāsti*. *jīrnihi* means decay or weakening or loss or wear and tear or wastage.

Nothing happens to me. I am *Nirvikāraha*. And I don't protest against the rise and fall of the waves also. But I should remember that it cannot affect me. Similarly, he gives another example. *sphatika adrihi* - I am like a mountain of crystals. Imagine a huge mountain made up of only crystal or Sphatikam! *adrihi* means ocean.

Imagine in the evening sky, colorful clouds are appearing and disappearing and moving. *When the colorful clouds move, what will happen to the crystal mountain?* The colors of the cloud can never tinge the mountain with its colors. Crystal does not become red because of a red cloud or orange cloud. It doesn't become blue because of blueness.

Crystal remains *asangaha*, untainted, uncolored, un-tinted, un-tinged whatever be the moving colors. Even though, seemingly, the crystal seems to gain different colors, crystal is ever untainted. Similarly, in our lives also, right from birth to death, varieties of events are taking place. People are born in the family, and I am all smiles.

There is crying when terrible events take place in the family. Similarly, *Rāga, Dvēsha, Kāma, Krōdha* - both in mind and outside. Colorful events are taking place and they can never change me. I can never have *Rāga, Dvēsha, Kāma, Krōdha* because *Chaitanyam* cannot be tainted by the changes in the world.

Therefore, he says *mē rāgaha nāsti*. *rāgaha* has double meaning. With regard to the Sphatika mountain, *rāgaha* means color. So, Sphatikam cannot have any color or the clouds. When you bring to the original *Ātma Chaitanyam*, I don't have *Rāga*. Which means I don't have emotions like *Rāga, Dvēsha, Kāma, Krōdha*.

The mind goes through emotions. The emotions of the mind cannot taint me, the witness of the emotions. So, the witness consciousness is not contaminated by *Rāga* etc. Therefore, *na mē rāgaha* - I don't have *Rāga-Dvēsha* or I don't have any color caused by the world because of *swāpna sandhyābhra vibhramaih*.

When you take the example of Sphatikam, *sandhyābhra* means evening clouds. *vibhramaha* means movements or motion. And *sandhyābhra vibhrama* means the movement of colorful clouds cannot cause any *rāgaha* (color) to this Sphatika mountain. The movement of the colorful clouds cannot color the Sphatika mountain.

Similarly, events in life cannot contaminate me, the *Ātma*. *What is the reason?* Because they are all *Swāpnaha*. *Swāpnaha* means unreal. So, all these unreal events cannot contaminate me, the real consciousness. In short, *asangōham asangōham asangōham punah punaha*. And we will say that I know I am *asanagaha* but my son is not all right.

So, the moment you say that my son is not all right, the word *asangaha* is only lip service. The only service that we do is lip service. Therefore, if I claim I am Asangaha and I mean that I am Asangaha, I am free here and now. Therefore, *Aham Brahma Asmi*. Continuing . .

Verse No. 22

*swarūpamēva mē satvam na tu dharmō nabhastvavat
madanyasya satō bhāvāt nahi sa jyātirishyatē*

Now, he is concluding with the same topic with which he began. I am *Sath Chit Ānanda Swarūpaha*. This was the beginning also. In the beginning he said -

*ahamasmi sadā bhāmīm kadā chinnāha mapriyaha
bramhaivāha matasiddham sacchidānanda lakshanam*

The only difference is that in the beginning, he mentioned *Sath Chit Ānanda* - all the three in one verse. But in conclusion, he is writing one

verse each for Sath, Chit and Ānanda. Therefore, verse 22 shows that I am *Sadrūpaha*. Verse 23 says that I am *Chidrūpaha*. Verse 24 says that I am *Ānanda Rūpaha*.

This, he presents in a technical language. He says, when I say that I exist, the existence that I claim for myself is not my property. As I say in the five features, existence is not a product, property of any object. That is being said here. When I say I exist, the existence that I claim for myself cannot be a property. He gives a reason for that.

Suppose, existence is a property, then what will happen? Tarka Shāstra discusses these topics. A property is always dependent on a substance. A property can never exist independently. Any property whether it is color or form etc must rest in a substance. Just as in grammar, any adjective must be connected to a noun. Adjective cannot exist by itself.

So, if existence is a property, what will it mean? Existence depends upon something else for its existence. If existence is a property, it will mean that existence depends upon some other substance for its existence. This is logically wrong because existence being existence, its very nature is Existence.

And when existence has got the nature of existence, how can it depend upon some other thing for its existence? Therefore, if existence is a property, it will have to depend upon something else for its existence. Existence cannot depend upon something else for its existence. Therefore, existence cannot be a property.

Again, there is a second problem also. *If existence as a property depends upon something other than existence, what will be that something else other than existence?* Non-existence. *Then, what will happen?* You will get a funny situation. Existence is a property and it depends upon some substance.

And that substance is different from this property. And that has to be something other than existence. Therefore, it is non-existence.

Therefore, you will have to tell that existence is a property which depends upon non-existence for its existence! Therefore, existence is not a property. *Then, what is it?* It is my very nature.

