A Thousand Teachings

ŚAṄKARA

A Thousand Teachings

उपदेशसाहस्री

Translated from the Sanskrit with AI (Claude) and edited



FORAGE
forage.com

A Thousand Teachings · Śaṅkara

Translated from the Sanskrit with AI (Claude) and edited. Parallel-text edition, Forage, October 2026. forage.com/shankara/a-thousand-teachings

Sanskrit text: *The Works of Sri Sankaracharya*, vol. 14 (Srirangam: Sri Vani Vilas Press, 1910), the "Memorial Edition" issued under T. K. Balasubrahmanya Aiyar (1874–1947); public domain. Transcribed from the Internet Archive scan (archive.org/details/wg1069) in two independent passes against the page images. Four pages missing from every available scan (pp. 129, 167, 205 and 243: Prose 1.42–44 and Verse 10.14–11.5, 17.40–47, 19.12–16) are supplied from the text of two manuscripts with Rāmatīrtha's commentary in the Pandit Shivadatta Shukla collection, Chunilal Gandhi Vidyabhavan, Surat (acc. 0462 (archive.org/details/upadeshasahasri_padayojanikagadyabandhasahita_-CGV-PSS-1500-0462), acc. 0654 (archive.org/details/upadeshasahasri_padayojanikasahita_-CGV-PSS-1501-0654)). The edition's footnotes and running heads are omitted. English: translated from the Sanskrit with AI (Claude), then edited for accuracy and consistency. Not reviewed by a human specialist. Free to reuse under CC BY-SA 4.0. Margin numbers: P = Prose Part, chapter and paragraph (the edition numbers its paragraphs 1–116 straight through: Prose 2.1 = ¶45, 3.1 = ¶112); V = Verse Part, chapter and verse in this edition's count.

The original text is in the public domain. This translation is free to share and adapt under the Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International license (CC BY-SA 4.0): creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0

Set in Source Serif 4, Noto Serif Devanagari.

CONTENTS

Introduction vii

Prose Part 1

Chapter 1: Instructing the Pupil 1

Who are you? 3

Pain, ritual and the one self 9

Chapter 2: Awareness of the Changeless, Nondual Self 13

Superimposition 14

The changeless perceiver 18

Knowing that needs no proof 21

Chapter 3: Meditation by Enumeration 26

Verse Part 29

Chapter 1: Introduction 29

Chapter 2: How Knowledge of the Self Arises 32

Chapter 3: The Lord Is the Self 32

Chapter 4: The Nature of Knowing the Truth 33

Chapter 5: The Fault Lies in the Intellect 33

Chapter 6: Setting Aside the Qualifications 34

Chapter 7: What Is Mounted on the Intellect 35

Chapter 8: Dissolving the Mind 35

Chapter 9: Subtlety and Pervasiveness 36

Chapter 10: Seeing the True Nature of Awareness 37

Chapter 11: The Seer 39

Chapter 12: Light 41

Chapter 13: Without Eyes 42

Chapter 14: Dream and Memory 45

Chapter 15: One Thing Does Not Become Another 50

Chapter 16: Made of Earth 56

Chapter 17: Right Understanding 63

Chapter 18: “You Are That” 73

Chapter 19: Applying the Remedy 95

INTRODUCTION

Śaṅkara, who probably lived in the early eighth century AD, is the most celebrated teacher of Advaita ("nondual") Vedanta, the school that reads the Upanishads as teaching one thing only: that the self within each person is *brahman*, the single reality behind the world. Most of his surviving work is commentary on scripture, and only a handful of independent writings are accepted by scholars as his own. *A Thousand Teachings* is the most important of these: a manual for teachers on how to lead a pupil to liberation.

It has two parts. The Prose Part shows the method in action: how a teacher should test and instruct a pupil, then two dialogues in which a pupil who asks how to escape birth and death is led to see that his suffering rests on ignorance, on taking body and mind for the self—a "superimposition," like mistaking mother-of-pearl for silver—and a closing meditation for those seeking release. The Verse Part gathers nineteen chapters of compact arguments and meditations: on the self as pure seeing, changeless like the sky; on the error of thinking "I am the doer"; on the Upanishad's sentence "you are that," analyzed word by word in a long eighteenth chapter; and on the teacher's "remedy" for the illness of ignorance.

The work is direct and unadorned, and its arguments engage the rival schools of the day—Buddhist, Sāṃkhya, Vaiśeṣika and Mīmāṃsā. It is quoted by later Advaita authors more than any other independent work of Śaṅkara's and remains a standard introduction to his thought.

Prose Part

गद्यप्रबन्धः *(Gadyaprabandha)*

How a teacher should instruct a pupil; two dialogues on ignorance, superimposition and the changeless self; a meditation for seekers of liberation.

CHAPTER 1: INSTRUCTING THE PUPIL

How liberating knowledge should be taught, to which pupils, and by what kind of teacher.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
P 1.1	अथ मोक्षसाधनोपदेशविधिं व्याख्यास्यामो मुमुक्षूणां श्रद्दधानानामर्थिनामर्थाय ॥	Now we shall explain the method of teaching the means to liberation, for the benefit of those who seek liberation, who have faith and who are eager for it.
P 1.2	तदिदं मोक्षसाधनं ज्ञानं साधनसाध्यादनित्यात्सर्वस्माद्विरक्ताय त्यक्तपुत्रवित्तलोकैषणाय प्रतिपन्नपरमहंसपारिव्राज्याय शमदमदयादियुक्ताय शास्त्रप्रसिद्धशिष्यगुणसंपन्नाय शुचये ब्राह्मणाय विधिवदुपसन्नाय शिष्याय जातिकर्मवृत्तविद्याभिजनैः परीक्षिताय ब्रूयात्पुनः पुनः यावद्ग्रहणं दृढीभवति ॥	This knowledge, the means to liberation, should be taught again and again, until it is firmly grasped, to a pupil who has become indifferent to everything impermanent that is achieved through means; who has given up the desire for sons, for wealth and for worlds; who has taken up the life of a renunciant of the highest order; who is endowed with calm, self-restraint, compassion and the like; who has the qualities of a pupil well known from the scriptures; who is pure; who is a Brahmin; who has approached the teacher in the proper manner; and whose caste, occupation, conduct, learning and family have been examined.[1]
P 1.3	श्रुतिश्च— ‘परीक्ष्य ... तत्त्वतो ब्रह्मविद्याम्’ इति । दृढगृहीता हि विद्या आत्मनः श्रेयसे संतत्यै च भवति । विद्यासंततिश्च प्राण्यनुग्रहाय भवति, नौरिव नदीं तितीर्षोः । शास्त्रं च— ‘यद्यप्यस्मा इमामद्भिः परिगृहीतां धनस्य पूर्णां दद्यादेतदेव ततो भूयः’ इति । अन्यथा च ज्ञानप्राप्त्यभावात् ‘आचार्यवान् पुरुषो वेद’ ‘आचार्याद्धैव विद्या विदिता’ ‘आचार्यः प्लावयिता तस्य सम्यग्ज्ञानं प्लव इहोच्यते’ इत्यादिश्रुतिभ्यः, ‘उपदेक्ष्यन्ति ते ज्ञानम्’ इत्यादिस्मृतिभ्यश्च ॥	And scripture says: “Having examined ... the knowledge of *brahman*, as it truly is.” For knowledge firmly grasped serves one’s own good and is passed on without a break. And the unbroken passing on of knowledge benefits living beings, as a boat helps one who wants to cross a river. And scripture says: “Even if one were to give him this earth, girdled by water and full of wealth, this is greater than that.” It must be taught, because otherwise knowledge is not attained, as scriptural texts say: “A person who has a teacher knows,” “Only knowledge learned from a teacher ...,” “The teacher is the one who ferries across; right knowledge is called the boat here,” and as traditional texts say: “They will teach you knowledge.”[2]

1 A renunciant of the highest order (*paramahaṃsa*) is an ascetic of the highest grade, who has given up home, possessions and ritual.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
P 1.4	शिष्यस्य ज्ञानाग्रहणं च लिङ्गैर्बुद्ध्वा तदग्रहणहेतून् अधर्मलौकिकप्रमादनित्यानित्यवस्तुविवेकविषयासंजातदृढपूर्वश्रुतत्वलोकचिन्तावेक्षणाद्यविरोधिभिः तत्प्रतिपक्षैः श्रुतिस्मृतिविहितैः अपनयेत् अक्रोधादिभिः अहिंसादिभिश्च यमैः, ज्ञानाविरुद्धैश्च नियमैः ॥	When he recognizes from signs that the pupil has not grasped the knowledge, he should remove the causes of his not grasping it—demerit, worldly negligence, the lack of earlier, firmly grasped instruction on discriminating between eternal and non-eternal things, concern for what people think, pride in caste and the like—by their opposites as enjoined in scripture and tradition: by freedom from anger and the like, by the restraints such as nonviolence, and by the observances that do not conflict with knowledge.[3]
P 1.5	अमानित्वादिगुणं च ज्ञानोपायं सम्यग्ग्राहयेत् ॥	He should also make him properly grasp the qualities, beginning with humility, that are the means to knowledge.[4]
P 1.6	आचार्यस्तु ऊहापोहग्रहणधारणशमदमदयानुग्रहादिसंपन्नो लब्धागमो दृष्टादृष्टभोगेष्वनासक्तः त्यक्तसर्वकर्मसाधनो ब्रह्मवित् ब्रह्मणि स्थितः अभिन्नवृत्तो दम्भदर्पकुहकशाठ्यमायामात्सर्यानृताहंकारममत्वादिदोषविवर्जितः केवलपरानुग्रहप्रयोजनो विद्योपयोगार्थी पूर्वमुपदिशेत् ‘सदेव सोम्येदमग्र आसीदेकमेवाद्वितीयम्’ ‘यत्र नान्यत्पश्यति’ ‘आत्मैवेदं सर्वम्’ ‘आत्मा वा इदमेक एवाग्र आसीत्’ ‘सर्वं खल्विदं ब्रह्म’ इत्याद्याः आत्मैक्यप्रतिपादनपराः श्रुतीः ॥	The teacher, for his part, is skilled in reasoning for and against, in grasping and in retaining; endowed with calm, self-restraint, compassion, kindness and the like; versed in the traditional teaching; unattached to pleasures seen and unseen; one who has given up all actions and their means; a knower of *brahman*, established in *brahman*; whose conduct never lapses; free of faults such as hypocrisy, arrogance, deceit, cunning, trickery, envy, falsehood, egotism and possessiveness; whose sole aim is to help others; and who wishes to put his knowledge to use. He should first teach the scriptural texts whose aim is to show the unity of the self, such as: “In the beginning, my dear, this was being alone, one only, without a second,” “where one sees nothing else,” “The self alone is all this,” “In the beginning this was the self alone, one only,” “All this is indeed *brahman*.”[5]
P 1.7	उपदिश्य च ग्राहयेत् ब्रह्मणो लक्षणम् ‘य आत्मापहतपाप्मा’ ‘यत्साक्षादपरोक्षाद्ब्रह्म’ ‘योऽशनायापिपासे’ ‘नेति नेति’ ‘अस्थूलमनणु’ ‘स एष नेति नेति’ ‘अदृष्टं द्रष्टृ’ ‘विज्ञानमानन्दं ब्रह्म’ ‘सत्यं ज्ञानमनन्तं ब्रह्म’ ‘अदृश्येऽनात्म्येऽनिरुक्ते’ ‘स वा एष महानज आत्मा’ ‘अप्राणो ह्यमनाः’ ‘सबाह्याभ्यन्तरो ह्यजः’ ‘विज्ञानघन एव’ ‘अनन्तरमबाह्यम्’ ‘अन्यदेव तद्विदितादथो अविदितादधि’ ‘आकाशो वै नाम’ इत्यादिश्रुतिभिः ॥	Having taught these, he should make him grasp the defining marks of *brahman* through scriptural texts such as: “the self that is free from evil,” “the *brahman* that is immediate and direct,” “that which is beyond hunger and thirst,” “not this, not this,” “not coarse, not fine,” “That self is not this, not this,” “unseen, the seer,” “*Brahman* is awareness and bliss,” “*Brahman* is truth, knowledge, the

2 *Brahman*: the absolute, the ground of all. Quotations: Mundaka Upanishad 1.2.12–13; Chandogya Upanishad 3.11.6, 6.14.2, 4.9.3; Bhagavad Gita 4.34.

3 The restraints (*yama*: nonviolence, truthfulness and the like) and observances (*niyama*: purity, contentment and the like) are the first two limbs of yoga discipline.

4 The list of qualities beginning with humility is in Bhagavad Gita 13.7–11.

5 *Ātman* (“the self”): one’s own inmost being, the witness that is pure awareness. Quotations: Chandogya Upanishad 6.2.1, 7.24.1, 7.25.2; Aitareya Upanishad 1.1.1; Chandogya 3.14.1.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
		infinite," "in what is invisible, bodiless, indefinable," "this great unborn self," "without breath, without mind," "unborn, without and within," "nothing but a mass of awareness," "without inside, without outside," "It is other than the known, and beyond the unknown," "What is called space …"[6]
P 1.8	स्मृतिभिश्च— 'न जायते म्रियते' 'नादत्ते कस्यचित्पापम् 'यथाकाशस्थितो नित्यम्' 'क्षेत्रज्ञं चापि मां विद्धि' 'न सत्तन्नासदुच्यते' 'अनादित्वान्निर्गुणत्वात्' 'समं सर्वेषु भूतेषु' 'उत्तमः पुरुषस्त्वन्यः' इत्यादिभिः श्रुत्युक्तलक्षणाविरुद्धाभिः परमात्मासंसारित्वप्रतिपादनपराभिः तस्य सर्वेणानन्यत्वप्रतिपादनपराभिश्च ॥	And through traditional texts such as: "is never born, never dies," "takes on no one's evil," "just as it always rests in space," "Know me also as the knower of the field," "It is said to be neither being nor non-being," "because it is without beginning and without qualities," "the same in all beings," "But the highest person is another"—texts which do not conflict with the marks stated in scripture, and whose aim is to show that the highest self is not subject to the round of rebirth and that it is not different from anything.[7]

WHO ARE YOU?

The teacher asks the pupil who he is: caste, family and rites belong to the body, not the self.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
P 1.9	एवं श्रुतिस्मृतिभिः गृहीतपरमात्मलक्षणं शिष्यं संसारसागरादुत्तितीर्षुं पृच्छेत् — कस्त्वमसि सोम्य इति ॥	When the pupil has thus grasped, through scripture and tradition, the defining marks of the highest self, and wishes to cross the ocean of the round of rebirth, the teacher should ask him: Who are you, my dear?
P 1.10	स यदि ब्रूयात्— ब्राह्मणपुत्रः अदोन्वयः ब्रह्मचार्यासम्, गृहस्थो वा, इदानीमस्मि परमहंसपरिव्राद् संसारसागरात् जन्ममृत्युमहाग्राहात् उत्तितीर्षुरिति ॥	If he should say: I am the son of a Brahmin, of such-and-such a family; I was a celibate student, or a householder, and now I am a renunciant of the highest order, wishing to cross the ocean of the round of rebirth, whose great crocodiles are birth and death—[8]
P 1.11	आचार्यो ब्रूयात्— इहैव तव सोम्य मृतस्य शरीरं वयोभिरद्यते मृद्भावं वापद्यते । तत्र कथं संसारसागरादुद्धर्तुमिच्छसीति । न हि नद्या अवरे कूले भस्मीभूते नद्याः पारं तरिष्यसीति ॥	The teacher should say: My dear, when you die, your body will be eaten by birds or turn to earth right here. How then do you hope to rise out of the ocean of the round of rebirth? For once you are burned to ashes on the near bank of the river, you will not cross to its far side.
P 1.12	स यदि ब्रूयात्— अन्योऽहं शरीरात् । शरीरं तु जायते म्रियते वयोभिरद्यते मृद्भावमापद्यते शस्त्राग्न्यादिभिश्च विनाश्यते व्याध्यादिभिश्च प्रयुज्यते ।	If he should say: I am different from the body. The body is born, dies, is eaten by birds, turns to earth, is destroyed by weapons, fire and the like,

6 "Not this, not this": the Brihadaranyaka Upanishad's formula for *brahman* (2.3.6). The other quotations come from the Chandogya, Brihadaranyaka, Taittiriya, Mundaka and Kena Upanishads.

7 These are from the Bhagavad Gita (2.20, 5.15, 9.6, 13.2, 13.12, 13.31, 13.27, 15.17).

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
	तस्मिन् अहं स्वकृतधर्माधर्मवशात् पक्षी नीडमिव प्रविष्टः पुनः पुनः शरीरविनाशे धर्माधर्मवशात् शरीरान्तरं यास्यामि पूर्वनीडविनाशे पक्षीव नीडान्तरम् । एवमेवाहमनादौ संसारे देवमनुष्यतिर्यङ्निरयस्थानेषु स्वकर्मवशादुपात्तमुपात्तं शरीरं त्यजन् नवं नवं चान्यदुपाददानो जन्ममरणप्रबन्धचक्रे घटीयन्त्रवत् स्वकर्मणा भ्राम्यमाणः क्रमेणेदं शरीरमासाद्य संसारचक्रभ्रमणादस्मान्निर्विण्णो भगवन्तमुपसन्नोऽस्मि संसारचक्रभ्रमणप्रशमनाय । तस्मान्नित्य एवाहं शरीरादन्यः ।	and is afflicted by disease and the like. I have entered it, by force of the merit and demerit I myself have produced, as a bird enters a nest; and again and again, whenever the body perishes, I shall go to another body by force of merit and demerit, as a bird goes to another nest when its former nest is destroyed. In just this way, in the beginningless round of rebirth, in the conditions of gods, humans, animals and the hells, I have been giving up, by force of my own action, each body I took on, and taking up one new body after another; whirled by my own action on the wheel of the unbroken series of births and deaths like a water wheel, I have in due course reached this body; and, weary of whirling on this wheel of the round of rebirth, I have come to you, venerable sir, to bring that whirling to an end. Therefore I am eternal, different from the body.[9]
	शरीराणि आगच्छन्त्यपगच्छन्ति च वासांसीव पुरुषस्येति ॥	Bodies come and go, like a person's clothes.
P 1.13	आचार्यो ब्रूयात्— साध्ववादीः, सम्यक्पश्यसि । कथं मृषा अवादीः ब्राह्मणपुत्रोऽदोन्वयो ब्रह्मचार्यासम्, गृहस्थो वा, इदानीमस्मि परमहंसपरिव्राडिति ॥	The teacher should say: You have spoken well; you see rightly. Why then did you speak falsely, saying: I am the son of a Brahmin, of such-and-such a family; I was a celibate student, or a householder, and now I am a renunciant of the highest order?
P 1.14	स यदि ब्रूयात्— भगवन् कथमहं मृषावादिषम् इति ॥	If he should say: Venerable sir, how have I spoken falsely?
P 1.15	तं प्रति ब्रूयादाचार्यः— यतस्त्वं भिन्नजात्यन्वयसंस्कारं शरीरं जात्यन्वयसंस्कारवर्जितस्यात्मनः प्रत्यभ्यज्ञासीः ब्राह्मणपुत्रोऽदोन्वय इत्यादिना वाक्येनेति ॥	The teacher should say to him: Because by the statement "I am the son of a Brahmin, of such-and-such a family," and the rest, you identified the self, which is free of caste, family and rites, with the body, which is different and has caste, family and rites.
P 1.16	स यदि पृच्छेत्— कथं भिन्नजात्यन्वयसंस्कारं शरीरम्, कथं वा अहं जात्यन्वयसंस्कारवर्जितः इति ॥	If he should ask: How is the body different, with caste, family and rites? And how am I free of caste, family and rites?
P 1.17	आचार्यो ब्रूयात्— शृणु सोम्य तदेव यथेदं शरीरं त्वत्तो भिन्नं भिन्नजात्यन्वयसंस्कारम्, त्वं च जात्यन्वयसंस्कारवर्जितः इत्युक्त्वा तं स्मारयेत्— स्मर्तुमर्हसि सोम्य परमात्मानं सर्वात्मानं यथोक्तलक्षणं श्रावितोऽसि 'सदेव सोम्येदम्' इत्यादिभिः श्रुतिभिः स्मृतिभिश्च, लक्षणं च तस्य श्रुतिभिः स्मृतिभिश्च ॥	The teacher should say: Listen, my dear, to just how this body is different from you and has caste, family and rites, and how you are free of caste, family and rites. Having said this, he should remind him: You should remember, my dear, the highest self, the self of all, with the marks described; you have heard of it through scriptural

8 The celibate student (*brahmacārin*) and the householder are the first two of the four stages of life; the forest-dweller and the renunciant are the other two.

9 The water wheel (*ghaṭīyantra*) has pots tied to its rim, which rise and fall without end.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
		texts such as "Being alone, my dear, was this ...," and through traditional texts, and you have heard its defining marks through scripture and tradition.
P 1.18	लब्धपरमात्मलक्षणस्मृतये ब्रूयात्— योऽसावाकाशनामा नामरूपाभ्यामर्थान्तरभूतः अशरीरः अस्थूलादिलक्षणः अपहतपाप्मत्वादिलक्षणश्च सर्वैः संसारधर्मैरनागन्धितः यत्साक्षादपरोक्षाद्ब्रह्म एष त आत्मा सर्वान्तरः अदृष्टो द्रष्टा अश्रुतः श्रोता अमतो मन्ता अविज्ञातो विज्ञाता नित्यविज्ञानस्वरूपः अनन्तरः अबाह्यः विज्ञानघन एव परिपूर्णः आकाशवत् अनन्तशक्तिः आत्मा सर्वस्य अशनायादिवर्जितः आविर्भावतिरोभाववर्जितश्च स्वात्मविलक्षणयोः नामरूपयोः जगद्बीजभूतयोः स्वात्मस्थयोः तत्त्वान्यत्वाभ्यामनिर्वचनीययोः स्वसंवेद्यया सद्भावमात्रेणाचिन्त्यशक्तित्वाद्ध्याकर्ता अव्याकृतयोः ॥	To bring back to his memory the marks of the highest self he has learned, he should say: That which is called space, which is other than name and form, bodiless, marked by being not coarse and so on and by being free from evil and so on, untouched by any of the attributes of the round of rebirth, the *brahman* that is immediate and direct —this is your self, within all; unseen, the seer; unheard, the hearer; unthought, the thinker; unknown, the knower; whose very nature is eternal awareness; without inside, without outside; nothing but a mass of awareness; all-filling, like space; of infinite power; the self of all; free from hunger and the like, and free from appearing and disappearing. By its mere existence, known to itself alone, because its power is inconceivable, it makes manifest the unmanifest name and form, which are different from itself, are the seed of the world, rest in it, and cannot be described either as it or as other than it.[10]
P 1.19	ते नामरूपे अव्याकृते सती व्याक्रियमाणे तस्मादेतस्मादात्मन आकाशनामाकृती संवृत्ते । तच्चाकाशाख्यं भूतमनेन प्रकारेण परमात्मनः संभूतं प्रसन्नादिव सलिलान्मलमिव फेनम् । न सलिलं न च सलिलादत्यन्तं भिन्नं फेनम्, सलिलव्यतिरेकेणादर्शनात्, सलिलं तु स्वच्छम् अन्यत् फेनान्मलरूपात् । एवं परमात्मा नामरूपाभ्यामन्यः फेनस्थानीयाभ्यां शुद्धः प्रसन्नस्तद्विलक्षणः । ते नामरूपे अव्याकृते सती व्याक्रियमाणे फेनस्थानीये आकाशनामाकृती संवृत्ते ॥	That name and form, unmanifest, while being made manifest, took from this self the name and shape of space. And the element called space arose from the highest self in this way, as foam, a kind of impurity, arises from clear water. Foam is neither water nor wholly different from water, since it is not seen apart from water; but the water is clear and different from the foam, which is of the nature of impurity. In the same way the highest self is different from name and form, which correspond to the foam: it is pure, clear and of a different nature. That name and form, unmanifest, while being made manifest, took on, like the foam, the name and shape of space.[11]
P 1.20	ततोऽपि स्थूलभावमापद्यमाने नामरूपे व्याक्रियमाणे वायुभावमापद्येते, ततोऽप्यग्निभावम्, अग्नेरब्भावम्, ततः पृथिवीभावम्, इत्येवंक्रमेण पूर्वपूर्वभवस्योत्तरोत्तरानुप्रवेशेन पञ्च महाभूतानि पृथिव्यन्तान्युत्पन्नानि । ततः पञ्चगुणविशिष्टा पृथिवी । पृथिव्याश्च पञ्चात्मिका व्रीहियवाद्या ओषधयः जायन्ते । ताभ्यो भक्षिताभ्यो लोहितं शुक्रं च स्त्रीपुंसशरीरसंबन्धि जायते । तदुभयम् ऋतुकाले अविद्याप्रयुक्तकामखजनिर्मथनोद्भूतं मन्त्रसंस्कृतं गर्भाशये	Then name and form, becoming coarser still as they were made manifest, became wind; from that, fire; from fire, water; and from water, earth. In this order, each preceding element entering into each succeeding one, the five great elements, ending with earth, came into being. Hence earth is marked by five qualities. From earth arise the plants, rice, barley and the rest, made of the five

10 Name and form (*nāmarūpa*): the world of distinct, named things, which before creation lies unmanifest, like a seed.
11 Space (*ākāśa*) is the first and subtlest of the five elements.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
	निषिच्यते । तत्स्वयोनिरसानुप्रवेशेन विवर्धमानं गर्भीभूतं नवमे दशमे वा मासि जायते ॥	elements. From these, when they are eaten, arise blood and semen, belonging to the bodies of woman and man. Both of these, churned out by the churning stick of desire impelled by ignorance, and consecrated with sacred formulas, are poured into the womb at the proper season. Growing by absorbing the fluids of its womb, it becomes an embryo and is born in the ninth or tenth month.[12]
P 1.21	तज्जातं लब्धनामाकृतिकं जातकर्मादिभिः मन्त्रसंस्कृतं पुनः उपनयनसंस्कारयोगेण ब्रह्मचारिसंज्ञं भवति । तदेव शरीरं पत्नीयोगसंस्कारयोगेण गृहस्थसंज्ञं भवति । तदेव वनस्थसंस्कारेण तापससंज्ञं भवति । तदेव क्रियानिवृत्तिनिमित्तेन संस्कारेण परिव्राड्संज्ञं भवति । इत्येवं त्वत्तो भिन्नं भिन्नजात्यन्वयसंस्कारं शरीरम् ॥	Once born, it obtains a name and shape and is consecrated with sacred formulas through the birth rite and the others; then, through the rite of initiation, it is given the name "celibate student." That same body, through the rite of union with a wife, is given the name "householder." That same body, through the rite of forest-dwelling, is given the name "ascetic." That same body, through the rite occasioned by ceasing from action, is given the name "renunciant." In this way the body is different from you and has caste, family and rites.[13]
P 1.22	मनश्चेन्द्रियाणि च नामरूपात्मकान्येव, 'अन्नमयं हि सोम्य मनः' इत्यादिश्रुतिभ्यः ॥	The mind and the senses, too, consist only of name and form, according to scriptural texts such as "For the mind, my dear, is made of food."[14]
P 1.23	कथं चाहं भिन्नजात्यन्वयसंस्कारवर्जितः इत्येतच्छृणु— योऽसौ नामरूपयोर्व्याकर्ता नामरूपधर्मविलक्षणः स एव नामरूपे व्याकुर्वन् सृष्ट्वेदं शरीरं स्वयं संस्कारधर्मवर्जितो नामरूपे इह प्रविष्टः अन्यैरदृष्टः स्वयं पश्यन् तथा अश्रुतः शृण्वन् अमतो मन्वानः अविज्ञातो विजानन् सर्वाणि रूपाणि विचित्य धीरो नामानि कृत्वाभिवदन्यदास्ते इति । अस्मिन्नर्थे श्रुतयः सहस्रशः — 'तत्सृष्ट्वा ।	And as for how you are free of caste, family and rites, listen to this: He who makes manifest name and form, and whose nature is different from the attributes of name and form—he himself, making manifest name and form and creating this body, himself free of rites and such attributes, has entered here into name and form; unseen by others, he himself sees; likewise unheard, he hears; unthought, he thinks; unknown, he knows; and having distinguished all forms and made names, the wise one abides, speaking them. There are thousands of scriptural texts on this point: "Having created it,[15]
	तदेवानुप्राविशत्' 'अन्तः प्रविष्टः शास्ता जनानाम्' 'स एष इह प्रविष्टः' 'एष त आत्मा' 'स एतमेव सीमानं विदार्यैतया द्वारा प्रापद्यत' 'एष सर्वेषु भूतेषु गूढोऽत्मा' 'सेयं देवतैक्षत हन्ताहमिमास्तिस्रो देवताः' इत्याद्याः श्रुतयः ॥	he entered into it," "Having entered within, the ruler of creatures," "He has entered here," "This is your self," "Splitting open this very suture, he entered by that door," "This self, hidden in all beings," "That deity thought, 'Well, let me ... these three deities,'" and other such scriptural texts.[16]

12 Ignorance (*avidyā*) is not a lack of facts but the misidentification of the self with what it is not.
13 The birth rite and initiation, when a boy receives the sacred thread and begins Vedic study, are among the life-cycle rites (*saṃskāra*).
14 Chandogya Upanishad 6.5.4.
15 The line about the wise one who distinguishes forms and makes names is from Taittiriya Aranyaka 3.12.7.
16 Taittiriya Upanishad 2.6.1; Taittiriya Aranyaka 3.11.1; Brihadaranyaka Upanishad 1.4.7, 3.4.1; Aitareya Upanishad 1.3.12; Katha Upanishad 3.12; Chandogya Upanishad 6.3.2.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
P 1.24	स्मृतयोऽपि— 'आत्मैव देवताः सर्वाः' 'नवद्वारे पुरे देही 'क्षेत्रज्ञं चापि मां विद्धि 'समं सर्वेषु भूतेषु' 'उपद्रष्टानुमन्ता च' 'उत्तमः पुरुषस्त्वन्यः' 'अशरीरं शरीरेषु' इत्याद्याः । तस्मात् जात्यन्वयसंस्कारवर्जितस्त्वमिति सिद्धम् ॥	Traditional texts too, such as: "The self alone is all the gods," "the embodied one in the city of nine gates," "Know me also as the knower of the field," "the same in all beings," "the onlooker and the one who consents," "But the highest person is another," "bodiless among bodies." Therefore it is established that you are free of caste, family and rites.[17]
P 1.25	स यदि ब्रूयात्— अन्य एवाहमज्ञः सुखी दुःखी बद्धः संसारी, अन्योऽसौ मद्विलक्षणः असंसारी देवः, तमहं बल्युपहारनमस्कारादिभिः वर्णाश्रमकर्मभिश्चाराध्य संसारसागरादुत्तितीर्षुरस्मि । कथमहं स एवेति ॥	If he should say: I am one thing—ignorant, feeling pleasure and pain, bound, subject to the round of rebirth—and he is another, different from me, not subject to the round of rebirth, a god. By worshipping him with oblations, offerings, salutations and the like, and with the actions prescribed for my class and stage of life, I wish to cross the ocean of the round of rebirth. How can I be he?[18]
P 1.26	आचार्यो ब्रूयात्— नैवं सोम्य प्रतिपत्तुमर्हसि, प्रतिषिद्धत्वाद्भेदप्रतिपत्तेः । कथं प्रतिषिद्धा भेदप्रतिपत्तिरित्यत आह— 'अन्योऽसावन्योऽहमस्मीति न स वेद' 'ब्रह्म तं परादाद्योऽन्यत्रात्मनो ब्रह्म वेद' 'मृत्योः स मृत्युमाप्नोति य इह नानेव पश्यति' इत्येवमाद्याः ॥	The teacher should say: My dear, you should not understand it so, for the notion of difference is forbidden. As to how the notion of difference is forbidden, he says: "'He is one, I am another'—he does not know," "*Brahman* forsakes whoever knows *brahman* as elsewhere than in the self," "He goes from death to death who sees as if there were diversity here," and other such texts.[19]
P 1.27	एता एव श्रुतयो भेदप्रतिपत्तेः संसारगमनं दर्शयन्ति ॥	These very scriptural texts show that the notion of difference leads into the round of rebirth.
P 1.28	अभेदप्रतिपत्तेश्च मोक्षं दर्शयन्ति सहस्रशः । 'स आत्मा तत्त्वमसि इति परमात्मभावं विधाय 'आचार्यवान्पुरुषो वेद' इत्युक्त्वा 'तस्य तावदेव चिरम् इति मोक्षं दर्शयन्त्यभेदविज्ञानादेव । सत्याभिसंधस्यातस्करस्येव दाहाद्यभावदृष्टान्तेन संसाराभावं दर्शयन्ति । भेददर्शनादसत्याभिसंधस्य संसारगमनं दर्शयन्ति तस्करस्येव दाहादिदृष्टान्तेन ॥	And in thousands of passages they show that liberation comes from the notion of non-difference. Having established the state of being the highest self with "That is the self; you are that," and having said "A person who has a teacher knows," they show with "For him the delay lasts only so long" that liberation comes from the knowledge of non-difference alone. Through the example of the man true to his word who, not being a thief, is not burned, they show the absence of the round of rebirth. Through the example of the thief who is burned, they show that one untrue to his word, because he sees difference, goes on in the round of rebirth.[20]
P 1.29	'त इह व्याघ्रो वा इत्यादिना च अभेददर्शनात् 'स स्वराड् भवति' इत्युक्त्वा तद्विपरीतेन भेददर्शनेन संसारगमनं दर्शयन्ति 'अथ येऽन्यथातो	And with the passage beginning "Whatever they are here, tiger or ...," and after saying that through

17 The "city of nine gates" is the body with its nine openings. Sources: Manu 12.119; Bhagavad Gita 5.13, 13.22; Katha Upanishad 2.22.
18 Class (*varṇa*) refers to the four social classes, stage of life (*āśrama*) to the four stages from student to renunciant.
19 Brihadaranyaka Upanishad 1.4.10, 2.4.6; Katha Upanishad 4.10.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
	विदुरन्यराजानस्ते क्षय्यलोका भवन्ति' इति प्रतिशाखम् । तस्मात् मृषैवैवमवादीः ब्राह्मणपुत्रोऽदोन्वयः संसारी परमात्मविलक्षण इति ॥	seeing non-difference "he becomes self-ruling," they show in every Vedic branch that through its opposite, seeing difference, one goes on in the round of rebirth: "But those who know otherwise are ruled by another and have worlds that perish." Therefore you spoke falsely in saying that you are the son of a Brahmin, of such-and-such a family, one subject to the round of rebirth, different from the highest self.[21]
P 1.30	तस्मात्प्रतिषिद्धत्वाद्भेददर्शनस्य, भेदविषयत्वाच्च कर्मोपादानस्य, कर्मसाधनत्वाच्च यज्ञोपवीतादेः, कर्मसाधनोपादानस्य परमात्माभेदप्रतिपत्त्या प्रतिषेधः कृतो वेदितव्यः, कर्मणां तत्साधनानां च यज्ञोपवीतादीनां परमात्माभेदप्रतिपत्तिविरुद्धत्वात् । संसारिणो हि कर्माणि विधीयन्ते तत्साधनानि च यज्ञोपवीतादीनि, न परमात्मनोऽभेददर्शिनः । भेददर्शनमात्रेण च ततोऽन्यत्वम् ॥	Therefore—since seeing difference is forbidden, since taking up action has difference as its sphere, and since the sacred thread and the like are means of action—it should be understood that the notion of non-difference from the highest self forbids taking up action and its means; for actions and their means, the sacred thread and the like, contradict the notion of non-difference from the highest self. For actions and their means, the sacred thread and the like, are enjoined for one subject to the round of rebirth, not for one who sees his non-difference from the highest self. And it is merely through seeing difference that one is other than it.[22]
P 1.31	यदि कर्माणि कर्तव्यानि न निविवर्तयिषितानि कर्मसाधनासंबन्धिनः कर्मनिमित्तजात्याश्रमाद्यसंबन्धिनश्च, परमात्मनश्च आत्मनैवाभेदप्रतिपत्तिं नावक्ष्यत् 'स आत्मा तत्त्वमसि' इत्येवमादिभिर्निश्चितरूपैर्वाक्यैः, भेदप्रतिपत्तिनिन्दां च नाभ्यधास्यत् 'एष नित्यो महिमा ब्राह्मणस्य' 'अनन्वागतं पुण्येनानन्वागतं पापेन' 'अत्र स्तेनोऽस्तेनः' इत्यादिना ॥	If actions were to be performed and were not meant to be given up, scripture would not have declared, in such definite statements as "That is the self; you are that," that one's self is not different from the highest self, which has no connection with the means of action, nor with caste, stage of life and the rest that occasion action; nor would it have condemned the notion of difference with such passages as "This is the eternal greatness of the Brahmin," "untouched by good, untouched by evil," "Here a thief is no thief."[23]
P 1.32	कर्मासंबन्धिस्वरूपत्वं कर्मनिमित्तवर्णाद्यसंबन्धरूपतां च नाभ्यधास्यत् कर्माणि च कर्मसाधनानि च यज्ञोपवीतादीनि यद्यपरित्याजयिषितानि । तस्मात्ससाधनं कर्म परित्यक्तव्यं मुमुक्षुणा, परमात्माभेददर्शनविरोधात् । आत्मा च पर एवेति प्रतिपत्तव्यो यथाश्रुत्युक्तलक्षणः ॥	Nor would it have declared that the self's nature has no connection with action, nor with class and the rest that occasion action, if actions and their means, the sacred thread and the like, were not meant to be given up. Therefore one who seeks liberation should give up action together with its means, since it contradicts seeing non-difference from the highest self. And the self should be un-

20 "You are that": Chandogya Upanishad 6.8.7. In Chandogya 6.16 a man accused of theft grasps a heated axe; if he is innocent and his word true, he is not burned.
21 Chandogya Upanishad 6.9.3, 7.25.2. A branch (*śākhā*) is a school of Vedic recitation with its own recension of the text.
22 The sacred thread (*yajñopavīta*), worn by initiated men of the three upper classes, is required for performing Vedic ritual.
23 Brihadaranyaka Upanishad 4.4.23, 4.3.22.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
		derstood to be the highest self itself, with the marks stated in scripture.