Therefore, he says *satvam mama swarūpamēva*. When I say I exist, existence is my very nature - *na tu dharmaha*. In this context, *dharmaha* means property or attribute. *na tu dharmaha* means it is not a property. So, never say that existence is a property. In *Tarka Shāstra*, he says that existence is a Universal.

It is like in this hall there are several human beings. Different types of human beings are here. Each one is physically different, mentally different, intellectually different but there are many human beings. Since there are so many human beings, all of us have got one common feature. One Universal is there. *What is that?*

Humanness or *Manushyatvam* which is called a Universal. When there are several *Manushyās*, *Manushyatvam* becomes a Universal characteristic or feature which is there, common to all human beings. *Thus, what is common when there are several chairs?* Even though, each chair may be of different height and different weight, chair-ness is common to all of them. Similarly, table-ness.

In English, that 'ness' indicates universal otherwise, called generic nature. *The Tarka Shāstra person says, why can't you say that existence is such a generic nature? Why?* Because there is one man who is existent and there is a table which is existent. So, there is an existent man, there is an existent table and there is an existent book. Thus, existent, existent, existent.

There are so many existent's. *Since the existent things are many, why can't you say that existence is the Universal belonging to so many existent things?* Like when there is a blue pen, blue man, blue carpet, blue wall etc. There are so many blues and in all those blues, blue-ness

is common. And if you have a basketball team, so many tall people are there.

Therefore, what is common to all of them? Tallness is common. *Similarly, why can't you say that existence is the generic nature which belongs to so many existent things in the Universe?* So, *Sathvam* can be taken as a Universal. *Why can't you do that?* Here it says that is also not possible because for Universal, plurality is required.

You can have man-ness as a Universal because there are several men. You can have chair-ness as a Universal because there are several chairs. Plurality is required for Universal, generic nature. And Vedānta says, you cannot count existence. You can count people, you can count chairs.

Existence is not many. There is only one existence which pervades all the people. Unlike blue color which is there here and there. There is no blue color in-between. Therefore, you can count blueness. Therefore, Universal is possible but with regard to existence, you cannot count. *Like what? nabhastvavat.*

Just as you cannot count space as pot space, room space, stomach space, head space etc. You cannot count many spaces because space is only one. When you count the spaces, the plurality belongs to the containers. But there is no plurality with respect to space. Therefore, you cannot have space-ness as a Universal.

Similarly, existence cannot be a universal because there is only *ēkam ēva advitīyam* - only one existence is there. *What is that one existence?* That is I. Therefore, there is only one existence. It is neither Universal nor a property. It is my very nature. That one existence which is myself, am lending existence to all the *Nāma-Rūpās*. This is my *Swarūpam*.

Therefore, he says *anyasya sataha abhāvāt*. Since there is no second existence to count as Number 2, other than myself (*mad anyasya*); *mat* means me, *anya* means other, *sataha* means existence. Since there is no

second existence other than me, *sa jyātihi* - a Universal of existence or existence as a universal, existence as a generic nature.

Or another word that they use is Genus; So, existence as a generic nature is not possible because you can talk of generic nature only when there are many. Like *nabhastvavat* - space. You cannot have a Universal for space. You cannot have generic nature for space. So, *sa jyātihi* means existence as Universal.

So, *jyātihi* is a very important concept in *Tarka Shāstra*. Tarka Shāstra begins introducing creation into *Sapta Pathārthās*, Seven categories - *Dravyam, Guna, Karma, Sāmānya, Vishēsha, Samavāya, Abhāva*. Substance, Property, Action, Universal; Universal he counts as the fourth category. *What is Universal?* Man-ness, woman-ness, chair-ness etc.

Therefore, for him, the Universal is an important category. And he claims that existence is a Universal which is common to all the existent objects of the Universe. We have to argue a lot with him. And Sankarāchārya writes a brilliant commentary in *Chāndōgya Mantra - sadēva soumya idamagra āsīt*.

Where Vedānta introduces Sath as only one, where is the question of Universal? It is a very big topic in Tarka Shāstra which he is hinting here. They are all very subtle concepts. So, *sa jyātihi nāsti*. Here, *jyāti* means Universal. Continuing . .

Verse No. 23

*swarūpamēva mē gnyānam na gunah sa gunō yadi
anātmatvamasatvam vā gnyēyāgnyēyatvayō patēt*

Another subtle verse. All are very technical and subtle. Now, he says that consciousness also is not a property of me, the *Ātma*. Consciousness is not a property belonging to me. It is my very nature. If

consciousness is taken as a property, then there will be certain technical problem. *What is that?*

If consciousness is my property, it will mean that consciousness belongs to me who am the substance. I will become a substance and consciousness will become my property. Thus, property and substance are different because what belongs to me, I am not.

Therefore, *Ātma* becomes different from consciousness because consciousness is a property and *Ātma* becomes a substance. Property and substance are different because one belongs to the other. Property is possessed, substance is the possessor. Possessor - possessed difference will come.

So, first problem is that *Ātma* becomes different as a substance and consciousness will become different as a property. This is the split the Nyāya philosopher makes. Suppose, consciousness is a property and *Ātma* is a substance different, then the question will come - *Is the Ātma known to consciousness or unknown to consciousness?*

Because once you say Ātma is different from consciousness (Ātma is a substance, consciousness is a property), is the Ātma substance known to the consciousness property or not? We ask the question. The author says that you will have a problem either way.

If you say *Ātma* is known, then the conclusion will be that every known thing in the creation is inert. Any object of knowledge that we experience, is all inert in nature. *Ātma* also will become inert. *Therefore, what will be the conclusion? ātma jadaha gnyēyatvāt ghatavat.*

Therefore, *Ātma* will become *jadam*. And if you say that *Ātma*, I am - it will essentially mean I am the *jada dravyam*. *Will anyone accept or claim I am jadaha?* It is never possible. Therefore, it cannot be a known object. *To avoid this problem, what should you say?* If *Ātma* is known, it will become *jadam*.

Therefore, let us say Ātma is not known. *Not known to what?* The consciousness property. *Then what will be the problem?* He says, if Ātma is not known to consciousness, you can never prove the very existence of Ātma. Thus, *Ātma* will become *Asat* because it is never knowable.

What is never knowable will come under nonexistent. If Ātma becomes *Asat* and *Ātma* is I; if Ātma is nonexistent and if I am that Ātma, it means that I am nonexistent. *How can anyone say that I am not there?* Therefore, if Ātma becomes different from consciousness, then Ātma will either become the object of consciousness or non-object.

If it is an object also it is problem - it will become *jadam*. If it is non-object also it is a problem - it will become nonexistent. Therefore, Ātma should never be different from consciousness. Therefore, consciousness is never a property of Ātma, consciousness is Ātma. Again you have to think over a lot. Now, look at the Slōka.

gnyānam mē swarūpam - consciousness is my very nature. It is not a property possessed by me. I am not the possessor of consciousness. I am consciousness itself. *na gunaha* - it is not a property. *yadi saha gunahasyāt* - *if consciousness is taken as a property for argument's sake, then what will happen?*

anātmatvamasatvam vā - I, the Ātma will become either *Jada Anātma*; So, I the substance will become either *jada vastu* or *asatvam*. I will become a nonexistent entity depending on two conditions - *gnyēya agnyēyatvayō*. If I am the object of consciousness, I will become *Jadam* and if I am not an object of consciousness, I will become non-existent.

If consciousness is a property and I am a substance, as a substance I will become different from consciousness. *And if I am standing separate from consciousness, what will happen?* Either I am known to consciousness or unknown. If I am known, I will become *Jadam*.

If I am unknown, I will become nonexistent. It won't work either way. Therefore, I am not a substance possessing consciousness. I am consciousness itself. So, *gnyēya agnyēyatvayōho sati (saptami)* - by being either known or unknown I will become inert or nonexistent. Such a situation will happen (*patēt*).

So, I will fall into inert category or I will fall into nonexistent category. Both cannot be logical. Previous verse was real heavy and this verse is equally heavy. So, existence is neither a property nor a universal. Existence is myself. Consciousness is not a property. It is myself. *Then, what is left out?* Happiness. *What is that?* Look at the Slōka.

Verse No. 24

*ahamēva sukham nānyat anyacchēnaiva tat sukham
amadartham nahi prēyaha madartham na swatah priyam*

So, another equally subtle verse. He says, happiness cannot be any object in the creation. Happiness will have to be myself only. Logically, nothing in the creation can be happiness. There cannot be happiness anywhere in the creation as an object. It has to be myself. Therefore, he says *aham ēva sukham* - happiness is only myself.

na anyat - it cannot be anything else in the creation. *Why?* He gives logic (all powerful!). He says, you always identify happiness by using a principle. *What is that?* Happiness is one thing which is always an object of love for all the people at all times. And he says, let us analyze the various things and the beings in the creation.

You will find that there are several things in the creation. Most of them are not loved by us at all. We don't bother about their existence or nonexistence. Since we hate most of the things in the creation or we don't love or we are indifferent to most of them (neutral).

For example, I don't care whether Pluto it is a planet or not. Therefore, most of the things are not loved by us. Therefore, it is very clear that

they are not happiness. Then, there are a few things which we love. We are very particular. When we analyze them as to why you love them, you will always say that they are all connected to me.

So, any object or person of love is an object or person of love only because of one reason - they are connected to me in one way or the other. Suppose, they say that there is an earth quake in Indonesia or Los Angeles. We don't give much importance to that News unless we know someone who resides there. Some connection, either direct or indirect.

No object is loved for their own sake. It is because it is connected to me. Therefore, they are all conditionally loved. Therefore, that love is because of my connection. They are not real objects of love. If that person changes the job and left Los Angeles and has gone to Canada (Vancouver), then we don't even bother about the next earth quake in Los Angeles.