PAIN, RITUAL AND THE ONE SELF

The teacher places pain in the body, not the knower, and traces all difference to ignorance.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
P 1.33	स यदि ब्रूयात्— भगवन्, दह्यमाने च्छिद्यमाने वा देहे प्रत्यक्षा वेदना, अशनायादिनिमित्तं च प्रत्यक्षं दुःखं मम । परश्चायमात्मायमात्मापहतपाप्मा विरजो विमृत्युर्विशोको विजिघत्सोऽपिपासः सर्वगन्धरसवर्जितः श्रूयते सर्वश्रुतिषु स्मृतिषु च । कथं तद्विलक्षणः अनेकसंसारधर्मसंयुक्तः परमात्मानमात्मत्वेन मां च संसारिणं परमात्मत्वेन अग्निमिव शीतत्वेन प्रतिपद्येय ? संसारी च सन् सर्वाभ्युदयनिःश्रेयससाधने अधिकृतः अभ्युदयनिःश्रेयससाधनानि कर्माणि तत्साधनानि च यज्ञोपवीतादीनि कथं परित्यजेयमिति ॥	If he should say: Venerable sir, when the body is burned or cut I directly perceive pain, and I directly perceive suffering caused by hunger and the like. But this highest self is heard in all scripture and tradition to be free from evil, free from aging, free from death, free from sorrow, free from hunger and thirst, and devoid of all smell and taste. How could I, who am different from it and joined with the many attributes of the round of rebirth, understand the highest self as my self, and myself, subject to the round of rebirth, as the highest self —as though I took fire to be cold? And since, being subject to the round of rebirth, I am qualified for the means to all prosperity and the highest good, how could I give up actions, which are the means to prosperity and the highest good, and their means, the sacred thread and the like?
P 1.34	तं प्रति ब्रूयात्— यदवोचो दह्यमाने च्छिद्यमाने वा देहे प्रत्यक्षा वेदनोपलभ्यते ममेति, तदसत् । कस्मात् ? दह्यमाने च्छिद्यमान इव वृक्षे उपलब्धुरुपलभ्यमाने कर्मणि शरीरे दाहच्छेदवेदनाया उपलभ्यमानत्वात् दाहादिसमानाश्रयैव वेदना । यत्र हि दाहः छेदो वा क्रियते तत्रैव व्यपदिशति दाहादिवेदनां लोकः, न वेदनां दाहाद्युपलब्धरीति । कथम् ? क्व ते वेदनेति पृष्टः शिरसि मे वेदना उरसि उदरे इति वा यत्र दाहादिस्तत्रैव व्यपदिशति, न तूपलब्धरीति ।	He should say to him: What you said—that when the body is burned or cut, pain is directly perceived as yours—is not correct. Why? Because the pain of burning and cutting is perceived in the body, an object perceived by the perceiver, just as in a tree being burned or cut; so the pain has the same locus as the burning and the rest. For people speak of the pain of burning and the like as being just where the burning or cutting is done, not in the perceiver of the burning and the rest. How so? Asked, "Where is your pain?", one points to just where the burning and the rest are: "The pain is in my head," or "in my chest," or "in my belly"—not to the perceiver.
	यद्युपलब्धरि वेदना स्यात् वेदनानिमित्तं वा दाहच्छेदादि वेदनाश्रयत्वेनोपदिशेद्दाहाद्याश्रयवत् ॥	If pain, or burning, cutting and the like that cause pain, were in the perceiver, one would point to it as the seat of pain, just as one points to the seat of the burning and the rest.
P 1.35	स्वयं च नोपलभ्येत, चक्षुर्गतरूपवत् । तस्मात् दाहच्छेदादिसमानाश्रयत्वेन उपलभ्यमानत्वाद्दाहादिवत् कर्मभूतैव वेदना । भावरूपत्वाच्च साश्रया तण्डुलपाकवत् । वेदनासमानाश्रय एव तत्संस्कारः स्मृतिसमानकाल एवोपलभ्यमानत्वात् वेदनाविषयः तन्निमित्तविषयश्च द्वेषोऽपि	And the pain itself would not be perceived, just as the color in the eye is not. Therefore, since pain is perceived as having the same locus as burning, cutting and the like, it is an object, like burning and the rest. And because it is something existent, it has a locus, like the cooking of rice. The impres-

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
	संस्कारसमानाश्रय एव । तथा चोक्तम्— रूपसंस्कारतुल्याधी रागद्वेषौ भयं च यत् । गृह्यते धीश्रयं तस्माज्ज्ञाता शुद्धोऽभयः सदा ॥	sion left by pain has the same locus as the pain, since it is perceived only together with the memory of it. Aversion, too, whose object is pain or its cause, has the same locus as the impression. And so it has been said: "Since attachment, aversion and fear are perceived as having the same locus as the impressions of forms, they rest in the intellect; therefore the knower is always pure and free of fear."
P 1.36	किमाश्रयाः पुनः रूपादिसंस्कारादय इति, उच्यते— यत्र कामादयः । क्व पुनस्ते कामादयः ? 'कामः संकल्पो विचिकित्सा' इत्यादिश्रुतेः बुद्धावेव । तत्रैव रूपादिसंस्कारादयोऽपि, 'कस्मिन्नु रूपाणि प्रतिष्ठितानीति हृदये' इति श्रुतेः । 'कामा येऽस्य हृदि श्रिताः' 'तीर्णो हि यदा सर्वान् शोकान् हृदयस्य' 'असङ्गो ह्ययम्' 'तद्वा अस्यैतदतिच्छन्दाः' इत्यादिश्रुतिशतेभ्यः, 'अविकार्योऽयमुच्यते 'अनादित्वान्निर्गुणत्वात्' इत्यादिभ्यः— इच्छाद्वेषादि च क्षेत्रस्यैव विषयस्य धर्मो नात्मन इति— स्मृतिभ्यश्च कर्मस्थैवाशुद्धिः नात्मस्था इति ॥	What, then, is the locus of the impressions of forms and the like? It is answered: where desire and the like are. And where are desire and the like? In the intellect alone, according to the scriptural text "Desire, intention, doubt ..." The impressions of forms and the like are there too, according to the text "'On what are forms based?' 'On the heart.'" From hundreds of scriptural texts such as "the desires that dwell in his heart," "For then he has crossed all the sorrows of the heart," "For this one is unattached," "That is his form beyond desires," and from traditional texts such as "It is said to be unchangeable," "because it is without beginning and without qualities"—and those which say that desire, aversion and the like are attributes of the field, the object, and not of the self—it follows that impurity resides in the object, not in the self.[24]
P 1.37	अतो रूपादिसंस्काराद्यशुद्धिसंबन्धाभावात् न परस्मादात्मनो विलक्षणस्त्वमिति प्रत्यक्षादिविरोधाभावात् युक्तं पर एवात्माहमिति प्रतिपत्तुम्, 'तदात्मानमेवावेदहं ब्रह्मास्मीति' 'एकधैवाऽनुद्रष्टव्यम्' 'अहमेवाधस्तात्' 'आत्मैवाधस्तात्' 'सर्वमात्मानं पश्येत्' 'यत्र त्वस्य सर्वमात्मैव 'इदं सर्वं यदयमात्मा 'स एषोऽकलः, 'अनन्तरमबाह्यम्' 'सबाह्याभ्यन्तरो ह्यजः' 'ब्रह्मैवेदम् 'एतया द्वारा प्रापद्यत 'प्रज्ञानस्य नामधेयानि' 'सत्यं ज्ञानमनन्तं ब्रह्म 'तस्माद्वा' 'तत्सृष्ट्वा तदेवानुप्राविशत्' 'एको देवः सर्वभूतेषु गूढः सर्वव्यापी' 'अशरीरं शरीरेषु' 'न जायते म्रियते' 'स्वप्नान्तं जागरितान्तम्' 'स म आत्मेति विद्यात्' 'यस्तु सर्वाणि भूतानि' 'तदेजति तन्नैजति' 'वेनस्तत्पश्यन्' 'तदेवाग्निः' 'अहं मनुरभवं सूर्यश्च' 'अन्तः प्रविष्टः शास्ता जनानाम्' 'सदेव सोम्य' 'तत्सत्यं स आत्मा तत्त्वमसि' इत्यादिश्रुतिभ्यः ॥	Therefore, since you have no connection with the impurity of the impressions of forms and the like, you are not different from the highest self; and since this does not conflict with perception and the rest, it is right to understand "I am the highest self itself," according to scriptural texts such as: "It knew only itself: 'I am *brahman*,'" "It is to be seen as one only," "I am below," "The self is below," "He should see everything as the self," "But when for him everything has become the self," "All this is this self," "He is without parts," "without inside, without outside," "unborn, without and within," "All this is *brahman*," "He entered by this door," "names of intelligence," "*Brahman* is truth, knowledge, the infinite," "From that, indeed," "Having created it, he entered into it," "the one god, hidden in all beings, all-pervading," "bodiless among bodies," "is never born, never dies," "the state of

24 Brihadaranyaka Upanishad 1.5.3, 3.9.20, 4.4.7, 4.3.22, 4.3.15, 4.3.21; Bhagavad Gita 2.25, 13.31. The "field" is the body and mind, as in Gita 13.6.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
		dream and the state of waking," "He should know, 'He is my self,'" "But one who ... all beings," "It moves; it does not move," "Vena, seeing that," "That alone is fire," "I became Manu and the sun," "Having entered within, the ruler of creatures," "Being alone, my dear ...," "That is the truth; that is the self; you are that."[25]
P 1.38	स्मृतिभ्यश्च 'पूः प्राणिनः सर्व एव गुहाशयस्य' 'आत्मैव देवताः' 'नवद्वारे पुरे' 'समं सर्वेषु भूतेषु' 'विद्याविनयसंपन्ने' 'अविभक्तं विभक्तेषु' 'वासुदेवः सर्वम्' इत्यादिभ्यः एक एवात्मा परं ब्रह्म सर्वसंसारधर्मविनिर्मुक्तस्त्वमिति सिद्धम् ॥	And from traditional texts such as "All living beings are the city of the one who lies in the cave," "The self alone is the gods," "in the city of nine gates," "the same in all beings," "in one endowed with learning and humility," "undivided among the divided," "Vasudeva is all," it is established that you are the one self alone, the highest *brahman*, free from all the attributes of the round of rebirth.[26]
P 1.39	स यदि ब्रूयात्— यदि भगवन् अनन्तरः अबाह्यः सबाह्याभ्यन्तरो ह्यजः कृत्स्नः प्रज्ञानघन एव सैन्धवघनवदात्मा सर्वमूर्तिभेदवर्जितः आकाशवदेकरसः, किमिदं दृश्यते श्रूयते वा साध्यं साधनं वा साधकश्चेति श्रुतिस्मृतिलोकप्रसिद्धं वादिशतविप्रतिपत्तिविषय इति ॥	If he should say: Venerable sir, if the self is without inside, without outside, unborn, without and within, entire, nothing but a mass of intelligence like a lump of salt, free of all differences of shape, of a single nature like space—what, then, is this that is seen or heard: the end to be achieved, the means, and the one who achieves it, well known from scripture, tradition and the world, and the subject of disagreement among hundreds of disputants?[27]
P 1.40	आचार्यो ब्रूयात्— अविद्याकृतमेतद्यदिदं दृश्यते श्रूयते वा साध्यं साधनं साधकश्चेति । परमार्थतस्त्वेक एवात्मा अविद्यादृष्टेः अनेकवत् आभासते, तिमिरदृष्ट्या अनेकचन्द्रवत् । 'यत्र वा अन्यदिव स्यात्' 'यत्र हि द्वैतमिव भवति तदितर इतरं पश्यति' 'मृत्योः स मृत्युमाप्नोति' 'अथ यत्रान्यत्पश्यति अन्यच्छृणोति अन्यद्विजानाति तदल्पम्' 'अथ यदल्पं तन्मर्त्यमिति' 'वाचारम्भणं विकारो नामधेयम् 'अनृतम्' 'अन्योऽसावन्योऽहम्' इति भेददर्शननिन्दोपपत्तेरविद्याकृतं द्वैतम्, 'एकमेवाद्वितीयम्' 'यत्र त्वस्य' 'को मोहः कः शोकः' इत्याद्येकत्वविधिश्रुतिभ्यश्चेति ॥	The teacher should say: What is seen or heard—the end, the means and the one who achieves it—is produced by ignorance. In the highest truth there is only the one self, which, through the vision of ignorance, appears as though many, as the moon appears as many to vision affected by an eye disease. Duality is produced by ignorance, as is shown by the condemnation of seeing difference in such texts as "Where there seems to be another," "For where there is duality, as it were, there one sees another," "He goes from death to death," "But where one sees something else, hears something else, knows something else, that is the small," "And what is small is mortal," "A modification is a name, a matter of words," "untrue," "He is one, I am another," and by the texts enjoining oneness, such as "one only, without a second," "But

25 Vena is a Vedic seer; Manu is the first human. The quotations come chiefly from the Brihadaranyaka, Chandogya, Taittiriya, Aitareya, Katha, Isha and Shvetashvatara Upanishads.
26 Vasudeva is Krishna. Sources include Apastamba Dharmasutra 1.8.22.4 and Bhagavad Gita 5.18, 13.16, 7.19.
27 The lump of salt, salty through and through, is an image from Brihadaranyaka Upanishad 4.5.13.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
		when for him ...," "What delusion, what sorrow ..."[28]
P 1.41	यद्येवं भगवन्, किमर्थं श्रुत्या साध्यसाधनादिभेद उच्यते उत्पत्तिः प्रलयश्चेति ? ॥	If that is so, venerable sir, why does scripture speak of the differences of end, means and so on, and of origination and dissolution?
P 1.42	अत्रोच्यते— अविद्यावतः उपात्तशरीरादिभेदस्य इष्टानिष्टयोगिनमात्मानं मन्यमानस्य साधनैरेवेष्टानिष्टप्राप्तिपरिहारोपायविवेकमजानतः इष्टप्राप्तिं चानिष्टपरिहारं चेच्छतः शनैस्तद्विषयमज्ञानं निवर्तयितुं शास्त्रं न साध्यसाधनादिभेदं विधत्ते, अनिष्टरूपः संसारो हि स इति । तद्भेददृष्टिमेवाविद्यां संसारमूलमुन्मूलयत्युत्पत्तिप्रलयादेरेकत्वोपपत्तिदर्शनेन ॥	To this it is replied: Consider a person who has ignorance, who has taken on the distinctions of body and the rest, who thinks of himself as connected with what he desires and what he does not, who does not know how to discern the ways of attaining the desired and avoiding the undesired except through means, and who wishes to attain the desired and avoid the undesired. In order gradually to remove his ignorance in this matter, scripture does not enjoin the differences of end, means and so on; for that is the round of rebirth, whose nature is the undesired. Rather, it uproots that very ignorance, the view of difference, the root of the round of rebirth, by showing that origination, dissolution and the rest are consistent with oneness.
P 1.43	अविद्यायामुन्मूलितायां श्रुतिस्मृतिन्यायेभ्योऽनन्तरमबाह्यं सबाह्याभ्यन्तरो ह्यजः सैन्धवघनवत्प्रज्ञानघन एवैकरस आत्माकाशवत्परिपूर्ण इत्यत्रैवैका प्रज्ञा प्रतिष्ठिता परमार्थदर्शिनो भवति, न साध्यसाधनोत्पत्तिप्रलयादिभेदेनाशुद्धिगन्धोऽप्युपपद्यते ॥	When ignorance has been uprooted through scripture, tradition and reasoning, the single insight of one who sees the highest truth becomes established in this alone: the self is without inside, without outside, unborn, without and within, nothing but a mass of intelligence like a lump of salt, of a single nature, all-filling like space; and not even a trace of impurity, through the differences of end, means, origination, dissolution and so on, is possible.
P 1.44	तच्चैतत्परमार्थदर्शनं प्रतिपत्तुमिच्छता वर्णाश्रमाद्यभिमानकृतपाङ्क्तरूपपुत्रवित्तैषणादिभ्यो व्युत्थानं कर्तव्यम् । सम्यक्प्रत्ययविरोधात्तदभिमानस्य भेददर्शनप्रतिषेधार्थोपपत्तिश्चोपपद्यते । न ह्येकस्मिन्नात्मन्यसंसारित्वबुद्धौ शास्त्रन्यायोत्पादितायां तद्विपरीता बुद्धिर्भवति । न ह्यग्नौ शीतत्वबुद्धिः शरीरे वाजरामरणबुद्धिः । तस्मादविद्याकार्यत्वात्सर्वकर्मणां तत्साधनानां च यज्ञोपवीतादीनां परमार्थदर्शननिष्ठेन त्यागः कर्तव्यः ॥	One who wishes to attain this vision of the highest truth must turn away from the desires for a son, for wealth and the rest, which are fivefold in form and produced by identifying oneself with class, stage of life and the like. Such identification conflicts with right cognition, and so the purpose of scripture's denial of seeing difference also makes sense. For when the notion that the one self is free of the round of rebirth has arisen through scripture and reasoning, the contrary notion does not arise—just as one does not think that fire is cold, or that the body is free of old age and death. Therefore, since all actions and their means, the

28 *Timira* is an eye disease that makes one see double. Sources: Brihadaranyaka Upanishad 4.3.31, 2.4.14; Chandogya Upanishad 7.24.1, 6.1.4; Isha Upanishad 7.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
		sacred thread and the like, are effects of ignorance, one devoted to the vision of the highest truth must give them up.[29]

CHAPTER 2: AWARENESS OF THE CHANGELESS, NONDUAL SELF

A pupil asks how to escape birth and death; the teacher names ignorance as the cause.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
P 2.1	सुखमासीनं ब्राह्मणं ब्रह्मनिष्ठं कश्चित् ब्रह्मचारी जन्मजरामरणलक्षणात् संसारात् निर्विण्णो मुमुक्षुः विधिवदुपसन्नः पप्रच्छ— भगवन्, कथमहं संसारान्मोक्ष्ये शरीरेन्द्रियविषयवेदनावान् । जागरिते दुःखमनुभवामि, तथा स्वप्नेऽनुभवामि । पुनः पुनः सुषुप्तिप्रतिपत्त्या विश्रम्य विश्रम्य जाग्रत्स्वप्नयोर्दुःखमनुभवामि । किमयमेव मम स्वभावः ? किं वा अन्यस्वभावस्य सतो नैमित्तिकः ? इति । यदि अयमेव स्वभावः, न मे मोक्षाशा, स्वभावस्यावर्जनीयत्वात् । अथ नैमित्तिकः, निमित्तपरिहारे स्यान्मोक्षोपपत्तिः ॥	A certain celibate student, weary of the round of rebirth marked by birth, old age and death, and seeking liberation, approached in the proper manner a Brahmin established in *brahman*, who was sitting at ease, and asked him: Venerable sir, how shall I be freed from the round of rebirth? I am bound up with a body, senses, objects and feelings. In waking I experience pain, and in dream as well. Again and again I pass into deep sleep and rest, and again and again I experience the pain of waking and dream. Is this my own nature? Or is it caused by something, while my nature is other? If this is my own nature, I have no hope of liberation, since one cannot escape one's own nature. But if it is caused, liberation is possible once the cause is removed.
P 2.2	तं गुरुरुवाच— शृणु वत्स, न तवायं स्वभावः, किंतु नैमित्तिकः ॥	The teacher said to him: Listen, my child. This is not your own nature; it is caused.
P 2.3	इत्युक्तः शिष्य उवाच— किं निमित्तम् ? किं वा तस्य निवर्तकम् ? को वा मम स्वभावः ? यस्मिन्निमित्ते निवर्तिते नैमित्तिकाभावः रोगनिमित्तनिवृत्ताविव रोगी स्वभावं प्रतिपद्येयेति ॥	Told this, the pupil said: What is the cause? And what removes it? And what is my own nature, so that, when the cause is removed, what it caused will cease, and I may regain my own nature, like a sick man when the cause of his illness is removed?
P 2.4	गुरुरुवाच— अविद्या निमित्तम्, विद्या तस्या निवर्तिका । अविद्यायां निवृत्तायां तन्निमित्ताभावात् मोक्ष्यसे जन्ममरणलक्षणात्संसारात् । स्वप्नजाग्रद्दुःखं च नानुभविष्यसीति ॥	The teacher said: Ignorance is the cause; knowledge removes it. When ignorance is removed, its effect will be gone, and you will be freed from the round of rebirth marked by birth and death, and you will no longer experience the pain of dream and waking.
P 2.5	शिष्य उवाच— का सा अविद्या ? किंविषया वा ? विद्या च का अविद्यानिवर्तिका यया स्वभावं प्रतिपद्येय ? इति ॥	The pupil said: What is that ignorance? What is its object? And what is the knowledge that removes ignorance, through which I may regain my own nature?
P 2.6		The teacher said: You are the highest self, free from the round of rebirth, yet you wrongly take

29 Fivefold: the Brihadaranyaka Upanishad (1.4.17) describes the ritual life as fivefold—mind, speech, breath, wife and son—like the sacrifice itself.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
	गुरुरुवाच— त्वं परमात्मानं सन्तम् असंसारिणं संसार्यहमस्मीति विपरीतं प्रतिपद्यसे, अकर्तारं सन्तं कर्तेति, अभोक्तारं सन्तं भोक्तेति, विद्यमानं चाविद्यमानमिति । इयमविद्या ॥	yourself to be "I, who am subject to the round of rebirth"; you are not an agent, yet you take yourself to be an agent; you are not an enjoyer, yet you take yourself to be an enjoyer; and you exist, yet you take yourself not to exist. This is ignorance.

SUPERIMPOSITION

The pupil doubts the self can be superimposed; the teacher shows body and self are always confused.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
P 2.7	शिष्य उवाच— यद्यप्यहं विद्यमानः, तथापि न परमात्मा । कर्तृत्वभोक्तृत्वलक्षणः संसारो मम स्वभावः, प्रत्यक्षादिभिः प्रमाणैः अनुभूयमानत्वात् । न अविद्यानिमित्तः, अविद्यायाश्चात्मविषयत्वानुपपत्तेः । अविद्या नाम अन्यस्मिन् अन्यधर्माध्यारोपणा, यथा प्रसिद्धं रजतं प्रसिद्धायां शुक्तिकायाम्, यथा प्रसिद्धं पुरुषं स्थाणावध्यारोपयति, प्रसिद्धं वा स्थाणुं पुरुषे, नाप्रसिद्धं प्रसिद्धे, प्रसिद्धं वा अप्रसिद्धे । न च आत्मन्यनात्मानमध्यारोपयति, आत्मनः अप्रसिद्धत्वात्, तथा आत्मानम् अनात्मनि, आत्मनोऽप्रसिद्धत्वादेव ॥	The pupil said: Even if I exist, still I am not the highest self. The round of rebirth, marked by being an agent and an enjoyer, is my own nature, since it is experienced through the means of knowledge, perception and the rest. It is not caused by ignorance, because ignorance cannot have the self as its object. Ignorance is the superimposition of the attributes of one thing on another: as one superimposes known silver on known mother-of-pearl, or a known person on a post, or a known post on a person—not something unknown on something known, nor something known on something unknown. And one does not superimpose the non-self on the self, because the self is not known; nor the self on the non-self, again because the self is not known.[30]
P 2.8	तं गुरुरुवाच— न, व्यभिचारात् । न हि वत्स, प्रसिद्धं प्रसिद्ध एवाध्यारोपयतीति नियन्तुं शक्यम्, आत्मन्यध्यारोपणदर्शनात्, गौरोऽहं कृष्णोऽहमिति देहधर्मस्य अहंप्रत्ययविषये आत्मनि, अहंप्रत्ययविषयस्य च आत्मनः देहे अयमहमस्मीति ॥	The teacher said to him: No, because there are exceptions. My child, it cannot be laid down as a rule that one superimposes the known only on the known, for superimposition on the self is seen: the attributes of the body, as in "I am fair" or "I am dark," are superimposed on the self, the object of the notion "I"; and the self, the object of the notion "I," is superimposed on the body, as in "I am this."
P 2.9	शिष्य आह— प्रसिद्ध एव तर्ह्यात्मा अहंप्रत्ययविषयतया, देहश्च अयमिति । तत्रैवं सति, प्रसिद्धयोरेव देहात्मनोरितरेतराध्यारोपणा स्थाणुपुरुषयोः शुक्तिकारजतयोरिव । तत्र कं विशेषमाश्रित्य भगवतोक्तं प्रसिद्धयोरितरेतराध्यारोपणेति नियन्तुं न शक्यते इति ? ॥	The pupil said: Then the self is indeed known, as the object of the notion "I," and the body as "this." That being so, the mutual superimposition of body and self is of two known things, like that of post and person, or of mother-of-pearl and silver. On what particular point, then, did you, venerable sir, say that it cannot be laid down as a rule that mutual superimposition is of two known things?
P 2.10	गुरुराह— शृणु, सत्यं प्रसिद्धौ देहात्मानौ । न तु स्थाणुपुरुषाविव विविक्तप्रत्ययविषयतया सर्वलोकप्रसिद्धौ । कथं तर्हि ? नित्यमेव निरन्तराविविक्तप्रत्ययविषयतया प्रसिद्धौ । न हि अयं देहः, अयमात्मा, इति	The teacher said: Listen. It is true that body and self are known. But they are not known to everyone as objects of distinct notions, as post and per-

30 Superimposition (*adhyāropaṇa*): taking one thing for another, as silver on mother-of-pearl or a snake on a rope.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
	विविक्ताभ्यां प्रत्ययाभ्यां देहात्मानौ गृह्णाति यः कश्चित् । अत एव हि मोमुह्यते लोकः आत्मानात्मविषये एवमात्मा, नैवमात्मा इति । इमं विशेषमाश्रित्यावोचं नैवं नियन्तुं शक्यमिति ॥	son are. How, then? They are always known as the object of a single, continuous notion in which they are not distinguished. For no one grasps body and self through two distinct notions, "This is the body" and "This is the self." That is precisely why people are thoroughly confused about self and non-self, saying "The self is like this" and "The self is not like this." It was on this particular point that I said it cannot be laid down as a rule.
P 2.11	ननु, अविद्याध्यारोपितं यत्र यत् तदसत् तत्र दृष्टम्, यथा रजतं शुक्तिकायाम्, स्थाणौ पुरुषः, रज्ज्वां सर्पः, आकाशे तलमलिनत्वमित्यादि । तथा देहात्मनोरपि नित्यमेव निरन्तराविविक्तप्रत्ययेन इतरेतराध्यारोपणा कृता स्यात् । तत् इतरेतरयोः नित्यमेव असत्त्वं स्यात् । यथा शुक्तिकादिषु अविद्याध्यारोपितानां रजतादीनां नित्यमेव अत्यन्तासत्त्वम्, तद्विपरीतानां च विपरीतेषु, तद्वत् देहात्मनोरविद्ययैव इतरेतराध्यारोपणा कृता स्यात् । तत्रैवं सति देहात्मनोरसत्त्वं प्रसज्येत । तच्चानिष्टम्, वैनाशिकपक्षत्वात् ।	But surely, whatever is superimposed by ignorance on something is seen to be unreal there—like silver on mother-of-pearl, a person on a post, a snake on a rope, a surface and dirtiness on space, and so on. In the same way, if body and self were always mutually superimposed through a continuous, undistinguished notion, then each would always be unreal in the other. Just as silver and the rest, superimposed by ignorance on mother-of-pearl and the rest, are always utterly unreal, and likewise their opposites on their opposites, so the mutual superimposition of body and self would be made by ignorance alone. That being so, it would follow that body and self are unreal. And that is unacceptable, for it is the position of the Vainā́śikas.[31]
	अथ तद्विपर्ययेण देहः आत्मन्यविद्यया अध्यारोपितः, देहस्यात्मनि सति असत्त्वं प्रसज्येत । तच्चानिष्टम्, प्रत्यक्षादिविरोधात् । तस्माद्देहात्मानौ नाविद्यया इतरेतरस्मिन् अध्यारोपितौ । कथं तर्हि ? वंशस्तम्भवन्नित्यसंयुक्तौ ॥	If, conversely, the body is superimposed by ignorance on the self, it would follow that the body is unreal in the self, which is real. And that is unacceptable, since it contradicts perception and the rest. Therefore body and self are not superimposed on each other by ignorance. How, then? They are permanently joined, like bamboo and post.
P 2.12	न, अनित्यत्वपरार्थत्वप्रसङ्गात् । संहतत्वात् परार्थत्वम् अनित्यत्वं च वंशस्तम्भादिवदेव । किंच— यस्तु परैर्देहेन संहतः कल्पितः आत्मा स संहतत्वात् परार्थः । तेन असंहतः परोऽन्यो नित्यः सिद्धस्तावत् ॥	No, for then it would follow that they are impermanent and exist for the sake of another. Because they are combined, they would exist for the sake of another and be impermanent, just like bamboo, post and the like. Moreover, the self that others imagine to be combined with the body exists, because it is combined, for the sake of another. Therefore one that is highest and different, not combined and eternal, is established in the first place.
P 2.13		Since that uncombined one is superimposed on the body as being the body itself, the faults of un-

31 The "surface" of space is the sky's apparent vault. *Vainā́śika,* "one who holds that things perish," is Shankara's name for Buddhists who deny a lasting self.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
	तस्यासंहतस्य देहे देहमात्रतया अध्यारोपितत्वेन असत्त्वानित्यत्वादिदोषप्रसङ्गो भवति । तत्र निरात्मको देह इति वैनाशिकपक्षप्राप्तिदोषः स्यात् ॥	reality, impermanence and the rest follow. Then there would be the fault of arriving at the Vainā́śika position, that the body has no self.
P 2.14	न, स्वत एवात्मन आकाशस्येव असंहतत्वाभ्युपगमात् सर्वेण असंहतः स च आत्मेति न निरात्मको देहादिः सर्वः स्यात् । यथा चाकाशं सर्वेणासंहतमिति सर्वं न निराकाशं भवति, एवम् । तस्मान्न वैनाशिकपक्षप्राप्तिदोषः स्यात् ॥	No, for it is accepted that the self, by its own nature, is not combined with anything, like space. Though uncombined with everything, it is the self, and so the body and all the rest are not without a self. Just as space is uncombined with everything and yet nothing is without space—so it is here. Therefore there is no fault of arriving at the Vainā́śika position.
P 2.15	यत्पुनरुक्तम्— देहस्यात्मन्यसत्त्वे प्रत्यक्षादिविरोधः स्यादिति, तन्न, प्रत्यक्षादिभिः आत्मनि देहस्य सत्त्वानुपलब्धेः । न ह्यात्मनि— कुण्डे बदरम्, क्षीरे सर्पिः, तिले तैलम्, भित्तौ चित्रमिव च— प्रत्यक्षादिभिः देह उपलभ्यते । तस्मान्न प्रत्यक्षादिविरोधः ॥	As for what was said further—that if the body did not exist in the self, perception and the rest would be contradicted—that is not so, for perception and the rest do not apprehend the body as existing in the self. The body is not apprehended in the self by perception and the rest as a jujube is in a bowl, ghee in milk, oil in sesame, or a picture on a wall. Therefore there is no contradiction of perception and the rest.
P 2.16	कथं तर्हि प्रत्यक्षाद्यप्रसिद्धात्मनि देहाध्यारोपणा, देहे चात्मारोपणा ? ॥	How, then, is the body superimposed on the self, which is not known through perception and the rest, and the self on the body?
P 2.17	नायं दोषः, स्वभावप्रसिद्धत्वादात्मनः । न हि कादाचित्कसिद्धावेव अध्यारोपणा न नित्यसिद्धौ इति नियन्तुं शक्यम्, आकाशे तलमलाद्यध्यारोपणदर्शनात् ॥	This is no fault, because the self is known by its very nature. It cannot be laid down as a rule that superimposition occurs only on what is known occasionally and not on what is always known, for we see a surface, dirt and the like superimposed on space.
P 2.18	किं भगवन्, देहात्मनोः इतरेतराध्यारोपणा देहादिसंघातकृता, अथवा आत्मकृता ? इति ॥	Venerable sir, is the mutual superimposition of body and self made by the aggregate of body and the rest, or by the self?
P 2.19	गुरुरुवाच— यदि देहादिसंघातकृता, यदि वा आत्मकृता, किं तत्र स्यात् ? ॥	The teacher said: Whether it is made by the aggregate of body and the rest or by the self, what would follow?
P 2.20	इत्युक्तः शिष्य आह— यद्यहं देहादिसंघातमात्रः, ततो ममाचेतनत्वात् परार्थत्वमिति न मत्कृता देहात्मनोः इतरेतराध्यारोपणा । अथाहमात्मा परोऽन्यः संघातात्, चितिमत्त्वात् स्वार्थ इति मयैव चितिमता आत्मनि अध्यारोपणा क्रियते सर्वानर्थबीजभूता ॥	Told this, the pupil said: If I am merely the aggregate of body and the rest, then, since I am not conscious, I exist for the sake of another, and so the mutual superimposition of body and self is not made by me. But if I am the self, the highest, different from the aggregate, then, since I am conscious, I exist for my own sake, and so it is I, the conscious one, who make the superimposition on the self that is the seed of every evil.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
P 2.21	इत्युक्तो गुरुरुवाच— अनर्थबीजभूतां चेन्मिथ्याध्यारोपणां जानीषे, मा कार्षीस्तर्हि ॥	Told this, the teacher said: If you know that false superimposition is the seed of evil, then do not make it.
P 2.22	नैव भगवन्, शक्नोमि न कर्तुम् । अन्येन केनचित्प्रयुक्तोऽहं न स्वतन्त्र इति ॥	Venerable sir, I simply cannot help making it. I am impelled by someone else; I am not independent.
P 2.23	न तर्हि अचितिमत्त्वात् स्वार्थः त्वम् । येन प्रयुक्तः अस्वतन्त्रः प्रवर्तसे स चितिमान् स्वार्थः । संघात एव त्वम् ॥	Then, because you are not conscious, you do not exist for your own sake. The one by whom you are impelled, so that you act without independence, is the conscious one, who exists for his own sake. You are only the aggregate.
P 2.24	यद्यचेतनोऽहम्, कथं सुखदुःखवेदनां भवदुक्तं च जानामि ? ॥	If I am not conscious, how do I know the feeling of pleasure and pain, and what you have said?
P 2.25	गुरुरुवाच— किं सुखदुःखवेदनायाः मदुक्ताच्चान्यस्त्वम्, किं वा अनन्य एव ? इति ॥	The teacher said: Are you different from the feeling of pleasure and pain and from what I have said, or are you not different?
P 2.26	शिष्य उवाच— नाहं तावदनन्यः । कस्मात् ? यस्मात्तदुभयं कर्मभूतं घटादिकमिव जानामि । यद्यनन्योऽहम्, तेन तदुभयं न जानीयाम्, किंतु जानामि, तस्मादन्यः । सुखदुःखवेदनाविक्रिया च स्वार्थैव प्राप्नोति, त्वदुक्तं च स्यात्, अनन्यत्वे । न च तयोः स्वार्थता युक्ता । न हि चन्दनकण्टककृते सुखदुःखे चन्दनकण्टकार्थे, घटोपयोगो वा घटार्थः । तस्मात् तद्विज्ञातुर्मम चन्दनादिकृतः अर्थः । अहं हि ततोऽन्यः समस्तमर्थं जानामि बुद्ध्यारूढम् ॥	The pupil said: I am certainly not non-different. Why? Because I know both of them as objects, as I know a pot and the like. If I were not different, I could not know them; but I do know them; therefore I am different. If I were not different, the change that is the feeling of pleasure and pain would exist for its own sake, and so would what you have said. But it is not reasonable that they should exist for their own sake. The pleasure and pain produced by sandalwood and a thorn are not for the sake of the sandalwood or the thorn, nor is the use of a pot for the sake of the pot. Therefore the purpose served by sandalwood and the rest is for me, who know them. For I, being different from them, know every object that has entered the intellect.
P 2.27	तं गुरुरुवाच— एवं तर्हि स्वार्थस्त्वं चितिमत्त्वान्न परेण प्रयुज्यसे । न हि चितिमान्परतन्त्रः परेण प्रयुज्यते, चितिमतश्चितिमदर्थत्वानुपपत्तेः समत्वात्प्रदीपप्रकाशयोरिव । नापि अचितिमदर्थत्वं चितिमतो भवति, अचितिमतोऽचितिमत्त्वादेव स्वार्थसंबन्धानुपपत्तेः । नापि अचितिमतोः अन्योन्यार्थत्वं दृष्टम् । न हि काष्ठकुड्ये अन्योन्यार्थं कुर्वाते ॥	The teacher said to him: Then you exist for your own sake, because you are conscious, and you are not impelled by another. For a conscious being is not dependent and impelled by another, since one conscious being cannot exist for the sake of another conscious being, the two being equal, like the light of two lamps. Nor does a conscious being exist for the sake of what is not conscious, since what is not conscious, precisely because it is not conscious, can have no relation to a purpose of its own. Nor are two things that are not conscious seen to exist for each other's sake: wood and a wall do not serve each other's purpose.
P 2.28		

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
	ननु चितिमत्त्वे समेऽपि भृत्यस्वामिनोः अन्योन्यार्थत्वं दृष्टम् ॥	But surely, though equal in being conscious, servant and master are seen to exist for each other's sake.
P 2.29	नैवम्, अग्नेरुष्णप्रकाशवत्तव चितिमत्त्वस्य विवक्षितत्वात् । प्रदर्शितश्च दृष्टान्तः प्रदीपप्रकाशयोरिति । तत्रैवं सति स्वबुद्ध्यारूढमेव सर्वमुपलभसे अग्न्युष्णप्रकाशतुल्येन कूटस्थनित्यचैतन्यस्वरूपेण । यदि चैवमात्मनः सर्वदा निर्विशेषत्वमुपगच्छसि, किमित्यूचिवान् 'सुषुप्ते विश्रम्य विश्रम्य जाग्रत्स्वप्नयोः दुःखमनुभवामि, किमयमेव मम स्वभावः किं वा नैमित्तिकः' इति च । किमसौ व्यामोहोऽपगतः, किं वा न ?	Not so, for what I meant was that your consciousness is like the heat and light of fire. And I gave the example of the light of two lamps. That being so, you perceive everything that has entered your own intellect through your own nature, which is changeless, eternal consciousness, comparable to the heat and light of fire. And if you thus accept that the self is always without distinctions, why did you say: "Resting again and again in deep sleep, I experience pain in waking and dream. Is this my own nature, or is it caused?" Has that delusion gone, or not?[32]

THE CHANGELESS PERCEIVER

The pupil doubts that a perceiving self is changeless; perceiving proves to be its unchanging nature.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
P 2.30	इत्युक्तः शिष्य आह— भगवन्, अपगतः त्वत्प्रसादात् । किंतु मम कूटस्थतायां संशयः । कथम् ? शब्दादीनां स्वतःसिद्धिर्नास्ति, अचेतनत्वात्, शब्दाद्याकारप्रत्ययोत्पत्तेस्तु तेषाम् । प्रत्ययानामितरेतरव्यावृत्तविशेषणानां नीलपीताद्याकारवतां स्वतःसिद्ध्यसंभवात् । तस्माद्बाह्याकारनिमित्तत्वं गम्यते इति वाह्याकारवत् शब्दाद्याकारत्वसिद्धिः । तथा प्रत्ययानामपि अहंप्रत्ययालम्बनवस्तुभेदानां संहतत्वात् अचैतन्योपपत्तेः । स्वार्थत्वासंभवात् स्वरूपव्यतिरिक्तग्राहकग्राह्यत्वेन सिद्धिः शब्दादिवदेव । असंहतत्वे सति चैतन्यात्मकत्वात् स्वार्थोऽपि अहंप्रत्ययानां नीलपीताद्याकाराणामुपलब्धेति विक्रियावानेव, कथं कूटस्थ इति संशयः ॥	Told this, the pupil said: Venerable sir, by your grace it has gone. But I have a doubt about my being changeless. How so? Sound and the rest are not established by themselves, since they are not conscious; they are established through the arising of notions that take the forms of sound and the rest. For notions, which are qualified by mutually exclusive features and have forms such as blue and yellow, cannot be established by themselves. From this it is understood that they are caused by external forms, and so it is established that they have the forms of sound and the rest, as the external forms do. Likewise notions too, the various things supported by the notion "I," are not conscious, because they are combined; since they cannot exist for their own sake, they are established, just like sound and the rest, by being grasped by a grasper different from themselves. And since I am not combined and am of the nature of consciousness, I exist for my own sake; yet I perceive the notions of the "I," which have forms such as blue and yellow, and so I am indeed subject to change. How, then, am I changeless? That is my doubt.
P 2.31	तं गुरुरुवाच— न युक्तस्तव संशयः, यतस्तेषां प्रत्ययानां नियमेन अशेषतः उपलब्धेरेव अपरिणामित्वात् कूटस्थत्वसिद्धौ निश्चयहेतुमेव	The teacher said to him: Your doubt is not reasonable. For you cite as the cause of doubt the very

32 *Kūṭastha*, "changeless": literally, unchanging like an anvil, which stays the same while everything is shaped upon it.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
	अशेषचित्तप्रचारोपलब्धिं संशयहेतुमात्थ । यदि हि तव परिणामित्वं स्यात्, अशेषस्वविषयचित्तप्रचारोपलब्धिर्न स्यात् चित्तस्येव स्वविषये यथा चेन्द्रियाणां स्वविषयेषु । न च तथा आत्मनस्तव स्वविषयैकदेशोपलब्धिः । अतः कूटस्थतैव तवेति ॥	thing that is the cause of certainty in establishing your changelessness: your perceiving all the movements of the mind without exception, which shows that you are not transformed, since you invariably perceive those notions in their entirety. If you were subject to transformation, you would not perceive all the movements of the mind, your object, without exception—just as the mind does not with its own object, nor the senses with theirs. And you, the self, do not in that way perceive only part of your object. Therefore you are simply changeless.
P 2.32	तत्राह— उपलब्धिर्नाम धात्वर्थो विक्रियैव, उपलब्धुः कूटस्थात्मता चेति विरुद्धम् ॥	On this he said: Perceiving, being the meaning of a verbal root, is itself a change; and it is contradictory that the perceiver should be changeless by nature.[33]
P 2.33	न, धात्वर्थविक्रियायाम् उपलब्ध्युपचारात् । यो हि बौद्धः प्रत्ययः स धात्वर्थो विक्रियात्मकः आत्मनः उपलब्ध्याभासफलावसानः इति उपलब्धिशब्देन उपचर्यते, यथा छिदिक्रिया द्वैधीभावफलावसानेति धात्वर्थत्वेनोपचर्यते तद्वत् ॥	No, because the word "perceiving" is applied figuratively to the change that is the meaning of the root. The notion in the intellect, which is the meaning of the root and is of the nature of change, ends in a result that is a semblance of the self's perceiving; and so it is figuratively called by the word "perceiving"—just as the action of cutting, which ends in the result of something's being split in two, is figuratively spoken of as the meaning of the root.
P 2.34	इत्युक्तः शिष्य आह— ननु भगवन्, मम कूटस्थत्वप्रतिपादनं प्रति असमर्थो दृष्टान्तः । कथम् ? छिदिः छेद्यविक्रियावसाना उपचर्यते यथा धात्वर्थत्वेन, तथा उपलब्धिशब्दोपचरितोऽपि धात्वर्थो बौद्धप्रत्ययः आत्मनः उपलब्धिविक्रियावसानश्चेत्, नात्मनः कूटस्थतां प्रतिपादयितुं समर्थः ॥	Told this, the pupil said: But surely, venerable sir, the example does not serve to establish my changelessness. How so? Just as cutting, which ends in a change in the thing cut, is figuratively spoken of as the meaning of the root, so too the notion in the intellect, the meaning of the root figuratively called by the word "perceiving": if it ends in a change in the self, namely perceiving, it cannot serve to establish the self's changelessness.
P 2.35	गुरुरुवाच— सत्यमेव स्यात्, यदि उपलब्ध्युपलब्ध्योः विशेषः । नित्योपलब्धिमात्र एव हि उपलब्धा । न तु तार्किकसमय इव अन्या उपलब्धिः अन्यः उपलब्धा च ॥	The teacher said: That would indeed be so if there were a distinction between perceiving and perceiver. But the perceiver is nothing but eternal perceiving. It is not as in the doctrine of the logicians, where perceiving is one thing and the perceiver another.[34]
P 2.36	ननूपलब्धिफलावसानो धात्वर्थः कथमिति ॥	But how is it that the meaning of the root ends in the result that is perceiving?