What does that mean? Anyone is loved because of self connection. Without that, that is not love. Therefore, there is no love towards Los Angeles or any person also for that matter. *Then, why do I love myself?* *What is the condition?* Condition for self love is no condition - unconditional love.

Therefore, I will have to be of the nature of happiness. Happiness alone is unconditionally loved by all. Self alone is unconditionally loved by all. Therefore, happiness is equal to self. Think about this.

*Pūrnamadah Pūrnamidam Pūrnāth Pūrnām Udachyatē
Pūrnasya Pūrnāmādāya Pūrnāmēvā Vasishyatē*

Om shānti shānti shāntihi



Advaita Makaranda Verses - 24 to 28

*sadāsiva samārambhām sankarāchārya madhyamām
asmad āchārya paryantām vande guru paramparām*

Verse No. 24

*ahamēva sukham nānyat anyacchēnaiva tat sukham
amadartham nahi prēyaha madartham na swatah priyam*

Up to the 19th verse, the author established the essential teaching of Vedānta - *brahma satyam jagan mithyā jīvo brahmaiva nā paraha*. *Brahman* alone is *Satyam*, real. *Jagat*, the world is less real (*Mithyā*). And *Jīva*, that is 'I' am identical with Brahman in my essential nature. By essential nature we mean that I dis-identified from the *Pancha Kōshās*.

As the *Sākshi Chaitanya Ātma*, I am identical with Brahman. Having given this teaching up to the 19th verse, from 20th verse to 27th verse, the author is summing up the teaching once again in which he is restating the essential nature of ourselves as *Sath Chit Ānanda Swarūpaha*.

In that he established Ātma is *Sadrūpa* and *Chidrūpa* in verses 22 and 23. In the 24th verse which we were seeing in the last class, the author said that I, the Ātma alone am *Ānanda Swarūpaha*. The reason he gives is that I, the Ātma alone am unconditionally loved by me.

This is based on the principle or law that whatever is an object of love, is the source of Ānanda or joy. *yat yat priya vishayatvam tat tat ānanda hētuhu*. He says, every object in the creation is either loved conditionally or not loved at all. It is either an object of no love or an object of conditional love.

What is the condition for loving the object? There is only one condition and that is my comfort. The moment the object is uncomfortable to me, I reject the object. If not physically at-least, I mentally reject the object.

Therefore, there is only one thing in the creation which is unconditionally loved and that is I, the Ātma.

Therefore, Ātma alone is *Ānanda Swarūpam*. That is what he says in the Slōka - *aham ēva sukham*. I, the Ātma alone is *Sukham* or *Ānanda Swarūpaha. na anyat* - no other object in the creation is a source of *Ānanda. anyacchēt* - if there is something other than me as an object, *tat naiva sukham* - it is never a source of Ānanda.

How do you say that? He says, *amadartham nahi prēyaha*. All those objects which are not connected to me are never an object of love. Millions of millions of unrelated objects are there. I have no love for them. So, *amadartham* means, that which is not related to the self. *madartham* means for my sake.

amadartham means not for my sake. That means, not related to me. All the unrelated objects, *nahi prēyaha* - are not at all objects of love. I am absolutely unconcerned even about their existence. *Why?* Because it is not an object of *Ānanda* for me. And there are a few objects in the creation which I love.

But all of them are objects of conditional love but not unconditional. Therefore, he says *madartham chēt* - all the related objects (objects related or connected to me). When I say objects, it includes people also. All the related objects are the objects of love but not for their own sake. They are objects of love for my sake, for my comfort, for myself only (*madartham*).

That means, they are all objects of conditional love and the condition is that I must be comfortable. The moment I become uncomfortable because of the person, my love for that person comes down. Every old person experiences that at home that our wanted condition gradually comes down.

Thereafter, as a duty the old people may be protected but never as an object of love because that is what the instinctive nature. *ātmanastu*

kāmaya sarvam priyam bhavati. It is a truth, unfortunately a bitter truth. Therefore, *madartham chēt* - if an object is loved for my sake, then it is not an object of unconditional love. It is only an object of conditional love.

Then, what is an object of unconditional love? That is I. And that I which is an object of unconditional love must be a source of unconditional *Ānanda*. Whatever is a source of unconditional *Ānanda*, must have *Ānanda* as its intrinsic nature. Therefore, I am *Ānanda Swarūpaha*. Thus, *Ātma Sath Chit Ānandaha* he established. Continuing. .

Verse No. 25

*nahi nā nā swarūpam syāt ēkam vastu kadāchana
tasmād akhanda yēvāsmi vijahajjā gatīm bhidām*

So, a doubt may arise based on the previous three verses. We said that *Ātma* is *Sath Chit Ānandaha*. And a person may mistake that these three are three parts of *Ātma*. *Sath* may be mistaken as one part of *Ātma*, *Chit* may be mistaken as another part and *Ānanda* as a third part because we say *Ātma* is *Sacchidānanda*.