33 The "meaning of the verbal root" (*dhātvartha*) is, in Sanskrit grammar, the action a verb denotes.
34 The logicians (*tārkika*) are the Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika schools, for whom cognition is a quality that arises in a self distinct from it.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
P 2.37	उच्यते शृणु, उपलब्ध्याभासफलावसान इत्युक्तम् । किं न श्रुतं तत् त्वया ? न त्वात्मा विक्रियोत्पादनावसान इति मयोक्तम् ॥	Here is the answer; listen. I said that it ends in a result that is a semblance of perceiving. Did you not hear that? I did not say that it ends in producing a change in the self.
P 2.38	शिष्य आह— कथं तर्हि कूटस्थे मयि अशेषस्वविषयचित्तप्रचारोपलब्धृत्वमित्यात्थ ? ॥	The pupil said: How, then, did you say that I, who am changeless, perceive all the movements of the mind, which are my objects?
P 2.39	तं गुरुरुवाच— सत्यमेवावोचम्, तेनैव कूटस्थतामब्रवं तव ॥	The teacher said to him: What I said was true, and by that very fact I declared your changelessness.
P 2.40	यद्येवं भगवन्, कूटस्थनित्योपलब्धिस्वरूपे मयि शब्दाद्याकारबौद्धप्रत्ययेषु च मत्स्वरूपोपलब्ध्याभासफलावसानवत्सु उत्पद्यमानेषु कस्त्वपराधो मम ? ॥	If so, venerable sir, since I am by nature changeless, eternal perceiving, and the notions in the intellect that take the forms of sound and the rest arise ending in a result that is a semblance of my own nature as perceiving, what fault is mine?
P 2.41	सत्यम्, नास्त्यपराधः, किंतु अविद्यामात्रस्त्वपराध इति प्रागेवावोचम् ॥	True, there is no fault. But, as I said before, the fault is only ignorance.
P 2.42	यदि भगवन्, सुषुप्त इव मम विक्रिया नास्ति, कथं स्वप्नजागरिते ? ॥	Venerable sir, if, as in deep sleep, there is no change in me, how is it in dream and waking?
P 2.43	तं गुरुरुवाच— किं त्वनुभूयेते त्वया सततम् ॥	The teacher said to him: But do you experience them continuously?
P 2.44	शिष्य उवाच— बाढमनुभवामि, किंतु विच्छिद्य विच्छिद्य, न तु सततम् ॥	The pupil said: Certainly I experience them, but intermittently, not continuously.
P 2.45	गुरुरुवाच— तर्ह्यागन्तुके त्वेते, न तवात्मभूते । यदि तवात्मभूते चैतन्यस्वरूपवत् स्वतःसिद्धे सतते एव स्याताम् । किंच, स्वप्नजागरिते न तव आत्मभूते, व्यभिचारित्वात् वस्त्रादिवत् । न हि यस्य यत् स्वरूपं तत् तद्व्यभिचारि दृष्टम् । स्वप्नजागरिते तु चैतन्यमात्रत्वात् व्यभिचरतः । सुषुप्ते चेत् स्वरूपं व्यभिचरेत् तत् नष्टं नास्तीति वा बाध्यमेव स्यात्, आगन्तुकानामतद्धर्माणामुभयात्मकत्वदर्शनात्, यथा धनवस्त्रादीनां नाशो दृष्टः, स्वप्नभ्रान्तिलब्धानां तु अभावो दृष्टः ॥	The teacher said: Then they are adventitious, not your very self. If they were your very self, they would be established by themselves and continuous, like your nature as consciousness. Moreover, dream and waking are not your very self, because they depart from you, like clothes and the like. For what is the nature of a thing is never seen to depart from it. But dream and waking depart from you, who are consciousness alone. If your own nature departed in deep sleep, it would have to be negated as “destroyed” or “nonexistent,” for adventitious things, which do not belong to one’s nature, are seen to be of these two kinds: wealth, clothes and the like are seen to be destroyed, while things gained in the delusion of dream are seen to be nonexistent.
P 2.46	ननु एवं भगवन्, चैतन्यस्वरूपमपि आगन्तुकं प्राप्तम्, स्वप्नजागरितयोरिव सुषुप्ते अनुपलब्धेः । अचैतन्यस्वरूपो वा स्यामहम् ॥	But surely, venerable sir, in that case my nature as consciousness, too, turns out to be adventitious, since it is not perceived in deep sleep, just as dream and waking are not. Or else I would be of a nature that is not conscious.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
P 2.47	न, पश्य, तदनुपपत्तेः । चैतन्यस्वरूपं चेदागन्तुकं पश्यसि, पश्य, नैतत् वर्षशतेनापि उपपत्त्या कलयितुं शक्नुमो वयम्, अन्यो वाचैतन्योऽपि । तस्य संहतत्वात् पारार्थ्यम् अनेकत्वं नाशित्वं च न केनचिदुपपत्त्या वारयितुं शक्यम्, अस्वार्थस्य स्वतःसिद्ध्यभावादित्यवोचाम । चैतन्यस्वरूपस्य तु आत्मनः स्वतःसिद्धेः अन्यानपेक्षत्वं न केनचित् वारयितुं शक्यम्, अव्यभिचारात् ॥	No. Look: that is not tenable. If you regard your nature as consciousness as adventitious—look, we could not make sense of that by reasoning even in a hundred years, nor could anyone else, even one who is not conscious. For what is combined, no reasoning can prevent its existing for another's sake, its being many and its perishing, since what does not exist for its own sake is not established by itself—as we have said. But for the self whose nature is consciousness, being established by itself, nothing can prevent its independence of anything else, because it never departs.
P 2.48	ननु व्यभिचारो दर्शितो मया सुषुप्ते न पश्यामीति ॥	But surely I have shown that it does depart: in deep sleep I do not see.
P 2.49	न, व्याहतत्वात् । कथं व्याघातः ? पश्यतस्तव न पश्यामीति व्याहतं वचनम् । न हि कदाचित् भगवन्, सुषुप्ते मया चैतन्यमन्यद्वा किंचित् दृष्टम् । पश्यन् तर्हि सुषुप्ते त्वम्, यस्मात् दृष्टमेव प्रतिषेधसि, न दृष्टिम् । या तव दृष्टिः तच्चैतन्यमिति मयोक्तम् । यया त्वं विद्यमानया न किंचित् दृष्टमिति प्रतिषेधसि सा दृष्टिः तच्चैतन्यम् । तर्हि सर्वत्र अव्यभिचारात् कूटस्थनित्यत्वं सिद्धं स्वत एव, न प्रमाणापेक्षम् ।	No, because that is self-contradictory. How is it contradictory? You are seeing, and yet you say "I do not see": the statement contradicts itself. But never, venerable sir, have I seen consciousness or anything else in deep sleep. Then you are seeing in deep sleep, for you deny only what is seen, not the seeing. What I have called consciousness is your seeing. That seeing, by whose presence you deny, saying "nothing was seen"—that seeing is consciousness. Then, since it never departs from anything, its changeless eternity is established by itself, without depending on a means of knowledge.
	स्वतःसिद्धस्य हि प्रमातुः अन्यस्य प्रमेयस्य परिच्छित्तिं प्रति प्रमाणापेक्षा । या तु अन्या नित्या परिच्छित्तिरपेक्ष्यते अन्यस्य अपरिच्छित्तिरूपस्य परिच्छेदाय, सा हि नित्यैव कूटस्था स्वयंज्योतिःस्वभावा । आत्मनि प्रमाणत्वे प्रमातृत्वे वा न तां प्रति प्रमाणापेक्षा, तत्स्वभावत्वात् । यथा प्रकाशनमुष्णत्वं वा लोहोदकादिषु परतः अपेक्ष्यते अग्न्यादित्यादिभ्यः, अतत्स्वभावत्वात्, न अग्न्यादित्यादीनां तदपेक्षा, सदा तत्स्वभावत्वात् ॥	For a knower who is established by himself needs a means of knowledge to determine an object of knowledge other than himself. But that other, eternal cognition, which is required to determine something else that is not of the nature of cognition—it is eternal, changeless, self-luminous by nature. Whether it serves in the self as means of knowledge or as knower, it needs no means of knowledge for itself, since that is its very nature. Just as iron, water and the like depend on something else, fire, the sun and the like, for light or heat, since these are not their nature; but fire, the sun and the like do not depend on anything for them, since these are always their nature.

KNOWING THAT NEEDS NO PROOF

Realization is eternal and needs no means of knowledge; the pupil is declared free.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
P 2.50	अनित्यत्वे एव प्रमा स्यात्, न नित्यत्वे इति चेत् ॥	

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
		If you say that knowing would be valid knowledge only if it were transient, and not if it were eternal —
P 2.51	न, अवगतेर्नित्यत्वानित्यत्वयोः विशेषानुपपत्तेः । न हि अवगतेः प्रमात्वे अनित्या अवगतिः प्रमा, न नित्या इति विशेषः अवगम्यते ॥	No, because no distinction can be drawn between realization that is eternal and realization that is transient. Where realization is valid knowledge, no such distinction as "transient realization is valid knowledge, eternal realization is not" is known.
P 2.52	नित्यायां प्रमातुः अपेक्षाभावः, अनित्यायां तु यत्नान्तरितत्वात् अवगतिः अपेक्ष्यत इति विशेषः स्यादिति चेत् ॥	If you say that the distinction would be this: when realization is eternal, the knower depends on nothing, but when it is transient, realization has to be sought, because effort stands between him and it—
P 2.53	सिद्धा तर्हि आत्मनः प्रमातुः स्वतःसिद्धिः प्रमाणनिरपेक्षतयैवेति ॥	Then it is established that the self, the knower, is self-established, precisely because it does not depend on any means of knowledge.
P 2.54	अभावेऽपि अपेक्षाभावः, नित्यत्वात् इति चेत् ॥	If you say that even when realization is absent there is no dependence, because the self is eternal —
P 2.55	न, अवगतेरेव आत्मनि सद्भावादिति परिहृतमेतत् । प्रमातुश्चेत् प्रमाणापेक्षा सिद्धिः कस्य प्रमित्सा स्यात् । यस्य प्रमित्सा स एव प्रमाता अभ्युपगम्यते । तदीया च प्रमित्सा प्रमेयविषयैव, न प्रमातृविषया, प्रमातृविषयत्वे अनवस्थाप्रसङ्गात् प्रमातुः तदिच्छायाश्च तस्याप्यन्यः प्रमाता तस्याप्यन्यः इति, एवमेव इच्छायाः प्रमातृविषयत्वे । प्रमातुः आत्मनः अव्यवहितत्वाच्च प्रमेयत्वानुपपत्तिः । लोके हि प्रमेयं नाम प्रमातुः इच्छास्मृतिप्रयत्नप्रमाणजन्मव्यवहितं सिध्यति, नान्यथा, अवगतिः प्रमेयविषया दृष्टा ।	No, for realization itself exists in the self. This has already been answered. If the knower depended on a means of knowledge to be established, whose would the desire to know be? The one who has the desire to know is accepted as the knower. His desire to know has the knowable as its object, not the knower. If it had the knower as its object, an infinite regress would follow: there would be another knower of that knower and of his desire, and yet another of that one. The same regress would follow if the desire itself were directed to the knower. And because nothing stands between the self, the knower, and itself, it cannot be an object of knowledge. In the world an object of knowledge is established only when it is set apart from the knower by the arising of desire, memory, effort and a means of knowledge, and not otherwise. Realization is seen to have the knowable as its object.
	न च प्रमातुः प्रमाता स्वस्य स्वयमेव केनचित् व्यवहितः कल्पयितुं शक्यः इच्छादीनामन्यतमेनापि । स्मृतिश्च स्मर्तव्यविषया, न स्मर्तृविषया । तथाइच्छायाः इष्टविषयत्वमेव, न इच्छावद्विषयत्वम् । स्मर्त्रिच्छावद्विषयत्वेऽपि हि उभयोः अनवस्था पूर्ववत् अपरिहार्या स्यात् ॥	Nor can the knower be imagined to be set apart from himself by anything at all, as if he were his own knower, not even by one of desire and the rest. Memory has what is to be remembered as its object, not the one who remembers. Likewise desire has only what is desired as its object, not the one who desires. Even if they had the one who remembers and the one who desires as their objects,

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
		the infinite regress would be unavoidable in both cases, as before.
P 2.56	ननु प्रमातृविषयावगत्यनुत्पत्तौ अनवगत एव प्रमाता स्यादिति चेत् ॥	If you say that, if no realization arises that has the knower as its object, the knower would remain unknown—
P 2.57	न, अवगन्तुः अवगतेः अवगन्तव्यविषयत्वात् । अवगन्तृविषयत्वे चानवस्था पूर्ववत्स्यात् । अवगतिश्चात्मनि कूटस्थनित्यात्मज्योतिः अन्यतः अनपेक्षैव सिद्धा, अग्न्यादित्याद्युष्णप्रकाशवदिति पूर्वमेव प्रसाधितम् । अवगतेः चैतन्यात्मज्योतिषः स्वात्मनि अनित्यत्वे आत्मनः स्वार्थतानुपपत्तिः । कार्यकरणसंघातवत् संहतत्वात् पारार्थ्यं दोषवत्त्वं च अवोचाम । कथम् ? चैतन्यात्मज्योतिषः स्वात्मनि अनित्यत्वे स्मृत्यादिव्यवधानात् सान्तरत्वम् । ततश्च तस्य चैतन्यज्योतिषः प्रागुत्पत्तेः प्रध्वंसाच्चोर्ध्वमात्मन्येवाभावात् चक्षुरादीनामिव संहतत्वात् पारार्थ्यं स्यात् ।	No, because the realization of the one who realizes has what is to be realized as its object. If it had the one who realizes as its object, there would be an infinite regress, as before. Realization, the changeless and eternal light of the self, is established in the self without depending on anything else, like the heat and light of fire or the sun. This has already been shown. If realization, the light of the self that is consciousness, were transient in the self, the self could not exist for its own sake. Being composite, like the aggregate of body and senses, it would exist for the sake of another and be subject to defects, as we have said. How so? If the light of the self that is consciousness were transient in the self, it would be interrupted, because memory and the rest would come between. That light of consciousness would then be absent from the self before it arose and after it perished. So the self would be composite like the eye and the other senses, and it would exist for the sake of another.
	यदा च तत् उत्पन्नम् आत्मनि विद्यते, न तदा आत्मनः स्वार्थत्वम् । तद्भावाभावापेक्षा हि आत्मानात्मनोः स्वार्थत्वपरार्थत्वसिद्धिः । तस्मात् आत्मनः अन्यनिरपेक्षमेव नित्यचैतन्यज्योतिष्ट्वं सिद्धम् ॥	And even when that light has arisen and exists in the self, the self would not then exist for its own sake. Whether the self exists for its own sake and the non-self for the sake of another is settled by the presence or absence of that light. Therefore it is established that the self is the light of eternal consciousness, independent of anything else.
P 2.58	ननु एवं सति असति प्रमाश्रयत्वे, कथं प्रमातुः प्रमातृत्वम् ? ॥	But if this is so, and the self is not the seat of valid knowledge, how can the knower be a knower?
P 2.59	उच्यते— प्रमायाः नित्यत्वे अनित्यत्वे च रूपविशेषाभावात् । अवगतिर्हि प्रमा । तस्याः स्मृतीच्छादिपूर्विकायाः अनित्यायाः, कूटस्थनित्याया वा, न स्वरूपविशेषो विद्यते, यथा धात्वर्थस्य तिष्ठत्यादेः फलस्य गत्यादिपूर्वकस्य अनित्यस्य अपूर्वस्य नित्यस्य वा रूपविशेषो नास्तीति तुल्यो व्यपदेशो दृष्टः 'तिष्ठन्ति मनुष्याः' 'तिष्ठन्ति पर्वताः' इत्यादि, तथा नित्यावगतिस्वरूपेऽपि प्रमातरि प्रमातृत्वव्यपदेशो न विरुध्यते फलसामान्यादिति ॥	The answer is: valid knowledge has no difference of form whether it is eternal or transient. Valid knowledge is realization. Realization that is transient and preceded by memory, desire and the rest does not differ in its nature from realization that is changeless and eternal. Take the result denoted by a verbal root such as "stand." It has no difference of form whether it is transient and preceded by motion and the like, or eternal and preceded by nothing. So we see the same expression used in "people stand," "mountains stand," and so on. In the same way, there is no contradiction in calling

SANSKRIT

ENGLISH

the knower a knower, even though his nature is eternal realization, because the result is the same.

P 2.60 अत्राह शिष्यः— नित्यावगतिस्वरूपस्य आत्मनः अविक्रियत्वात् कार्यकरणैः असंहत्य तक्षादीनामिव वास्यादिभिः कर्तृत्वं नोपपद्यते । असंहतस्वभावस्य च कार्यकरणोपादाने अनवस्था प्रसज्येत । तक्षादीनां तु कार्यकरणैः नित्यमेव संहतत्वमिति वास्याद्युपादाने नानवस्था स्यादिति ॥

Here the pupil said: The self, whose nature is eternal realization, is free of change. So it cannot be an agent without being combined with body and senses, as a carpenter and others are agents with an adze and other tools. And if what is by nature uncombined were to take up body and senses, an infinite regress would follow. A carpenter and the like, however, are always already combined with body and senses, so no regress arises when they take up an adze and the rest.

P 2.61 इह तु असंहतस्वभावस्य करणानुपादाने कर्तृत्वं नोपपद्यत इति करणमुपादेयम्, तदुपादानमपि विक्रियैवेति तत्कर्तृत्वे करणान्तरमुपादेयम्, तदुपादानेऽपि अन्यदिति प्रमातुः स्वातन्त्र्ये अनवस्था अपरिहार्या स्यादिति । न च क्रियैव आत्मानं कारयति, अनिर्वर्तितायाः स्वरूपाभावात् । अथ अन्यत् आत्मानमुपेत्य क्रियां कारयतीति चेत्, न, अन्यस्य स्वतःसिद्धत्वाविषयत्वाद्यनुपपत्तेः । न हि आत्मनः अन्यत् अचेतनं वस्तु स्वप्रमाणकं दृष्टम् । शब्दादि सर्वमेव अवगतिफलावसानप्रत्ययप्रमितं सिद्धं स्यात् ।

In this case, though, one whose nature is uncombined cannot be an agent without taking up an instrument, so an instrument must be taken up. But taking it up is itself a change. So for that act another instrument must be taken up, and for taking that up yet another. If the knower is independent, then, the regress is unavoidable. Nor can action itself make the self act, since an action not yet brought about has no nature of its own. If you say that something else approaches the self and makes it act—no, because self-establishment, not being an object, and the like are impossible for anything other than the self. No unconscious thing other than the self has ever been seen to be its own means of knowledge. Sound and everything else would be established only as known by a cognition that ends in realization as its result.

अवगतिश्चेत् आत्मनोऽन्यस्य स्यात् सोऽपि आत्मैव असंहतः स्वार्थः स्यात्, न परार्थः । न च देहेन्द्रियविषयाणां स्वार्थताम् अवगन्तुं शक्नुमः अवगत्यवसानप्रत्ययापेक्षसिद्धिदर्शनात् ॥

If realization belonged to something other than the self, that too would be the self: uncombined, existing for its own sake and not for another's. We cannot regard the body, the senses or their objects as existing for their own sake, because we see that they are established only by depending on cognitions that end in realization.

P 2.62 ननु देहस्यावगतौ न कश्चित् प्रत्यक्षादिप्रत्ययान्तरमपेक्षते ॥

But surely, to know the body no one depends on any further cognition such as perception.

P 2.63 बाढम्, जाग्रति एव स्यात् । मृतिसुषुप्तयोस्तु देहस्यापि प्रत्यक्षादिप्रमाणापेक्षैव सिद्धिः । तथैव इन्द्रियाणाम् । बाह्या एव हि शब्दादयो देहेन्द्रियाकारपरिणता इति प्रत्यक्षादिप्रमाणापेक्षैव हि सिद्धिः । सिद्धिरिति च प्रमाणफलमवगतिमवोचाम, सा च अवगतिः कूटस्था स्वयंसिद्धात्मज्योतिःस्वरूपेति च ॥

Quite so, but only in the waking state. In death and in deep sleep, even the body is established only by depending on means of knowledge such as perception, and so are the senses. Sound and the rest are external, and they have been transformed into the shapes of the body and the senses. Therefore they are established only by depending on means of knowledge such as perception. By "established" we have meant realization, the result of the means

SANSKRIT

ENGLISH

of knowledge. We have also said that this realization is changeless and self-established, and that its nature is the light of the self.

P 2.64 अत्राह चोदकः— अवगतिः प्रमाणानां फलं कूटस्थनित्यात्मज्योतिःस्वरूपेति च विप्रतिषिद्धम् । इत्युक्तवन्तमाह— न विप्रतिषिद्धम् । कथं तर्ह्यवगतेः फलत्वम् ? तत्त्वोपचारात् । कूटस्था नित्यापि सती प्रत्यक्षादिप्रत्ययान्ते लक्ष्यते तादर्थ्यात् । प्रत्यक्षादिप्रत्ययस्य अनित्यत्वे अनित्येव भवति । तेन प्रमाणानां फलमित्युपचर्यते ॥

Here an objector says: That realization is the result of the means of knowledge, and that its nature is the changeless, eternal light of the self—these two claims contradict each other. To one who says this, the reply is: There is no contradiction. How then is realization a result? It is called a result figuratively. Though it is changeless and eternal, it is noticed at the end of cognitions such as perception, because these exist for its sake. Since cognitions such as perception are transient, it appears transient. Therefore it is figuratively called the result of the means of knowledge.

P 2.65 यद्येवं भगवन्, कूटस्थनित्यावगतिः आत्मज्योतिःस्वरूपैव स्वयंसिद्धा, आत्मनि प्रमाणनिरपेक्षत्वात्, ततोऽन्यत् अचेतनं संहत्यकारित्वात् परार्थम् । येन च सुखदुःखमोहहेतुप्रत्ययावगतिरूपेण पारार्थ्यम्, तेनैव स्वरूपेण अनात्मनः अस्तित्वं नान्येन रूपान्तरेण । अतो नास्तित्वमेव परमार्थतः । यथा हि लोके रज्जुसर्पमरीच्युदकादीनां तदवगतिव्यतिरेकेण अभावो दृष्टः, एवं जाग्रत्स्वप्नद्वैतभावस्यापि तदवगतिव्यतिरेकेण अभावो युक्तः । एवमेव परमार्थतः भगवन्, अवगतेः आत्मज्योतिषः नैरन्तर्यभावात् कूटस्थनित्यता अद्वैतभावश्च, सर्वप्रत्ययभेदेषु अव्यभिचारात् । प्रत्ययभेदाश्च अवगतिं व्यभिचरन्ति ।

If this is so, venerable sir, then realization that is changeless and eternal is self-established, its nature being the light of the self, since in the self it depends on no means of knowledge. Everything else is unconscious and exists for the sake of another, because it acts only in combination. The non-self exists only in the form in which it serves another, as the realization of cognitions that cause pleasure, pain and delusion, and in no other form. Therefore, in the highest truth, it does not exist at all. In the world we see that the snake in the rope, the water in the mirage and the like do not exist apart from the realization of them. In the same way it is right that the duality of waking and dream also does not exist apart from the realization of it. In just this way, venerable sir, in the highest truth, realization, the light of the self, is uninterrupted, and so it is changeless, eternal and without a second, because it never varies in any of the different cognitions. The different cognitions, however, vary with respect to realization.[35]

यथा स्वप्ने नीलपीताद्याकारभेदरूपाः प्रत्ययाः तदवगतिं व्यभिचरन्तः परमार्थतो न सन्तीत्युच्यन्ते, एवं जाग्रत्यपि । नीलपीतादिप्रत्ययभेदाः तामेवावगतिं व्यभिचरन्तः असत्यरूपाः भवितुम् अर्हन्ति । तस्याश्च अवगतेरन्यः अवगन्ता नास्तीति न स्वेन स्वरूपेण स्वयमुपादातुं हातुं वा शक्यते, अन्यस्य च अभावात् ॥

In dream, the cognitions that take various forms such as blue and yellow are said not to exist in the highest truth, because they vary while that realization does not. The same is true in waking. The various cognitions of blue, yellow and the like vary with respect to that same realization, and so they must be unreal in form. There is no realizer of that realization other than itself, so it cannot

35 The rope and the snake are a stock image: a rope seen in dim light is taken for a snake, and the snake has no existence apart from that mistaken awareness. The mirage is a parallel example.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
		take itself up or let itself go by its own nature, and there is nothing else that could do so.
P 2.66	तथैवेति । एषा अविद्या यन्निमित्तः संसारो जाग्रत्स्वप्नलक्षणः । तस्या अविद्याया विद्या निवर्तिका । इत्येवं त्वम् अभयं प्राप्नोषि, नातः परं जाग्रत्स्वप्नदुःखमनुभविष्यसि । संसारदुःखान्मुक्तोऽसीति ॥	It is just so. This is ignorance, the cause of the round of rebirth that consists in waking and dream. Knowledge is what removes that ignorance. In this way you reach fearlessness. From now on you will not experience the suffering of waking and dream. You are freed from the suffering of the round of rebirth.
P 2.67	ओमिति ॥	"Om."[36]

CHAPTER 3: MEDITATION BY ENUMERATION

A meditation reflecting that sounds, touches and other objects cannot touch the self.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
P 3.1	मुमुक्षूणाम् उपात्तपुण्यापुण्यक्षपणपराणामपूर्वानुपचयार्थिनां परिसंख्यानमिदमुच्यते— अविद्याहेतवो दोषाः वाङ्मनःकायप्रवृत्तिहेतवः, प्रवृत्तेश्च इष्टानिष्टमिश्रफलानि कर्माणि उपचीयन्ते इति तन्मोक्षार्थम् ॥	For those who seek liberation, who are intent on exhausting the merit and demerit they have already acquired and who wish to accumulate no new ones, this meditation of reckoning is taught. The faults that arise from ignorance give rise to activity of speech, mind and body. Through activity, actions accumulate whose fruits are desired, undesired or mixed. This meditation is taught for liberation from them.[37]
P 3.2	तत्र शब्दस्पर्शरूपरसगन्धानां विषयाणां श्रोत्रादिग्राह्यत्वात् स्वात्मनि परेषु वा विज्ञानाभावः । तेषामेव परिणतानां यथा लोष्टादीनाम् । श्रोत्रादिद्वारैश्च ज्ञायन्ते । येन च ज्ञायन्ते स ज्ञातृत्वात् अतज्जातीयः । ते हि शब्दादयः अन्योन्यसंसर्गित्वात् जन्मवृद्धिविपरिणामापक्षयनाशसंयोगवियोगाविर्भावतिरोभावविकारविकारिक्षेत्रबीजाद्यनेकधर्माणः, सामान्येन च सुखदुःखाद्यनेककर्माणः तद्विज्ञातृत्वादेव तद्विज्ञाता सर्वशब्दादिधर्मविलक्षणः ॥	Now, the objects of the senses are sound, touch, form, taste and smell. They are grasped by the ear and the other senses, so they have no awareness either of themselves or of anything else. In this they are like clods of earth and the like, which are transformations of these same objects. They are known through the ear and the other senses, which serve as doors. That by which they are known is the knower, and so it is of a different kind from them. Sound and the rest combine with one another, and so they have many attributes. These include birth, growth, transformation, decline and destruction; conjunction and disjunction; appearance and disappearance; being a modification and being modified; and being field and seed. In general they also have many effects, such as pleasure and pain. Their knower, simply because it is their knower, is distinct from all the attributes of sound and the rest.

36 Om is the sacred syllable, used here as an expression of assent.
37 The "meditation of reckoning" (*parisaṃkhyāna*, literally "reckoning up") is a reflection in which one distinguishes oneself, point by point, from the objects of the senses.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
P 3.3	तत्र शब्दादिभिः उपलभ्यमानैः पीड्यमानो विद्वान् एवं परिसंचक्षीत ॥	Then the one who knows, when afflicted by sound and the other objects as they are perceived, should reflect as follows:
P 3.4	शब्दस्तु ध्वनिसामान्यमात्रेण वा विशेषधर्मैर्वा षड्जादिभिः प्रियैः स्तुत्यादिभिः इष्टैः अनिष्टैश्च असत्यबीभत्सपरिभवाक्रोशादिभिः वचनैर्वा मां दृक्स्वभावमसंसर्गिणमविक्रियमचलमनिधनमभयमत्यन्तसूक्ष्मविषयं गोचरीकृत्य स्प्रष्टुं नैवार्हति, असंसर्गित्वादेव माम् । अत एव न शब्दनिमित्ता हानिः वृद्धिर्वा । अतो मां किं करिष्यति स्तुतिनिन्दादिप्रियाप्रियत्वादिलक्षणः शब्दः । अविवेकिनं हि शब्दमात्मत्वेन गतं प्रियः शब्दो वर्धयेत् अप्रियश्च क्षपयेत्, अविवेकित्वात् । न तु मम विवेकिनो वालाग्रमात्रमपि कर्तुमुत्सहते इति ।	Sound may come as mere sound in general, or with particular qualities such as the note *ṣaḍja*. It may come as words that are pleasant and welcome, such as praise, or as words that are unwelcome, such as falsehood, coarse talk, insult and abuse. In none of these forms can it make me its object and touch me. My nature is seeing; I am free of contact, free of change, unmoving, deathless and fearless, utterly subtle, and no object. It cannot touch me, simply because I am free of contact. For this very reason sound brings me neither loss nor gain. So what can sound do to me, whether it is praise or blame, pleasant or unpleasant? A pleasant sound might exalt a person who does not discriminate and has taken sound to be his self, and an unpleasant one might diminish him, because he does not discriminate. But to me, who discriminate, it cannot do even as much as the tip of a hair.[38]
	एवमेव स्पर्शसामान्येन तद्विशेषैश्च शीतोष्णमृदुकर्कशादिज्वरोदरशूलादिलक्षणैश्च अप्रियैः प्रियैश्च कैश्चित् शरीरसमवायिभिः बाह्यागन्तुकनिमित्तैश्च न मम काचित् विक्रिया वृद्धिहानिलक्षणा अस्पर्शत्वात् क्रियते, व्योम्न इव मुष्टिघातादिभिः । तथा रूपसामान्येन तद्विशेषैश्च प्रियाप्रियैः स्त्रीव्यञ्जनादिलक्षणैः अरूपत्वात् न मम काचित् हानिः वृद्धिर्वा क्रियते । तथा रससामान्येन तद्विशेषैश्च प्रियाप्रियैः मधुराम्ललवणकटुतिक्तकषायैः मूढबुद्धिभिः परिगृहीतैः अरसात्मकस्य मम न काचित् हानिः वृद्धिर्वा क्रियते ।	In the same way, touch can bring about no change in me, whether gain or loss, because I am without touch. This holds for touch in general and for its particular forms, such as cold and heat, softness and harshness. It holds for the pleasant and unpleasant ones, such as fever and stomach pain. It holds both for those that belong to the body and for those that arise from external, incidental causes. Touch can no more change me than blows of the fist can change the sky. Likewise form can bring me no loss or gain, because I am without form. This holds for form in general and for its particulars, pleasant and unpleasant, such as a woman's features. Likewise taste can bring no loss or gain to me, whose nature is without taste. This holds for taste in general and for its particulars, pleasant and unpleasant: sweet, sour, salty, pungent, bitter and astringent, which people of deluded intellect cling to.
	तथा गन्धसामान्येन तद्विशेषैः प्रियाप्रियैः पुष्पाद्यनुलेपनादिलक्षणैः अगन्धात्मकस्य न मम काचित् हानिः वृद्धिर्वा क्रियते, 'अशब्दमस्पर्शमरूपमव्ययं तथारसं नित्यमगन्धवच्च यत्' इति श्रुतेः ॥	Likewise smell can bring no loss or gain to me, whose nature is without smell. This holds for smell in general and for its particulars, pleasant and unpleasant, such as the scent of flowers or of ointments. For scripture says: "That which is

38 *Ṣaḍja* is the first note of the Indian musical scale.

SANSKRIT

ENGLISH

without sound, without touch, without form, imperishable, likewise without taste, eternal, and without smell."[39]

P 3.5 किं च— ये एव बाह्याः शब्दादयः ते शरीराकारेण संस्थिताः, तत्परिमाणरूपैस्तद्ग्राहकैश्च श्रोत्राद्याकारैः, अन्तःकरणद्वयतद्विषयाकारेण च, तेषामन्योन्यसंसर्गित्वात् संहतत्वाच्च सर्वक्रियासु । तत्रैवं सति विदुषो न मम कश्चित् शत्रुः मित्रम् उदासीनो वा अस्ति । तत्र यदि कश्चित् मिथ्याज्ञानाभिमानेन प्रियमप्रियं वा प्रयुयुक्षेत क्रियाफललक्षणं तन्मृषैव प्रयुयुक्षते सः, तस्याविषयत्वान्मम, 'अव्यक्तोऽयमचिन्त्योऽयम्' इति स्मृतेः । तथा सर्वेषां पञ्चानामपि भूतानामविकार्यः, अविषयत्वात्, 'अच्छेद्योऽयमदाह्योऽयम्' इति स्मृतेः ।

Moreover, it is the external objects themselves, sound and the rest, that are arranged in the form of the body. They are also arranged in the form of the ear and the other senses, which match them in measure and grasp them, and in the form of the two inner faculties and their objects. This is because they combine with one another and are joined together in every activity. This being so, for me, the one who knows, there is no enemy, no friend and no one indifferent. If anyone, from the conceit of false knowledge, should try to bring something pleasant or unpleasant upon me in the form of the fruit of an action, he tries in vain, because I am not his object. As tradition says: "This is unmanifest, this is unthinkable." Likewise none of the five elements can change me, because I am not their object. As tradition says: "This cannot be cut, this cannot be burned."[40]

यापि शरीरेन्द्रियसंस्थानमात्रमुपलक्ष्य मद्भक्तानां विपरीतानां च प्रियाप्रियादिप्रयुयुक्षा, तज्जा च धर्माधर्मादिप्राप्तिः, सा तेषामेव, न तु मयि अजरे अमृते अभये, 'नैनं कृताकृते तपतः' 'न वर्धते कर्मणा नो कनीयान्' 'सबाह्याभ्यन्तरो ह्यजः' 'न लिप्यते लोकदुःखेन बाह्यः' इत्यादिश्रुतिभ्यः । अनात्मवस्तुनश्च असत्त्वं परमो हेतुः । आत्मनश्च अद्वयत्वे, द्वयस्य असत्त्वात्, यानि सर्वाणि उपनिषद्वाक्यानि विस्तरशः समीक्षितव्यानि समीक्षितव्यानि ॥

Those devoted to me, and those opposed to me, may wish to bring pleasant or unpleasant things upon me, taking note only of the arrangement of body and senses, and from this they may acquire merit and demerit and the like. All this belongs to them alone. It does not belong to me, who am ageless, deathless and fearless. For the scriptures say: "What he has done and what he has left undone do not torment him," "It does not grow greater by action, nor smaller," "For it is unborn, within and without," "Being outside it, it is not stained by the suffering of the world," and so on. The ultimate reason is that what is not the self does not exist. All the sentences of the Upanishads that teach that the self is without a second, since duality does not exist, should be examined in detail—should be examined.[41]

39 Katha Upanishad 3.15.
40 Bhagavad Gita 2.25 and 2.24.
41 Brihadaranyaka Upanishad 4.4.22 and 4.4.23; Mundaka Upanishad 2.1.2; Katha Upanishad 5.11.

Verse Part

पद्यप्रबन्धः *(Padyaprabandha)*

Nineteen chapters of verse on the self as pure seeing, the error of agency, the sentence "you are that," and the remedy for ignorance.

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Homage to consciousness; knowledge, not ritual action, removes the ignorance at the root of rebirth.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
V 1.1	चैतन्यं सर्वगं सर्वं सर्वभूतगुहाशयम् । / यत्सर्वविषयातीतं तस्मै सर्वविदे नमः ॥	To that consciousness which pervades all and is all, which dwells in the hidden depth of every being and lies beyond every object—to that all-knowing one, homage.
V 1.2	समापय्य क्रियाः सर्वा दाराग्न्याधानपूर्विकाः । / ब्रह्मविद्यामथेदानीं वक्तुं वेदः प्रचक्रमे ॥	Having completed all the rites, beginning with taking a wife and establishing the sacred fires, the Veda now sets out to teach the knowledge of *brahman*.[1]
V 1.3	कर्माणि देहयोगार्थं देहयोगे प्रियाप्रिये । / ध्रुवे स्यातां ततो रागो द्वेषश्चैव ततः क्रियाः ॥	Actions bring about union with a body. Once there is union with a body, pleasant and unpleasant things are inevitable. From these come desire and aversion, and from these come actions.
V 1.4	धर्माधर्मौ ततोऽज्ञस्य देहयोगस्तथा पुनः । / एवं नित्यप्रवृत्तोऽयं संसारश्चक्रवद्धृशम् ॥	From actions come merit and demerit for the ignorant person, and from these, once again, union with a body. In this way the round of rebirth rolls on without ceasing, with great force, like a wheel.
V 1.5	अज्ञानं तस्य मूलं स्यादिति तद्धानमिष्यते । / ब्रह्मविद्यात आरब्धा ततो निःश्रेयसं भवेत् ॥	Since ignorance is its root, the removal of ignorance is what is sought. That is why the knowledge of *brahman* has been taken up, for from it the highest good will follow.[2]
V 1.6	विद्यैवाज्ञानहानाय न कर्माप्रतिकूलतः । / नाज्ञानस्याप्रहाणे हि रागद्वेषक्षयो भवेत् ॥	Only knowledge removes ignorance. Action does not, because it is not opposed to ignorance, and unless ignorance is removed, desire and aversion do not come to an end.
V 1.7	रागद्वेषक्षयाभावे कर्म दोषोद्भवं ध्रुवम् । / तस्मान्निःश्रेयसार्थाय विद्यैवात्र विधीयते ॥	As long as desire and aversion have not ended, action arising from these faults is certain. Therefore knowledge alone is enjoined here for the sake of the highest good.
V 1.8		

1 *brahman*, the absolute, the ground of all that is; not to be confused with Brahmā, the creator god.
2 Ignorance (*ajñāna, avidyā*) is not a lack of facts but the misidentification of the self with what it is not.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
	ननु कर्म तथा नित्यं कर्तव्यं जीवने सति । / विद्यायाः सहकारित्वं मोक्षं प्रति हि तद्व्रजेत् ॥	But surely the regular obligatory rites must still be performed as long as one lives, for they would then serve knowledge as an aid toward liberation.
V 1.9	यथा विद्या तथा कर्म चोदितत्वाविशेषतः । / प्रत्यवायस्मृतेश्चैव कार्यं कर्म मुमुक्षुभिः ॥	Action is enjoined just as knowledge is, with no difference in that respect, and tradition speaks of the fault incurred by neglecting it. Therefore those who seek liberation must perform action.
V 1.10	ननु ध्रुवफला विद्या नान्यत्किंचिदपेक्षते । / नाग्निष्टोमो यथैवान्यद्ध्रुवकार्योऽप्यपेक्षते ॥	"But knowledge, whose result is certain, depends on nothing else." Not so: the Agnishtoma, too, has a certain effect, and yet it depends on other things.[3]
V 1.11	तथा ध्रुवफला विद्या कर्म नित्यमपेक्षते । / इत्येवं केचिदिच्छन्ति न कर्म प्रतिकूलतः ॥	In the same way knowledge, though its result is certain, depends on regular obligatory action. So some maintain. Not so, because action is opposed to knowledge.
V 1.12	विद्यायाः प्रतिकूलं हि कर्म स्यात्साभिमानतः । / निर्विकारात्मबुद्धिश्च विद्येतीह प्रकीर्तिता ॥	Action is opposed to knowledge because it carries the sense of "I" and "mine," and here knowledge is declared to be the understanding that the self is free of change.[4]
V 1.13	अहं कर्ता ममेदं स्यादिति कर्म प्रवर्तते । / वस्त्वधीना भवेद्विद्या कर्त्रधीनो भवेद्विधिः ॥	Action sets in with the thought, "I am the doer; this will be mine." Knowledge depends on the thing as it is. An injunction depends on the doer.
V 1.14	कारकाण्युपमृद्नाति विद्या बुद्धिमिवोषरे । / तत्सत्यमतिमादाय कर्म कर्तुं व्यवस्यति ॥	Knowledge destroys the factors of action, just as it destroys the notion of water on a salt flat. Only someone who takes these factors to be real resolves to perform action.[5]
V 1.15	विरुद्धत्वादतः शक्यं कर्म कर्तुं न विद्यया । / सहैव विदुषा तस्मात्कर्म हेयं मुमुक्षुणा ॥	Because the two are contradictory, action cannot be performed together with knowledge. Therefore the knower who seeks liberation must give up action.
V 1.16	देहाद्यैरविशेषेण देहिनो ग्रहणं निजम् । / प्राणिनां तदविद्योत्थं तावत्कर्मविधिर्भवेत् ॥	Living beings naturally take the embodied one to be no different from the body and the rest. This arises from ignorance, and as long as it lasts, the injunction to act applies.
V 1.17	नेति नेतीति देहादीनपोह्यात्मावशेषितः । / निर्विशेषात्मभानार्थं तेनाविद्या निवर्तिता ॥	When the body and the rest have been negated with "not this, not this," the self is left remaining, so that the self free of all distinctions may come to light. By this, ignorance is dispelled.[6]

3 The Agniṣṭoma is a major Vedic soma sacrifice, performed by many priests together with numerous accessory rites.
4 *ātman*, one's own inmost being, the witness that is pure awareness.
5 The "factors of action" (*kāraka*) are the agent, instrument, object and the like that every action presupposes. On barren salt ground a mirage is mistaken for water.
6 Brihadaranyaka Upanishad 2.3.6: the Upanishad's formula for *brahman*, which can be described only by negating every attribute.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
V 1.18	निवृत्ता सा कथं भूयः प्रसूयेत प्रमाणतः । / असत्येवाविशेषेऽपि प्रत्यगात्मनि केवले ॥	Once ignorance has been removed by a means of knowledge, how could it arise again? It does not exist at all in the inner self, which is alone and free of distinctions.
V 1.19	न चेद्भूयः प्रसूयेत कर्ता भोक्तेति धीः कथम् । / सदस्मीति च विज्ञाने तस्माद्विद्यासहायिका ॥	And if it does not arise again, how could the thought "I am a doer, an enjoyer" occur once one knows "I am being"? Therefore knowledge needs no helper.
V 1.20	अत्यरेचयदित्युक्तो न्यासः श्रुत्यात एव हि । / कर्मभ्यो मानसान्तेभ्य एतावदिति वाजिनाम् ॥	For this very reason scripture teaches the renunciation of actions, up to and including mental ones, saying that renunciation "surpassed" them. And in the text of the Vajasaneyins it says, "This much ..."[7]
V 1.21	अमृतत्वं श्रुतं तस्मात्त्याज्यं कर्म मुमुक्षुभिः । / अग्निष्टोमवदित्युक्तं तत्रेदमभिधीयते ॥	"... is immortality." Therefore those who seek liberation must give up action. To the claim that knowledge is like the Agnishtoma, the reply is as follows.
V 1.22	नैककारकसाध्यत्वात्फलान्यत्वाच्च कर्मणः । / विद्या तद्विपरीतातो दृष्टान्तो विषमो भवेत् ॥	Action is accomplished by many factors, and its result is something other than itself. Knowledge is the opposite of this. Hence the analogy does not fit.
V 1.23	कृष्यादिवत्फलार्थत्वादन्यकर्मोपबृंहणम् । / अग्निष्टोमस्त्वपेक्षेत विद्यान्यत्किमपेक्षते ॥	Since the Agnishtoma, like farming and similar work, aims at a result, it may require the support of other actions. But what else would knowledge require?
V 1.24	प्रत्यवायस्तु तस्यैव यस्याहंकार इष्यते । / अहंकारफलार्थित्वे विद्येते नात्मवेदिनः ॥	The fault of omission applies only to one in whom ego is assumed. Neither ego nor the desire for results exists in one who knows the self.[8]
V 1.25	तस्मादज्ञानहानाय संसारविनिवृत्तये । / ब्रह्मविद्याविधानाय प्रारब्धोपनिषत्त्वियम् ॥	Therefore this Upanishad has been begun to remove ignorance, to bring the round of rebirth to an end, and to set forth the knowledge of *brahman*.
V 1.26	सदेरुपनिपूर्वस्य क्विपि चोपनिषद्भवेत् । / मन्दीकरणभावाच्च गर्भादिः शातनात्तथा ॥	The word *upaniṣad* comes from the root *sad* with the prefixes *upa* and *ni* and the suffix *kvip*. It is so called because it loosens, and also because it destroys, entry into the womb and the rest.[9]

7 Mahanarayana Upanishad 78–79 says that renunciation "surpassed" the lower austerities. The Vajasaneyins, followers of the White Yajurveda, transmit the Brihadaranyaka Upanishad (4.5.15).
8 *ahaṃkāra*, the ego, literally "the I-maker."
9 Shankara takes the root *sad* in its senses "to loosen" and "to destroy." *Kvip* is the grammarians' name for a suffix that leaves the bare root standing as a noun.

CHAPTER 2: HOW KNOWLEDGE OF THE SELF ARISES

The self is what remains after "not this, not this," grasped directly as "I am not this."

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
V 2.1	प्रतिषेद्धुमशक्यत्वान्नेति नेतीति शेषितम् । / इदं नाहमिदं नाहमित्यद्धा प्रतिपद्यते ॥	Because it cannot be negated, the self is what remains after "not this, not this." One grasps it directly in the thought, "I am not this, I am not this."
V 2.2	अहंधीरिदमात्मोत्था वाचारम्भणगोचरा । / निषिद्धात्मोद्भवत्वात्सा न पुनर्मानतां व्रजेत् ॥	The notion "I" springs from a self taken as "this," and it falls within the range of what is "a matter of words." Because it springs from a self that has been negated, it can never again count as a means of knowledge.[10]
V 2.3	पूर्वबुद्धिमबाधित्वा नोत्तरा जायते मतिः । / दृशिरेकः स्वयं सिद्धः फलत्वात्स न बाध्यते ॥	A later cognition does not arise without canceling the earlier one. But awareness that sees is one and self-established, and because it is the very result of knowing, it is never canceled.
V 2.4	इदं वनमतिक्रम्य शोकमोहादिदूषितम् । / वनाद्गान्धारको यद्वत्स्वात्मानं प्रतिपद्यते ॥	Passing beyond this forest, spoiled by grief, delusion and the rest, one arrives at one's own self, just as the man of Gandhara made his way out of the forest to his home.[11]

CHAPTER 3: THE LORD IS THE SELF

If the Lord is the self, knowing "I am the Lord" removes the notion that he is other.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
V 3.1	ईश्वरश्चेदनात्मा स्यान्नासावस्मीति धारयेत् । / आत्मा चेदीश्वरोऽस्मीति विद्या सान्यनिवर्तिका ॥	If the Lord were other than the self, one should not hold the thought, "I am he." If he is the self, the knowledge "I am the Lord" removes the notion that he is other.
V 3.2	आत्मनोऽन्यस्य चेद्धर्मा अस्थूलत्वादयो मताः । / अज्ञेयत्वेऽस्य किं तैः स्यादात्मत्वे त्वन्यधीहृतिः ॥	If attributes such as "not coarse" were held to belong to something other than the self, what use would they be, since that thing would be unknowable? But if they belong to the self, they remove the notion that it is something other.[12]
V 3.3	मिथ्याध्यासनिषेधार्थं ततोऽस्थूलादि गृह्यताम् । / परत्र चेन्निषेधार्थं शून्यतावर्णनं हि तत् ॥	Hence "not coarse" and the rest should be understood as negating false superimposition. If they served to negate something in a being other than the self, they would amount to a description of emptiness.[13]
V 3.4		And if the negation were meant to apply to something other than the inner self of the one who

10 Chandogya Upanishad 6.1.4: every modification of clay is "a matter of words," a mere name; only the clay is real.
11 Chandogya Upanishad 6.14: a man led blindfolded from Gandhara and abandoned in the wilderness finds his way home once someone tells him the way. The Upanishad uses this as its image of the teacher.
12 Brihadaranyaka Upanishad 3.8.8 describes the imperishable as "not coarse, not fine, not short, not long."

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
	बुभुत्सोर्यदि चान्यत्र प्रत्यगात्मन इष्यते । / अप्राणो ह्यमनाः शुभ्र इति चानर्थकं वचः ॥	seeks to know, then the words "without breath, without mind, pure" would be meaningless.[14]

CHAPTER 4: THE NATURE OF KNOWING THE TRUTH

Action springs from the notion "I"; once that seed is burned, it cannot sprout again.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
V 4.1	अहंप्रत्ययबीजं यदहंप्रत्ययवत्स्थितम् । / नाहंप्रत्ययवद्दग्धं कथं कर्म प्ररोहति ॥	Action has the notion "I" for its seed and abides in one who has that notion. Once it has been burned and that notion is gone, how could it sprout?
V 4.2	दृष्टवच्चेत्प्ररोहः स्यान्नान्यकर्मा स इष्यते । / तन्निरोधे कथं तत्स्यात्पृच्छामो वस्तदुच्यताम् ॥	If you say it does sprout, as we see it do, then, since it is not held to come from anything else, how could it arise once its seed has been stopped? We ask you: tell us that.
V 4.3	देहाद्यारम्भसामर्थ्याज्ज्ञानं सद्विषयं त्वयि । / अभिभूय फलं कुर्यात्कर्मान्ते ज्ञानमुद्भवेत् ॥	Because action has the power to bring about a body and the rest, it may overpower the knowledge in you whose object is being and produce its result. When the action is spent, knowledge would emerge.
V 4.4	आरब्धस्य फले ह्येते भोगो ज्ञानं च कर्मणः । / अविरोधस्तयोर्युक्तो वैधर्म्यं चेतरस्य तु ॥	Both experience and knowledge are results of action that has already begun, so it is reasonable that they do not conflict. Action of the other kind, however, is different in nature.[15]
V 4.5	देहात्मज्ञानवज्ज्ञानं देहात्मज्ञानबाधकम् । आत्मन्येव भवेद्यस्य स नेच्छन्नपि मुच्यते । ततः सर्वमिदं सिद्धं प्रयोगोऽस्माभिरीरितः ॥	Whoever has knowledge in the self alone, a knowledge like the knowledge "the body is the self" but one that cancels it, is liberated even without wishing to be. Thus all this is established. We have set forth the argument.

CHAPTER 5: THE FAULT LIES IN THE INTELLECT

Abiding in the intellect, the self seems to move and think, as trees seem to move from a boat.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
V 5.1	मूत्राशङ्को यथोदङ्को नाग्रहीदमृतं यथा । / कर्मनाशभयाज्जन्तोरात्मज्ञानाग्रहस्तथा ॥	Just as Udanka, suspecting it was urine, would not take the nectar of immortality, so people do not accept knowledge of the self, for fear that their action will be destroyed.[16]
V 5.2	बुद्धिस्थश्चलतीवात्मा ध्यायतीव च दृश्यते । / नौगतस्य यथा वृक्षास्तद्वत्संसारविभ्रमः ॥	Abiding in the intellect, the self appears to move and appears to think, just as trees appear to move

13 Superimposition: taking one thing for another, as when mother-of-pearl is seen as silver or a rope as a snake.
14 Mundaka Upanishad 2.1.2.
15 Action that has already begun to bear fruit (*prārabdha*) is held to sustain the body even of one who knows, until it is spent.
16 In a Mahabharata story the god Indra, in disguise, offered the sage Udanka the nectar of immortality as if it were urine, and Udanka refused it.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
		to someone in a boat. Such is the delusion of the round of rebirth.
V 5.3	नौस्थस्य प्रातिलोम्येन नगानां गमनं यथा । / आत्मनः संसृतिस्तद्वद्ध्यायतीवेति हि श्रुतिः ॥	Just as, to someone in a boat, the trees seem to move in the opposite direction, so the self seems to pass from birth to birth. For scripture says, "it seems to think."[17]
V 5.4	चैतन्यप्रतिबिम्बेन व्याप्तो बोधो हि जायते । / बुद्धेः शब्दादिनिर्भासस्तेन मोमुह्यते जगत् ॥	The intellect's awareness, which shows forth sound and the other objects, arises pervaded by the reflection of consciousness, and this is what so deeply deludes the world.
V 5.5	चैतन्यभास्यताहमस्तादर्थ्यं च तदस्य यत् । / इदमंशप्रहाणे न परः सोऽनुभवो भवेत् ॥	The "I" is lit up by consciousness and exists for its sake. When the part that is "this" is removed, that experience is the supreme itself.

CHAPTER 6: SETTING ASIDE THE QUALIFICATIONS

Every qualifier of the self is like a severed hand; the knower is free of them all.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
V 6.1	छित्त्वा त्यक्तेन हस्तेन स्वयं नात्मा विशेष्यते । / तथा शिष्टेन सर्वेण येन येन विशेष्यते ॥	A hand cut off and thrown away no longer qualifies the self. The same holds for everything else that remains, whatever it may be that qualifies it.
V 6.2	तस्मात्त्यक्तेन हस्तेन तुल्यं सर्वं विशेषणम् । / अनात्मत्वेन तस्माज्ज्ञो मुक्तः सर्वैर्विशेषणैः ॥	Therefore every qualifier is just like the hand that was thrown away, because it is not the self. Therefore the knower is free of all qualifiers.
V 6.3	विशेषणमिदं सर्वं साध्वलंकरणं यथा । / अविद्यास्तमतः सर्वं ज्ञात आत्मन्यसद्भवेत् ॥	All these qualifiers are like a fine ornament put on by ignorance. Therefore, once the self is known, all of them become unreal.
V 6.4	ज्ञातैवात्मा सदा ग्राह्यो ज्ञेयमुत्सृज्य केवलः । / अहमित्यपि यद्ग्राह्यं व्यपेताङ्गसमं हि तत् ॥	The self is always to be grasped as the knower alone, setting aside what is known. Even what is grasped as "I" is like a limb that has been removed.
V 6.5	यावान्स्यादिदमंशो यः स स्वतोऽन्यो विशेषणम् । / विशेषप्रक्षयो यत्र सिद्धो ज्ञश्चित्रगुर्यथा ॥	Whatever is the part that is "this," however large, is a qualifier distinct from oneself. Where all distinctions have vanished, the knower is established, as with Chitragu, "the man of the dappled cows."[18]
V 6.6	इदमंशोऽहमित्यत्र त्याज्यो नात्मेति पण्डितैः । / अहं ब्रह्मेति शिष्टांशो भूतपूर्वगतेर्भवेत् ॥	In the word "I," the wise should discard the part that is "this" as not the self. In "I am *brahman*," it is the remaining part that is meant, the word being applied on the strength of its former use.[19]

17 Brihadaranyaka Upanishad 4.3.7.

18 *Citragu*, "one whose cows are dappled," is the grammarians' stock example of a compound that names something other than its parts: the owner, not the cows.

CHAPTER 7: WHAT IS MOUNTED ON THE INTELLECT

Everything in every intellect is seen by me, so I am the all-knowing, supreme brahman.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
V 7.1	बुद्ध्यारूढं सदा सर्वं दृश्यते यत्र तत्र वा । / मया तस्मात्परं ब्रह्म सर्वज्ञश्चास्मि सर्वगः ॥	Everything that has entered the intellect, wherever it may be, is always seen by me. Therefore I am the supreme *brahman*, all-knowing and all-pervading.
V 7.2	यथात्मबुद्धिचाराणां साक्षी तद्वत्परेष्वपि । / नैवापोढुं न चादातुं शक्यस्तस्मात्परो ह्यहम् ॥	As I am the witness of the movements of my own intellect, so I am of others' as well. I can be neither removed nor taken up. Therefore I am the supreme.
V 7.3	विकारित्वमशुद्धत्वं भौतिकत्वं न चात्मनः । / अशेषबुद्धिसाक्षित्वाद्बुद्धिवन्नाल्पवेदना ॥	The self is subject to neither change, impurity nor materiality, because it is the witness of every intellect, and its awareness is not limited as an intellect's is.
V 7.4	मणौ प्रकाश्यते यद्वद्रक्ताद्याकारतातपे । / मयि संदृश्यते सर्वमातपेनेव तन्मया ॥	Just as, in sunlight, a gem shows forms such as red, so everything is seen in me, made visible by me as by sunlight.
V 7.5	बुद्धौ दृश्यं भवेद्बुद्धौ सत्यां नास्ति विपर्यये । / द्रष्टा यस्मात्सदा द्रष्टा तस्माद्वैतं न विद्यते ॥	What is seen exists in the intellect when the intellect exists, and not otherwise. Since the seer is always the seer, there is no duality.
V 7.6	अविवेकात्पराभावं यथा बुद्धिरवेत्तथा । / विवेकात्तु परादन्यः स्वयं चापि न विद्यते ॥	Just as the intellect, failing to discriminate, takes the supreme to be nonexistent, so through discrimination it finds that nothing other than the supreme exists, not even itself.

CHAPTER 8: DISSOLVING THE MIND

The self tells the mind that its restless doings bring nothing to pure consciousness.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
V 8.1	चितिः स्वरूपं स्वत एव मे मते रसादियोगस्तव मोहकारितः । / अतो न किंचित्तव चेष्टितेन मे फलं भवेत्सर्वविशेषहानतः ॥	Mind, my own nature is simply consciousness. Your connection with tastes and the other objects is the work of delusion. So nothing at all comes to me from your doings, for I am free of every distinction.[20]
V 8.2	विमुच्य मायामयकार्यतामिह प्रशान्तिमायाह्यसदीहितात्सदा । / अहं परं ब्रह्म सदा विमुक्तिमत्तथाजमेकं द्वयवर्जितं यतः ॥	Give up, here and now, your busyness with what is made of illusion, and come to rest for good from your false striving. For I am the supreme *brahman*, forever free, unborn, one, without duality.
V 8.3		I am always the same in all beings, alone, like space: all-pervading, imperishable, auspicious,

19 "I am *brahman*": Brihadaranyaka Upanishad 1.4.10. The grammatical principle of former use (*bhūtapūrvagati*) lets a word still apply to what it formerly denoted.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
	सदा च भूतेषु समोऽस्मि केवलो यथा च खं सर्वगमक्षरं शिवम् । / निरन्तरं निष्कलमक्रियं परं ततो न मेऽस्तीह फलं तवेहितैः ॥	without gaps, without parts, without action, supreme. Therefore nothing comes to me here from your efforts.
V 8.4	अहं ममैको न मदन्यदिष्यते तथा न कस्याप्यहमस्म्यसङ्गतः । / असङ्गरूपोऽहमतो न मे त्वया कृतेन कार्यं तव चाद्वयत्वतः ॥	I am one. Nothing other than me is held to be mine, and I belong to no one, since I am unattached. My nature is free of attachment, so I have no use for anything you do, and since there is no duality, neither do you.
V 8.5	फले च हेतौ च जनो विषक्तवानिति प्रचिन्त्याहमतो विमोक्षणे । / जनस्य संवादमिमं प्रक्लृप्तवान्स्वरूपतत्त्वार्थविबोधकारणम् ॥	Seeing that people are bound up with results and with their causes, I have composed this dialogue for their release, to awaken them to the truth of their own nature.
V 8.6	संवादमेतं यदि चिन्तयेन्नरो विमुच्यतेऽज्ञानमहाभयागमात् । / विमुक्तकामश्च तथा जनः सदा चरत्यशोकः सम आत्मवित्सुखी ॥	Anyone who reflects on this dialogue is freed from the great terror that ignorance brings. Such a person, free of desire, goes about forever without sorrow, even-minded, knowing the self, and happy.

CHAPTER 9: SUBTLETY AND PERVASIVENESS

The elements grow subtler and more pervasive up to the inner self, one and without a second.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
V 9.1	सूक्ष्मताव्यापिते ज्ञेये गन्धादेरुत्तरोत्तरम् । / प्रत्यगात्मावसानेषु पूर्वपूर्वप्रहाणतः ॥	Subtlety and pervasiveness are to be understood as increasing step by step, from smell and the rest up to the inner self, where the series ends, as each earlier one is left behind.[21]
V 9.2	शारीरा पृथिवी तावद्यावद्ब्राह्या प्रमाणतः । / अम्ब्वादीनि च तत्त्वानि तावज्ज्ञेयानि कृत्स्नशः ॥	The earth in the body is as great in measure as the earth outside, and water and the other elements are likewise to be known as just as great in their entirety.
V 9.3	वाय्वादीनां यथोत्पत्तेः पूर्वं खं सर्वगं तथा । / अहमेकः सदा शुद्धश्चिन्मात्रः सर्वगोऽद्वयः ॥	Just as space, before air and the rest arise, pervades everything, so I am one, always pure, consciousness alone, all-pervading, without a second.
V 9.4	ब्रह्माद्याः स्थावरान्ता ये प्राणिनो मम पूः स्मृताः । / कामक्रोधादयो दोषा जायेरन्मे कुतोऽन्यतः ॥	Living beings, from Brahma down to things that do not move, are known as my dwelling. From what other source could faults such as desire and anger arise in me?[22]
V 9.5	भूतदोषैः सदास्पृष्टं सर्वभूतस्थमीश्वरम् । / नीलं व्योम यथा बालो दुष्टं मां वीक्षते जनः ॥	People look on me as tainted, just as a child sees the sky as blue, though I am the Lord, present in all beings and never touched by their faults.
V 9.6		Since the thoughts of all living beings are always lit up by my consciousness, all living beings are

20 This chapter is addressed by the self to the mind, in the dialogue the author says he has devised (8.5).
21 "The inner self" renders *pratyagātman*.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
	मच्चैतन्यावभास्यत्वात्सर्वप्राणिधियां सदा । / पूर्मम प्राणिनः सर्वे सर्वज्ञस्य विपाप्मनः ॥	the dwelling of me, the all-knowing one, free from evil.
V 9.7	जनिमज्ज्ञानविज्ञेयं स्वप्नज्ञानवदिष्यते । / नित्यं निर्विषयं ज्ञानं तस्माद्द्वैतं न विद्यते ॥	Knowledge that comes to be, together with what it knows, is held to be like knowledge in a dream. Knowledge itself is eternal and has no object, and so duality does not exist.
V 9.8	ज्ञातुर्ज्ञातिर्हि नित्योक्ता सुषुप्ते त्वन्यशून्यतः । / जाग्रज्ज्ञातिस्त्वविद्यातस्तद्ग्राह्यं चासदिष्यताम् ॥	For the knowing of the knower is declared eternal, since in deep sleep there is nothing else. But knowing in the waking state comes from ignorance, and what it grasps is to be regarded as unreal.
V 9.9	रूपवत्त्वाद्यसत्त्वान्न दृष्ट्यादेः कर्मता यथा । / एवं विज्ञानकर्मत्वं भूम्नो नास्तीति गम्यते ॥	Seeing and the like cannot be objects, since they have no color or other such qualities. In the same way, it is understood that the plenitude cannot be an object of knowledge.[23]

CHAPTER 10: SEEING THE TRUE NATURE OF AWARENESS

The self is pure seeing, like the sky: unborn, one, untouched by waking, dream or sleep.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
V 10.1	दृशिस्वरूपं गगनोपमं परं सकृद्विभातं त्वजमेकमक्षरम् । / अलेपकं सर्वगतं यदद्वयं तदेव चाहं सततं विमुक्त ॐ ॥	That which is awareness that sees, like the sky, the highest, shining once and for all, unborn, one, imperishable, untouched by any stain, all-pervading, without a second—that am I, ever free. Om.[24]
V 10.2	दृशिस्तु शुद्धोऽहमविक्रियात्मको न मेऽस्ति कश्चिद्विषयः स्वभावतः । / पुरस्तिरश्चोर्ध्वमधश्च सर्वतः सुपूर्णभूमा त्वज आत्मनि स्थितः ॥	I am seeing itself, pure, by nature free of change, and by my very nature I have no object at all. In front, across, above, below, on every side, I am the plenitude, wholly full, unborn, abiding in myself.
V 10.3	अजोऽमरश्चैव तथाजरोऽमृतः स्वयंप्रभः सर्वगतोऽहमद्वयः । / न कारणं कार्यमतीव निर्मलः सदैव तृप्तश्च ततो विमुक्त ॐ ॥	I am unborn and deathless, ageless and immortal, self-luminous, all-pervading, without a second. I am neither cause nor effect, utterly stainless, always content, and therefore free. Om.
V 10.4	सुषुप्तजाग्रत्स्वपतश्च दर्शनं न मेऽस्ति किंचित्तु मतेर्हि मोहनम् । / स्वतश्च तेषां परतोऽप्यसत्त्वतस्तुरीय एवास्मि सदा दृगद्वयः ॥	No seeing of any kind belongs to me, whether in deep sleep, waking or dream; it is a delusion of the mind. Since these states have no reality, either of themselves or through anything else, I am always the Fourth alone, the seeing without a second.[25]
V 10.5	शरीरबुद्धीन्द्रियदुःखसंततिर्न मे न चाहं मम निर्विकारतः । / असत्त्वहेतोश्च तथैव संततेरसत्त्वमस्याः स्वपतो हि दृश्यवत् ॥	The stream of suffering made up of body, intellect and senses is not mine, nor is it I, for I am free of

22 Brahmā is the creator god, the first of embodied beings; the name is a different word from *brahman*, the absolute. "Dwelling" renders *pūḥ*, "city," the body as the stronghold the self inhabits.
23 "The plenitude" (*bhūman*) is the Chandogya Upanishad's name (7.23–24) for that which is infinite and has nothing beyond it.
24 Om is the sacred syllable of the Veda, uttered at the beginning and end of recitation.
25 The Fourth (*turīya*) is the self beyond the three states of waking, dream and deep sleep, as taught in the Mandukya Upanishad.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
		change. Since its cause is unreal, this stream is unreal too, like what a dreamer sees.
V 10.6	इदं तु सत्यं मम नास्ति विक्रिया विकारहेतुर्न हि मेऽद्वयत्वतः । / न पुण्यपापे न च मोक्षबन्धने न चास्ति वर्णाश्रमिताशरीरतः ॥	This is the truth: there is no change in me, and no cause of change, since I am without a second. I have neither merit nor sin, neither liberation nor bondage, nor do I belong to any class or stage of life, for I am bodiless.[26]
V 10.7	अनादितो निर्गुणतो न कर्म मे फलं च तस्मात्परमोऽहमद्वयः । / यथा नभः सर्वगतं न लिप्यते तथा ह्यहं देहगतोऽपि सूक्ष्मतः ॥	Since I am without beginning and without qualities, I have no action and no fruit of action; therefore I am the highest, without a second. Space is everywhere, yet nothing stains it. In the same way, nothing stains me, though I am present in the body, because I am subtle.
V 10.8	सदा च भूतेषु समोऽहमीश्वरः क्षराक्षराभ्यां परमो ह्यथोत्तमः । / परात्मतत्त्वं च तथाद्वयोऽपि सन्विपर्ययेणाभिवृतस्त्वविद्यया ॥	I am the Lord, always the same in all beings, beyond both the perishable and the imperishable, and so the highest of all. Though I am the reality of the supreme self, and without a second, ignorance covers me over by making things appear the wrong way round.
V 10.9	अविद्यया भावनया च कर्मभिर्विवित्त आत्माव्यवधिः सुनिर्मलः । / दृगादिशक्तिप्रचितोऽहमद्वयः स्थितः स्वरूपे गगनं यथाचलम् ॥	The self is set apart from ignorance, from mental impressions and from actions; nothing stands between it and anything, and it is utterly stainless. Filled with the powers of seeing and the rest, I, without a second, abide in my own nature, unmoving like the sky.
V 10.10	अहं परं ब्रह्म विनिश्चयात्मदृङ् न जायते भूय इति श्रुतेर्वचः । / न चैव बीजेऽप्यसति प्रजायते फलं न जन्मास्ति ततो ह्यमोहता ॥	Scripture says: "One who sees the self with the firm conviction 'I am the supreme *brahman*' is not born again." Where there is no seed, no fruit is produced. So there is no birth, since there is no delusion.
V 10.11	ममेदमित्थं च तथेदमीदृशं तथाहमेवं न परो न चान्यथा । / विमूढतैव न जनस्य कल्पना सदा समे ब्रह्मणि चाद्वये शिवे ॥	People imagine: "This is mine," "it is like this," "this is of such a kind," "I am thus, not another, and not otherwise." Such imaginings are sheer delusion, and none of them exists in *brahman*, which is ever the same, without a second, and benign.
V 10.12	यदद्वयं ज्ञानमतीव निर्मलं महात्मनां तत्र न शोकमोहता । / तयोरभावे न हि जन्म कर्म वा भवेदयं वेदविदां विनिश्चयः ॥	In great souls, whose knowledge is without a second and utterly stainless, there is no grief or delusion. Where these two are absent, there can be neither birth nor action. This is the settled conviction of those who know the Veda.
V 10.13	सुषुप्तवज्जाग्रति यो न पश्यति द्वयं तु पश्यन्नपि चाद्वयत्वतः । / तथा च कुर्वन्नपि निष्क्रियश्च यः स आत्मविन्नान्य इतीह निश्चयः ॥	One who sees no duality while awake, as in deep sleep, or who sees it yet does not, since he is

26 Brahmanical society was ordered by four social classes (*varṇa*) and four stages of life (*āśrama*).

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
		without a second, and who likewise is free of action though acting, knows the self, and no one else does. This is the settled conclusion here.
V 10.14	इतीदमुक्तं परमात्मदर्शनं मया हि वेदान्तविनिश्चितं परम् । / विमुच्यतेऽस्मिन्यदि निश्चितो भवेन्न लिप्यते व्योम इवेह कर्मभिः ॥	Thus I have set forth this vision of the supreme self, the highest, as the Vedanta has settled it. One who is firmly convinced of it is liberated, and here and now actions no more stain him than they stain space.[27]

CHAPTER 11: THE SEER

Being the seer is self-established; "not this, not this" leaves the knower free of action.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
V 11.1	ईक्षितृत्वं स्वतःसिद्धं जन्तूनां च ततोऽन्यता । / अज्ञानादित्यतोऽन्यत्वं सदसीति निवर्त्यते ॥	Being the seer is self-established for living beings; their being other than that comes from ignorance. Therefore the words "You are being" remove this otherness.[28]
V 11.2	न तावद्ध्यमृतत्वं न किंचिदन्यत्सहायकम् । / ज्ञानस्येति ब्रुवच्छास्त्रं सलिङ्गं कर्म बाधते ॥	Scripture says that immortality is not to be had that way, and that nothing else is an aid to knowledge. In saying so, it sets aside action together with its outward marks.
V 11.3	सर्वेषां मनसो वृत्तमविशेषेण पश्यतः । / तस्य मे निर्विकारस्य विशेषः स्यात्कथंचन ॥	I see the workings of the minds of all without distinction. How, then, could there be any distinction in me, who am free of change?
V 11.4	मनोवृत्तं मनस्येव स्वप्ने जाग्रति चेक्षितुः । / संप्रसादे द्वयाभावाच्चिन्मात्रः सर्वगोऽद्वयः ॥	For the seer, the workings of the mind in dream and waking lie in the mind alone. In the serenity of deep sleep there is no duality, and so the seer is consciousness alone, all-pervading, without a second.
V 11.5	स्वप्नः सत्यो यथा बोधाद्देहात्मत्वं तथैव च । / प्रत्यक्षादेः प्रमाणत्वं जाग्रत्स्यादात्मवेदनात् ॥	A dream is real until one wakes. In the same way, in the waking state, identifying the self with the body and treating perception and the rest as means of knowledge hold good until the self is known.
V 11.6	व्योमवत्सर्वभूतस्थो भूतदोषैर्विवर्जितः । / साक्षी चेतागुणः शुद्धो ब्रह्मैवास्मि स केवलः ॥	Like space, I am present in all beings, yet free from their faults. I am the witness, the perceiver, without qualities, pure. I am *brahman* itself, that one alone.
V 11.7	नामरूपक्रियाभ्योऽन्यो नित्यमुक्तस्वरूपवान् । / अहमात्मा परं ब्रह्म चिन्मात्रोऽहं सदाद्वयः ॥	Other than name, form and action, by nature ever free, I am the self, the supreme *brahman*; I am consciousness alone, always without a second.[29]

27 Vedānta, "the end of the Veda," here means the Upanishads and the teaching drawn from them.
28 "You are being" paraphrases the Chandogya Upanishad's "you are that" (6.8.7), where "that" is being (*sat*), the existent from which the world arose.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
V 11.8	अहं ब्रह्मास्मि कर्ता च भोक्ता चास्मीति ये विदुः । / ते नष्टा ज्ञानकर्मभ्यां नास्तिकाः स्युर्न संशयः ॥	Some know, "I am *brahman*, and I am also an agent and an enjoyer." They are lost to both knowledge and action, and without doubt they would be unbelievers.[30]
V 11.9	धर्माधर्मफलैर्योग इष्टोऽदृष्टो यथात्मनः । / शास्त्राद्ब्रह्मत्वमप्यस्य मोक्षो ज्ञानात्तथेष्यताम् ॥	The self's connection with the fruits of merit and demerit cannot be seen, yet it is accepted on the authority of scripture. Its being *brahman*, and liberation through knowledge, should be accepted on scripture in the same way.
V 11.10	या माहारजनाद्यास्ता वासनाः स्वप्नदर्शिभिः । / अनुभूयन्त एवेह ततोऽन्यः केवलो दृशिः ॥	The impressions that appear as saffron-colored and the like are experienced by those who dream. Seeing is other than these, alone by itself.[31]
V 11.11	कोशादिव विनिष्कृष्टः कार्यकारणवर्जितः । / यथासिर्दृश्यते स्वप्ने तद्वद्बोद्धा स्वयंप्रभः ॥	In a dream one sees a sword drawn, as it were, from its sheath. In the same way, the knower, free of effect and cause, is self-luminous.
V 11.12	आपेषात्प्रतिबुद्धस्य ज्ञस्य स्वाभाविकं पदम् । / उक्तं नेत्यादिवाक्येन कल्पितस्यापनेतृणा ॥	The words "not this, not this" teach the natural state of the knower, the man who wakes when he is rubbed with the hand. These words remove all that has been imagined onto it.[32]
V 11.13	महाराजादयो लोका मयि यद्वत्प्रकल्पिताः । / स्वप्ने तद्वद्वयं विद्याद्रूपं वासनया सह ॥	In dream I imagine worlds within me, such as being a great king. In the same way, one should know that the two forms, together with their impressions, are imagined.[33]
V 11.14	देहलिङ्गात्मना कार्या वासनारूपिणा क्रिया । / नेति नेत्यात्मरूपत्वान्न मे कार्या क्रिया क्वचित् ॥	Action is for the self that is identified with the body and the subtle body, which consists of impressions. Since my nature is "not this, not this," I never have any action to do.[34]
V 11.15	न ततोऽमृतताशास्ति कर्मणोऽज्ञानहेतुतः । / मोक्षस्य ज्ञानहेतुत्वान्न तदन्यदपेक्षते ॥	Therefore there is no hope of immortality from action, since action has ignorance for its cause. Liberation has knowledge for its cause, and so it depends on nothing else.
V 11.16	अमृतं चाभयं नार्तं नेतीत्यात्मा प्रियो मम । / विपरीतमतोऽन्यद्यत्त्यजेत्तत्सक्रियं ततः ॥	The self is immortal, free from fear and free from suffering; it is "not this, not this," and it is dear to me. Whatever is other than it is the opposite, so one should give it up, together with action.

29 "Name and form" is the Upanishadic phrase for the whole manifest world of distinct things.
30 An unbeliever (*nāstika*) is one who denies the authority of the Veda.
31 Brihadaranyaka Upanishad 2.3.6 describes the forms of the person as like a saffron-dyed cloth, like white wool and so on, just before the words "not this, not this."
32 In Brihadaranyaka Upanishad 2.1.15–20, King Ajatashatru wakes a sleeping man by rubbing him with his hand, to show where the self was during sleep.
33 The two forms of *brahman*, the formed and the formless, are described in Brihadaranyaka Upanishad 2.3.1.
34 The subtle body (*liṅga*) is the inner apparatus that carries impressions from one life to the next.

CHAPTER 12: LIGHT

The mind takes the seer's reflection for the seer, like the man who forgets he is the tenth.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
V 12.1	प्रकाशस्थं यथा देहं सालोकमभिमन्यते । / द्रष्टाभासं तथा चित्तं द्रष्टाहमिति मन्यते ॥	A person standing in the light takes his body to be luminous itself. In the same way, the mind, which holds the reflection of the seer, supposes, "I am the seer."
V 12.2	यदेव दृश्यते लोके तेनाभिन्नत्वमात्मनः । / प्रपद्यते ततो मूढस्तेनात्मानं न विन्दति ॥	Whatever is seen in the world, the deluded person takes himself to be one with it, and because of this he does not find the self.
V 12.3	दशमस्य नवात्मत्वप्रतिपत्तिवदात्मनः । / दृश्येषु तद्वदेवायं मूढो लोको न चान्यथा ॥	The tenth man identifies himself with the nine. In just this way, and no other, these deluded people identify the self with the things they see.[35]
V 12.4	त्वं कुरु त्वं तदेवेति प्रत्ययावेककालिकौ । / एकनीडौ कथं स्यातां विरुद्धौ न्यायतो वद ॥	"Do this!" and "You are that" are two contradictory notions. Tell me, according to reason, how they could be present in the same place at the same time.
V 12.5	देहाभिमानिनो दुःखं नादेहस्य स्वभावतः । / स्वापवत्तत्प्रहाणाय तत्त्वमित्युच्यते दृशेः ॥	Suffering belongs to one who identifies himself with the body. It does not belong to one who is by nature bodiless, as in deep sleep. To remove it, "you are that" is said of seeing.
V 12.6	दृशेश्छाया यदारूढा मुखच्छायेव दर्शने । / पश्यंस्तं प्रत्ययं योगी दृष्ट आत्मेति मन्यते ॥	When the reflection of seeing has entered a notion, like the reflection of a face in a mirror, the yogi sees that notion and thinks, "The self has been seen."
V 12.7	तं च मूढं च यद्यन्यं प्रत्ययं वेत्ति नो दृशेः । / स एव योगिनां श्रेष्ठो नेतरः स्यान्न संशयः ॥	If he knows that this notion, and the other, deluded one, are not seeing, then he alone is the best of yogis and no one else, without doubt.
V 12.8	विज्ञातेर्यस्तु विज्ञाता स त्वमित्युच्यते यतः । / स स्यादनुभवस्तस्य ततोऽन्योऽनुभवो मृषा ॥	What is called "you" is the knower of knowing. So that alone can be one's experience, and any experience other than that is false.
V 12.9	दृशिरूपे सदा नित्ये दर्शनादर्शने मयि । / कथं स्यातां ततो नान्य इष्यतेऽनुभवस्ततः ॥	My nature is seeing, always eternal. How could there be seeing and not seeing in me? Therefore no other experience is admitted.
V 12.10	यत्स्थस्तापो रवेर्देहे दृशेः स विषयो यथा । / सत्त्वस्थस्तद्वदेवेह दृशेः स विषयस्तथा ॥	The heat of the sun in the body is an object for seeing. In the same way, whatever resides in the intellect is an object for seeing.[36]
V 12.11		Once every part that can be called "this" has been denied, the knower is like space, of one uniform

35 In the story of the tenth man, ten men ford a river. Each counts the others, finds only nine and forgets himself, until someone tells him, "You are the tenth."

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
	प्रतिषिद्धेदमंशो ज्ञः खमिवैकरसोऽद्वयः । / नित्यमुक्तस्तथा शुद्धः सोऽहं ब्रह्मास्मि केवलः ॥	essence, without a second, ever free and pure. I am that *brahman*, the alone.
V 12.12	विज्ञातुर्नैव विज्ञाता परोऽन्यः संभवत्यतः । / विज्ञाताहं परो मुक्तः सर्वभूतेषु सर्वदा ॥	There can be no other, higher knower of the knower. Therefore I am the knower, the highest, free, in all beings at all times.
V 12.13	यो वेदालुप्तदृष्टित्वमात्मनोऽकर्तृतां तथा । / ब्रह्मवित्त्वं तथा मुक्त्वा स आत्मज्ञो न चेतरः ॥	One knows the self, and no one else does, if he knows that the self's seeing is never lost and that the self is not an agent, and has also given up the idea of being a knower of *brahman*.
V 12.14	ज्ञातैवाहमविज्ञेयः शुद्धो मुक्तः सदेत्यपि । / विवेकी प्रत्ययो बुद्धेर्दृश्यत्वान्नाशवान्यतः ॥	There is the discriminating notion, "I am only the knower, unknowable, pure, ever free." Even this notion belongs to the intellect, since it is something seen, and for that reason it perishes.
V 12.15	अलुप्ता त्वात्मनो दृष्टिर्नोत्पाद्या कारकैर्यतः । / दृश्यया चान्यया दृष्ट्या जन्यतास्याः प्रकल्पिता ॥	But the seeing of the self is never lost, since the factors of action cannot produce it. Its being produced is imagined because of another seeing, the one that is an object.
V 12.16	देहात्मबुद्ध्यपेक्षत्वादात्मनः कर्तृता मृषा । / नैव किंचित्करोमीति सत्या बुद्धिः प्रमाणजा ॥	The self's agency depends on the idea that the body is the self, so it is false. The notion "I do nothing at all" is true, born of a valid means of knowledge.[37]
V 12.17	कर्तृत्वं कारकापेक्षमकर्तृत्वं स्वभावतः । / कर्ता भोक्तेति विज्ञानं मृषैवेति सुनिश्चितम् ॥	Agency depends on the factors of action, while non-agency is the self's own nature. It is firmly established that the awareness "I am an agent, an enjoyer" is simply false.
V 12.18	एवं शास्त्रानुमानाभ्यां स्वरूपेऽवगते सति । / नियोज्योऽहमिति ह्येषा सत्या बुद्धिः कथं भवेत् ॥	Once one's own nature has been understood in this way through scripture and inference, how could the notion "I am someone to be enjoined to act" be true?
V 12.19	यथा सर्वान्तरं व्योम व्योम्नोऽप्याभ्यन्तरो ह्यहम् । / निर्विकारोऽचलः शुद्धोऽजरो मुक्तः सदाद्वयः ॥	Space is within everything, and I am within even space. I am free of change, unmoving, pure, ageless, free, always without a second.

CHAPTER 13: WITHOUT EYES

Without eyes, mind or breath, the self has neither knowledge nor ignorance, distraction nor concentration.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
V 13.1	अचक्षुष्ट्वान्न दृष्टिर्मे तथाश्रोत्रस्य का श्रुतिः । / अवाक्त्वान्न तु वक्तिः स्यादमनस्त्वान्मतिः कुतः ॥	I have no eyes, and so I have no seeing. I have no ears, so what hearing could I have? I have no speech, so there can be no speaking. I have no mind, so how could there be thinking?