Therefore, here the *Āchārya* says that these three words do not refer to three parts of *Ātma* because it is clearly said that *Ātma* is part-less. In the previous three verses, he has already said that *Sacchidānanda* is not the property. Existence is not the property but it is the very nature. He said that Consciousness is not the property.

Therefore, *Sacchidānanda* are not the properties of *Ātma* also. *Sacchidānanda* are not parts of *Ātma* also. *Why do we say so?* He says, based on *Shruti Pramāna* and *Yukti Pramāna* reasoning, *Ātma* is part-less. In *Mundakōpanishad* we saw, *hiranmayē parē kōshē virajam brahma nishkalam*.

nishkalam means it is part-less. Therefore, Sacchidānanda are not part of Ātma. By logic also we come to know that Ātma has to be part-less. *What is the reasoning?* Because we see in the creation, anything that has part is subject to destruction, disintegration.

Anything made of parts will gradually disintegrate. The parts will go apart. That which can be parted is called part. Therefore, *yat yat sāvayavam tat tat anityam* is the law. If Ātma is *sāvayavam* (with parts), then Ātma also will become *Anityam* - *ātma anityaha sāvayavatvāt ghatavat*.

But we clearly know that Ātma is *Nitya Swarūpaha*. Therefore, it has to be part-less only. Therefore, both by *Shruti Pramāna* and *Yukti Pramāna*, we conclude that Sacchidānanda are not parts of Ātma. Therefore, he says *ēkam vastu*. This non-dual reality called Ātma, *nā nā swarūpam nasyāt* - can never be subject to division or duality.

That is why in *Chāndōgya Upanishad*, *sadēva soumya idamagra āsīt ēkam ēva advitīyam* - three words are there. While commenting upon three words, we say that Ātma is free from all types of division. There is no second Ātma there. If there is a second Ātma, it will be *Sajātīya Bhēda*.

There is no *Anātma* also. Then, it will be *Vijātīya Bhēda*. And one Ātma itself cannot have internal divisions like head, tail, right, left etc. It will be called *Swagata Bhēda*. *ēkam ēva advitīyam*, the Shruti statement reveals. Ātma is free from *Sajātīya*, *Vijātīya*, *Swagata Bhēda*. Which means, it is free from all kinds of divisions, including internal divisions.

Therefore, Sacchidānanda cannot be the internal parts of Ātma. Therefore, he says *nā nā swarūpam naiva syāt*. *Therefore, what is Ātma?* *tasmād akhandā ēva asmi*. Therefore, I, the Ātma am *Akhandaha*. *Akhandaha* means division-less. That is why, we give the example of space. Just as space cannot be divided into various parts.

If space can be divided and separated, what can we do? If we have got less space inside the house, wherever there is lot of unused space, we can cut off some space from outside and we can bring home. *Why are we not able to do that?* Because space is indivisible. In the same way I, the *Chaitanyam* also am one indivisible whole.

ēva asmi vijahat bhidām - *vijahat* means free from. *vi + hā dhātu* - present active participle. *vijahāti* is the verbal form. *vijahat* is the participle form. In this context, *vijahat* means free from. *bhidā* means *bhēdaha*. *bhēdaha* means threefold *Bhēda*. So, like the difference between one man and another man is called *Sajātīya Bhēda* (belonging to the same species).

Difference between a man and a stone is called *Vijātīya Bhēda* because they belong to different species. Difference within one member of tree itself; the differences in the form of branch, root, leaf, fruit etc is called *Swagata Bhēda*. Here, the word *bhidā* means *Sajātīya Vijātīya Swagata Bhēda*, all the threefold differences.

jāgatīm means which belong to the world. That means empirical. It is adjective to *bhidām*. So, *jāgatīm bhidām* means all the empirical differences, all the worldly differences in the form of *Sajātīya Vijātīya Swagata Bhēda*. All these are absent in I, the Ātma. So, *Aham Akhanda Swarūpaha Asmi*.

Then comes the question, if Ātma is division-less, why do you give three different names - Sath, Chit and Ānanda? I am getting confused because you are using these three words. If Ātma is division-less, you better give it one name. Call it Sath or Chit or Ānanda. For that, our answer is - not that Ātma has divisions.

One division-less Ātma is known by three different names from three different angles. It is the angle of observation. It is like one and the same person is called son from the stand point of his father, is called

husband from the stand point of the wife and is called father from the stand point of the son.

So, one and the same person is called father, husband and son. It doesn't mean that the top portion is father, Madhyama portion is husband and the bottom portion is son. These three are three different incidental names from the standpoint of three different things.

When you look at Ātma from temporary objects in the creation, the objects have got temporary existence and Ātma becomes the lender of existence to those objects. Therefore, from that standpoint, *Ātma* is called *Sath*. When you take the temporarily sentient bodies; The physical body is temporarily sentient.

After death, the body becomes insentient. From the standpoint of temporarily sentient objects, Ātma is seen as that which loans sentiency for those objects. From the standpoint of temporary objects, Ātma is lender of existence.

From the standpoint of temporarily sentient bodies, Ātma is seen as the *Adhishtānam* which lends consciousness to the bodies. Then, Ātma gets the name *Chidrūpaha*. When people are happy now and then, from the standpoint of temporary happy people, Ātma is known as the source of that temporary happiness.

From their standpoint, I say Ātma is *Ānanda Swarūpaha*. Lending happiness to all those temporarily happy people. Thus, from three different angles, Ātma is *Sath Chit Ānanda*. From its own stand point, Ātma cannot even be called *Sacchidānanda*. From these three angles, Ātma is called Sacchidānanda.

From its own standpoint, it is *Anāmakam*, *Arūpakam*. It is *Nāma Rūpa Rahitam*. Therefore, Sacchidānanda are not parts of Ātma. They are not even properties of Ātma. Continuing . .

Verse No. 26

*parōkshatā paricchēda shābalyāpōha nirmalam
tadasīti girā lakshyam ahamēkarasam mahaha*

Here, the author says that it is this division-less 'I', the *Chaitanyam* which is implied through the *Mahā Vākya* - *Tat Tvam Asi*. Look at the second line. *tat asi iti girā* - You have to supply *tvam*. '*tat tvam asi*' *iti girā*. *girā* here means *Mahā Vākyaēna*. *girā* - *gir shabdaha rēphānta strī lingaha tritīyā vibhaktihi ēkavachanam*.

Through the *Mahā Vākya* (*Tatvamsi*), *aham lakshyam* - 'I', that undivided consciousness alone has been revealed. *lakshyam* means implied or indirectly revealed. *What type of consciousness is it? ēka rasam mahaha*. *mahaha* means light, *gyōtihi* - *sakārāntaha napumsaka lingaha mahat shabdaha*.

Here the word *gyōtihi* means the light of consciousness. *What type of consciousness? ēka rasam* - which is uniform or homogeneous. Which is the same as *Akhandaha* mentioned in the previous verse. I am *Akhanda Chaitanya Prakāshaha* revealed through *Mahā Vākya*, *Tat Tvam Asi*.

And he says that this pure consciousness alone is called *Paramātma* that is, *tat* when the consciousness is associated with *Māyā*, the macro Universe. So, the word '*tat*' is the name of the *Paramātma*. *What is that Paramātma?* The very same consciousness associated with the Macro Universe is called '*tat*' the *Paramātma*.

The very same consciousness associated with the micro individual body is called *Tvam*, the *Jīvātma*. Thus, both *Paramātma* and *Jīvātma* revealed through *Tat* and *Tvam* are nothing but one and the same consciousness with two different masks. It is like an actor playing two different roles with *Māyā Upādhi* and *Sharīra Upādhi*.

When the consciousness is associated with the *Macro*, that is the *Maya Upādhi*, the *Paramātma* has got superior attributes. The very same *Ātma* associated with the body has got inferior attributes. When you remove

the two *Vēsham* (the body *Vēsham* and *Māyā Vēsham*), when unmasked, *Paramātma* is *Ātma*.

The *Parama* adjective is gone. *Jīvātma* is also *Ātma*. The *Jīva* attribute is gone. There is only one attribute-less *Ātma*. Therefore, he says *nirmalam* (first line). The *Ātma* is pure attribute-less *Ātma*. *apōha - apōha* means free from, rid of, stripped of. It is the attribute-less consciousness stripped of *shābalyam*. *shābalyam* means attributes.

What are the various attributes of Paramātma and Jīvātma? He gives two samples. *Paramātma* has got the attribute of remoteness. *parōkshatā* means remoteness. Because whenever we talk about *Paramātma* (God) we always feel that he is remotely placed. Either spatially remote or time wise remote.

The remoteness is an attribute of *Paramātma* caused by *Māyā Upādhi*, the *Kāranatva Upādhi*. And *Parōkshata* represents all the other attributes like omniscience, omnipotence etc. All of them are temporary attributes because of *Māyā* association. Similarly, the *Jīvātma* has got an attribute. *What is that? paricchēdaha*.

paricchēdaha means localization or limitation. So, we say that *Paramātma* is far away and *Jīvātma* is limited. Not only that, but all the people are struggling to reach the *Paramātma* also. That is the goal of all spiritual seekers. They want to travel and travel and travel and merge into *Paramātma*.

Both the remoteness of *Paramātma* and limitation of *Jīvātma* which makes us desire to travel and reach *Paramātma*. Both these misconceptions are because of association with *Upādhi*. Remove the *Māyā* and the *Sharīram*. There is no question of travelling and reaching. I and the *Paramātma* are one *Ātma* only.

Therefore, *parōkshatā paricchēda shābalya apōha*. This is called *Bhāga Tyāga Lakshana*. When you remove those *Upādhi*, what is left out is one *Ātma* and I am that *Ātma*. *If somebody asks are you Jīvātma or*

Paramātma, what would you answer? Jīvātma and Paramātma are two of my masked appearances.

Paramātma also is my own masked appearance. Jīvātma is also my own masked appearance. When I remove both the masks, I am Ātma. So, *ēka rasam mahaha asmi*. Now he concludes the teaching.