36 "Intellect" here renders *sattva*, the inner organ, not the quality of goodness.
37 "I do nothing at all" echoes Bhagavad Gita 5.8.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
V 13.2	अप्राणस्य न कर्मास्ति बुद्ध्यभावे न वेदिता । / विद्याविद्ये ततो न स्तश्चिन्मात्रज्योतिषो मम ॥	One without breath has no action, and where there is no intellect there is no knower. So neither knowledge nor ignorance belongs to me, whose light is consciousness alone.
V 13.3	नित्यमुक्तस्य शुद्धस्य कूटस्थस्याविचालिनः । / अमृतस्याक्षरस्यैवमशरीरस्य सर्वदा ॥	I am ever free, pure, changeless, unmoving, immortal, imperishable, and so forever without a body.[38]
V 13.4	जिघत्सा वा पिपासा वा शोकमोहौ जरामृती । / न विद्यन्तेऽशरीरत्वाद्व्योमवद्व्यापिनो मम ॥	Hunger and thirst, grief and delusion, old age and death do not exist for me, since I am bodiless and pervade all things like space.
V 13.5	अस्पर्शत्वान्न मे स्पृष्टिर्नाजिह्वत्वाद्रसज्ञता । / नित्यविज्ञानरूपस्य ज्ञानाज्ञाने न मे सदा ॥	Since I have no touch, there is no touching for me; since I have no tongue, there is no knowing of taste. My nature is eternal consciousness, so I never have either knowledge or ignorance.
V 13.6	या तु स्यान्मानसी वृत्तिश्चाक्षुष्का रूपरञ्जना । / नित्यमेवात्मनो दृष्ट्या नित्यया दृश्यते हि सा ॥	But whatever activity of the mind arises through the eye and is colored by visible form is always seen by the eternal seeing of the self.
V 13.7	तथान्येन्द्रिययुक्ता या वृत्तयो विषयाञ्जनाः । / स्मृती रागादिरूपा च केवलान्तर्मनस्यपि ॥	So too are the activities joined to the other senses and tinged by their objects, and memory, and states such as desire, which occur within the mind alone.
V 13.8	मानस्यस्तद्वदन्यस्य दृश्यन्ते स्वप्नवृत्तयः । / द्रष्टुर्दृष्टिस्ततो नित्या शुद्धानन्ता च केवला ॥	In the same way, the mind's activities in dream are seen by another. Therefore the seeing of the seer is eternal, pure, infinite and alone.
V 13.9	अनित्या साविशुद्धेति गृह्यतेऽत्राविवेकतः । / सुखी दुःखी तथा चाहं दृश्ययोपाधिभूतया ॥	Here, for want of discrimination, it is taken to be impermanent and impure. And so, through the seen object, which acts as a limiting adjunct, one thinks "I am happy" or "I am unhappy,"[39]
V 13.10	मूढया मूढ इत्येवं शुद्धया शुद्ध इत्यपि । / मन्यते सर्वलोकोऽयं येन संसारमृच्छति ॥	or, through a dull object, "I am dull," and through a pure one, "I am pure." So this whole world thinks, and so it goes into the round of rebirth.
V 13.11	अचक्षुष्कादिशास्त्रोक्तं सबाह्याभ्यन्तरं ह्यजम् । / नित्यमुक्तमिहात्मानं मुमुक्षुश्चेत्सदा स्मरत् ॥	Anyone who seeks liberation should always remember the self here as scripture describes it: "without eyes" and the rest, "within and without, unborn," eternally free.[40]
V 13.12	अचक्षुष्कादिशास्त्राच्च नेन्द्रियाणि सदा मम । / अप्राणो ह्यमनाः शुभ्र इति चाथर्वणं वचः ॥	And because scripture says "without eyes" and the rest, I never have senses. There is also the word of the Atharva Veda: "without breath, without mind, pure."[41]

38 "Changeless" renders *kūṭastha*, unchanging like an anvil.
39 A limiting adjunct (*upādhi*) lends its features to what lies near it, as a red flower makes clear crystal look red.
40 "Without eyes" is from Brihadaranyaka Upanishad 3.8.8. "Within and without, unborn" is from Mundaka Upanishad 2.1.2.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
V 13.13	शब्दादीनामभावश्च श्रूयते मम काठके । / अप्राणो ह्यमना यस्मादविकारी सदा ह्यहम् ॥	And in the Katha the absence of sound and the rest is taught of me. Since I am without breath and without mind, I am always free of change.[42]
V 13.14	विक्षेपो नास्ति तस्मा मे न समाधिस्ततो मम । / विक्षेपो वा समाधिर्वा मनसः स्याद्विकारिणः ॥	Therefore I have no distraction, and so no concentration either. Distraction or concentration can belong only to the mind, which changes.
V 13.15	अमनस्कस्य शुद्धस्य कथं तत्स्याद्वयं मम । / अमनस्त्वाविकारित्वे विदेहव्यापिनो मम ॥	How could this pair belong to me, who am without mind and pure? Freedom from mind and freedom from change belong to me, who am bodiless and all-pervading.
V 13.16	इत्येतद्यावदज्ञानं तावत्कार्यं ममाभवत् । / नित्यमुक्तस्य शुद्धस्य बुद्धस्य च सदा मम ॥	So, as long as there was this ignorance, there was something for me to do, though I am always eternally free, pure and awake.
V 13.17	समाधिर्वासमाधिर्वा कार्यं चान्यत्कुतो भवेत् । / मां हि ध्यात्वा च बुद्ध्वा च मन्यन्ते कृतकृत्यताम् ॥	How could there be concentration or its absence, or any other task? For by meditating on me and knowing me, people come to think they have done all there was to do.
V 13.18	अहं ब्रह्मास्मि सर्वोऽस्मि शुद्धो बुद्धोऽस्म्यतः सदा । / अजः सर्वत एवाहमजरश्चाक्षयोऽमृतः ॥	I am *brahman*; I am all; therefore I am always pure and awake. I am unborn and everywhere, unaging, undecaying, immortal.
V 13.19	मदन्यः सर्वभूतेषु बोद्धा कश्चिन्न विद्यते । / कर्माध्यक्षश्च साक्षी च चेता नित्योऽगुणोऽद्वयः ॥	In all beings there is no knower other than me. I am the overseer of actions, the witness, the conscious one, eternal, without qualities, without a second.[43]
V 13.20	न सच्चाहं न चासच्च नोभयं केवलः शिवः । / न मे संध्या न रात्रिर्वा नाहर्वा सर्वदा दृशेः ॥	I am neither being nor non-being nor both; I am alone and auspicious. For me there is no twilight, no night, no day, since I am always the awareness that sees.[44]
V 13.21	सर्वमूर्तिविमुक्तं यद्यथा खं सूक्ष्ममद्वयम् । / तेनाप्यस्मि विना भूतं ब्रह्मैवाहं तथाद्वयम् ॥	Space is free of every form, subtle and without a second. I am without even that. I am *brahman* alone, and likewise without a second.
V 13.22	ममात्मास्य त आत्मेति भेदो व्योम्नो यथा भवेत् । / एकस्य सुषिभेदेन तथा मम विकल्पितः ॥	"My self," "his self," "your self": just as distinctions arise in the one space through its different hollows, so this distinction is imagined in me.[45]
V 13.23	भेदोऽभेदस्तथा चैको नाना चेति विकल्पितः । / ज्ञेयं ज्ञाता गतिर्गन्ता मय्येकस्मिन्कुतो भवेत् ॥	Difference and non-difference, one and many, are likewise imagined. How could the known and the

41 The Mundaka Upanishad (2.1.2), quoted here, belongs to the Atharva Veda.
42 Katha Upanishad 1.3.15.
43 Compare Shvetashvatara Upanishad 6.11.
44 Compare Shvetashvatara Upanishad 4.18.
45 The image of space enclosed in jars and other hollows: the space is one, the enclosures are many.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
		knower, the going and the goer, exist in me, who am one?
V 13.24	न मे हेयं न चाहेयमविकारी यतो ह्यहम् । / सदा मुक्तः सदा शुद्धः सदा बुद्धोऽगुणोऽद्वयः ॥	There is nothing for me to give up and nothing for me to keep, because I am free of change: always free, always pure, always awake, without qualities, without a second.
V 13.25	इत्येवं सर्वदात्मानं विद्यात्सर्वं समाहितः । / विदित्वा मां स्वदेहस्थमृषिर्मुक्तो ध्रुवो भवेत् ॥	So, with a collected mind, one should always know the self as all. Having known me as dwelling in one's own body, one becomes a sage, liberated and steadfast.
V 13.26	कृतकृत्यश्च सिद्धश्च योगी ब्राह्मण एव च । / यदेवं वेद तत्त्वार्थमन्यथा ह्यात्महा भवेत् ॥	Whoever knows the truth in this way has done what was to be done. He is accomplished, a yogi, and a Brahmin indeed. Otherwise he would be a slayer of the self.
V 13.27	वेदार्थो निश्चितो ह्येष समासेन मयोदितः । / संन्यासिभ्यः प्रवक्तव्यः शान्तेभ्यः शिष्टबुद्धिना ॥	I have stated this settled meaning of the Veda in brief. One of disciplined understanding should teach it to renunciants who are at peace.

CHAPTER 14: DREAM AND MEMORY

The intellect takes the forms of objects; one who knows the self has nothing left to do.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
V 14.1	स्वप्नस्मृत्योर्घटादेर्हि रूपाभासः प्रदृश्यते । / पुरा नूनं तदाकारा धीर्दृष्टेत्यनुमीयते ॥	In dream and in memory, a semblance of the form of a jar or the like appears. From this it is inferred that the intellect must earlier have been seen in that form.
V 14.2	भिक्षामटन्यथा स्वप्ने दृष्टो देहो न स स्वयम् । / जाग्रद्दृश्यात्तथा देहाद्द्रष्टृत्वादन्य एव सः ॥	The body seen in a dream wandering for alms is not oneself. In the same way, because one is its seer, one is other than the body seen in waking.
V 14.3	मूषासिक्तं यथा ताम्रं तन्निभं जायते तथा । / रूपादीन्व्याप्नुवच्चित्तं तन्निभं दृश्यते ध्रुवम् ॥	Just as copper poured into a mold takes on its shape, so the mind, pervading visible forms and the rest, surely appears in their likeness.
V 14.4	व्यञ्जको वा यथालोको व्यङ्ग्यस्याकारतामियात् । / सर्वार्थव्यञ्जकत्वाद्धीरर्थाकारा प्रदृश्यते ॥	Or, just as light, which reveals, takes on the form of what it reveals, so the intellect, because it reveals all things, appears in the form of its objects.
V 14.5	धीरेवार्थस्वरूपा हि पुंसा दृष्टा पुरापि च । / न चेत्स्वप्ने कथं पश्येत्स्मरतो वाकृतिः कुतः ॥	For what the person has seen before as well is the intellect itself in the form of the object. If not, how could one see in dream? And where would the form come from for one who remembers?
V 14.6	व्यञ्जकत्वं तदेवास्या रूपाद्याकारदृश्यता । / द्रष्टृत्वं च दृशेस्तद्वद्ध्याप्तिः स्याद्धिय उद्भवे ॥	Its being a revealer is just this: its being seen in the form of visible form and the rest. Likewise, the seeing awareness is a seer in that it pervades the intellect as it arises.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
V 14.7	चिन्मात्रज्योतिषा सर्वाः सर्वदेहेषु बुद्धयः । / मया यस्मात्प्रकाश्यन्ते सर्वस्यात्मा ततो ह्यहम् ॥	All the intellects in all bodies are lit by me, whose light is pure consciousness. Therefore I am the self of all.
V 14.8	करणं कर्म कर्ता च क्रिया स्वप्ने फलं च धीः । / जाग्रत्येवं यतो दृष्टा द्रष्टा तस्मात्ततोऽन्यथा ॥	In dream, the instrument, the object, the agent, the action and the result are all the intellect. Since it is seen to be so in waking too, the seer is other than it.
V 14.9	बुद्ध्यादीनामनात्मत्वं हेयोपादेयरूपतः । / हानोपादानकर्तात्मा न त्याज्यो न च गृह्यते ॥	The intellect and the rest are not the self, since they are things to be rejected or accepted. The self, which does the rejecting and accepting, can be neither given up nor taken hold of.
V 14.10	सबाह्याभ्यन्तरे शुद्धे प्राज्ञानेकरसे घने । / बाह्यमाभ्यन्तरं चान्यत्कथं हेयं प्रकल्प्यते ॥	In what is pure, within and without, solid, whose one essence is consciousness, how could anything else, outer or inner, be thought of as something to reject?
V 14.11	य आत्मा नेति नेतीति परापोहेन शेषितः । / स चेद्ब्रह्मविदात्मेष्टो यतेतातः परं कथम् ॥	The self is what remains when everything else is excluded by "not this, not this." If the knower of *brahman* accepts that as the self, how could he still strive after anything further?
V 14.12	अशनायाद्यतिक्रान्तं ब्रह्मैवास्मि निरन्तरम् । / कार्यवान्स्यां कथं चाहं विमृशेदेवमञ्जसा ॥	One should reflect plainly in this way: "I am *brahman* alone, beyond hunger and the rest, without any break. How could I have anything to do?"
V 14.13	पारगस्तु यथा नद्यास्तत्स्थः पारं यियासति । / आत्मज्ञश्चेत्तथा कार्यं कर्तुमन्यदिहेच्छति ॥	If one who knows the self still wants to do some other task here, he is like a man who has reached the far bank of a river and, standing there, wants to cross to the far bank.
V 14.14	आत्मज्ञस्यापि यस्य स्याद्धानोपादानता यदि । / न मोक्षार्हः स विज्ञेयो वान्तोऽसौ ब्रह्मणा ध्रुवम् ॥	If someone who knows the self still has things to reject and accept, he should be known as unfit for liberation. *Brahman* has surely spat him out.
V 14.15	सादित्यं हि जगत्प्राणस्तस्मान्नाहर्निशैव वा । / प्राणज्ञस्यापि न स्यातां कुतो ब्रह्मविदोऽद्वये ॥	Breath is the world, together with the sun. Therefore even for one who knows breath there is neither day nor night. How much less for the knower of *brahman*, in what is without a second?[46]
V 14.16	न स्मरत्यात्मनो ह्यात्मा विस्मरेद्वाप्यलुप्तचित् । / मनोऽपि स्मरतीत्येतज्ज्ञानमज्ञानहेतुजम् ॥	The self does not remember itself, nor could it forget itself, since its consciousness is never lost. And the knowledge that "the mind, too, remembers" is born of ignorance as its cause.
V 14.17	ज्ञातुर्ज्ञेयः परो ह्यात्मा सोऽविद्याकल्पितः स्मृतः । / अपोढे विद्यया तस्मिन्रज्ज्वां सर्प इवाद्वयः ॥	A self that is known, distinct from the knower, is held to be imagined by ignorance. When knowledge removes it, like the snake on the rope, there is no second.[47]

46 Breath (*prāṇa*) is the life-force, which the Upanishads identify with the whole world (compare Chandogya Upanishad 3.11).

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
V 14.18	कर्तृकर्मफलाभावात्सबाह्याभ्यन्तरं ह्यजम् । / ममाहं वेति यो भावस्तस्मिन्कस्य कुतो भवेत् ॥	Since there is no agent, no action and no fruit, the self is within and without, unborn. In it, whose could the notion "mine" or "I" be, and where could it come from?
V 14.19	आत्मा ह्यात्मीय इत्येष भावोऽविद्याप्रकल्पितः । / आत्मैकत्वे ह्यसौ नास्ति बीजाभावे कुतः फलम् ॥	The notion of "self" and "belonging to the self" is created by ignorance. When the self is one, it does not exist. Where there is no seed, how can there be fruit?
V 14.20	द्रष्टृ श्रोतृ तथा मन्तृ विज्ञात्रेव तदक्षरम् । / द्रष्टृ नान्यदतस्तस्माद्यस्माद्द्रष्टाहमक्षरम् ॥	That imperishable is the seer, the hearer, the thinker, the knower; there is no other seer than it. Therefore, since I am the seer, I am the imperishable.[48]
V 14.21	स्थावरं जङ्गमं चैव द्रष्टृत्वादिक्रियायुतम् । / सर्वमक्षरमेवातः सर्वस्यात्माक्षरं त्वहम् ॥	Therefore all that is unmoving and moving, joined to the activity of seeing and the rest, is the imperishable alone; and I am the imperishable, the self of all.
V 14.22	अकार्यशेषमात्मानमक्रियात्मक्रियाफलम् । / निर्ममं निरहंकारं यः पश्यति स पश्यति ॥	Whoever sees the self as having nothing left to do, free of action and of action's fruit, without "mine," without ego—he sees.[49]
V 14.23	ममाहंकारयत्नेच्छाः शून्या एव स्वभावतः । / आत्मनीति यदि ज्ञातमाध्वं स्वस्थाः किमीहितैः ॥	If you know that "mine," ego, effort and desire are by their very nature empty in the self, then rest, established in yourselves. What use is striving?
V 14.24	योऽहंकर्तारमात्मानं तथा वेत्तारमेव च । / वेत्त्यनात्मज्ञ एवासौ योऽन्यथाज्ञः स आत्मवित् ॥	One who knows the self as the maker of the notion "I," and also as the knower, does not know the self. One who knows it otherwise is the knower of the self.
V 14.25	यथान्यत्वेऽपि तादात्म्यं देहादिष्वात्मनो मतम् । / तथाकर्तुरविज्ञानात्फलकर्मात्मतात्मनः ॥	Just as the self is thought to be one with the body and the rest though it is other than them, so, through lack of knowledge, the self, which does not act, is taken to be one with action and its fruit.
V 14.26	दृष्टिः श्रुतिर्मतिर्ज्ञातिः स्वप्ने दृष्टा जनैः सदा । / तासामात्मस्वरूपत्वादतः प्रत्यक्षतात्मनः ॥	People always find seeing, hearing, thinking and knowing in dream. Since these are the very nature of the self, the self is directly evident.
V 14.27	परलोकभयं यस्य नास्ति मृत्युभयं तथा । / तस्यात्मज्ञस्य शोच्याः स्युः सब्रह्मेन्द्रा अपीश्वराः ॥	For the knower of the self who has no fear of the next world and no fear of death, even the mighty lords, Brahma and Indra among them, would be objects of pity.[50]
V 14.28		What would lordship mean to him, or the rank of Brahma or Indra, if his craving, the evil from

47 The rope and the snake: in dim light a rope is taken for a snake, and the snake vanishes when the rope is seen for what it is.
48 Brihadaranyaka Upanishad 3.8.11.
49 The closing words echo Bhagavad Gita 13.27.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
	ईश्वरत्वेन किं तस्य ब्रह्मेन्द्रत्वेन वा पुनः । / तृष्णा चेत्सर्वतश्छिन्ना सर्वदैन्योद्भवाशुभा ॥	which all wretchedness springs, has been cut off on every side?
V 14.29	अहमित्यात्मधीर्या च ममेत्यात्मीयधीरपि । / अर्थशून्या यदा यस्य स आत्मज्ञो भवेत्तदा ॥	When the notion of the self as "I" and the notion of what belongs to the self as "mine" have become empty of any object, then one is a knower of the self.
V 14.30	बुद्ध्यादौ सत्युपाधौ च तथा सत्यविशेषता । / यस्य चेदात्मनो ज्ञाता तस्य कार्यं कथं भवेत् ॥	If someone knows that the self is without distinguishing features even while limiting adjuncts such as the intellect are present, how could he have anything to do?
V 14.31	प्रसन्ने विमले व्योम्नि प्रज्ञानैकरसेऽद्वये । / उत्पन्नात्मधियो ब्रूत किमन्यत्कार्यमिष्यते ॥	Say, then: for one in whom the knowledge of the self has arisen, the self that is clear and stainless space, whose one essence is consciousness, without a second, what other task could be required?
V 14.32	आत्मानं सर्वभूतस्थममित्रं चात्मनोऽपि यः । / पश्यन्निच्छत्यसौ नूनं शीतीकर्तुं विभावसुम् ॥	One who sees the self as dwelling in all beings and yet sees someone as his enemy surely wants to make fire cold.
V 14.33	प्रज्ञाप्राणानुकार्यात्मा च्छायेवाक्षादिगोचरः । / ध्यायतीवेति चोक्तो हि शुद्धो मुक्तः स्वतो हि सः ॥	The self copies the intellect and the breath, and, like a reflection, comes within the range of the eye and the other senses; so scripture says, "it seems to think." Yet in itself it is pure and free.[51]
V 14.34	अप्राणस्यामनस्कस्य तथासंसर्गिणो दृशेः । / व्योमवद्व्यापिनो ह्यस्य कथं कार्यं भवेन्मम ॥	How could I have anything to do, I, the awareness that sees, without breath and without mind, unattached, pervading all like space?
V 14.35	असमाधिं न पश्यामि निर्विकारस्य सर्वदा । / ब्रह्मणो मे विशुद्धस्य शोध्यं नान्यद्विपाप्मनः ॥	I see no lack of concentration in me, who am always free of change. For me, *brahman*, wholly pure and free from evil, there is nothing else to be purified.
V 14.36	गन्तव्यं च तथा नैव सर्वगस्याचलस्य च । / नोर्ध्वं नाधस्तिरो वापि निष्कलस्यागुणत्वतः ॥	Likewise there is nowhere for me to go, since I am everywhere and unmoving. There is no up, no down, no across, since I am without parts and without qualities.
V 14.37	चिन्मात्रज्योतिषो नित्यं तमस्तस्मिन्न विद्यते । / कथं कार्यं ममैवाद्य नित्यमुक्तस्य शिष्यते ॥	I am ever the light of pure consciousness, and in it there is no darkness. How then could anything still remain for me to do now, when I am eternally free?
V 14.38	अमनस्कस्य का चिन्ता क्रिया वानिन्द्रियस्य का । / अप्राणो ह्यमनाः शुभ्र इति सत्यं श्रुतेर्वचः ॥	What thought can there be for one without mind, or what action for one without senses? The word

50 Indra is the king of the gods.
51 Brihadaranyaka Upanishad 4.3.7.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
		of scripture is true: “without breath, without mind, pure.”
V 14.39	अकालत्वाददेशत्वाद्विभुत्वादनिमित्ततः । / आत्मनो नैव कालादेरपेक्षा ध्यायतः सदा ॥	Because the self is beyond time and place, all-pervading and without cause, one who always meditates on it has no need of time, place or the like.
V 14.40	यस्मिन्देवाश्च वेदाश्च पवित्रं कृत्स्नमेकताम् । / व्रजत्तन्मानसं तीर्थं यस्मिन्स्नात्वामृतो भवेत् ॥	That in which the gods, the Vedas and everything that purifies become one is the sacred bathing-place of the mind; whoever bathes there becomes immortal.[52]
V 14.41	न चास्ति शब्दादिरनन्यवेदनः परस्परेणापि न चैव दृश्यते । परेण दृश्यास्तु यथा रसादयस्तथैव दृश्यत्वत एव दैहिकाः ॥	There is no sound or other object that is known by itself alone, nor are they seen by one another. Just as tastes and the rest are seen by something other, so too what belongs to the body is seen by another, simply because it is seen.
V 14.42	अहं ममेत्येषणयत्नविक्रियासुखादयस्तद्वदिह प्रदृश्यतः । / दृश्यन्वयोगाच्च परस्परेण ते न दृश्यतां यान्ति ततः परो भवेत् ॥	In the same way the notions “I” and “mine,” desire, effort, change, pleasure and the rest are seen here by another, because they are seen. Since they all share in being objects, they cannot be objects for one another; therefore there must be something beyond them.
V 14.43	अहंक्रियाद्या हि समस्तविक्रिया स्वकर्तृका कर्मफलेन संहता । / चितिस्वरूपेण समन्ततोऽर्कवत्प्रकाश्यमानासिततात्मनो ह्यतः ॥	For every change, beginning with the activity of the ego, is bound up, together with its own agent, with the fruit of action. It is therefore lit up on every side, as if by the sun, by the unattached self, whose very form is consciousness.
V 14.44	दृशिस्वरूपेण हि सर्वदेहिनां वियद्यथा व्याप्य मनांस्यवस्थितः । / अतो न तस्मादपरोऽस्ति वेदिता परोऽपि तस्मादत एक ईश्वरः ॥	As the awareness that sees, it pervades the minds of all embodied beings, as space does. Therefore there is no knower besides it, and none higher than it; it is the one Lord.
V 14.45	शरीरबुद्ध्योर्यदि चान्यदृश्यता निरात्मवादाः सुनिराकृता मया । / परश्च शुद्धो ह्यविशुद्धिकर्मतः सुनिर्मलँ सर्वगतोऽसितोऽद्वयः ॥	And if body and intellect are seen by something other than themselves, then I have thoroughly refuted the doctrines that deny a self. The supreme is pure, because impurity can never make it its object. It is wholly stainless, all-pervading, unattached, without a second.[53]
V 14.46	घटादिरूपं यदि ते न गृह्यते मनः प्रवृत्तं बहुधा स्ववृत्तिभिः । / अशुद्ध्यचिद्रूपविकारदोषता मतेर्यथा वारयितुं न पार्यते ॥	If you do not accept that the mind, active in many ways through its own modifications, takes on the form of a jar and the like, then there is no warding off the faults that belong to the intellect: impurity, non-consciousness, form and change.
V 14.47		Just as pure space, unbroken, neither clings to anything nor is stained by it, so this true self, al-

52 A *tīrtha* is a ford or sacred bathing-place on a river, where pilgrims bathe to be purified.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
	यथा विशुद्धं गगनं निरन्तरं न सज्जते नापि च लिप्यते तथा । / समस्तभूतेषु सदैव तेष्वयं समः सदात्मा ह्यजरोऽमरोऽभयः ॥	ways the same in all beings, neither clings nor is stained. It is ageless, deathless and free of fear.
V 14.48	अमूर्तमूर्तानि च कर्मवासना दृशिस्वरूपस्य बहिः प्रकल्पिताः । / अविद्यया ह्यात्मनि मूढदृष्टिभिर्व्यपोह्य नेतीत्यवशेषितो दृशिः ॥	People of confused vision, through ignorance, project the unformed and the formed, and the latent impressions of action, onto the self, as though they lay outside that whose nature is seeing. When these are set aside with the words "not this," seeing alone remains.[54]
V 14.49	प्रबोधरूपं मनसोऽर्थयोगजं स्मृतौ च सुप्तस्य च दृश्यतेऽर्थवत् । / तथैव देहप्रतिमानतः पृथग्दृशेः शरीरं च मनश्च दृश्यतः ॥	The form the mind takes in waking, produced by its contact with objects, is seen as if it were an object, both in memory and by one who is asleep. In the same way, because the body too appears as such an image, body and mind are distinct from seeing, since they are seen.
V 14.50	स्वभावशुद्धे गगने घनादिके मलेऽपयाते सति चाविशेषता । / यथा च तद्वच्छ्रुतिवारितद्वये सदाविशेषो गगनोपमे दृशौ ॥	When clouds and other stains have passed from the sky, which is pure by its very nature, it is without distinctions. In the same way seeing, which is like the sky and in which scripture has ruled out all duality, is always without distinctions.

CHAPTER 15: ONE THING DOES NOT BECOME ANOTHER

One thing cannot become another; the self is the light that reveals all states of mind.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
V 15.1	नान्यदन्यद्भवेद्यस्मान्नान्यत्किंचिद्विचिन्तयेत् । / अन्यस्यान्यात्मभावे हि नाशस्तस्य ध्रुवो भवेत् ॥	Since one thing cannot become another, one should not meditate on anything else; for if one thing were to become the self of another, its destruction would be certain.
V 15.2	स्मरतो दृश्यते दृष्टं पटे चित्रमिवार्पितम् । / यत्र येन च तौ ज्ञेयौ सत्त्वक्षेत्रज्ञसंज्ञकौ ॥	When someone remembers, what was once seen is seen again, like a picture painted on canvas. That in which it is seen and that by which it is seen are to be known as the two called the intellect and the knower of the field.[55]
V 15.3	फलान्तं चानुभूतं यद्युक्तं कर्त्रादिकारकैः । / स्मर्यमाणं हि कर्मस्थं पूर्वकर्मैव तच्चितम् ॥	What was experienced, ending in its result and joined with the agent and the other factors of action, stands as an object when it is remembered. It is simply the earlier action, stored up.
V 15.4	द्रष्टुश्चान्यद्भवेद्दृश्यं दृश्यत्वाद्घटवत्सदा । / दृश्याद्द्रष्टासजातीयो न धीवत्साक्षितान्यथा ॥	What is seen must always be other than the seer, because it is seen, like a jar. The seer is not of the

53 The doctrines that there is no self (*nirātmavāda*) are chiefly those of the Buddhists.
54 "Not this" echoes "not this, not this" (Brihadaranyaka Upanishad 2.3.6), where the formed and the unformed are also named.
55 *Sattva* here means the intellect. The *kṣetrajña*, "knower of the field," is the Bhagavad Gita's name for the conscious self that knows the body (13.1–2).

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
		same kind as the seen, as the intellect is; otherwise it could not be the witness.
V 15.5	स्वात्मबुद्धिमपेक्ष्यासौ विधीनां स्यात्प्रयोजकः । / जात्यादिः शववत्तेन तद्वज्ज्ञानात्मतान्यथा ॥	Caste and the like, which in themselves are like a corpse, can prompt one to carry out the injunctions only through the notion that they are one's own self. Otherwise they would have to be, like that self, of the nature of knowledge.
V 15.6	न प्रियाप्रिय इत्युक्तेर्नदिहत्वं क्रियाफलम् । / देहयोगः क्रियाहेतुस्तस्माद्विद्वान्क्रियास्त्यजेत् ॥	Because scripture says "neither pleasant nor unpleasant," bodilessness is not the fruit of action. Connection with a body is the cause of action; therefore the wise should give up actions.[56]
V 15.7	कर्मस्वात्मा स्वतन्त्रश्चेन्निवृत्तौ च तथेष्यताम् । / अदेहत्वे फलेऽकार्ये ज्ञाते कुर्यात्कथं क्रियाः ॥	If you say the self is free to act, then grant that it is equally free to cease from action. Once it is known that bodilessness is a result that cannot be produced, how could one go on performing actions?
V 15.8	जात्यादीन्संपरित्यज्य निमित्तं कर्मणां बुधः । / कर्महेतुविरुद्धं यत्स्वरूपं शास्त्रतः स्मरेत् ॥	Setting aside caste and the like, which are the occasions for actions, the wise should keep in mind, as scripture teaches it, their own nature, which runs counter to the causes of action.
V 15.9	आत्मैकः सर्वभूतेषु तानि तस्मिंश्च खे यथा । / पर्यगाद्व्योमवत्सर्वं शुक्रं दीप्तिमदिष्यते ॥	The self is one in all beings, and they are in it, as things are in space. It "has encompassed" everything, like space, and is held to be "bright," full of light.[57]
V 15.10	व्रणस्नाय्वोरभावेन स्थूलं देहं निवारयेत् । / शुद्धापापतयालेपं लिङ्गं चाकायमित्युत ॥	Through the words "without wound" and "without sinews" one should rule out the gross body. Through "pure" and "untouched by evil" one should rule out any stain, and through "bodiless," the subtle body as well.
V 15.11	वासुदेवो यथाश्वत्थे स्वदेहे चाब्रवीत्समम् । / तद्वद्वेत्ति य आत्मानं समं स ब्रह्मवित्तमः ॥	Vasudeva spoke of himself as the same in the sacred fig tree and in his own body. Whoever knows the self in that way, as the same everywhere, is the foremost of those who know *brahman*.[58]
V 15.12	यथा ह्यन्यशरीरेषु ममाहंता न चेष्यते । / अस्मिंश्चापि तथा देहे धीसाक्षित्वाविशेषतः ॥	Just as no one takes other people's bodies as "I" or "mine," it should be the same with this body, since being the witness of the intellect is no different here.
V 15.13	रूपसंस्कारतुल्याधी रागद्वेषौ भयं च यत् । / गृह्यते धीश्रयं तस्माज्ज्ञाता शुद्धोऽभयः सदा ॥	Attraction, aversion and fear have the same seat as the impressions of visible form. Because they are perceived, they rest in the intellect; therefore the knower is always pure and free of fear.

56 Chandogya Upanishad 8.12.1: "pleasant and unpleasant do not touch one who is without a body."
57 Isha Upanishad 8: "He has encompassed all—bright, bodiless, without wound, without sinews, pure, untouched by evil."
58 Vasudeva is Krishna, who in the Bhagavad Gita (10.26) names himself the sacred fig (*aśvattha*) among trees.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
V 15.14	यन्मनास्तन्मयोऽन्यत्वे नात्मत्वात्सौ क्रियात्मनि । / आत्मत्वे चानपेक्षत्वात्सापेक्षं हि न तत्स्वयम् ॥	"One becomes whatever one's mind is set on." This holds when the object is something other. It does not hold for the self, which is free of action, because it is one's own self. As one's own self it depends on nothing, for what depends on something else is not oneself.
V 15.15	खमिवैकरसा ज्ञप्तिरविभक्ताजरामला । / चक्षुराद्युपधाना सा विपरीता विभाव्यते ॥	Knowing, like space, is of a single nature: undivided, ageless and stainless. Through limiting adjuncts such as the eye, it is imagined to be the opposite.
V 15.16	दृश्यत्वादहमित्येष नात्मधर्मो घटादिवत् । / तथान्ये प्रत्यया ज्ञेया दोषाश्चात्मामलो ह्यतः ॥	This "I," because it is seen, is not a property of the self, any more than a jar is. The other notions and the faults are to be understood in the same way; therefore the self is stainless.
V 15.17	सर्वप्रत्ययसाक्षित्वादविकारी च सर्वगः । / विक्रियेत यदि द्रष्टा बुद्ध्यादीवाल्पविद्भवेत् ॥	Because it is the witness of all notions, the self is free of change and all-pervading. If the seer changed, it would know only a little, like the intellect and the rest.
V 15.18	न दृष्टिर्लुप्यते द्रष्टुश्चक्षुरादेर्यथैव तत् । / न हि द्रष्टुरिति ह्युक्तं तस्माद्द्रष्टा सदैव दृक् ॥	The seer's seeing is never lost, as the seeing of the eye and the other senses is. Scripture says, "there is no loss of the seeing of the seer." Therefore the seer is always seeing.[59]
V 15.19	संघातो वास्मि भूतानां करणानां तथैव च । / व्यस्तो वान्यतमो वास्मि को वास्मीति विचारयेत् ॥	One should inquire: "Am I the combination of the elements, and likewise of the sense faculties? Or am I one of them taken singly? Who am I?"
V 15.20	व्यस्तं नाहं समस्तं वा भूतमिन्द्रियमेव वा । / ज्ञेयत्वात्करणत्वाच्च ज्ञातान्योऽस्माद्घटादिवत् ॥	I am not an element or a sense faculty, whether singly or together, since they are known, like a jar, and since they are instruments. The knower is other than they are.
V 15.21	आत्माग्नेरिन्धना बुद्धिरविद्याकामकर्मभिः । / दीपिता प्रज्वलत्येषा द्वारैः श्रोत्रादिभिः सदा ॥	The intellect is the fuel of the fire that is the self. Kindled by ignorance, desire and action, it blazes always through the doors of hearing and the other senses.
V 15.22	दक्षिणाक्षिप्रधानेषु यदा बुद्धिर्विचेष्टते । / विषयैर्हविषा दीप्त आत्माग्निः स्थूलभुक्तदा ॥	When the intellect is active in the senses, chief among them the right eye, the fire of the self, kindled by objects as its oblation, is then the enjoyer of the gross.[60]
V 15.23	हूयन्ते तु हवींषीति रूपादिग्रहणे स्मरन् । / अरागद्वेष आत्माग्नौ जाग्रद्दोषैर्न लिप्यते ॥	One who, in perceiving form and the like, remembers, "Oblations are being offered into the fire of

59 Brihadaranyaka Upanishad 4.3.23.
60 The Brihadaranyaka Upanishad (4.2.2) places the waking self in the right eye, and the Mandukya (3) calls the waking self the "enjoyer of the gross." This and the next verses describe waking, dream and deep sleep.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
		the self," and is free of attraction and aversion, is not stained by faults in the waking state.
V 15.24	मानसे तु गृहे व्यक्ता अविद्याकर्मवासनाः । / पश्यंस्तैजस आत्मोक्तः स्वयंज्योतिःप्रकाशिताः ॥	When it sees, in the house of the mind, the latent impressions of ignorance and action made manifest and lit up by its own light, the self is called "the luminous one."[61]
V 15.25	विषया वासना वापि चोद्यन्ते नैव कर्मभिः । / यदा बुद्धौ तदा ज्ञेयः प्राज्ञ आत्मा ह्यनन्यदृक् ॥	When neither objects nor impressions are stirred up in the intellect by actions, then the self is to be known as "the knowing one," seeing nothing other than itself.[62]
V 15.26	मनोबुद्धीन्द्रियाणां च ह्यवस्थाः कर्मचोदिताः । / चैतन्येनैव भास्यन्ते रविणेव घटादयः ॥	The states of mind, intellect and senses, set in motion by action, are lit up by consciousness alone, as jars and the like are lit up by the sun.
V 15.27	तत्रैव सति बुद्धीर्ज्ञ आत्मभासावभासयन् । / कर्ता तासां यदर्थास्ता मूढैरेवाभिधीयते ॥	This being so, the knower, which lights up the intellect's cognitions with its own light, is called their agent only by the deluded, because the cognitions exist for its sake.
V 15.28	सर्वज्ञोऽप्यत एव स्यात्स्वेन भासावभासयन् । / सर्वं सर्वक्रियाहेतोः सर्वकृत्त्वं तथात्मनः ॥	For this very reason it would also be all-knowing, since it lights up everything with its own light. In the same way the self is the doer of all, because it is the cause of all actions.
V 15.29	सोपाधिश्चैवमात्मोक्तो निरुपाख्योऽनुपाधिकः । / निष्कलो निर्गुणः शुद्धस्तं मनो वाक्च नाप्नुतः ॥	Thus the self has been described with its limiting adjuncts. Without adjuncts it is indescribable: without parts, without qualities, pure. Mind and speech do not reach it.
V 15.30	चेतनोऽचेतनो वापि कर्ताकर्ता गतोऽगतः । / बद्धो मुक्तस्तथा चैकोऽनेकः शुद्धोऽन्यथेति वा ॥	Whether it is conscious or unconscious, agent or non-agent, moving or unmoving, bound or free, one or many, pure or otherwise—
V 15.31	अप्राप्यैव निवर्तन्ते वाचो धीभिः सहैव तु । / निर्गुणत्वात्क्रियाभावाद्विशेषाणामभावतः ॥	—words turn back without reaching it, and thoughts with them, because it has no qualities, no action and no distinguishing features.[63]
V 15.32	व्यापकं सर्वतो व्योम मूर्तैः सर्वैर्वियोजितम् । / यथा तद्वदिहात्मानं विन्द्याच्छुद्धं परं पदम् ॥	Space pervades everything, yet it is free of every form. In the same way one should know the self here as the pure and highest state.
V 15.33	दृष्टं हित्वा स्मृतिं तस्मिन्सर्वग्रश्च तमस्त्यजेत् । / सर्वदृग्ज्योतिषा युक्तो दिनकृच्छार्वरं यथा ॥	Leaving behind, in it, what is seen and what is remembered, the one who pervades all should cast off darkness as well. Joined with the light of all-seeing awareness, one does this as the sun casts off the darkness of night.

61 *Taijasa*, "the luminous one," is the Mandukya Upanishad's name for the self in dream. The Brihadaranyaka (4.3.9) says that in dream the person is his own light.
62 *Prājña*, "the knowing one," is the Mandukya Upanishad's name for the self in deep sleep.
63 Echoes Taittiriya Upanishad 2.4.1: "from which words turn back, together with the mind, without reaching it."

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
V 15.34	रूपस्मृत्यन्धकारार्थाः प्रत्यया यस्य गोचराः । / स एवात्मा समो द्रष्टा सर्वभूतेषु सर्वगः ॥	The one whose field is the notions whose objects are form, memory and darkness is the self alone. It is the same seer in all beings, all-pervading.
V 15.35	आत्मबुद्धिमनश्चक्षुर्विषयालोकसंगमात् । / विचित्रो जायते बुद्धेः प्रत्ययोऽज्ञानलक्षणः ॥	From the meeting of self, intellect, mind, eye, object and light, a varied notion arises in the intellect, a notion marked by ignorance.
V 15.36	विविच्यास्मात्स्वमात्मानं विन्द्याच्छुद्धं परं पदम् । / द्रष्टारं सर्वभूतस्थं समं सर्वभयातिगम् ॥	Distinguishing one's own self from this, one should know it as the pure and highest state: the seer present in all beings, the same in all, beyond every fear.
V 15.37	समस्तं सर्वगं शान्तं विमलं व्योमवत्स्थितम् । / निष्कलं निष्क्रियं सर्वं नित्यं द्वन्द्वैर्विवर्जितम् ॥	It is whole, all-pervading, at peace and stainless, abiding like space. It is without parts and without action, it is everything, eternal, free of the pairs of opposites.
V 15.38	सर्वप्रत्ययसाक्षी ज्ञः कथं ज्ञेयो मयेत्युत । / विमृश्यैव विजानीयाज्ज्ञातं ब्रह्म न वेति वा ॥	One should reflect, "How can the knower, the witness of all notions, be known by me?" Only after such reflection should one decide whether *brahman* is known or not.
V 15.39	अदृष्टं द्रष्टृविज्ञातं दभ्रमित्यादिशासनात् । / नैव ज्ञेयं मयान्यैर्वा परं ब्रह्म कथंचन ॥	Scripture teaches in such words as "unseen, the seer" and "if you think you know it well, you know but little." Therefore the supreme *brahman* cannot in any way be known, whether by me or by others.[64]
V 15.40	स्वरूपाव्यवधानाभ्यां ज्ञानालोकस्वभावतः । / अन्यज्ञानानपेक्षत्वाज्ज्ञातं ब्रह्म सदा मया ॥	Yet *brahman* is always known by me, because it is my own nature and nothing stands between us. Its very nature is the light of knowledge, and it needs no other knowledge.
V 15.41	नान्येन ज्योतिषा कार्यं रवेरात्मप्रकाशने । / स्वबोधान्नान्यबोधेच्छा बोधस्यात्मप्रकाशने ॥	The sun needs no other light to reveal itself. In the same way awareness, being awareness by its own nature, requires no other awareness in order to reveal itself.
V 15.42	न तस्यैवान्यतोऽपेक्षा स्वरूपं यस्य यद्भवेत् । / प्रकाशान्तरदृश्यो न प्रकाशो ह्यस्ति कश्चन ॥	Whatever is a thing's own nature, it depends on nothing else for that. There is no light that has to be seen by another light.
V 15.43	व्यक्तिः स्यादप्रकाशस्य प्रकाशात्मसमागमात् । / प्रकाशस्त्वर्ककार्यं स्यादिति मिथ्यावचो ह्यतः ॥	What is not luminous becomes manifest through contact with what is luminous by nature. Hence it is false to say that light is something the sun produces.
V 15.44	यतोऽभूत्वा भवेद्यच्च तस्य तत्कार्यमिष्यते । / स्वरूपत्वादभूत्वा न प्रकाशो जायते रवेः ॥	What comes to be from something, having not been before, is held to be that thing's effect. Light

64 Brihadaranyaka Upanishad 3.7.23; Kena Upanishad 2.1.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
		is the sun's own nature, so it does not arise from the sun after not having been.
V 15.45	सत्तामात्रे प्रकाशस्य कर्तादित्यादिरिष्यते । / घटादिव्यक्तितो यद्वत्तद्वद्बोधात्मनीष्यताम् ॥	The sun and the like are held to be the makers of light merely by existing, since jars and other things become manifest through them. Accept the same for the self that is awareness.
V 15.46	बिलात्सर्पस्य निर्याणे सूर्यो यद्वत्प्रकाशकः । / प्रयत्नेन विना तद्वज्ज्ञातात्मा बोधरूपतः ॥	When a snake comes out of its hole, the sun lights it up without any effort. In the same way the self is the knower without effort, because its nature is awareness.
V 15.47	दग्धैवमुष्णः सत्तायां तद्वद्बोधात्मनीष्यताम् । / सत्येव यदुपाधौ तु ज्ञाते सर्प इवोत्थिते ॥	In the same way, what is hot burns simply by existing; accept the same of the self that is awareness. Only when a limiting adjunct is present and known, as when the snake has come out—
V 15.48	ज्ञानायत्नोऽपि तद्वज्ज्ञः कर्ता भ्रामकवद्भवेत् । / स्वरूपेण स्वयं नात्मा ज्ञेयोऽज्ञेयोऽथवा ततः ॥	—is the knower, though it makes no effort to know, likewise an agent, like a lodestone. In its own nature, then, the self is neither knowable nor unknowable.[65]
V 15.49	विदिताविदिताभ्यां तदन्यदेवेति शासनात् । / बन्धमोक्षादयो भावास्तद्वदात्मनि कल्पिताः ॥	This follows from the teaching that "it is other than the known, and other than the unknown." Bondage, liberation and the other states are likewise imagined in the self.[66]
V 15.50	नाहोरात्रे यथा सूर्ये प्रभारूपाविशेषतः । / बोधरूपाविशेषान्न बोधाबोधौ तथात्मनि ॥	Day and night do not exist in the sun, because its nature as light is without distinctions. In the same way knowing and not knowing do not exist in the self, because its nature as awareness is without distinctions.
V 15.51	यथोक्तं ब्रह्म यो वेद हानोपादानवर्जितम् । / यथोक्तेन विधानेन स सत्यं नैव जायते ॥	Whoever knows *brahman* by the method set out here, as it has been described, beyond anything to be given up or taken up, is truly never born again.
V 15.52	जन्ममृत्युप्रवाहेषु पतितो नैव शक्नुयात् । / इत उद्धर्तुमात्मानं ज्ञानादन्येन केनचित् ॥	Whoever has fallen into the streams of birth and death can never rise out of them by any means other than knowledge.
V 15.53	भिद्यते हृदयग्रन्थिश्छिद्यन्ते सर्वसंशयाः । / क्षीयन्ते चास्य कर्माणि तस्मिन्दृष्ट इति श्रुतेः ॥	For scripture says: "The knot of the heart is cut, all doubts are severed, and his actions are exhausted when he is seen."[67]
V 15.54	ममाहमित्येतदपोह्य सर्वतो विमुक्तदेहं पदमम्बरोपमम् । / सुदृष्टशास्त्रानुमितिभ्य ईरितं विमुच्यतेऽस्मिन्यदि निश्चितो नरः ॥	If a person casts off "I" and "mine" on every side and is firmly settled in this state, which is free of the body, like the sky, and taught here on the basis

65 A lodestone (*bhrāmaka*), a natural magnet, sets iron in motion without itself moving.
66 Kena Upanishad 1.4.
67 Mundaka Upanishad 2.2.8.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
		of well-examined scripture and inference, he is liberated.

CHAPTER 16: MADE OF EARTH

The body and senses are made of elements; rival accounts of bondage and liberation are refuted.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
V 16.1	पार्थिवः कठिनो धातुर्द्रवो देहे स्मृतोऽम्मयः । / पक्तिचेष्टावकाशाः स्युर्वह्निवाय्वम्बरोद्भवाः ॥	In the body, the hard element is held to be of earth and the fluid element of water. Digestion, movement and open space come from fire, wind and ether.
V 16.2	घ्राणादीनि तदर्थाश्च पृथिव्यादिगुणाः क्रमात् । / रूपालोकवदिष्टं हि सजातीयार्थमिन्द्रियम् ॥	The organs of smell and the rest, and their objects, are qualities of earth and the other elements, in that order. Each sense is held to have an object of its own kind, as light has visible form.
V 16.3	बुद्ध्यर्थान्याहुरेतानि वाक्पाण्यादीनि कर्मणे । / तद्विकल्पार्थमन्तःस्थं मन एकादशं भवेत् ॥	These, they say, serve knowing, while speech, the hands and the rest serve action. For construing what they bring there is the mind, the eleventh, which is internal.
V 16.4	निश्चयार्था भवेद्बुद्धिस्तां सर्वार्थानुभावनीम् । / ज्ञातात्मोक्तः स्वरूपेण ज्योतिषा व्यञ्जयन्सदा ॥	The intellect serves determination, and it brings all objects to experience. The self is called the knower, because it always makes the intellect manifest by the light that is its own nature.
V 16.5	व्यञ्जकस्तु यथालोको व्यङ्ग्यस्याकारतां गतः । / व्यतिकीर्णोऽप्यसंकीर्णस्तद्वज्ज्ञः प्रत्ययैः सदा ॥	Light, which reveals, takes on the form of what it reveals, and though it mingles with it, it does not mix with it. The knower always stands in the same way toward notions.
V 16.6	स्थितो दीपो यथायत्नः प्राप्तं सर्वं प्रकाशयेत् । / शब्दाद्याकारबुद्धीर्ज्ञः प्राप्तास्तद्वत्प्रपश्यति ॥	A lamp that stands still lights up, without effort, whatever comes within its reach. In the same way the knower sees the intellect's cognitions, which take the form of sound and the rest, as they come before it.
V 16.7	शरीरेन्द्रियसंघात आत्मत्वेन गता धियम् । / नित्यात्मज्योतिषा दीप्ता विशिंषन्ति सुखादयः ॥	In the aggregate of body and senses, pleasure and the rest reach the intellect, which is taken to be the self. Lit by the light of the eternal self, they give it its particular character.
V 16.8	शिरोदुःखादिनात्मानं दुःख्यस्मीति हि पश्यति । / द्रष्टान्यो दुःखिनो दृश्याद्द्रष्टृत्वाच्च न दुःख्यसौ ॥	Because of a headache or the like, one sees oneself as "I am in pain." But the seer is other than the one in pain, since the one in pain is seen. Because he is the seer, he is not in pain.
V 16.9	दुःखी स्याद्दुःख्यहंमानाद्दुःखिनो दर्शनान्न वा । / संहतेऽङ्गादिभिर्द्रष्टा दुःखी दुःखस्य नैव सः ॥	One might be in pain through the conceit "I am in pain," but not through seeing the one in pain. The one in pain is what is compounded of limbs and the like. The seer of the pain is not the one in pain.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
V 16.10	चक्षुर्वत्कर्मकर्तृत्वं स्याच्चेन्नानेकमेव तत् । / संहतं च ततो नात्मा द्रष्टृत्वात्कर्मतां व्रजेत् ॥	If you say that the self, like the eye, can be both object and agent: no, for the eye is manifold and compounded. Therefore the self, being the seer, cannot become an object.
V 16.11	ज्ञानयत्नाद्यनेकत्वमात्मनोऽपि मतं यदि । / नैकज्ञानगुणत्वात्तु ज्योतिर्वत्तस्य कर्मता ॥	If the self too is held to be manifold, having knowledge, effort and the like: no. Since knowledge is its one quality, it can no more be its own object than light can.
V 16.12	ज्योतिषो द्योतकत्वेऽपि यद्वन्नात्मप्रकाशनम् । / भेदेऽप्येवं समत्वाज्ज्ञ आत्मानं नैव पश्यति ॥	Light illuminates, yet it does not illuminate itself. In the same way, even if a division within it were granted, the knower does not see itself, because the parts would be alike.
V 16.13	यद्धर्मा यः पदार्थो न तस्यैवेयात्स कर्मताम् । / न ह्यात्मानं दहत्यग्निस्तथा नैव प्रकाशयेत् ॥	A thing does not become the object of the very property it possesses. Fire does not burn itself, and in the same way it does not illuminate itself.
V 16.14	एतेनैवात्मनात्मनो ग्रहो बुद्धेर्निराकृतः । / अंशोऽप्येवं समत्वाद्धि निर्भेदत्वान्न युज्यते ॥	This same argument refutes the view that the intellect grasps itself by itself. Nor can one part grasp another, since the parts would be alike and it has no internal division.
V 16.15	शून्यतापि न युक्तैवं बुद्धेरन्येन दृश्यता । / युक्तातो घटवत्तस्याः प्राक्सिद्धेश्च विकल्पतः ॥	In the same way, emptiness is not tenable either. It is therefore reasonable that the intellect, like a jar, is seen by something other than itself, and that something is established before conceptual construction.[68]
V 16.16	अविकल्पं तदस्त्येव यत्पूर्वं स्याद्विकल्पनात् । / विकल्पोत्पत्तिहेतुत्वाद्द्वयस्यैव तु कारणम् ॥	That which comes before conceptual construction surely exists, and it is free of construction. But whatever gives rise to construction is, for that reason, the cause of duality alone.
V 16.17	अज्ञानं कल्पनामूलं संसारस्य नियामकम् । / हित्वात्मानं परं ब्रह्म विन्द्यान्मुक्तं सदाभयम् ॥	Ignorance is the root of construction and governs the round of rebirth. Having cast it off, one should know the self as the supreme *brahman*, liberated and forever without fear.
V 16.18	जाग्रत्स्वप्नौ तयोर्बीजं सुषुप्ताख्यं तमोमयम् । / अन्योन्यस्मिन्नसत्त्वाच्च नास्तीत्येतत्त्रयं त्यजेत् ॥	There are waking and dream, and their seed, called deep sleep, which is made of darkness. Since each is absent in the others, one should give up all three as nonexistent.
V 16.19	आत्मबुद्धिमनश्चक्षुरालोकार्थादिसंकरात् । / भ्रान्तिः स्यादात्मकर्मेति क्रियाणां संनिपाततः ॥	Self, intellect, mind, eye, light, object and the rest become mixed together, and because their activities occur at the same time, the error arises that action belongs to the self.
V 16.20		

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
	निमीलोन्मीलने स्थाने वायव्ये ते न चक्षुषः । / प्रकाशत्वान्मनस्येवं बुद्धौ न स्तः प्रकाशतः ॥	Closing and opening belong to the seat of the eye, which is of the nature of air, and not to the eye, because the eye illuminates. Likewise these activities are not in the mind or the intellect, since they too illuminate.
V 16.21	संकल्पाध्यवसायौ तु मनोबुद्ध्योर्यथा क्रमात् । / नेतरेतरधर्मत्वं सर्वं चात्मनि कल्पितम् ॥	Volition belongs to the mind and determination to the intellect. Neither has the property of the other, and all of it is imagined in the self.
V 16.22	स्थानावच्छेददृष्टिः स्यादिन्द्रियाणां तदात्मताम् । / गता धीस्तां हि पश्यञ्ज्ञो देहमात्र इवेक्ष्यते ॥	The senses see only within their own locations. The intellect takes on their nature, and the knower, who sees the intellect, appears as if confined to the body.
V 16.23	क्षणिकं हि तदत्यर्थं धर्ममात्रं निरन्तरम् । / सादृश्याद्दीपवद्धीस्तच्छान्तिः पुरुषार्थता ॥	The intellect is utterly momentary, nothing but factors in a ceaseless stream. It seems one through the likeness of its moments, like a lamp flame, and its extinction is the human goal.[69]
V 16.24	स्वाकारान्यावभास्यं च येषां रूपादि विद्यते । / येषां नास्ति ततश्चान्यत्पूर्वासंगतिरुच्यते ॥	Some hold that visible form and the rest exist and are made manifest by something other than their own form. Others hold that nothing exists apart from the intellect. For both, an inconsistency with the position stated before is pointed out.[70]
V 16.25	बाह्याकारत्वतो ज्ञप्तेः स्मृत्यभावः सदा क्षणात् । / क्षणिकत्वाच्च संस्कारं नैवाधत्ते क्वचित्तु धीः ॥	If cognition takes the form of an external object, there could never be memory, because cognition lasts only a moment. Being momentary, the intellect could never lay down an impression anywhere.
V 16.26	आधारस्याप्यसत्त्वाच्च तुल्यतानिर्निमित्ततः । / स्थाने वा क्षणिकत्वस्य हानं स्यान्न तदिष्यते ॥	Since there is no substratum either, everything would be alike, for want of a cause. And if the intellect persisted, momentariness would be lost, which they do not accept.
V 16.27	शान्तेश्चायत्नसिद्धत्वात्साधनोक्तिरनर्थिका । / एकैकस्मिन्समाप्तत्वाच्छान्तेरन्यानपेक्षता ॥	Since extinction comes about without effort, teaching a means to it is pointless. Since extinction is complete in each single moment, it depends on nothing else.
V 16.28	अपेक्षा यदि भिन्नेऽपि परसंतान इष्यताम् । / सर्वार्थे क्षणिके कस्मिंस्तथाप्यन्यानपेक्षता ॥	If dependence is accepted, let it be on a different stream as well, someone else's. But in which momentary thing could every purpose be served? Even so, there would be no dependence on anything else.
V 16.29		

68 Emptiness (*śūnyatā*) is the teaching of the Madhyamaka school of Buddhism that nothing has a fixed nature of its own.
69 Verses 23–30 examine a Buddhist view. On that view the mind is a stream of momentary factors (*dharmas*), and their extinction is liberation.
70 The two views are those of Buddhists who accept external objects and of Buddhists who hold that only consciousness exists.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
	तुल्यकालसमुद्भूताविंतरेतरयोगिणौ । / योगाच्च संस्कृतो यस्तु सोऽन्यं हीक्षितुमर्हति ॥	Two things that arise at the same moment would be joined to each other, and the one shaped by that joining could look to the other.
V 16.30	मृषाध्यासस्तु यत्र स्यात्तन्नाशस्तत्र नो मतः । / सर्वनाशो भवेद्यस्य मोक्षः कस्य फलं वद ॥	For us, a false superimposition is destroyed where it occurs. But tell me: if liberation is the destruction of everything, whose fruit is it?
V 16.31	अस्ति तावत्स्वयं नाम ज्ञानं वात्मान्यदेव वा । / भावाभावज्ञतस्तस्य नाभावस्त्वधिगम्यते ॥	To begin with, there is something that exists of itself, whether you call it knowledge, the self, or something else. Since it knows both existence and nonexistence, its own nonexistence is never known.
V 16.32	येनाधिगम्यतेऽभावस्तत्सत्स्यात्तन्न चेद्भवेत् । / भावाभावानभिज्ञत्वं लोकस्य स्यान्न चेष्यते ॥	That by which nonexistence is known must exist. If it did not, the world would know neither existence nor nonexistence, and no one accepts that.
V 16.33	सदसत्सदसच्चेति विकल्पात्प्राग्यदिष्यते । / तदद्वैतं समत्वात्तु नित्यं चान्यद्विकल्पितात् ॥	What is held to come before the construction "existent, nonexistent, both existent and nonexistent" is nondual, because it is everywhere the same. It is eternal, because it is other than what is constructed.
V 16.34	विकल्पोद्भवतोऽसत्त्वं स्वप्नदृश्यवदिष्यताम् । / द्वैतस्य प्रागसत्त्वाच्च सदसत्त्वादिकल्पनात् ॥	Duality should be held to be unreal, like what is seen in a dream, because it arises from construction. It is also unreal because it did not exist before existence, nonexistence and the rest were constructed.
V 16.35	वाचारम्भणशास्त्राच्च विकाराणां ह्यभावता । / मृत्योः स मृत्युमित्यादेर्मम मायेति च स्मृतेः ॥	Modifications are nonexistent according to the scripture that calls them "a matter of words," according to "he goes from death to death" and similar passages, and according to the tradition that says "my illusion."[71]
V 16.36	विशुद्धिश्चात एवास्य विकल्पाच्च विलक्षणः । / उपादेयो न हेयोऽत आत्मा नान्यैरकल्पितः ॥	For this very reason the self is pure, and it is different from construction. Since it is not constructed, the self is neither to be taken up nor to be given up by anyone else.
V 16.37	अप्रकाशो यथादित्ये नास्ति ज्योतिःस्वभावतः । / नित्यबोधस्वरूपत्वान्नाज्ञानं तद्वदात्मनि ॥	There is no absence of light in the sun, whose nature is light. In the same way there is no ignorance in the self, whose nature is eternal awareness.
V 16.38	तथाविक्रियरूपत्वान्नावस्थान्तरमात्मनः । / अवस्थान्तरवत्त्वे हि नाशोऽस्य स्यान्न संशयः ॥	Likewise, because its nature is free of change, the self has no other state. If it had another state, it would undoubtedly perish.
V 16.39		For anyone who takes liberation to be a different state, liberation is something made and therefore

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
	मोक्षोऽवस्थान्तरं यस्य कृतकः स चलो ह्यतः । / न संयोगो वियोगो वा मोक्षो युक्तः कथंचन ॥	transient. Liberation cannot properly be either a union or a separation in any way.
V 16.40	संयोगस्याप्यनित्यत्वाद्वियोगस्य तथैव च । / गमनागमने चैव स्वरूपं तु न हीयते ॥	Union is impermanent, and so is separation, and so are going and coming. But one's own nature is never lost.
V 16.41	स्वरूपस्यानिमित्तत्वात्सनिमित्ता हि चापरे । / अनुपात्तं स्वरूपं हि स्वेनात्यक्तं तथैव च ॥	One's own nature has no cause, while the other things have causes. One's own nature is not acquired, and in the same way it is not given up by oneself.
V 16.42	स्वरूपत्वान्न सर्वस्य त्यक्तुं शक्यो ह्यनन्यतः । / ग्रहीतुं वा ततो नित्योऽविषयत्वात्पृथक्त्वतः ॥	Because it is the very nature of everything, it cannot be given up, since it is not other, nor can it be taken hold of. It is therefore eternal, because it is not an object and stands apart.
V 16.43	आत्मार्थत्वाच्च सर्वस्य नित्य आत्मैव केवलः । / त्यजेत्तस्मात्क्रियाः सर्वाः साधनैः सह मोक्षवित् ॥	Since everything exists for the sake of the self, the self alone is eternal and absolute. Therefore one who knows liberation should give up all actions together with their means.
V 16.44	आत्मलाभः परो लाभ इति शास्त्रोपपत्तयः । / अलाभोऽनात्मलाभस्तु त्यजेत्तस्मादनात्मताम् ॥	"Gaining the self is the highest gain": so scripture and reasoning declare. Gaining what is not the self is no gain, so one should give up identification with what is not the self.[72]
V 16.45	गुणानां समभावस्य भ्रंशो न ह्युपपद्यते । / अविद्यादेः प्रसुप्तत्वान्न चान्यो हेतुरिष्यते ॥	The disturbance of the equilibrium of the *guṇas* cannot be accounted for, because ignorance and the rest lie dormant, and no other cause is accepted.[73]
V 16.46	इतरेतरहेतुत्वे प्रवृत्तिः स्यात्सदा न वा । / नियमो न प्रवृत्तीनां गुणेष्वात्मनि वा भवेत् ॥	If they cause one another, activity would either go on always or never begin. There could be no regularity of activity, whether its cause lies in the *guṇas* or in the self.
V 16.47	विशेषो मुक्तबद्धानां तादर्थ्ये न च युज्यते । / अर्थार्थिनोस्तु संबन्धो नार्थी ज्ञो नेतरोऽपि वा ॥	If one exists for the sake of the other, no distinction between the liberated and the bound can be maintained. There is a relation between an aim and one who seeks it, but the knower seeks nothing, and neither does the other.
V 16.48	प्रधानस्य च पारार्थ्यं पुरुषस्याविकारतः । / न युक्तं सांख्यशास्त्रेऽपि विकारेऽपि न युज्यते ॥	Even within Sāṃkhya teaching, primal matter cannot exist for the sake of another, since *puruṣa* is free of change. And if *puruṣa* changed, it would not hold either.
V 16.49		

71 Chandogya Upanishad 6.1.4; Katha Upanishad 4.10; Bhagavad Gita 7.14.
72 Compare Apastamba Dharmasutra 1.8.22.2: "there is nothing higher than gaining the self."
73 Sāṃkhya, a dualist school, holds that spirit (*puruṣa*) and primal matter (*prakṛti*, also *pradhāna*) are distinct. It teaches that matter's three *guṇas*, *sattva* (goodness/clarity), *rajas* (passion) and *tamas* (darkness/inertia), rest in equilibrium until creation begins.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
	संबन्धानुपपत्तेश्च प्रकृतेः पुरुषस्य च । / मिथोऽयुक्तं तदर्थत्वं प्रधानस्याचितित्वतः ॥	Since no relation between *prakṛti* and *puruṣa* is possible, it is untenable for primal matter, being unconscious, to exist for the other's sake.
V 16.50	क्रियोत्पत्तौ विनाशित्वं ज्ञानमात्रे च पूर्ववत् । / निर्निमित्ते त्वनिर्मोक्षः प्रधानस्य प्रसज्यते ॥	If liberation is produced by action, it is perishable. If it comes from knowledge alone, the earlier objection applies. If it has no cause, it follows that primal matter could never be released.
V 16.51	न प्रकाश्यं यथोष्णत्वं ज्ञानेनैव सुखादयः । / एकनीडत्वतोऽग्राह्याः स्युः कणादादिवर्त्मनाम् ॥	Heat is not illuminated by the light of the fire it shares. In the same way, for the followers of Kanada and others, pleasure and the rest could not be grasped by knowledge, since they share the same seat.[74]
V 16.52	युगपत्समवेतत्वं सुखविज्ञानयोरपि । / मनोयोगैकहेतुत्वादग्राह्यत्वं सुखस्य च ॥	Pleasure and cognition would also inhere in the self at the same time, since contact with the mind is their single cause. Pleasure would then be impossible to perceive.
V 16.53	तथान्येषां च भिन्नत्वाद्युगपज्जन्म नेष्यते । / गुणानां समवेतत्वं ज्ञानं चेन्न विशेषणात् ॥	Likewise, since the other qualities differ, they are not held to arise at the same time. If you say that knowledge is simply the qualities' inhering in the self: no, because of how it is qualified.
V 16.54	ज्ञानेनैव विशेष्यत्वाज्ज्ञानाप्यत्वं स्मृतेस्तथा । / सुखं ज्ञातं मयेत्येवं तवाज्ञानात्मकत्वतः ॥	Pleasure is qualified by knowledge alone, so it is reached by knowledge, and the memory "I knew pleasure" shows the same. But on your view the self is not knowledge by nature.
V 16.55	सुखादेर्नात्मधर्मत्वमात्मनस्तेऽविकारतः । / भेदादन्यस्य कस्मान्न मनसो वाविशेषतः ॥	On your view pleasure and the rest are not properties of the self, since the self is free of change. Since they are distinct from it, why should they not belong to something else, or to the mind, since there is no difference?
V 16.56	स्यान्मालापरिहार्या तु ज्ञानं चेज्ज्ञेयतां व्रजेत् । / युगपद्वापि चोत्पत्तिरभ्युपेतात इष्यताम् ॥	If knowledge became an object of knowledge, an endless chain would be unavoidable. Otherwise you would have to grant that cognitions arise simultaneously, and then let that be accepted.
V 16.57	अनवस्थान्तरत्वाच्च बन्धो नात्मनि युज्यते । / नाशुद्धिश्चाप्यसङ्गत्वादसङ्गो हीति च श्रुतेः ॥	Since the self has no other state, bondage cannot be ascribed to it. Nor can impurity, since it is unattached, as scripture says: "for he is unattached."[75]
V 16.58	सूक्ष्मैकागोचरेभ्यश्च न लिप्यत इति श्रुतेः । / एवं तर्हि न मोक्षोऽस्ति बन्धाभावात्कथंचन ॥	Being subtle, one and beyond the senses, it "is not tainted," as scripture says. If so, then since there is no bondage, there is no liberation at all.[76]

74 Vaiśeṣika, the school traced to Kaṇāda, holds that pleasure, pain, knowledge and the like are qualities that inhere in the self and arise through its contact with the mind.
75 Brihadaranyaka Upanishad 4.3.15.
76 Compare Katha Upanishad 5.11 and Bhagavad Gita 13.32.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
V 16.59	शास्त्रानर्थक्यमेवं स्यान्न बुद्धेर्भ्रान्तिरिष्यते । / बन्धो मोक्षश्च तन्नाशः स यथोक्तो न चान्यथा ॥	Then scripture would be pointless. No: bondage is held to be an error of the intellect, and liberation its destruction, just as stated and not otherwise.
V 16.60	बोधात्मज्योतिषा दीप्ता बोधमात्मनि मन्यते । / बुद्धिर्नान्योऽस्ति बोद्धेति सेयं भ्रान्तिर्हि धीगता ॥	Lit by the light of the self, which is awareness, the intellect thinks that awareness is in itself and that there is no knower other than itself. This error lies in the intellect.
V 16.61	बोधस्यात्मस्वरूपत्वान्नित्यं तत्रोपचर्यते । / अविवेकोऽप्यनाद्योऽयं संसारो नान्य इष्यते ॥	Since awareness is the self's own nature, it is always ascribed to the intellect in a figurative sense. This failure to discriminate has no beginning, and it is the round of rebirth, nothing else.
V 16.62	मोक्षस्तन्नाश एव स्यान्नान्योऽस्त्यनुपपत्तितः । / येषां वस्त्वन्तरापत्तिर्मोक्षो नाशस्तु तैर्मतः ॥	Liberation can only be its destruction. There is no other liberation, because no other is tenable. Those for whom liberation means turning into a different thing in effect hold it to be destruction.
V 16.63	अवस्थान्तरमप्येवमविकारान्न युज्यते । / विकारेऽवयवित्वं स्यात्ततो नाशो घटादिवत् ॥	In the same way, a different state is untenable, since the self is free of change. If it changed, it would be made of parts, and then it would perish, like a jar.
V 16.64	तस्माद्भ्रान्तिरतोऽन्या हि बन्धमोक्षादिकल्पना । / सांख्यकाणादबौद्धानां मीमांसार्हतकल्पना ॥	Therefore every other notion of bondage, liberation and the like is an error. This includes the notions of Sāṃkhya, of Kanada's school, of the Buddhists, of Mīmāṃsā and of the Jains.[77]
V 16.65	शास्त्रयुक्तिविरोधात्ता नादर्तव्याः कदाचन । / शक्यन्ते शतशो वक्तुं दोषास्तासां सहस्रशः ॥	Since they conflict with scripture and reasoning, they should never be given credence. Their faults could be told by the hundreds and the thousands.
V 16.66	अपि निन्दोपपत्तेश्च यान्यतोऽन्यानि चेत्यतः । / त्यक्त्वातो ह्यन्यशास्त्रोक्तीर्मतिं कुर्याद्दृढां बुधः ॥	Censure of them is justified, and tradition speaks of "those that are other than this." For these reasons the wise should set aside what other systems teach and make their understanding firm.[78]
V 16.67	श्रद्धाभक्ती पुरस्कृत्य हित्वा सर्वमनार्जवम् । / वेदान्तस्यैव तत्त्वार्थे व्यासस्याभिमते तथा ॥	Putting faith and devotion first and abandoning all crookedness, they should make it firm in the true meaning of Vedanta alone, and in what Vyasa holds.[79]
V 16.68	इति प्रणुन्ना द्वयवादिकल्पना निरात्मवादाश्च तथा हि युक्तितः । / व्यपेतशङ्काः परवादतः स्थिरा मुमुक्षवो ज्ञानपथे स्युरित्यतः ॥	So the constructions of those who teach duality, and the doctrines that deny a self, have been refuted by reasoning. Those who seek liberation

77 Mīmāṃsā is the school of Vedic exegesis centered on ritual action. The Jains (*ārhata*, followers of the *arhats*) are a renunciant tradition that holds the soul is freed by shedding the matter of *karma*.
78 Manu 12.96 says that teachings other than the Veda arise and pass away and are fruitless.
79 Vyasa, the legendary compiler of the Vedas and the Mahabharata, is identified in the tradition with the author of the Brahmasutra.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
		may now stand firm on the path of knowledge, free of the doubts that others' doctrines raise.
V 16.69	स्वसाक्षिकं ज्ञानमतीव निर्मलं विकल्पनाभ्यो विपरीतमद्वयम् । / अवाप्य सम्यग्यदि निश्चितो भवेन्निरन्वयो निर्वृतिमेति शाश्वतीम् ॥	If one rightly attains the knowledge that is its own witness, utterly pure, the opposite of all conceptual constructions, and nondual, and is firmly convinced of it, then, free of every connection, one reaches everlasting peace.
V 16.70	इदं रहस्यं परमं परायणं व्यपेतदोषैरभिमानवर्जितैः । / समीक्ष्य कार्या मतिरार्जवे सदा न तत्त्वदृक्शाठ्यमतिर्हि कश्चन ॥	This is the highest secret, the final refuge. Those who are free of faults and without pride should examine it and keep their minds always set on honesty, for no one who sees the truth has a mind inclined to deceit.
V 16.71	अनेकजन्मान्तरसंचितैर्नरो विमुच्यतेऽज्ञाननिमित्तपातकैः । / इदं विदित्वा परमं च पावनं न लिप्यते व्योमवदेव कर्मभिः ॥	Knowing this, which is supreme and purifying, a person is freed from the sins piled up over many births, sins caused by ignorance, and like the sky he is not stained by actions.
V 16.72	प्रशान्तचित्ताय जितेन्द्रियाय च प्रहीणदोषाय यथोक्तकारिणे । / गुणान्वितायानुगताय सर्वदा प्रदेयमेतत्सततं मुमुक्षवे ॥	This should be imparted constantly to one who seeks liberation: one whose mind is calm, who has mastered the senses, who is rid of faults, who does as he is taught, who has good qualities and who always follows the teacher.
V 16.73	परस्य देहे न यथात्ममानिता परस्य तद्वत्परमार्थमीक्ष्य च । / इदं हि विज्ञानमतीव निर्मलं संप्राप्य मुक्तोऽथ भवेच्च सर्वतः ॥	Just as one does not take another person's body to be oneself, so too, having seen the highest truth, one does not take one's own body to be oneself. Having attained this utterly pure awareness, one is then free in every respect.
V 16.74	न हीह लाभोऽभ्यधिकोऽस्ति कश्चन स्वरूपलाभात्स इतो हि नान्यतः । / न देयमैन्द्रादपि राज्यतोऽधिकं स्वरूपलाभं त्वपरीक्ष्य यत्नतः ॥	There is no gain here greater than the gain of one's own nature, and it comes from this and from nothing else. This gain of one's own nature, which surpasses even the kingship of Indra, must not be given without careful examination.

CHAPTER 17: RIGHT UNDERSTANDING

Knowledge of brahman comes from the Veda alone; the self is like a conjurer untouched by illusion.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
V 17.1	आत्मा ज्ञेयः परो ह्यात्मा यस्मादन्यन्न विद्यते । / सर्वज्ञः सर्वदृक्शुद्धस्तस्मै ज्ञेयात्मने नमः ॥	The self is what is to be known, the highest self, apart from which nothing exists. Homage to that self which is to be known, all-knowing, all-seeing and pure.
V 17.2	पदवाक्यप्रमाणज्ञैर्दीपभूतैः प्रकाशितम् । / ब्रह्म वेदरहस्यं यैस्तान्नित्यं प्रणतोऽस्म्यहम् ॥	I bow forever to those who, like lamps, versed in words, sentences and the means of knowledge, have brought to light *brahman*, the secret of the Veda.[80]

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
V 17.3	यद्वाक्सूर्यांशुसंपातप्रणष्टध्वान्तकल्मषः । / प्रणम्य तान्गुरून्वक्ष्ये ब्रह्मविद्याविनिश्चयम् ॥	The sunbeams of their words fell on me and destroyed the darkness and stain within me. Bowing to those teachers, I will set out the settled truth of the knowledge of *brahman*.
V 17.4	आत्मलाभात्परो नान्यो लाभः कश्चन विद्यते । / यदर्था वेदवादाश्च स्मार्ताश्चापि तु याः क्रियाः ॥	There is no gain higher than the gain of the self. The statements of the Veda exist for its sake, and so do the rites laid down by tradition.
V 17.5	आत्मार्थोऽपि हि यो लाभः सुखायेष्टो विपर्ययः । / आत्मलाभः परः प्रोक्तो नित्यत्वाद्ब्रह्मवेदिभिः ॥	Even a gain sought for one's own sake and wanted for happiness is the contrary of this. The knowers of *brahman* declare the gain of the self supreme, because it is eternal.
V 17.6	स्वयं लब्धस्वभावत्वाल्लाभस्तस्य न चान्यतः । / अन्यापेक्षस्तु यो लाभः सोऽन्यदृष्टिसमुद्भवः ॥	Since the self's very nature is to be already attained by itself, the gain of it does not come from anything else. A gain that depends on something else arises from seeing something other.
V 17.7	अन्यदृष्टिस्त्वविद्या स्यात्तन्नाशो मोक्ष उच्यते । / ज्ञानेनैव तु सोऽपि स्याद्विरोधित्वान्न कर्मणा ॥	Seeing something other is ignorance, and its destruction is called liberation. Liberation comes through knowledge alone, because knowledge is opposed to ignorance, and not through action.
V 17.8	कर्मकार्यस्त्वनित्यः स्यादविद्याकामकारणः । / प्रमाणं वेद एवात्र ज्ञानस्याधिगमे स्मृतः ॥	What action produces is impermanent, because its causes are ignorance and desire. Here, for attaining knowledge, the Veda alone is held to be the means of knowledge.
V 17.9	ज्ञानैकार्थपरत्वात्तु वाक्यमेकं ततो विदुः । / एकत्वं ह्यात्मनो ज्ञेयं वाक्यार्थप्रतिपत्तितः ॥	Because it aims at the single purpose of knowledge, they regard it as one sentence, for the oneness of the self is to be known by understanding the meaning of the sentence.
V 17.10	वाच्यभेदात्तु तद्भेदः कल्प्यो वाच्योऽपि तच्छ्रुतेः । / त्रयं त्वेतत्सतः प्रोक्तं रूपं नाम च कर्म च ॥	Difference in it is imagined because of difference in what words denote, and what is denoted is in turn imagined from hearing the words. Three things are declared of the existent: form, name and action.[81]
V 17.11	असदेतत्त्रयं यस्मादन्योन्येन हि कल्पितम् । / कृतो वर्णौ यथाशब्दाच्छ्रुताऽन्यत्र धिया बहिः ॥	This triad is unreal, because each of its members is imagined through the others, just as letters heard as sound are given shape elsewhere, outside, by the mind.[82]
V 17.12	दृष्टं चापि यथा रूपं बुद्धेः शब्दाय कल्पते । / एवमेतज्जगत्सर्वं भ्रान्तिबुद्धिविकल्पितम् ॥	And just as a visible shape serves the intellect as a sound, so this whole world is constructed by an intellect in error.

80 Words, sentences and means of knowledge stand for the traditional disciplines of grammar, Vedic exegesis and logic.
81 The triad of name, form and action echoes Brihadaranyaka Upanishad 1.6.1.
82 The image is of writing: a sound that has been heard is turned by the mind into a written letter, and the written shape then stands for the sound.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
V 17.13	असदेतत्ततो युक्तं सम्विन्मात्रं न कल्पितम् । / वेदश्चापि स एवाद्यो वेद्यं चान्यत्तु कल्पितम् ॥	So it is right that this is unreal. Consciousness alone is not imagined. That primal one is also the knowing, while what is known, being other, is imagined.[83]
V 17.14	येन वेत्ति स वेदः स्यात्स्वप्ने सर्वं तु मायया । / येन पश्यति तच्चक्षुः शृणोति श्रोत्रमुच्यते ॥	That by which one knows is called knowing. In dream everything comes about through illusion: that by which one sees is called the eye, and that by which one hears, the ear.[84]
V 17.15	येन स्वप्नगतो वक्ति सा वाग्घ्राणं तथैव च । / रसनस्पर्शने चैव मनश्चान्यत्तथेन्द्रियम् ॥	That by which one speaks in a dream is speech, and the same holds for smell, taste and touch, for the mind, and for every other sense.
V 17.16	कल्प्योपाधिभिरेवैतद्भिन्नं ज्ञानमनेकधा । / आश्रिभेदाद्यथा भेदो मणेरेकस्य जायते ॥	This knowledge is divided in many ways only by imagined limiting adjuncts, just as a single gem appears different according to the different things it rests on.
V 17.17	जाग्रतश्च तथा भेदो ज्ञानस्यास्य विकल्पितः । / बुद्धिस्थं व्याकरोत्यर्थं भ्रान्त्या तृष्णोद्भवक्रियः ॥	In the same way the division of this knowledge is imagined for one who is awake. Through error, one whose actions spring from craving turns the object that lies within the intellect into something external.
V 17.18	स्वप्ने तद्वत्प्रबोधे यो बहिश्चान्तस्तथैव च । / आलेख्याध्ययने यद्वत्तदन्योन्यधियोद्भवम् ॥	As in dream, so in waking, what is outside and what is inside arise from each being conceived through the other, as with writing and recitation.
V 17.19	यदायं कल्पयेद्भेदं तत्कामः सन्यथाक्रतुः । / यत्कामस्तत्क्रतुर्भूत्वा कृतं यत्तत्प्रपद्यते ॥	When he imagines difference, he comes to desire it and resolves accordingly. Desiring something and resolved on it, he attains whatever he has done.[85]
V 17.20	अविद्याप्रभवं सर्वमसत्तस्मादिदं जगत् । / तद्वता दृश्यते यस्मात्सुषुप्ते न च गृह्यते ॥	All of this springs from ignorance, so this world is unreal, for it is seen by one who has ignorance and is not perceived in deep sleep.
V 17.21	विद्याविद्ये श्रुतिप्रोक्ते एकत्वान्यधियौ हि नः । / तस्मात्सर्वप्रयत्नेन शास्त्रे विद्या विधीयते ॥	Knowledge and ignorance, as scripture teaches, are for us the notion of oneness and the notion of something other. That is why scripture prescribes knowledge with every effort.
V 17.22	चित्ते ह्यादर्शवद्यस्माच्छुद्धे विद्या प्रकाशते । / यमैर्नित्यैश्च नियमैस्तपोभिस्तस्य शोधनम् ॥	Knowledge shines in a pure mind as an image does in a clean mirror. So the mind must be purified by the restraints, by the constant observances and by austerities.[86]

83 Shankara plays on *veda*, which means both "knowing" and the scripture.
84 *Māyā*, illusion: the power by which what is one appears as many.
85 This echoes Brihadaranyaka Upanishad 4.4.5.
86 The restraints (*yama*: nonviolence, truthfulness and the like) and observances (*niyama*: purity, contentment and the like) are the ethical groundwork of yoga discipline.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
V 17.23	शारीरादि तपः कुर्यात्तद्विशुद्ध्यर्थमुत्तमम् । / मनआदिसमाधानं तत्तद्देहविशोषणम् ॥	To purify it, one should practice the highest austerity, of body and the rest: the composing of the mind and the other faculties, and the wearing down of the body to that end.
V 17.24	मनसश्चेन्द्रियाणां च ह्यैकाग्र्यं परमं तपः । / तज्ज्यायः सर्वधर्मेभ्यः स धर्मः पर उच्यते ॥	One-pointedness of mind and senses is the supreme austerity. It is better than all other forms of *dharma* and is called the highest *dharma*.[87]
V 17.25	दृष्टं जागरितं विद्यात्स्मृतं स्वप्नं तदेव तु । / सुषुप्तं तदभावं च स्वमात्मानं परं पदम् ॥	One should know waking as what is seen and dream as that same thing remembered, deep sleep as their absence, and one's own self as the highest state.
V 17.26	सुषुप्त्याख्यं तमोऽज्ञानं बीजं स्वप्नप्रबोधयोः । / स्वात्मबोधप्रदग्धं स्याद्बीजं दग्धं यथाभवम् ॥	The darkness called deep sleep is ignorance, the seed of dream and waking. Burned by awakening to one's own self, it becomes like a burned seed, which can no longer sprout.
V 17.27	तदेवैकं त्रिधा ज्ञेयं मायाबीजं पुनः क्रमात् । / मायाव्यात्माविकारोऽपि बहुधैको जलार्कवत् ॥	That one seed of illusion should be known to appear threefold, in succession, again and again. The self, the conjurer, though one and free of change, appears as many, like the sun in water.[88]
V 17.28	बीजं चैकं यथा भिन्नं प्राणस्वप्नादिभिस्तथा । / स्वप्नजाग्रच्छरीरेषु तद्वच्चात्मा जलेन्दुवत् ॥	Just as the one seed is divided into breath, dream and the rest, so the self in the bodies of dream and waking is like the moon reflected in water.[89]
V 17.29	मायाहस्तिनमारुह्य मायाव्येको यथा व्रजेत् । / आगच्छंस्तद्वदेवात्मा प्राणस्वप्नादिगोचरः ॥	Just as a single conjurer mounts an illusory elephant and seems to go and come, so the self appears within the sphere of breath, dream and the rest.[90]
V 17.30	न हस्ती न तदारूढो मायाव्यन्यो यथा स्थितः । / न प्राणादि न तद्द्रष्टा तथा ज्ञोऽन्यः सदादृशिः ॥	Just as the conjurer is neither the elephant nor its rider but stands apart, so the knower is neither breath and the rest nor their seer, but is other, always the awareness that sees.
V 17.31	अबद्धचक्षुषो नास्ति माया मायाविनोऽपि वा । / बद्धाक्षस्यैव सा मायामायाव्येव ततो भवेत् ॥	For one whose eyes are not bound there is no illusion and no conjurer either. The illusion exists only for one whose eyes are bound, and so does the conjurer.
V 17.32	साक्षादेव स विज्ञेयः साक्षादात्मेति च श्रुतेः । / भिद्यते हृदयग्रन्थिर्न चेदित्यादितः श्रुतेः ॥	He is to be known directly, because scripture speaks of "the self that is direct," and because of the scriptures beginning "The knot of the heart is cut" and "If not …".[91]

87 *Dharma*: religious duty and virtue, the right order of life.
88 The image is of one sun reflected in many pools, each reflection seeming to be a separate sun.
89 "Breath" (*prāṇa*) here names the seed state of deep sleep, as in Gaudapada's verses on the Mandukya Upanishad.
90 Indian conjurers were famed for making spectators see illusory animals, the elephant above all.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
V 17.33	अशब्दादित्वतो नास्य ग्रहणं चेन्द्रियैर्भवेत् । / सुखादिभ्यस्तथान्यत्वाद्बुद्ध्या वापि कथं भवेत् ॥	Since it is without sound and the other sense qualities, it cannot be grasped by the senses. And since it is other than pleasure and the like, how could it be grasped by the intellect?
V 17.34	अदृश्योऽपि यथा राहुश्चन्द्रे बिम्बं यथाम्भसि । / सर्वगोऽपि तथैवात्मा बुद्धावेव स गृह्यते ॥	Rahu, though invisible, is seen on the moon, and an image is seen in water. In the same way the self, though all-pervading, is grasped only in the intellect.[92]
V 17.35	भानोर्बिम्बं यथा चौष्ण्यं जले दृष्टं न चाम्भसः । / बुद्धौ बोधो न तद्धर्मस्तथैव स्याद्विधर्मतः ॥	The sun's image and its heat are seen in water, yet they do not belong to the water. In the same way awareness is seen in the intellect, yet it is not a property of the intellect, because their properties differ.
V 17.36	चक्षुर्युक्ता धियो वृत्तिर्या तां पश्यन्नलुप्तदृक् । / दृष्टेर्द्रष्टा भवेदात्मा श्रुतेः श्रोता तथा श्रुतेः ॥	Seeing the modification of the intellect that is joined to the eye, the self, whose seeing is never lost, is the seer of seeing, and likewise the hearer of hearing, as scripture says.[93]
V 17.37	केवलां मनसो वृत्तिं पश्यन्मन्ता मतेरजः । / विज्ञातालुप्तशक्तित्वात्तथा शास्त्रान्न हीत्यतः ॥	Seeing the bare modification of the mind, the unborn one is the thinker of thought. And because its power is never lost, it is the knower, as scripture teaches with "For there is no loss ...".[94]
V 17.38	ध्यायतीत्यविकारित्वं तथा लेलायतीत्यपि । / अत्र स्तेनेति शुद्धत्वं तथानन्वागतश्रुतेः ॥	Its freedom from change is shown by "it thinks, as it were" and "it moves, as it were." Its purity is shown by "here a thief ..." and by the scripture "untouched ...".[95]
V 17.39	शक्त्यलोपात्सुषुप्ते ज्ञस्तथा बोधेऽविकारतः । / ज्ञेयस्यैव विशेषस्तु यत्र वेति श्रुतेर्मतः ॥	In deep sleep it remains the knower, because its power is not lost, and so it does in waking, because it does not change. The distinction belongs only to what is known. This is the view taken from the scripture "where, as it were ...".[96]
V 17.40	व्यवधानादिपारोक्ष्यं लोकदृष्टेरनात्मनः । / दृष्टेरात्मस्वरूपत्वात्प्रत्यक्षं ब्रह्म तत्स्मृतम् ॥	Ordinary seeing, which is of what is not the self, is indirect because of intervening things and the like. Since seeing is the very nature of the self, *brahman* is held to be immediate.
V 17.41	न हि दीपान्तरापेक्षा यद्वद्दीपप्रकाशने । / बोधस्यात्मस्वरूपत्वान्न बोधोऽन्यस्तथेष्यते ॥	

91 Brihadaranyaka Upanishad 3.4.1; Mundaka Upanishad 2.2.8; Kena Upanishad 2.5 ("if one has not known it here, great is the loss").
92 Rahu is the demon said to swallow the sun and moon at eclipses. He has no visible form of his own and is seen only as a shadow on the moon.
93 Brihadaranyaka Upanishad 3.4.2 and 4.3.23.
94 Brihadaranyaka Upanishad 4.3.30.
95 Brihadaranyaka Upanishad 4.3.7 and 4.3.22 ("here a thief is no thief ... untouched by good, untouched by evil").
96 Brihadaranyaka Upanishad 4.3.31 ("where there is, as it were, another").