Verse No. 27

*upashānta jagajjīva sishyāchāryēshwara bhramam
swatah siddha manādyantam paripūrna maham mahaha*

Another beautiful verse. *aham mahaha asmi - mahaha* is the same as in previous verse. *mahaha* means *jyōtihi*. *jyōtihi* means light. Here, the word light means, the light of consciousness. *What type of consciousness light am I? paripūrnam* - which is limitless, which is infinite.

And *anādyantam* - without *ādi* and *anta*. Without beginning and end both spatially and temporally. Space wise also I don't have beginning and end. Time wise also I don't have beginning and end. In short, I am eternal and all-pervading. And *swatah siddham* - I am self-experienced, self-evident because consciousness does not require any proof.

Everything else is proved by consciousness. Consciousness itself need not be proved. *If consciousness has to be proved, what do you require?* Another consciousness only. Therefore, it is self proven, it is self experienced, it is ever experienced. Generally, we say it is self evident. Whether students have come or not, I have to see.

But whether if I am in the class or not, I don't require any proof. I don't even have to see. It is evident. That is why you don't spend even one second to find out whether you are attending today's class or not because it is self evident and it is free from all the *bhramaha*. *bhramaha* means notions of difference.

dvaita bhramaha - all the apparent dualities, notional dualities. Apparent duality being apparent, it is not really there. *What are the things available in this duality or dualistic universe?* He says, everything that is there in the dualistic universe are not there in the Ātma. *What are they?* He gives the examples.

jagat - the whole world is not there. *upashānta* means, free from. *bhrama* means apparent duality, notional duality. It is free from apparent duality, notional duality which are in the form of *jaga* (means the universe). Then, *Jīvaha* means *jīva*. *Then, what about Ēshwara?* *Ēshwara* also falls within the world of plurality.

In-fact, *Jīva Jagat Ēshwara* is the *Triputi* which is within the empirical world. That is why when you go to sleep, *Jīva* is dissolved, *Jagat* is dissolved and *Ēshwara* is also dissolved. Therefore, *Jīva Jagat Ēshwara*, all of them are apparent *Mithyā*.

It is a very difficult verse and very emotionally disturbing verse because we don't mind negating anything but it is difficult to negate *Ēshwara*. In-fact, that is *Visishtādvaitins* anger with *Advaitins*. The author says, what can we do because *Ēshwara* also is relative reality because *Ēshwara* is *Ēshwara* only from the stand point of *Jīva* and *Jagat*.

Ēshwara means master. *Where is the question of master unless there is a servant?* Therefore, both are relative reality. Therefore, *Ātma* is free from *Jīva Jagat Ēshwara*. *If all these relative things are absent, what about Guru-Sishya?* The Guru says, *Guru-Sishya* is also a relative reality.

Because *Guru* is a *Guru* only from the stand point of the *Sishya*. *Sishya* is a *Sishya* only from the stand point of the *Guru*. From its own stand point, *Ātma* is neither *Guru* nor *Sishya*. Both are again roles played by the *Ātma*.

vishvam pashyati kārya kāranatayā swaswāmi sambandhataha sishya āchāryatayā tathaiva pitruputrādyātmanā bhētataha swapnē jāgrativā yayēsha purushaha māyā paribhāmitaha

Because of *bhrama* alone, all these divisions are appearing in the original *Dakshināmūrti*. This is Dakshināmūrti Slōka which we did once upon a time. In the original Dakshināmūrti, all these are not there. So, deity-devotee division is gone, Sishya-Āchārya division is gone, parent-child division is gone.

What division is there? No division. *Then, what is it?* It cannot even be call *Advaitam* because even the word Advaitam is only from the stand point of *Dvaitam*. To negate the word 'Dvaitam', we use the word 'Advaitam'. When the Dvaitam is negated, we don't retain the word 'Advaitam' also.

Then, what word do you use? *mouna vyākhyā prakatita parabrahma tatvam yuvānam*. Therefore, I am *Akhanda Ātma Asmi, Sacchidānanda Swarūpaha Asmi*. So, with this the author concludes the teaching part. Now, in the last Slōka the glory of this text is pointed out.

Verse No. 28

*lakshmīdhara kavē sūkti sharadambhōja sambhrutaha
advaita makarandōyam vidvat bhrugairnipīyatām*

With the previous verse, the summing up is also over. He summed up the teaching that he gave in the beginning. To go back to the entire development, I will just give you the portions that he went through. I am not going to give you a separate summary because it is a small text.

The development was - after *Mangalācharanam*, he established *Jīvātma Paramātma Aykyam* from verse 2 to verse 7. That was the central teaching of this text. Then, from 8th verse to 17th verse, he gave the condition for the Aykyam.

Without which condition Aykyam cannot be grasped or assimilated. *What is that condition? Dēha Abhimāna Tyāgaha.* We have to drop bodily identification, individuality identification, the ego identification, the relative 'I' identification.