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
		A lamp needs no other lamp to light it up. In the same way, since awareness is the very nature of the self, no other awareness is required to know it.
V 17.42	विषयत्वं विकारित्वं नानात्वं वा न हीष्यते । / न हेयो नाप्युपादेय आत्मा नान्येन वा ततः ॥	Being an object, being subject to change, or being many is not accepted of the self. Therefore the self can be neither rejected nor taken up, whether by itself or by anything else.
V 17.43	सबाह्याभ्यन्तरोऽजीर्णो जन्ममृत्युजरातिगः । / अहमात्मेति यो वेत्ति कुतो न्वेव बिभेति सः ॥	Whoever knows, "I am the self, within and without, unaging, beyond birth, death and old age," what could he possibly fear?
V 17.44	प्रागेवैतद्विधेः कर्म वर्णित्वादेरपोहनात् । / तदस्थूलादिशास्त्रेभ्यस्तत्त्वमेवेति निश्चयात् ॥	Action belongs only to the time before this teaching, because the teaching removes being of a caste and the like, through the certainty, drawn from such scriptures as "not gross …", that "you are that" alone.[97]
V 17.45	पूर्वदेहपरित्यागे जात्यादीनां प्रहाणतः । / देहस्यैव तु जात्यादिस्तस्याप्येवं ह्यनात्मता ॥	Caste and the like are lost when the former body is cast off. So caste and the like belong only to the body, and in this way the body too is shown not to be the self.
V 17.46	ममाहं चेत्यतोऽविद्या शरीरादिष्वनात्मसु । / आत्मज्ञानेन हेया स्यादसुराणामिति श्रुतेः ॥	Hence the ignorance that says "mine" and "I" about the body and the other things that are not the self must be abandoned through knowledge of the self, according to the scripture "of the demons …".[98]
V 17.47	दशाहाशौचकार्याणां पारिव्राज्ये निवर्तनम् । / यथा ज्ञानस्य संप्राप्तौ तद्वज्जात्यादिकर्मणाम् ॥	On becoming a renunciant, one ceases to perform the rites of the ten days of impurity. In the same way, on attaining knowledge, one ceases to perform the actions tied to caste and the like.[99]
V 17.48	यत्कामस्तत्क्रतुर्भूत्वा कृतं त्वज्ञः प्रपद्यते । / यदा स्वात्मदृशः कामाः प्रमुच्यन्तेऽमृतस्तदा ॥	The ignorant one, desiring something and resolved on it, attains what he has done. But when the desires of one who sees his own self are released, he is then immortal.[100]
V 17.49	आत्मरूपविधेः कार्यं क्रियादिभ्यो निवर्तनम् । / न साध्यं साधनं वात्मा नित्यतृप्तश्रुतेर्मतः ॥	The effect of the teaching about the self's nature is withdrawal from action and the like. The self is neither something to be accomplished nor a means, according to the scripture "ever content."[101]
V 17.50		The result of action is something to be produced, reached, modified or refined. Action can achieve

97 Brihadaranyaka Upanishad 3.8.8 ("neither gross nor fine").
98 Chandogya Upanishad 8.8.4–5, where the view that the body is the self is called the teaching of the demons (*asuras*).
99 A birth or death in the family brought ten days of ritual impurity with prescribed observances. A renunciant was exempt from them.
100 Brihadaranyaka Upanishad 4.4.7.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
	उत्पाद्याप्यविकार्याणि संस्कार्यं च क्रियाफलम् । / नातोऽन्यत्कर्मणा कार्यं त्यजेत्तस्मात्ससाधनम् ॥	nothing beyond these, so one should give it up together with its means.
V 17.51	तापान्तत्वादनित्यत्वादात्मार्थत्वाच्च या बहिः । / संहृत्यात्मनि तां प्रीतिं सत्यार्थी गुरुमाश्रयेत् ॥	Outward things end in torment, are impermanent and exist for the sake of the self. Therefore the seeker of truth should withdraw into the self the love he has for things outside, and go to a teacher,
V 17.52	शान्तं प्राज्ञं तथा मुक्तं निष्क्रियं ब्रह्मणि स्थितम् । / श्रुतेराचार्यवान्वेद तद्विद्धीति स्मृतेस्तथा ॥	one who is tranquil, wise, liberated, free of action and established in *brahman*. So says the scripture, "one who has a teacher knows," and so says the tradition, "know that ...".[102]
V 17.53	स गुरुस्तारयेद्युक्तं शिष्यं शिष्यगुणान्वितम् । / ब्रह्मविद्याप्लवेनाशु स्वान्तध्वान्तमहोदधिम् ॥	Such a teacher should quickly carry the earnest pupil who has a pupil's qualities across the great ocean of inner darkness, on the boat of the knowledge of *brahman*.
V 17.54	दृष्टिः स्पृष्टिः श्रुतिर्घ्रातिर्मतिर्विज्ञातिरेव च । / शक्तयोऽन्याश्च भिद्यन्ते चिद्रूपत्वेऽप्युपाधिभिः ॥	Seeing, touching, hearing, smelling, thinking, knowing and the other powers are divided by limiting adjuncts, though their nature is consciousness.
V 17.55	अपायोद्भूतिहीनाभिर्नित्यं दीप्यन्नविर्यथा । / सर्वदृक्सर्वगः शुद्धः सर्वं जानाति सर्वदा ॥	Like the sun, shining always with powers that neither arise nor pass away, the all-seeing, all-pervading, pure one knows everything at all times.
V 17.56	अन्यदृष्टिः शरीरस्थस्तावन्मात्रो ह्यविद्यया । / जलेन्द्वाद्युपमाभिस्तु तद्धर्मा च विभाव्यते ॥	Through ignorance he sees something other, dwells in the body and seems only as large as it. Through such comparisons as the moon in water, he is shown to appear to have its properties.
V 17.57	दृष्ट्वा बाह्यं निमील्याथ स्मृत्वा तत्प्रविहाय च । / अथोन्मील्यात्मनो दृष्टिं ब्रह्म प्राप्नोत्यनध्वगः ॥	Having seen what is outside, then closing the eyes and remembering it, then letting that go too, and then opening the self's own seeing, one reaches *brahman* without traveling any road.
V 17.58	प्राणाद्येवं त्रिकं हित्वा तीर्णोऽज्ञानमहोदधिम् । / स्वात्मस्थो निर्गुणः शुद्धो बुद्धो मुक्तः स्वतो हि सः ॥	Leaving behind in this way the triad of breath and the rest, he has crossed the great ocean of ignorance. Abiding in his own self, without attributes, pure, awake, he is free by his very nature.
V 17.59	अजोऽहं चामरोऽमृत्युरजरोऽभय एव च । / सर्वज्ञः सर्वदृक्शुद्ध इति बुद्धो न जायते ॥	"I am unborn, undying, deathless, ageless and fearless, all-knowing, all-seeing and pure." One who has awakened to this is not born.
V 17.60	पूर्वोक्तं यत्तमोबीजं तन्नास्तीति विनिश्चयः । / तदभावे कुतो जन्म ब्रह्मैकत्वं विजानतः ॥	He holds the firm conviction that the seed of darkness spoken of earlier does not exist. When it is absent, how could there be birth for one who knows oneness with *brahman*?

101 Bhagavad Gita 4.20.
102 Chandogya Upanishad 6.14.2; Bhagavad Gita 4.34 ("know that by bowing down, by questioning and by service").

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
V 17.61	क्षीरात्सर्पिर्यथोद्धृत्य क्षिप्तं तस्मिन्न पूर्ववत् । / बुद्ध्यादेर्ज्ञस्तथासत्यान्न देही पूर्ववद्भवेत् ॥	Ghee drawn out of milk and poured back into it does not become as it was before. In the same way the knower, once separated from the intellect and the rest, which are unreal, does not become embodied as before.
V 17.62	सत्यं ज्ञानमनन्तं च रसादेः पञ्चकात्परम् । / स्यामदृश्यादिशास्त्रोक्तमहं ब्रह्मेति निर्भयः ॥	Knowing "I am *brahman*, reality, knowledge, infinite, beyond the five that begin with the essence of food, the one scripture calls invisible and so on," I would be free of fear.[103]
V 17.63	यस्माद्भीताः प्रवर्तन्ते वाङ्मनः पावकादयः । / तदात्मानन्दतत्त्वज्ञो न बिभेति कुतश्चन ॥	Speech, mind, fire and the rest go about their work out of fear of it. One who knows the truth of that bliss which is the self fears nothing from anywhere.[104]
V 17.64	नामादिभ्यः परे भूम्नि स्वाराज्ये चेत्स्थितोऽद्वये । / प्रणमेत्कं तदात्मज्ञो न कार्यं कर्मणा तदा ॥	If one abides in the plenitude that lies beyond name and the rest, in self-rule, without a second, to whom should the knower of the self bow down? Then nothing remains to be done by action.[105]
V 17.65	विराड्वैश्वानरो बाह्यः स्मरन्नन्तः प्रजापतिः । / प्रविलीने तु सर्वस्मिन्प्राज्ञोऽव्याकृतमुच्यते ॥	As the outer, it is called Viraj and Vaishvanara; within, while it remembers, it is Prajapati; but when everything has dissolved, it is called Prajna, the unmanifest.[106]
V 17.66	वाचारम्भणमात्रत्वात्सुषुप्तादि त्रिकं त्वसत् । / सत्यो ज्ञश्चाहमित्येवं सत्यसंधो विमुच्यते ॥	Because they are only a matter of words, the three states, deep sleep and the others, are unreal; "I, the knower, am real"—one who holds fast to the truth in this way is set free.
V 17.67	भारूपत्वाद्यथा भानोर्नाहोरात्रे तथैव तु । / ज्ञानाज्ञाने न मे स्यातां चिद्रूपत्वाविशेषतः ॥	Just as the sun, being light by nature, has no day or night, so knowledge and ignorance cannot belong to me, for I am consciousness by nature without any distinction.
V 17.68	शास्त्रस्यानतिशङ्क्यत्वाद्ब्रह्मैव स्यामहं सदा । / ब्रह्मणो मे न हेयं स्याद्ग्राह्यं वेति च संस्मरेत् ॥	Since scripture cannot be doubted, I am always *brahman* alone; for me, who am *brahman*, there is nothing to be rejected or accepted—this one should keep in mind.
V 17.69	अहमेव च भूतेषु सर्वेष्वेको नभो यथा । / मयि सर्वाणि भूतानि पश्यन्नेव न जायते ॥	I alone, one, am in all beings, like space; one who sees all beings in me is not born again.
V 17.70	न बाह्यं मध्यतो वान्तर्विद्यतेऽन्यत्स्वतः क्वचित् । / अबाह्यान्तः श्रुतेः किंचित्तस्माच्छुद्धः स्वयंप्रभः ॥	Nothing other than itself exists anywhere, outside, in the middle or within, for scripture says it is

103 Taittiriya Upanishad 2.1–5, which defines *brahman* as "reality, knowledge, infinite" and describes five sheaths beginning with the one made of the essence of food; Mundaka Upanishad 1.1.6 ("invisible").
104 Taittiriya Upanishad 2.8–9.
105 The plenitude beyond name and the rest is the summit of Chandogya Upanishad 7.
106 Names for the self in its three states: in waking, Viraj (the cosmic form) or Vaishvanara; in dream, Prajapati; in deep sleep, Prajna.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
		"without inside or outside"; therefore it is pure and self-luminous.
V 17.71	नेति नेत्यादिशास्त्रेभ्यः प्रपञ्चोपशमोऽद्वयः । / अविज्ञातादिशास्त्राच्च नैव ज्ञेयो ह्यतोऽन्यथा ॥	Scriptures such as "not this, not this" show it as the stilling of the manifold world, without a second; and from scriptures such as "unknown" it follows that it cannot be known in any other way than this.
V 17.72	सर्वस्यात्माहमेवेति ब्रह्म चेद्विदितं परम् । / स आत्मा सर्वभूतानामात्मा ह्येषामिति श्रुतेः ॥	If the supreme *brahman* is known as "I alone am the self of all," then one is the self of all beings, for scripture says, "he is their self."
V 17.73	जीवश्चेत्परमात्मानं स्वात्मानं देवमञ्जसा । / देवोपास्यः स देवानां पशुत्वाच्च निवर्तते ॥	If the individual self knows the supreme self, the god, directly as its own self, it becomes one whom the gods worship and ceases to be their beast.[107]
V 17.74	अहमेव सदात्मज्ञः शून्यस्त्वन्यैर्यथाम्बरम् । / इत्येवं सत्यसंधत्वादसद्ध्यानान्न बध्यते ॥	"I alone am always the self, the knower, empty of everything else, like space"—one who holds fast to the truth in this way is not bound by meditation on the unreal.
V 17.75	कृपणास्तेऽन्यथैवातो विदुर्ब्रह्म परं हि ये । / स्वराड्योऽनन्यदृक्स्वस्थस्तस्य देवा असन्वशे ॥	Those who know the supreme *brahman* in any other way are therefore to be pitied. One who is self-ruling, who sees nothing other, who abides in himself—the gods are in his power.
V 17.76	हित्वा जात्यादिसंबन्धं वाचोऽन्याः सह कर्मभिः । / ओमित्येवं स्वमात्मानं सर्वं शुद्धं प्रपद्यथ ॥	Leaving behind every tie to caste and the like, and other words along with rituals, take refuge in your own self as Om—as all, and pure:[108]
V 17.77	सेतुं सर्वव्यवस्थानामहोरात्रादिवर्जितम् । / तिर्यगूर्ध्वमधः सर्वं सकृज्ज्योतिरनामयम् ॥	the dam that holds all ordered distinctions apart, free of day and night and the rest; across, above, below, it is all; light once and for all, untouched by any ill.[109]
V 17.78	धर्माधर्मविनिर्मुक्तं भूतभव्यात्कृताकृतात् । / स्वमात्मानं परं विद्याद्विमुक्तं सर्वबन्धनैः ॥	One should know one's own self as the supreme, free of merit and demerit, of past and future, of what is done and not done, released from all bonds.
V 17.79	अकुर्वन्सर्वकृच्छुद्धस्तिष्ठन्नत्येति धावतः । / मायया सर्वशक्तित्वादजः सन्बहुधा मतः ॥	Doing nothing, it does all; it is pure; standing still, it outruns those who run; because all powers are its own, through illusion it is thought of as manifold, though it is unborn.[110]
V 17.80	राजवत्साक्षिमात्रत्वात्सांनिध्याद्भ्रामको यथा । / भ्रामयञ्जगदात्माहं निष्क्रियोऽकारकोऽद्वयः ॥	Being a mere witness, like a king, and moving things by mere presence, like a magnet, I, the self,

107 Brihadaranyaka Upanishad 1.4.10: whoever worships a deity as other than himself is like a domestic animal to the gods.
108 Om, the sacred syllable, is used in the Upanishads as a support for meditation on the self (Mundaka Upanishad 2.2.5–6).
109 The self as a dam that day and night do not cross, and as light once and for all, comes from Chandogya Upanishad 8.4.1–2.
110 "Standing still, it outruns those who run" echoes Isha Upanishad 4; on the one appearing as many through illusion, compare Brihadaranyaka Upanishad 2.5.19.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
		set the world in motion while remaining action-less, no agent, without a second.
V 17.81	निर्गुणं निष्क्रियं नित्यं निर्द्वन्द्वं यन्निरामयम् । / शुद्धं बुद्धं तथा मुक्तं तद्ब्रह्मास्मीति धारयेत् ॥	That which is without qualities, without action, eternal, beyond the pairs of opposites, free of all ill, pure, awake and free—one should hold firmly, "I am that *brahman*."
V 17.82	बन्धं मोक्षं च सर्वं यत इदमुभयं हेयमेकं द्वयं च ज्ञेयाज्ञेयाभ्यतीतं परममधिगतं तत्त्वमेकं विशुद्धम् । / विज्ञायैतद्यथावच्छ्रुतिमुनिगदितं शोकमोहावतीतः सर्वज्ञः सर्वकृत्स्याद्भवभयरहितो ब्राह्मणोऽवाप्तकृत्यः ॥	Since all of this—bondage and liberation, both alike, unity and duality—is to be let go, and the supreme reality, one and utterly pure, beyond what can and cannot be known, has been realized: knowing this exactly as scripture and the sages have declared it, one passes beyond grief and delusion and becomes all-knowing, all-doing, free of the fear of worldly existence—a Brahmin who has done all that was to be done.
V 17.83	न स्वयं स्वस्य नान्यस्य नान्यश्चात्मा च हेयगः । / उपादेयो न चाप्येवमिति सम्यङ्मतिः स्मृता ॥	The self is not something to be given up, either by itself or by another, and there is no other; nor, likewise, is it something to be taken up. This is held to be right understanding.
V 17.84	आत्मप्रत्यायिका ह्येषा सर्ववेदान्तगोचरा । / ज्ञात्वैतां हि विमुच्यन्ते सर्वसंसारबन्धनैः ॥	For this understanding makes the self known; it is what all the Upanishads are about; knowing it, people are freed from all the bonds of the round of rebirth.
V 17.85	रहस्यं सर्ववेदानां देवानां चापि दुर्लभम् । / पवित्रं परमं ह्येतत्तदेतत्संप्रकाशितम् ॥	This is the secret of all the Vedas, hard even for the gods to obtain, the supreme purifier; and it is this that has now been fully brought to light.
V 17.86	नैतद्देयमशान्ताय रहस्यं ज्ञानमुत्तमम् । / विरक्ताय प्रदातव्यं शिष्यायानुगताय च ॥	This secret, the highest knowledge, is not to be given to one who is not at peace; it should be imparted to one who is free of passion, and to a pupil who follows the teacher.
V 17.87	ददतश्चात्मनो ज्ञानं निष्क्रयोऽन्यो न विद्यते । / ज्ञानमिच्छंस्तरेत्तस्माद्युक्तः शिष्यगुणैः सदा ॥	No other repayment exists for the one who gives knowledge of the self; therefore let the one who seeks knowledge cross over, always endowed with the qualities of a pupil.
V 17.88	ज्ञानं ज्ञेयं तथा ज्ञाता यस्मादन्यन्न विद्यते । / सर्वज्ञः सर्वशक्तिर्यस्तस्मै ज्ञानात्मने नमः ॥	Homage to the one whose self is knowledge, all-knowing and all-powerful, apart from whom there exists no knowledge, no object of knowledge, no knower.
V 17.89	विद्यया तारिताः स्मो यैर्जन्ममृत्युमहोदधिम् । / सर्वज्ञेभ्यो नमस्तेभ्यो गुरुभ्योऽज्ञानसंकुलम् ॥	Homage to those all-knowing teachers by whom, through knowledge, we have been carried across the great ocean of birth and death, teeming with ignorance.

CHAPTER 18: "YOU ARE THAT"

How "you are that" brings liberation: reflection, the ego, and why repeated meditation is not needed.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
V 18.1	येनात्मना विलीयन्त उद्भवन्ति च वृत्तयः । / नित्यावगतये तस्मै नमो धीप्रत्यगात्मने ॥	Homage to the self within the intellect, eternal knowing, in which the states of the mind dissolve and from which they arise.
V 18.2	प्रमथ्य वज्रोपमयुक्तिसंभृतैः श्रुतेररातीञ्शतशो वचोबलैः । / ररक्ष वेदार्थनिधिं विशालधीः नमो यतीन्द्राय गुरोर्गरीयसे ॥	With the force of words armed with arguments like thunderbolts, he crushed the enemies of scripture by the hundred; with his vast intellect he guarded the treasure that is the meaning of the Veda: homage to that lord of renunciants, more venerable than a teacher.[111]
V 18.3	नित्यमुक्तः सदेवास्मीत्येवं चेन्न भवेन्मतिः । / किमर्थं श्रावयत्येवं मातृवच्छ्रुतिरादृता ॥	If the understanding "I am eternally free, being itself" were not to arise, why would revered scripture, like a mother, teach us this so insistently?
V 18.4	सिद्धादेवाहमित्यस्माद्युष्मद्धर्मो निषिध्यते । / रज्ज्वामिवाहिधीर्युक्त्या तत्त्वमित्यादिशासनैः ॥	From the self-evident "I," the attributes of the "you" are negated by teachings such as "you are that," just as reasoning removes the idea of a snake from a rope.[112]
V 18.5	शास्त्रप्रामाण्यतो ज्ञेया धर्मादिरस्तिता यथा । / विषापोहो यथा ध्यानान्निवृत्तिः पाप्मनस्तथा ॥	Just as the existence of merit and the like is known on the authority of scripture, and just as poison is removed by meditation, so evil is removed.
V 18.6	सद्ब्रह्माहं करोमीति प्रत्ययावात्मसाक्षिकौ । / तयोरज्ञानजस्यैव त्यागो युक्ततरो मतः ॥	The notions "I am being, *brahman*" and "I act" both have the self as their witness; of the two, it is held more reasonable to give up the one born of ignorance.
V 18.7	सदस्मीति प्रमाणोत्था धीरन्या तन्निभोद्भवा । / प्रत्यक्षादिनिभा वापि बाध्यते दिग्भ्रमादिवत् ॥	The understanding "I am being" arises from a means of knowledge; the other arises from something that only resembles one. Or, even if it resembles perception and the like, it is canceled, like confusion about directions.
V 18.8	कर्ता भोक्तेति यच्छास्त्रं लोकबुद्ध्यनुवादि तत् । / सदस्मीति श्रुतेर्जाता बाध्यतेऽन्या तयैव धीः ॥	The scripture that speaks of an "agent" and an "enjoyer" merely restates worldly understanding; the understanding "I am being," born of scripture, cancels the other.
V 18.9	सदेव त्वमसीत्युक्ते नात्मनो मुक्तता स्थिरा । / प्रवर्तते प्रसंचक्षामतो युक्त्यानुचिन्तयेत् ॥	When one is told "you are being itself," the freedom of the self does not become firm; therefore one undertakes repeated meditation, and should reflect on it with reasoning.[113]

111 The lord of renunciants is not named here; tradition takes him to be a teacher in Shankara's own line.
112 "You" (*yuṣmad*, the second person) stands here for the objective sphere, the not-self, as against the self-evident "I" (*asmad*).
113 Repeated meditation (*prasaṃkhyāna*) means dwelling on the meaning of the scriptural sentence until it is experienced; verses 18.9–18 state the case for it, and Shankara answers from 18.19.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
V 18.10	सकृदुक्तं न गृह्णाति वाक्यार्थज्ञोऽपि यो भवेत् । / अपेक्षतेऽत एवान्यदवोचाम द्वयं हि तत् ॥	Even one who knows the meaning of the sentence does not grasp it when it is said once; he needs something further—and that is why we spoke of both.
V 18.11	नियोगोऽप्रतिपन्नत्वात्कर्मणा स यथा भवेत् । / अविरुद्धो भवेत्तावद्यावत्संवेद्यतादृढा ॥	Because the meaning has not yet been grasped, there can be an injunction, as there is for ritual action; and it does not conflict with the teaching so long as the experience has not become firm.
V 18.12	चेष्टितं च यतो मिथ्या स्वच्छन्दं प्रतिपद्यते । / प्रसंख्यानमतः कार्यं यावदात्मानुभूयते ॥	And because activity, false as it is, goes on at its own will, repeated meditation must be practiced until the self is experienced.
V 18.13	सदस्मीति च विज्ञानमक्षजो बाधते ध्रुवम् । / शब्दोत्थं दृढसंस्कारो दोषैश्चाकृष्यते बहिः ॥	The notion born of the senses, with its firmly rooted impressions, surely cancels the awareness "I am being" that arises from words, and one is dragged outward by faults.
V 18.14	श्रुतानुमानजन्मानौ सामान्यविषयौ यतः । / प्रत्ययावक्षजोऽवश्यं विशेषार्थौ निवारयेत् ॥	Since the notions produced by scripture and by inference have general objects, the notion born of the senses must override them where particular objects are concerned.
V 18.15	वाक्यार्थप्रत्ययी कश्चिन्निर्दुःखो नोपलभ्यते । / यदि वा दृश्यते कश्चिद्वाक्यार्थश्रुतिमात्रतः ॥	No one who has grasped the meaning of the sentence is found to be free of suffering; or, if someone is seen to be free of suffering merely from hearing the meaning of the sentence,
V 18.16	निर्दुःखोऽतीतदेहेषु कृतभावोऽनुमीयते । / चर्या नो शास्त्रसंवेद्या स्यादनिष्टं तथा सति ॥	then it is inferred that he had done the practice in earlier bodies. If it were otherwise, our course of practice would not be known from scripture, and that would be unwelcome.
V 18.17	सदसीति फलं चोक्त्वा विधेयं साधनं यतः । / न तदन्यत्प्रसंख्यानात्प्रसिद्धार्थमिहेष्यते ॥	For after stating the result—"you are being"—scripture must enjoin a means, and here no means other than repeated meditation is accepted for reaching that declared goal.
V 18.18	तस्मादनुभवायैव प्रसंचक्षीत यत्नतः । / त्यजन्साधनतत्साध्यविरुद्धं शमनादिमान् ॥	Therefore one should meditate repeatedly and with effort, solely for the sake of experience, giving up whatever conflicts with the means and with what it brings about, and possessed of tranquility and the rest.
V 18.19	नैतदेवं रहस्यानां नेति नेत्यवसानतः । / क्रियासाध्यं पुरा श्राव्यं न मोक्षो नित्यसिद्धतः ॥	No, it is not so, for the secret teachings culminate in "not this, not this." What is to be achieved by action would have to be taught first; liberation is not of that kind, since it is eternally accomplished.
V 18.20	पुत्रदुःखं यथाध्यस्तं पित्रा दुःखे स्व आत्मनि । / अहंकर्ता तथाध्यस्तो नित्यादुःखे स्व आत्मनि ॥	Just as a father superimposes his son's suffering on his own self, which does not suffer, so the ego, the

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
		agent, is superimposed on one's own self, which is eternally free of suffering.
V 18.21	सोऽध्यासो नेति नेतीति प्राप्तवत्प्रतिषिध्यते । / भूयोऽभ्यासविधिः कश्चित्कुतश्चिन्नोपपद्यते ॥	That superimposition is negated by "not this, not this," as something that had been present; no further injunction to repeated practice can be justified on any ground.
V 18.22	आत्मनीह यथाध्यासः प्रतिषेधस्तथैव च । / मलाध्यासनिषेधौ खे क्रियेते च यथाबुधैः ॥	Here, superimposition on the self and its negation are of the same kind, just as the unwise superimpose dirt on the sky and then deny it.
V 18.23	प्राप्तश्चेत्प्रतिषिध्येत मोक्षोऽनित्यो भवेद्ध्रुवम् । / अतोऽप्राप्तनिषेधोऽयं दिव्यग्निचयनादिवत् ॥	If something really present were negated, liberation would certainly be impermanent; so this is a negation of what was never there, like the rule against building the fire altar in heaven.[114]
V 18.24	संभाव्यो गोचरे शब्दः प्रत्ययो वा न चान्यथा । / न संभाव्यौ तदात्मत्वादहंकर्तुस्तथैव च ॥	A word or a notion can apply to an object, and not otherwise; neither can apply to the self, since it is their very self, and likewise the self of the ego.
V 18.25	अहंकर्त्रात्मनि न्यस्तं चैतन्ये कर्तृतादि यत् । / नेति नेतीति तत्सर्वं साहंकर्त्रा निषिध्यते ॥	Agency and the rest, which have been placed on consciousness, the self of the ego—all of that, together with the ego, is negated by "not this, not this."
V 18.26	उपलब्धिः स्वयंज्योतिर्दृशिः प्रत्यक्सदाक्रियः । / साक्षात्सर्वान्तरः साक्षी चेता नित्योऽगुणोऽद्वयः ॥	It is awareness itself, self-luminous, the awareness that sees, inward, ever actionless, immediate, innermost of all, the witness, the knower, eternal, free of qualities, without a second.
V 18.27	संनिधौ सर्वदा तस्य स्यात्तदाभोऽभिमानकृत् । / आत्मात्मीयं द्वयं चातः स्यादहंममगोचरः ॥	Because it is always present, there comes to be something that bears its reflection and claims it as itself; hence the pair, the self and what is one's own, the sphere of "I" and "mine."
V 18.28	जातिकर्मादिमत्त्वाद्धि तस्मिञ्शब्दास्त्वहंकृति । / न कश्चिद्वर्तते शब्दस्तदभावात्स्व आत्मनि ॥	Words apply to the ego, because it has a kind, an action and the like; no word applies to one's own self, for it has none of these.
V 18.29	आभासो यत्र तत्रैव शब्दाः प्रत्यग्दृशिं स्थिताः । / लक्षयेयुर्न साक्षात्तमभिदध्युः कथंचन ॥	Words, which stay only where the reflection is, can point to the inner awareness that sees, but can never denote it directly.
V 18.30	न ह्यजात्यादिमान्कश्चिदर्थः शब्दैर्निरूप्यते । / आत्माभासो यथाहंकृदात्मशब्दैस्तथोच्यते ॥	No thing that lacks a kind and the like is ever defined by words; but since the ego is a reflection of the self, it is accordingly spoken of with words for the self,
V 18.31	उल्मुकादौ यथाग्न्यर्थाः परार्थत्वान्न चाञ्जसा । / मुखादन्यो मुखाभासो यथादर्शानुकारतः ॥	just as words meaning fire are used of a firebrand and the like because their meaning belongs to

114 A Vedic rule says the fire altar is not to be built in the sky or in heaven—a prohibition of something that could never happen in the first place.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
		something else, not literally. And just as the reflection of a face is other than the face, since it follows the mirror,
V 18.32	आभासान्मुखमप्येवमादर्शाननुवर्तनात् । / अहंकृत्यात्मनिर्भासो मुखाभासवदिष्यते ॥	so the face, too, is other than the reflection, since it does not follow the mirror. The appearance of the self in the ego is held to be like the reflection of a face.
V 18.33	मुखवत्स्मृत आत्मान्योऽविविक्तौ तौ तथैव च । / संसारी च स इत्येक आभासो यस्त्वहंकृति ॥	The self is regarded as different, like the face; yet, in the same way, the two are not told apart. And some say that the one subject to the round of rebirth is the reflection in the ego.
V 18.34	वस्तु च्छाया स्मृतेरन्यन्माधुर्यादि च कारणम् । / नैकदेशो विकारो वा तदाभासाश्रयः परे ॥	Some hold that a reflection is a real thing, because it is remembered as something different, and because it causes sweetness and the like. In the case of the supreme, the locus of its reflection is neither a part of it nor a modification of it.[115]
V 18.35	अहंकर्तैव संसारी स्वतन्त्र इति केचन । / अहंकारादिसंतानः संसारी नान्वयी पृथक् ॥	Some say that the ego itself, independent, is the one subject to the round of rebirth. Others say that the series of ego and the rest is what undergoes rebirth, and that there is no separate entity persisting through it.
V 18.36	इत्येवं सौगता आहुस्तत्र न्यायो विचार्यताम् । / संसारिणां कथा त्वास्तां प्रकृतं त्वधुनोच्यते ॥	So say the Buddhists; let the reasoning on that be examined. But enough talk about those subject to rebirth; now the matter at hand is taken up.[116]
V 18.37	मुखाभासो य आदर्शे धर्मो नान्यतरस्य सः । / द्वयोरेकस्य चेद्धर्मो विविक्तेऽन्यतरे भवेत् ॥	The reflection of a face in a mirror is not a property of either one of them; if it were a property of one of the two, it would remain when the other is separated from it.
V 18.38	मुखेन व्यपदेशात्स मुखस्यैवेति चेन्मतम् । / नादर्शानुविधानाच्च मुखे सत्यप्यभावतः ॥	If you hold that it belongs to the face alone because it is named after the face—no, because it follows the mirror, and is absent even while the face is there.
V 18.39	द्वयोरेवेति चेत्तन्न द्वयोरेवाप्यदर्शनात् । / अदृश्यस्य सतो दृष्टिः स्याद्राहोश्चन्द्रसूर्ययोः ॥	If you say it belongs to both, that is not so, for it is not seen even where both are present. It might be the seeing of something that exists but is invisible, as with Rahu in the moon and the sun.
V 18.40	राहोः प्रागेव वस्तुत्वं सिद्धं शास्त्रप्रमाणतः । / छायापक्षे त्ववस्तुत्वं तस्य स्यात्पूर्वयुक्तितः ॥	Rahu's reality was already established on the authority of scripture; but on the view that it is a shadow, its unreality would follow from the reasoning given before.
V 18.41		

115 The word for reflection, *chāyā*, also means shadow and shade; the argument that follows turns on both senses.
116 The Buddhists (*saugata*, "followers of the Sugata," the Buddha) deny an abiding self beneath the stream of mental events.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
	छायाक्रान्तेर्निषेधोऽयं न तु वस्तुत्वसाधकः । / न ह्यर्थान्तरनिष्ठं सद्वाक्यमर्थान्तरं वदेत् ॥	This statement rules out the view that a shadow covers them, but it does not prove that it is a real thing; for a sentence devoted to one meaning should not be made to state another.
V 18.42	माधुर्यादि च यत्कार्यमुष्णद्रव्याद्यसेवनात् । / छायाया न त्वदृष्टत्वादपामेव च दर्शनात् ॥	And sweetness and the like, as an effect, come from not consuming hot substances and the like, not from the shade, since the shade is not seen to cause it, and only the water is seen.
V 18.43	आत्माभासाश्रयाश्चैव मुखाभासाश्रया यथा । / गम्यन्ते शास्त्रयुक्तिभ्यामाभासासत्त्वमेव च ॥	Through scripture and reasoning, the loci of the self's reflection are understood just as the loci of a face's reflection are, and so too is the unreality of the reflection.
V 18.44	न दृशेरविकारित्वादाभासस्याप्यवस्तुतः । / नाचितित्वादहंकर्तुः कस्य संसारिता भवेत् ॥	Not the awareness that sees, since it is free of change; not the reflection, since it is unreal; not the ego, since it lacks consciousness. To whom, then, could the round of rebirth belong?[117]
V 18.45	अविद्यामात्र एवातः संसारोऽस्त्वविवेकतः । / कूटस्थेनात्मना नित्यमात्मवानात्मनीव सः ॥	Therefore let the round of rebirth be mere ignorance, arising from a failure to discriminate. Through the changeless self it always has a self, as though it were in the self.
V 18.46	रज्जुसर्पो यथा रज्ज्वा सात्मकः प्राग्विवेकतः । / अवस्तुसन्नपि ह्येष कूटस्थेनात्मना तथा ॥	Just as the rope-snake has the rope for its self until discrimination comes, even though it is not real, so too does this, through the changeless self.
V 18.47	आत्माभासाश्रयश्चात्मा प्रत्ययैः स्वैर्विकारवान् । / सुखी दुःखी च संसारी नित्य एवेति केचन ॥	Some say that the self, the one that bears the reflection of the self, changes through its own cognitions and is happy and unhappy and caught in the round of rebirth, and yet is eternal.
V 18.48	आत्माभासापरिज्ञानाद्याथात्म्येन विमोहिताः । / अहंकर्तारमात्मेति मन्यन्ते ते निरागमाः ॥	They are deluded because they do not truly understand the reflection of the self, and so they take the ego to be the self. They have no scripture on their side.
V 18.49	संसारो वस्तुसंस्तेषां कर्तृभोक्तृत्वलक्षणः । / आत्माभासाश्रयाज्ञानात्संसरन्त्यविवेकतः ॥	For them the round of rebirth, marked by being an agent and an enjoyer, is real. Since they do not know what it is that bears the reflection of the self, they keep wandering in that round through lack of discrimination.
V 18.50	चैतन्याभासता बुद्धेरात्मनस्तत्स्वरूपता । / स्याच्चेत्त ज्ञानशब्दैश्च वेदः शास्तीति युज्यते ॥	If the intellect bears a reflection of consciousness, and consciousness is the self's own nature, then it makes sense that the Veda teaches by means of words for knowing.
V 18.51		

117 "Ego" renders *ahaṃkartṛ*, literally the "I-doer": the sense of oneself as the agent of action.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
	प्रकृतिप्रत्ययार्थौ यौ भिन्नावेकाश्रयौ यथा । / करोति गच्छतीत्यादौ दृष्टौ लोकप्रसिद्धितः ॥	The meanings of root and ending are distinct, yet common usage shows them to have a single locus, as in "he does," "he goes," and the like.[118]
V 18.52	नानयोर्द्व्याश्रयत्वं तु लोके दृष्टं स्मृतौ तथा । / जानात्यर्थेषु को हेतुर्द्व्याश्रयत्वे निगद्यताम् ॥	But neither common usage nor tradition shows these two having two separate loci. So tell us: what reason is there for the meanings in "knows" to have two loci?
V 18.53	आत्माभासस्तु तिङ्वाच्यो धात्वर्थश्च धियः क्रिया । / उभयं चाविवेकेन जानातीत्युच्यते मृषा ॥	The reflection of the self is what the personal ending denotes, and the meaning of the root is the action of the intellect. Because the two are not told apart, both together are falsely expressed as "knows."
V 18.54	न बुद्धेरवबोधोऽस्ति नात्मनो विद्यते क्रिया । / अतो नान्यतरस्यापि जानातीति च युज्यते ॥	The intellect has no awareness, and the self has no action. So "knows" cannot properly be said of either one.
V 18.55	नाप्यतो भावशब्देन ज्ञप्तिरित्यपि युज्यते । / न ह्यात्मा विक्रियामात्रं नित्य आत्मेति शासनात् ॥	For the same reason, the self cannot properly be called "knowing" with a noun of action either. The self is not mere change, because scripture teaches that the self is eternal.
V 18.56	न बुद्धेर्बुद्धिवाच्यत्वं करणं न ह्यकर्तृकम् । / नापि ज्ञायत इत्येवं कर्मशब्दैर्निरूप्यते ॥	Nor can the intellect be what the word *buddhi*, taken as the instrument of knowing, denotes, for there is no instrument without an agent. Nor is the self described by words for an object, as in "it is known."
V 18.57	न येषामेक एवात्मा निर्दुःखोऽविक्रियः सदा । / तेषां स्याच्छब्दवाच्यत्वं ज्ञेयत्वं चात्मनः सदा ॥	Some do not hold that the self is one alone, always free of suffering and free of change. For them the self may well be always expressible in words and always knowable as an object.
V 18.58	यदाहंकर्तुरात्मत्वं तदा शब्दार्थमुख्यता । / नाशनायादिमत्त्वात्तु श्रुतौ तस्यात्मतेष्यते ॥	If the ego were the self, these words would have their primary meaning. But scripture does not accept the ego as the self, because it is subject to hunger and the rest.[119]
V 18.59	हन्त तर्हि न मुख्यार्थो नापि गौणः कथंचन । / जानातीत्यादिशब्दस्य गतिर्वाच्या तथापि तु ॥	Well then, suppose words such as "knows" have no primary meaning and in no way a figurative one either. You must still say how they are to be understood.
V 18.60	शब्दानामयथार्थत्वे वेदस्याप्यप्रमाणता । / सा च नेष्टा ततो ग्राह्या गतिरस्य प्रसिद्धितः ॥	If words did not convey their meanings truly, the Veda too would not be a means of knowledge, and no one accepts that. So the way this word is understood must be taken from common usage.