As long as you love your ego, Vedānta is not for you. Therefore, *Dēha Abhimāna Tyāgaha* is the condition for *Ātma Gnyānam*. This Krishna said in the 12th chapter of the *Gīta*.

*klēshō dhikataras tēshām avyaktāsakta chētasām
avyaktā hi gatih dukkham dēhavadbhir avāpyatē*

Those who have strong individuality, *Dēha Abhimāna* which includes family Abhimāna because the family comes through the body only. As long as *Ahankāra* and *Mamakāra* are there, Vedānta won't work. Vedānta will work only when you drop Aham and Mama.

8th to 17th verse give the condition for *Ātma Gnyānam* - *Dēha Abhimāna Tyāgaha* otherwise *Pancha Kōsha Vivēkaha*. Then, in 18th and 19th verses, the author established *Jagan Mithyātvam* which is the corollary of *Mahā Vākyam* or *Aykyam*.

So, *Jīvātma Paramātma Aykyam's* corollary, derived teaching is *Jagan Mithyātvam*. From 20th verse to 27th verse, it is his own summary of his own teaching which he gave from verse 2 to verse 7. So, the first Aykyam is like *Pratignyā Vākyam*. The last Aykyam is like *Nigamana Vākyam*.

First, it is proposition, next it is conclusion. Therefore, from verse 20 to verse 27, he concluded that by restating the Aykyam. Now, in the 28th verse, the glory of the text is given through a beautiful metaphor or an example. He visualizes all these 27 verses as beautiful lotus flowers - *sūkti sharadambhōja*.

sūktihi means sacred teaching. *sharadambhōjaha* means the lotus that grows in the Autumn season. *sharat* means *sharat kāla*, the autumnal

season. *ambhōjaha* means lotus. *sharadambhōja* means the lotus of the *sharat kāla*. It is supposed to be beautiful, big and attractive.

In Indian literature, this example is often given. *shāradā shāradāmbhōja vadanā vadanāmbhujē - shāradāmbhōja* means the autumnal lotus. All these 26 verses (leaving aside the first Mangala Slōka) are *sūkti sharadambhōja*. *What can you draw from the flowers?* *Makarandaha* is there.

From these lotuses in the form of the sacred words, you get a special *Makaranda*. *What is that?* *Advaita Makaranda* can be extracted from these 26 verse lotuses. *sambhrutaha* means extracted. And these 26 verse lotuses are given by Lakshmīdhara Kavi which is the name of the author.

The flowers have got Makarandam or honey but it is not available for all people. Honey bees alone have the capacity to extract the Makaranda from the flowers. They have got these special antennae which have the capacity to extract. Others can enjoy the beauty of the flower.

They cannot extract the Makaranda. Similarly, this text book also is not available for all. It is only available for special honey bees. *What is the special honey bee?* *Sādhana Chatushtaya Sampattihi*. One should have a special qualified intellect.

That intellect alone will serve as a special means of extracting Advaita Makaranda. Therefore, he says *vidvat bhrungai - vidvat* here means a qualified student. So, this honey from this text is not available for all. Others may enjoy the Ānanda of chanting the verses.

But if you have to extract the Makaranda, you require the *Sādhana Chatushtaya Sampanna Sūkshma Buddhi*. Therefore, *vidvat bhruhgai*. *Bhrungaha* means a bee. By the honey bees in the form of qualified students, *nipīyatām* - let this honey be drunk, enjoyed by all these qualified students repeatedly.

nipānam means repeated consumption. Thus, with the glorification of the textbook as well as the teaching, the *Advaita Makaranda* text is over.

*Pūrnamadah Pūrnamidam Pūrnāth Pūrnām Udachyatē
Pūrnasya Pūrnāmādāya Pūrnāmēvā Vasishyatē*

Om shānti shānti shāntihi



Visit website www.arshaavinash.in

To download the following

Books On Pujya Swamiji

Biography of Swami Dayananda Saraswati in English, Hindi and Tamil

Books in English On Vedanta

Books on Indian culture, Yoga, Gita, Upanisads, Brahma Sutra and Vedanta Texts

Books in Tamil on Vedanta

Books on Indian culture, Upanisads and Vedanta Texts

Books on Sanskrit Grammar

Books on Dhatukosah, Astadhyayi and Sanskrit Grammar for Vedanta Students

Books on Sanskrit Texts

Text Books in Sanskrit on Gita, Upanisads and Brahma Sutra with Sankara Bhasyam

Books on Indian Culture

Books in English on Yoga and Indian Culture

Books for Youth

Books in English on Yoga, Indian Culture & Self improvement

Books on Holy Chant

Books in English and Sanskrit on Holy Chant

Articles

Articles in English on Indian culture & Vedanta Texts

PARTICIPATE IN ONLINE QUIZ

Online Quiz on Gita, Upanisad and Brahma Sutra

Website of:



Arsha Avinash Foundation
104 Third Street, Tatabad, Coimbatore 641012, INDIA
Phone: + 91 9487373635
E mail: arshaavinash@gmail.com
www.arshaavinash.in