118 In Sanskrit grammar a finite verb is analyzed into a root (*prakṛti*), which expresses the action, and a personal ending (*pratyaya*, technically *tiṅ*), which expresses the agent.
119 Brihadaranyaka Upanishad 3.5.1 describes the self as beyond hunger and thirst, sorrow and delusion, old age and death.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
V 18.61	प्रसिद्धिर्मूढलोकस्य यदि ग्राह्या निरात्मता । / लौकायतिकसिद्धान्तः स चानिष्टः प्रसज्यते ॥	If the usage of deluded people is what we must accept, then there is no self. The doctrine of the materialists follows, and that is unwelcome.[120]
V 18.62	अभियुक्तप्रसिद्धिश्चेत्पूर्ववद्दुर्विवेकता । / गतिशून्यं न वेदोऽयं प्रमाणं संवदत्युत ॥	If it is the usage of the learned, it is as hard to sort out as before. Yet surely the Veda, a means of knowledge, does not speak without any way of being understood?
V 18.63	आदर्शमुखसामान्यं मुखस्येष्टं हि मानवैः । / मुखस्य प्रतिबिम्बो हि मुखाकारेण दृश्यते ॥	People accept that a face has something in common with the face in a mirror, for the reflection of a face is seen in the form of the face.[121]
V 18.64	यत्र यस्यावभासस्तु तयोरेवाविवेकतः । / जानातीति क्रियां सर्वो लोको वक्ति स्वभावतः ॥	Wherever one thing is reflected in another, everyone naturally speaks of the action "knows," because they do not tell those two apart.
V 18.65	बुद्धेः कर्तृत्वमध्यस्य जानातीति ज्ञ उच्यते । / तथा चैतन्यमध्यस्य ज्ञत्वं बुद्धेरिहोच्यते ॥	People superimpose the agency of the intellect on the knower and so say of the knower, "he knows." In the same way they superimpose consciousness on the intellect and so speak of the intellect as a knower.
V 18.66	स्वरूपं चात्मनो ज्ञानं नित्यं ज्योतिः श्रुतेर्यतः । / न बुद्ध्या क्रियते तस्मादात्मनान्येन वा सदा ॥	Knowledge is the very nature of the self, since scripture calls it eternal light. Therefore it is never produced by the intellect, nor by the self, nor by anything else.
V 18.67	देहेऽहंप्रत्ययो यद्वज्जानातीति च लौकिकाः । / वदन्ति ज्ञानकर्तृत्वं तद्वद्बुद्धेस्तथात्मनः ॥	Ordinary people take the notion "I" to refer to the body. In just the same way they say "he knows," attributing the agency of knowing to the intellect and likewise to the self.
V 18.68	बौद्धैस्तु प्रत्ययैरेव क्रियमाणैश्च चिन्निभैः । / मोहिताः क्रियते ज्ञानमित्याहुस्तार्किका जनाः ॥	The logicians are deluded by the intellect's own cognitions, which are produced and which resemble consciousness. So they say that knowledge is produced.[122]
V 18.69	तस्माज्ज्ञाभासबुद्धीनामविवेकात्प्रवर्तिताः । / जानातीत्यादिशब्दश्च प्रत्ययो या च तत्स्मृतिः ॥	So words such as "knows," the cognition itself, and the memory of it all come about because the knower, its reflection, and the intellect are not told apart.
V 18.70	आदर्शानुविधायित्वं छायाया अस्यते मुखे । / बुद्धिधर्मानुकारित्वं ज्ञाभासस्य तथेष्यते ॥	The way a reflection conforms to the mirror is attributed to the face. In the same way, it is held that the reflection of the knower imitates the properties of the intellect.

120 The Lokāyatas, or materialists, held that only the perceptible world exists and that consciousness arises from the body and ends with it.

121 The face and the mirror: the chapter's central image. Consciousness is reflected in the intellect as a face is reflected in a mirror, and the reflection is mistaken for the original.

122 The logicians (*tārkikas*) are the Nyāya school, which treated cognition as a quality that arises in the self and then passes away.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
V 18.71	बुद्धेस्तु प्रत्ययास्तस्मादात्माभासेन दीपिताः । / ग्राहका इव भासन्ते दहन्तीवोल्मुकादयः ॥	Therefore the intellect's cognitions, lit up by the reflection of the self, appear to be perceivers, just as firebrands and the like appear to be what burns.
V 18.72	स्वयमेवावभास्यन्ते ग्राहकाः स्वयमेव च । / इत्येवं ग्राहकास्तित्वं प्रतिषेधन्ति सौगताः ॥	The Buddhists deny that a perceiver exists. They say the cognitions are illuminated by themselves and are themselves the perceivers.
V 18.73	यद्येवं नान्यदृश्यास्ते किं तद्वारणमुच्यताम् । / भावाभावौ हि तेषां यौ नान्यग्राह्यौ सतां यदि ॥	If so, they are not seen by anything else. Then tell us what rules out another perceiver, if indeed their presence and absence, while they exist, are not grasped by something other than themselves.
V 18.74	अन्वयी ग्राहकस्तेषामित्येतदपि तत्समम् । / अचित्त्वस्यापि तुल्यत्वादन्यस्मिन्ग्राहके सति ॥	Some say their perceiver is something that runs through them all. That fares no better, for it too would lack consciousness, and there would then be yet another perceiver.
V 18.75	अध्यक्षस्य समीपे तु सिद्धिः स्यादिति चेन्मतम् । / नाध्यक्षेऽनुपकारित्वादन्यत्रापि प्रसङ्गतः ॥	Perhaps you hold that they are established in the presence of the overseer. No: the overseer does nothing for them, and the same would then follow for other things as well.
V 18.76	अर्थी दुःखी च यः श्रोता स त्वध्यक्षोऽथवेतरः । / अध्यक्षस्य च दुःखित्वमर्थित्वं च न ते मतम् ॥	The hearer is the one who wants something and suffers. Is he the overseer, or the other? You do not hold that the overseer suffers or wants anything.
V 18.77	कर्ताध्यक्षः सदस्मीति नैव सङ्ग्रहमर्हति । / सदेवासीति मिथ्योक्तिः श्रुतेरपि न युज्यते ॥	The agent can never rightly lay hold of the thought "I am the overseer, being itself." And for scripture to make the false statement "you are being itself" is not acceptable either.
V 18.78	अविविच्योभयं वक्ति श्रुतिश्चेत्स्याद्ग्रहस्तथा । / अस्मदस्तु विविच्यैव त्वमेवेति वदेद्यदि ॥	If scripture speaks of the two without distinguishing them, the understanding will be equally undistinguished. But suppose it spoke only after setting the overseer apart from the "I," and said "you yourself"—
V 18.79	प्रत्ययान्वयिनिष्ठत्वमुक्तदोषं प्रसज्यते । / त्वमित्यध्यक्षनिष्ठश्चेदहमध्यक्षयोः कथम् ॥	then it would follow that the word refers to what runs through the cognitions, and that has the fault already stated. If instead "you" refers to the overseer, how are the "I" and the overseer related?
V 18.80	संबन्धो वाच्य एवात्र येन त्वमिति लक्षयेत् । / द्रष्टृदृश्यत्वसंबन्धो यद्यध्यक्षेऽक्रिये कथम् ॥	A relation must be stated here by which the word "you" could point to it. If it is the relation of seer and seen, how could that hold for the overseer, which does not act?
V 18.81	अक्रियत्वेऽपि तादात्म्यमध्यक्षस्य भवेद्यदि । / आत्माध्यक्षो ममास्तीति संबन्धाग्रहणेन धीः ॥	Suppose the overseer, though it does not act, were identical with the "I." Since that relation is not grasped, the thought would still be "I have a self, the overseer."

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
V 18.82	संबन्धग्रहणं शास्त्रादिति चेन्मन्यसे न हि । / पूर्वोक्ताः स्युस्त्रयो दोषा ग्रहो वा स्यान्ममेति च ॥	Perhaps you think the relation is grasped from scripture. No: either the three faults stated earlier would follow, or the grasp would take the form "mine."
V 18.83	अदृशिर्दृशिरूपेण भाति बुद्धिर्यदा तदा । / प्रत्यया अपि तस्याः स्युस्तप्तायोविस्फुलिङ्गवत् ॥	When the intellect, which is not awareness, shines in the form of awareness, its cognitions too would shine in that way, like sparks from red-hot iron.
V 18.84	आभासस्तदभावश्च दृशेः सीम्नो न चान्यथा । / लोकस्य युक्तितः स्यातां तद्ग्रहश्च तथा सति ॥	The reflection of awareness and its absence occur at the boundary of awareness, and not otherwise. That being so, people's usage would make sense by reasoning, and so would the grasping of awareness.
V 18.85	नन्वेवं दृशिसंक्रान्तिरयः पिण्डेऽग्निवद्भवेत् । / मुखाभासवदित्येतदादर्शे तन्निराकृतम् ॥	But in that case, wouldn't awareness pass over into the intellect, as fire passes into a lump of iron? That has been ruled out by the comparison with the reflection of a face in a mirror.
V 18.86	कृष्णायो लोहिताभासमित्येतद्दृष्टमुच्यते । / दृष्टदार्ष्टान्ततुल्यत्वं न तु सर्वात्मना क्वचित् ॥	The black iron that appears red is mentioned as something actually observed. But an example is never the same in every respect as what it illustrates.
V 18.87	तथैव चेतनाभासं चित्तं चेतन्यवद्भवेत् । / मुखाभासो यथादर्श आभासश्चोदितो मृषा ॥	In just this way the mind, in which consciousness is reflected, would seem conscious. But like the reflection of a face in a mirror, the reflection is declared to be false.
V 18.88	चित्तं चेतनमित्येतच्छास्त्रयुक्तिविवर्जितम् । / देहस्यापि प्रसङ्गः स्याच्चक्षुरादेस्तथैव च ॥	That the mind is conscious has no support in scripture or reasoning. If it were, it would follow that the body is conscious too, and so too the eye and the rest.
V 18.89	तदप्यस्त्विति चेत्तन्न लौकायतिकसंगतेः । / न च धीर्दृशिरस्मीति यद्याभासो न चेतसि ॥	If you say, "Let that be so too," no, for that is to side with the materialists. And if there were no reflection in the mind, there would be no thought "I am awareness."
V 18.90	सदस्मीति धियोऽभावे व्यर्थं स्यात्तत्त्वमस्यपि । / युष्मदस्मद्विभागज्ञे स्यादर्थवदिदं वचः ॥	Without the thought "I am being," even "you are that" would be pointless. This saying has meaning for one who knows the distinction between what is meant by "you" and by "I."
V 18.91	ममेदंप्रत्ययौ ज्ञेयौ युष्मद्येव न संशयः । / अहमित्यस्मदीष्टः स्यादयमस्मीति चोभयोः ॥	The notions "mine" and "this" must be understood to fall within the "you" alone. Of that there is no doubt. The notion "I" is held to belong to the "I," and the notion "I am this" to both.
V 18.92	अन्योन्यापेक्षया तेषां प्रधानगुणतेष्यते । / विशेषणविशेष्यत्वं तथा ग्राह्यं हि युक्तितः ॥	In relation to one another these are held to be principal and subordinate. Reasoning shows that

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
		the relation of qualifier and qualified must be understood in the same way.
V 18.93	ममेदं द्वयमप्येतन्मध्यमस्य विशेषणम् । / धनी गोमान्यथा तद्वद्देहोऽहंकर्तुरेव च ॥	Both “mine” and “this” qualify the middle term, just as in “a man of wealth” or “a man with cows.” In the same way the body too qualifies the ego.
V 18.94	बुद्ध्यारूढं सदा सर्वं साहंकर्ता च साक्षिणः । / तस्मात्सर्वावभासो ज्ञः किंचिदप्यस्पृशन्सदा ॥	Everything always rests on the intellect, and the intellect together with the ego is the object of the witness. Therefore the knower illuminates everything and never touches anything at all.
V 18.95	प्रतिलोममिदं सर्वं यथोक्तं लोकबुद्धितः । / अविवेकधियामस्ति नास्ति सर्वं विवेकिनाम् ॥	All of this, as described, runs counter to ordinary understanding. For those whose minds do not discriminate, it all exists. For those who discriminate, none of it does.
V 18.96	अन्वयव्यतिरेकौ हि पदार्थस्य पदस्य च । / स्यादेतदहमित्यत्र युक्तिरेवावधारणे ॥	Both a word’s meaning and the word itself are open to the method of agreement and difference. That method applies here, to “I,” for reasoning is what settles the matter.[123]
V 18.97	नाद्राक्षमहमित्यस्मिन्सुषुप्तेऽन्यन्मनागपि । / न वारयति दृष्टिं स्वां प्रत्ययं तु निषेधति ॥	When someone says of deep sleep, “I saw nothing else at all,” he does not rule out his own seeing. He denies only the cognition.
V 18.98	स्वयं ज्योतिर्न हि द्रष्टुरित्येवं संविदोऽस्तिताम् । कौटस्थ्यं च तथा तस्याः प्रत्ययस्य तु लुप्तताम् । स्वयमेवाब्रवीच्छास्त्रं प्रत्ययावगती पृथक् ॥	With the words “self-luminous” and “for there is no loss of the seer’s seeing,” scripture itself has stated that consciousness exists and is changeless, and that the cognition lapses. Cognition and realization are distinct.[124]
V 18.99	एवं विज्ञातवाक्यार्थे श्रुतिलोकप्रसिद्धितः । / श्रुतिस्तत्त्वमसीत्याह श्रोतुर्मोहापनुत्तये ॥	Once the meaning of the sentence has been understood in this way, from scripture and from common usage, scripture says “you are that” to dispel the hearer’s delusion.
V 18.100	ब्रह्मा दाशरथेर्यद्वदुक्त्यैवापानुदत्तमः । / तस्य विष्णुत्वसंबोधे न यत्नान्तरमूचिवान् ॥	In the same way Brahma dispelled the darkness of Dasharatha’s son by words alone, and spoke of no further effort to awaken him to his being Vishnu.[125]
V 18.101	अहंशब्दस्य या निष्ठा ज्योतिषि प्रत्यगात्मनि । / सैवोक्ता सदसीत्येवं फलं तत्र विमुक्तता ॥	The ground on which the word “I” rests is the light, the inner self. That very ground is what “you are being” states, and the result is liberation.
V 18.102	श्रुतमात्रेण चेन्न स्यात्कार्यं तत्र भवेद्ध्रुवम् । / व्यवहारात्पुरापीष्टः सद्भावः स्वयमात्मनः ॥	If liberation did not come from merely hearing this, there would certainly be something still to be

123 Agreement and difference (*anvaya* and *vyatireka*): noting what is present when something else is present and absent when it is absent. The method separates what persists from what comes and goes.
124 Brihadaranyaka Upanishad 4.3.9 and 4.3.23, from the account of dream and deep sleep.
125 In the Ramayana the creator god Brahma tells Rama, son of King Dasharatha, that he is in truth the god Vishnu.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
		done. But the existence of the self, of itself, is accepted even before all worldly dealings.
V 18.103	अशनायादिनिर्मुक्त्यै तत्काला जायते प्रमा । / तत्त्वमस्यादिवाक्यार्थे त्रिषु कालेष्वसंशयः ॥	At that very moment valid knowledge of the meaning of sentences such as “you are that” arises, bringing freedom from hunger and the rest. It is free of doubt in all three times: past, present and future.
V 18.104	प्रतिबन्धविहीनत्वात्स्वयं चानुभवात्मनः । / जायेतैव प्रमा तत्र स्वात्मन्येव न संशयः ॥	Nothing obstructs it, and the self is by nature experience itself. So valid knowledge must arise there, about one’s own self. Of that there is no doubt.
V 18.105	किं सदेवाहमस्मीति किं वान्यत्प्रतिपद्यते । / सदेव चेदहंशब्दः सता मुख्यार्थ इष्यताम् ॥	Does one understand “I am being itself,” or something else? If it is being itself, then let the word “I” be accepted as having being for its primary meaning.
V 18.106	अन्यश्चेत्सदहंग्राहिप्रतिपत्तिर्मृषैव सा । / तस्मान्मुख्यग्रहे नास्ति वारणावगतेरिह ॥	If it is something else, the understanding that takes being as “I” is simply false. Therefore, once the primary meaning is grasped, nothing here obstructs realization.
V 18.107	प्रत्ययी प्रत्ययश्चैव यदाभासौ तदर्थता । / तयोरचितिमत्त्वाच्च चैतन्ये कल्प्यते फलम् ॥	The one who has cognitions and the cognition itself are both reflections of something, and they exist for its sake. Since both lack consciousness, the result is assigned to consciousness.
V 18.108	कूटस्थेऽपि फलं योग्यं राजनीव जयादिकम् । / तदनात्मत्वहेतुभ्यां क्रियायाः प्रत्ययस्य च ॥	The result befits even what is changeless, as victory and the like befit a king, on two grounds: action and cognition are not the self, and the self is the reason for them.
V 18.109	आदर्शस्तु यदाभासो मुखाकारः स एव सः । / यथैव प्रत्ययादर्शो यदाभासस्तदा ह्यहम् ॥	A mirror bears the reflection of something, and the form of the face in it is that very face. Just so, the mirror of cognition bears the reflection of something, and that is what I am.
V 18.110	इत्येवं प्रतिपत्तिः स्यात्सदस्मीति च नान्यथा । / तत्त्वमित्युपदेशोऽपि द्वाराभावादनर्थकः ॥	In this way, and not otherwise, the understanding “I am being” can arise. Without it, even the teaching “you are that” would be pointless, for it would have no way in.
V 18.111	श्रोतुः स्यादुपदेशश्चेदर्थवत्त्वं तदा भवेत् । / अध्यक्षस्य न चेदिष्टं श्रोतृत्वं कस्य तद्भवेत् ॥	If the teaching is for the hearer, then it has meaning. But if you do not accept that the overseer is the hearer, then who is the hearer?
V 18.112	अध्यक्षस्य समीपे स्याद्बुद्धेरेवेति चेन्मतम् । / न तत्कृतोपकारोऽस्ति काष्ठाद्यद्वन्न कल्प्यते ॥	Perhaps you hold that hearing belongs to the intellect alone, in the presence of the overseer. No: the overseer does nothing for it, just as no help is supposed in the case of wood and the like.
V 18.113		

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
	बुद्धौ चेत्तत्कृतः कश्चिन्नन्वेवं परिणामिता । / आभासेऽपि च को दोषः सति श्रुत्याद्यनुग्रहे ॥	If you say that it does something for the intellect, then surely it would be subject to change. But what fault is there in its having a reflection, when scripture and the other sources support this?[126]
V 18.114	आभासे परिणामश्चेन्न रज्ज्वादिनिभत्ववत् । / सपदिश्च तथावोचमादर्शे च मुखत्ववत् ॥	If you say that having a reflection means change, no. As I have said, it is like a snake and the like appearing in the likeness of a rope and the like, and like a face appearing in a mirror.
V 18.115	नात्माभासत्वसिद्धिश्चेदात्मनो ग्रहणात्पृथक् । / मुखादेश्च पृथक्सिद्धिरिह त्वन्योन्यसंश्रयः ॥	If you say that it cannot be established that this is a reflection of the self, because the self is not grasped on its own, whereas a face and the like are established separately, and that here there is mutual dependence—
V 18.116	अध्यक्षस्य पृथक्सिद्धावाभासस्य तदीयता । / आभासस्य तदीयत्वे ह्यध्यक्षव्यतिरिक्तता ॥	the reflection would be the overseer's only if the overseer were established separately, and the overseer would be something distinct only if the reflection were its own.
V 18.117	नैव स्वप्ने पृथक्सिद्धेः प्रत्ययस्य दृशेस्तथा । / रथादेस्तत्र शून्यत्वात्प्रत्ययस्यात्मना ग्रहः ॥	Not so, for in dream the notion and the seeing are each established separately. Since there are no chariots and the like there, the notion is grasped by the self.[127]
V 18.118	अवगत्या हि संव्याप्तः प्रत्ययो विषयाकृतिः । / जायते स यदाकारः स बाह्यो विषयो मतः ॥	For the notion arises pervaded by knowing and takes the form of an object. The thing whose form it takes is held to be the external object.
V 18.119	कर्मेप्सिततमत्वात्स तद्वान्कार्ये नियुज्यते । / आकारो यत्र चार्प्येत करणं तदिहोच्यते ॥	Because it is what is most sought, the thing that has that form is assigned to the act as its object. That into which the form is placed is called here the instrument.[128]
V 18.120	यदाभासेन संव्याप्तः संज्ञातेति निगद्यते । / त्रयमेतद्विविच्यात्र यो जानाति स आत्मवित् ॥	That which is pervaded by its reflection is called the knower. Whoever distinguishes these three here and knows them knows the self.
V 18.121	सम्यक्संशयमिथ्योक्ताः प्रत्यया व्यभिचारिणः । / एकैवावगतिस्तेषु भेदस्तु प्रत्ययार्पितः ॥	Notions called right, doubtful and false come and go. Through them all the knowing is one and the same, and the difference is imposed on it by the notions.
V 18.122	आधिभेदाद्यथा भेदो मणेरवगतेस्तथा । / अशुद्धिः परिणामश्च सर्वं प्रत्ययसंश्रयात् ॥	Just as a crystal varies with the different things set beside it, so does knowing. Impurity, change and all the rest come from its dependence on notions.
V 18.123		The shining forth, grasping and establishing of notions come here from something other than them.

126 The intellect is said to take on a reflection of consciousness, as a mirror takes on the reflection of a face.
127 Brihadaranyaka Upanishad 4.3.10 says of dream: "There are no chariots there."
128 This follows the grammarian Panini's definition of the object as "what the agent most wants to reach" (*Aṣṭādhyāyī* 1.4.49).

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
	प्रथनं ग्रहणं सिद्धिः प्रत्ययानामिहान्यतः । / आपरोक्ष्यात्तदेवोक्तमनुमानं प्रदीपवत् ॥	Because of its immediacy, that very thing has been called an inference, as with a lamp.
V 18.124	किमन्यद्ग्राहयेत्कश्चित्प्रमाणेन तु केनचित् । / विनैव तु प्रमाणेन निवृत्त्यान्यस्य शेषतः ॥	Could anyone make that other known by some means of knowledge? It is known without any means of knowledge at all, as what remains once the other has been removed.
V 18.125	शब्देनैव प्रमाणेन निवृत्तिश्चेदिहोच्यते । / अध्यक्षस्याप्रसिद्धत्वाच्छून्यतैव प्रसज्यते ॥	If you say that the removal is brought about here by the word alone, as a means of knowledge, then, since the overseer is not known, only emptiness would follow.
V 18.126	चेतनस्त्वं कथं देह इति चेन्नाप्रसिद्धितः । / चेतनस्यान्यतः सिद्धावेव स्यादन्यहानतः ॥	If you say, "You are conscious—how could you be the body?", no, because the conscious one is not known. Only if it were established by something else could this come about by excluding the other.
V 18.127	अध्यक्षः स्वयमस्त्येव चेतनस्यापरोक्षतः । / तुल्य एव प्रबोधः स्यादन्यस्यासत्त्ववादिना ॥	The overseer simply exists by itself, because the conscious is immediately present. Otherwise the awakening would be no different from that of one who teaches that the other does not exist.
V 18.128	अहमज्ञासिषं चेदमिति लोकस्मृतेरिह । / करणं कर्म कर्ता च सिद्धास्त्वेकक्षणे किल ॥	Because people remember, "I knew this," it is claimed that the instrument, the object and the agent are established in a single moment.
V 18.129	प्रामाण्येऽपि स्मृतेः शैघ्र्याद्यौगपद्यं विभाव्यते । / क्रमेण ग्रहणं पूर्वं स्मृतेः पश्चात्तथैव च ॥	Even if memory is valid, their simultaneity is only imagined, because of speed. The grasping came first, in sequence, and the memory afterward, in the same way.
V 18.130	अज्ञासिषमिदं मां चेत्यपेक्षा जायते ध्रुवम् । / विशेषोऽपेक्ष्यते यत्र तत्र नैवैककालता ॥	In "I knew this, and myself," a dependence surely arises, and where a qualifier is required there is no simultaneity.
V 18.131	आत्मनो ग्रहणे चापि त्रयाणामिह संभवात् । / आत्मन्यासक्तकर्तृत्वं न स्यात्करणकर्मणोः ॥	And if the self grasped itself, all three would arise here. But the agency that rests in the self could not belong to the instrument and the object.
V 18.132	व्याप्तुमिष्टं च यत्कर्तुः क्रियया कर्म तत्स्मृतम् । / अतो हि कर्तृतन्त्रत्वं तस्येष्टं नान्यतन्त्रता ॥	What the agent wants to reach by the action is called the object. So it is held to depend on the agent, not on anything else.
V 18.133	शब्दाद्वानुमितेर्वापि प्रमाणाद्वा ततोऽन्यतः । / सिद्धिः सर्वपदार्थानां स्यादज्ञं प्रति नान्यथा ॥	For one who does not know them, all things are established from the word, from inference, or from some other means of knowledge, and not otherwise.
V 18.134	अध्यक्षस्यापि सिद्धिः स्यात्प्रमाणेन विनैव वा । / विना स्वस्य प्रसिद्धिस्तु नाज्ञं प्रत्युपयुज्यते ॥	The overseer too might be established either by a means of knowledge or with no means at all. But its being established in itself, without one, is of no use to one who does not know.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
V 18.135	तस्यैवाज्ञत्वमिष्टं चेज्ज्ञानत्वेऽन्या मतिर्भवेत् । / अन्यस्यैवाज्ञतायां च तद्विज्ञाने ध्रुवा भवेत् ॥	If you hold that the overseer itself is the one who does not know, then for it to know, another cognition would be needed. And if someone else is the one who does not know, then for that one to know, a cognition would certainly be needed.
V 18.136	ज्ञातता स्वात्मलाभो वा सिद्धिः स्यादन्यदेव वा । / ज्ञातत्वेऽनन्तरोक्तौ त्वं पक्षौ संस्मर्तुमर्हसि ॥	Being established is either being known, or coming into existence, or something else again. If it is being known, you should recall the two positions just stated.
V 18.137	सिद्धिः स्यात्स्वात्मलाभश्चेद्यत्नस्तत्र निरर्थकः । / सर्वलोकप्रसिद्धत्वात्स्वहेतुभ्यस्तु वस्तुनः ॥	If being established is coming into existence, effort there is pointless, since the whole world knows that a thing comes into existence from its own causes.
V 18.138	ज्ञानज्ञेयादिवादेऽतः सिद्धिर्ज्ञातत्वमुच्यते । / अध्यक्षाध्यक्ष्ययोः सिद्धिर्ज्ञेयत्वं नात्मलाभता ॥	Therefore, when knowledge, the knowable and the like are discussed, being established means being known. The establishment of the overseer and of what it oversees is their being knowable, not their coming into existence.
V 18.139	स्पष्टत्वं कर्मकर्त्रादेः सिद्धिता यदि कल्प्यते । / स्पष्टतास्पष्टते स्यातामन्यस्यैव न चात्मनः ॥	If being established is taken to be the clearness of the object, the agent and the rest, then clearness and unclearness would belong to something else, and not to the self.
V 18.140	अद्रष्टुर्नैव चान्धस्य स्पष्टीभावो घटस्य तु । / कर्त्रादेः स्पष्टतेष्टा चेद्द्रष्टृताध्यक्षकर्तृका ॥	A pot does not become clear to one who does not see, to a blind man. So if clearness is granted to the agent and the rest, their seeing is the overseer's doing.
V 18.141	अनुभूतेः किमन्यस्मिन्स्यात्तवापेक्षया वद । / अनुभवितरीष्टा स्यात्सोऽप्यनुभूतिरेव नः ॥	Tell me: in your view, does experience depend on anything other than itself? If you hold that it depends on an experiencer, that experiencer too is, for us, experience itself.
V 18.142	अभिन्नोऽपि हि बुद्ध्यात्मा विपर्यासितदर्शनैः । / ग्राह्यग्राहकसंवित्तिभेदवानिव लक्ष्यते ॥	Though the intellect itself is undivided, those whose vision is distorted see it as though it were divided into the grasped, the grasper and awareness.[129]
V 18.143	भूतिर्येषां क्रिया सैव कारकं सैव चोच्यते । / सत्त्वं नाशित्वमस्याश्चेत्सकर्तृत्वं तथेष्यताम् ॥	"For those for whom being is action, that same being is also said to be the factor of action." If its existence is its perishing, then you should likewise accept that it has an agent.[130]
V 18.144		If you say that no attribute at all is admitted, you abandon your own position. If you say that exist-

129 A verse of the Buddhist logician Dharmakirti (7th century AD, *Pramāṇavārttika*), stating the Yogācāra view that only consciousness is real.
130 A Buddhist dictum. Since all things are held to be momentary, a thing's very being is its activity.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
	न कश्चिच्चेष्यते धर्म इति चेत्पक्षहानता । / नन्वस्तित्वादयो धर्मा नास्तित्वादिनिवृत्तयः ॥	ence and the like are attributes only as exclusions of nonexistence and the like—[131]
V 18.145	न भूतेस्तर्हि नाशित्वं स्वालक्षण्यं मतं हि ते । / स्वलक्षणावधिर्नाशो नाशोऽनाशनिवृत्तिता ॥	then perishing does not belong to being, for you hold that it has only its own unique character. Perishing is the limit of the unique particular, and perishing would be merely the exclusion of not perishing.
V 18.146	अगोरसत्त्वं गोत्वं ते न तु तद्गोत्वलक्षणम् । / क्षणवाच्योऽपि योऽर्थः स्यात्सोऽप्यन्याभाव एव ते ॥	For you, cowhood is the absence of non-cow, not the defining mark of cowhood. Even what is meant by the word "moment" is, for you, nothing but the absence of something else.
V 18.147	भेदाभावेऽप्यभावस्य भेदो नामभिरिष्यते । / नामभेदैरनेकत्वमेकस्य स्यात्कथं तव ॥	Although an absence has no difference within it, you admit difference through names. But how, for you, could one thing become many through differences of name?
V 18.148	अपोहो यदि भिन्नानां वृत्तिस्तस्य कथं गवि । नाभावा भेदकाः सर्वे विशेषा वा कथञ्चन । नामजात्यादयो यद्वत्संविदस्तेऽविशेषतः ॥	If exclusion applies to things that differ, how does it apply to the cow? Absences cannot in any way be what differentiates, nor can they all be particulars, just as, for you, name, genus and the like cannot differentiate consciousness, since it has no distinctions.
V 18.149	प्रत्यक्षमनुमानं वा व्यवहारे यदिच्छसि । / क्रियाकारकभेदैस्तदभ्युपेयं ध्रुवं भवेत् ॥	Whatever perception or inference you accept in practical life must surely be accepted together with the distinctions of action and its factors.
V 18.150	तस्मान्नीलं तथा पीतं घटादिर्वा विशेषणम् । / संविदस्तदुपेयं स्याद्येन चाप्यनुभूयते ॥	Therefore blue and yellow, or a pot and the like, must be accepted as qualifiers of consciousness, and so must that by which it is experienced.
V 18.151	रूपादीनां यथान्यः स्याद्ग्राह्यत्वाद्ग्राहकस्तथा । / प्रत्ययस्य तथान्यः स्याद्व्यञ्जकत्वात्प्रदीपवत् ॥	Just as there is a grasper other than color and the like, because they are grasped, so there must be something other than the notion, which reveals it, like a lamp.
V 18.152	अध्यक्षस्य दृशेः कीदृक्संबन्धः संभविष्यति । / अध्यक्ष्येण तु दृश्येन मुक्त्वान्यो द्रष्टृदृश्यताम् ॥	What relation could the overseer, which is seeing, have with what it oversees, the seen, apart from that of seer and seen?
V 18.153	अध्यक्षेण कृता दृष्टिर्दृश्यं व्याप्नोत्यथापि वा । / नित्याध्यक्षकृतः कश्चिदुपकारो भवेद्धियाम् ॥	Either the seeing brought about by the overseer pervades the seen, or else the eternal overseer renders some help to cognitions.
V 18.154	स चोक्तस्तन्निभत्वं प्राक्संव्याप्तिश्च घटादिषु । / यथा लोकादिसंव्याप्तिर्व्यञ्जकत्वाद्धियस्तथा ॥	That help has already been stated: their taking on its likeness. And cognition pervades pots and the

131 The Buddhist theory of exclusion (*apoha*): a word means not a positive universal but the exclusion of everything else, so "cow" means "not non-cow."

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
		like as light and the like pervade them, because cognition reveals.
V 18.155	आलोकस्थो घटो यद्वद्बुद्ध्यारूढो भवेत्तथा । / धीव्याप्तिः स्याद्घटारोहो धियो व्याप्तौ क्रमो भवेत् ॥	Just as a pot stands in the light, so it comes to stand in the intellect. The pot's entry into the intellect is its pervasion by cognition, and in this pervasion by cognition there would be a sequence.
V 18.156	पूर्वं स्यात्प्रत्ययव्याप्तिस्ततोऽनुग्रह आत्मनः । / कृत्स्नाध्यक्षस्य नो युक्तः कालाकाशादिवत्क्रमः ॥	First would come the pervasion by the notion, then the help from the self. But for the overseer of everything, sequence is no more fitting than it is for time, space and the like.
V 18.157	विषयग्रहणं यस्य कारणापेक्षया भवेत् । / सत्येव ग्राह्यशेषे च परिणामी स चित्तवत् ॥	That which grasps objects by depending on instruments, and only while something remains to be grasped, is subject to change, like the mind.
V 18.158	अध्यक्षोऽहमिति ज्ञानं बुद्धेरेव विनिश्चयः । / नाध्यक्षस्याविशेषत्वान्न तस्यास्ति परो यतः ॥	The knowledge "I am the overseer" is a determination of the intellect alone, not of the overseer, because the overseer is without distinctions and there is nothing beyond it.
V 18.159	कर्त्रा चेदहमित्येवमनुभूयेत मुक्तता । / सुखदुःखविनिर्मोको नाहंकर्तरि युज्यते ॥	If liberation were experienced by an agent as "I," that would not fit, for release from pleasure and pain is not possible for the ego that makes the "I."
V 18.160	देहादावभिमानोत्थो दुःखीति प्रत्ययो ध्रुवम् । / कुण्डलीप्रत्ययो यद्वत्प्रत्यगात्माभिमानिना ॥	The notion "I am in pain" surely arises from identification with the body and the like, as the notion "I have earrings" does. And by one who identifies with the inner self
V 18.161	बाध्यते प्रत्ययेनेह विवेकेनाविवेकवान् । / विपर्यासेऽसदन्तः स्यात्प्रमाणस्याप्रमाणतः ॥	it is canceled here: the notion that lacks discrimination is canceled by the notion that discriminates. Were it the other way round, it would end in what is unreal, since a means of knowledge would then not be a means of knowledge.
V 18.162	दाहच्छेदविनाशेषु दुःखित्वं नान्यथात्मनः । / नव ह्यन्यस्य दाहादावन्यो दुःखी भवेत्क्वचित् ॥	When there is burning, cutting or destruction, the self is in pain in this way and in no other. For no one is ever in pain when someone else is burned or the like.
V 18.163	अस्पर्शत्वाददेहत्वान्नाहं दाह्यो यतः सदा । / तस्मान्मिथ्याभिमानोत्थं मृते पुत्रे मृतिर्यथा ॥	Because I am beyond touch and without a body, I can never be burned. So the pain arises from false identification, as when one feels death because one's son has died.
V 18.164	कुण्डल्यहमिति ह्येतद्बाध्येतैव विवेकिना । / दुःखीति प्रत्ययस्तद्वत्केवलाहंधिया सह ॥	Just as "I have earrings" is canceled by one who discriminates, so too is the notion "I am in pain," together with the bare notion "I."
V 18.165	सिद्धे दुःखित्व इष्टं स्यात्तच्छक्तिश्छन्दसात्मनः । / मिथ्याभिमानतो दुःखी तेनार्थापादनक्षमः ॥	If being in pain were real, one would have to grant the Veda a power to act on the self. But one is in

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
		pain through false identification, and so the Veda is able to accomplish its purpose.
V 18.166	अस्पर्शोऽपि यथा स्पर्शमचलश्चलनादि च । / अविवेकात्तथा दुःखं मानसं चात्मनीक्षते ॥	The self is beyond touch, yet one sees touch in it. It does not move, yet one sees movement and the like in it. In the same way, through lack of discrimination, one sees in the self the pain that belongs to the mind.
V 18.167	विवेकात्मधिया दुःखं नुद्यते चलनादिवत् । / अविवेकस्वभावेन मनो गच्छत्यनिच्छतः ॥	Through the notion of the self that discriminates, pain is dispelled, as movement and the like are. The mind, undiscriminating by nature, moves on even when one does not wish it.
V 18.168	तदा नु दृश्यते दुःखं नैश्चल्ये नैव तस्य तत् । / प्रत्यगात्मनि तस्मात्तद्दुःखं नैवोपपद्यते ॥	Then, indeed, pain is seen. When the mind is still, it has none. Therefore pain is not possible in the inner self.
V 18.169	त्वंसतोस्तुल्यनीडत्वान्नीलाश्ववदिदं भवेत् । / निर्दुःखवाचिना योगात्त्वंशब्दस्य तदर्थता ॥	Since "you" and "being" share the same referent, this would be like "a blue horse." Through its connection with the word that means what is free of pain, the word "you" comes to have that meaning.[132]
V 18.170	प्रत्यगात्माभिधानेन तच्छब्दस्य युतेस्तथा । / दशमस्त्वमसीत्येवं वाक्यं स्यात्प्रत्यगात्मनि ॥	Likewise, through the word "that" being joined with what denotes the inner self, the sentence comes to concern the inner self, as with "You are the tenth."
V 18.171	स्वार्थस्य ह्यप्रहाणेन विशिष्टार्थसमर्पकौ । / प्रत्यगात्मावगत्यन्तौ नान्योऽर्थोऽर्थाद्विरोध्यतः ॥	For without giving up their own meanings, the two words convey a qualified meaning that culminates in the realization of the inner self. No other meaning is possible, since it would conflict with what they mean.
V 18.172	नवबुद्ध्यपहाराद्धि स्वात्मानं दशपूरणम् । / अपश्यज्ज्ञातुमेवेच्छेत्स्वमात्मानं जनस्तथा ॥	A man whose attention is carried off by the nine fails to see himself, the one who completes the ten, and simply wants to know who the tenth is. In the same way a person wants to know his own self.
V 18.173	अविद्याबद्धचक्षुष्ट्वात्कामापहृतधीः सदा । / विविक्तं दृशिमात्मानं नेक्षते दशमं यथा ॥	Because his eyes are bound by ignorance and his mind is always carried off by desire, he does not see the self, the seeing that stands apart, just as that man did not see the tenth.
V 18.174	दशमस्त्वमसीत्येवं तत्त्वमस्यादिवाक्यतः । / स्वमात्मानं विजानाति कृत्स्नान्तःकरणेक्षणम् ॥	Just as a man learns from "You are the tenth," so one learns from sentences like "you are that" to know one's own self, the seer of the whole inner organ.
V 18.175		

132 Words in apposition qualify one another, as "blue" and "horse" do in "a blue horse."

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
	इदं पूर्वमिदं पश्चात्पदं वाक्यं भवेदिति । / नियमो नैव वेदेऽस्ति पदसांगत्यमर्थतः ॥	In the Veda there is no rule that in a sentence this word must come first and that one after. The words are connected through their meaning.
V 18.176	अन्वयव्यतिरेकाभ्यां ततो वाक्यार्थबोधनम् । / वाक्ये हि श्रूयमाणानां पदानामर्थसंस्मृतिः ॥	Hence the meaning of a sentence is conveyed through agreement and difference, for in a sentence the meanings of the words one hears are recalled.
V 18.177	यदा नित्येषु वाक्येषु पदार्थस्तु विविच्यते । / वाक्यार्थज्ञानसङ्क्रान्त्यै तदा प्रश्नो न युज्यते ॥	When the meanings of the words in the eternal sentences of the Veda have been sorted out, no question is called for before the knowledge of the sentence's meaning arises.
V 18.178	अन्वयव्यतिरेकोक्तिः पदार्थस्मरणाय तु । / स्मृत्यभावे न वाक्यार्थो ज्ञातुं शक्यो हि केनचित् ॥	Agreement and difference are taught so that the meanings of the words may be recalled, for without that recollection no one can know the meaning of a sentence.
V 18.179	तत्त्वमस्यादिवाक्येषु त्वंपदार्थाविवेकतः । / व्यज्यते नैव वाक्यार्थो नित्यमुक्तोऽहमित्यतः ॥	In sentences like "you are that," because the meaning of the word "you" has not been discriminated, the meaning of the sentence, "I am eternally free," does not become clear.
V 18.180	अन्वयव्यतिरेकोक्तिस्तद्विवेकाय नान्यथा । / त्वंपदार्थविवेके हि पाणावर्पितबिल्ववत् ॥	Agreement and difference are taught for that discrimination and for nothing else. For once the meaning of the word "you" has been discriminated, like a bilva fruit placed in the hand,[133]
V 18.181	वाक्यार्थो व्यज्यते चैव केवलोऽहंपदार्थतः । / दुःखीत्येतदपोहेन प्रत्यगात्मविनिश्चयात् ॥	the meaning of the sentence becomes evident as the pure meaning of the word "I," once "I am in pain" has been excluded and the inner self ascertained.
V 18.182	तत्रैवं संभवत्यर्थे श्रुतहानाश्रुतार्थधीः । / नैव कल्पयितुं युक्ता पदवाक्यार्थकोविदैः ॥	Where a meaning is possible in this way, those skilled in the meanings of words and sentences should not invent an understanding that drops what scripture says and supplies what it does not say.
V 18.183	प्रत्यक्षादीनि बाधेरन्कृष्णलादिषु पाकवत् । / अक्षजादिनिभैरेतैः कथं स्याद्वाक्यबाधनम् ॥	If you say that perception and the other means can override a sentence, as with the "cooking" of the gold pieces: how could a sentence be overridden by these, which only look like sense perception and the rest?[134]
V 18.184	दुःख्यस्मीति सति ज्ञाने निर्दुःखीति न जायते । / प्रत्यक्षादिनिभत्वेऽपि वाक्यान्न व्यभिचारतः ॥	If you say that while the knowledge "I am in pain" is present, the knowledge "I am free of pain" does not arise, no. Though the former looks like percep-

133 The bilva, or wood apple. A fruit held in the open hand is a stock image for what is plainly evident.
134 A Vedic rite prescribes "cooking" small pieces of gold (*kṛṣṇala*). Since gold cannot be softened, Mimamsa takes the word in another sense.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
		tion and the rest, the latter does arise from the sentence, because the former does not hold constant.
V 18.185	स्वप्ने दुःख्यहमध्यासं दाहच्छेदादिहेतुतः । / तत्कालभाविभिर्वाक्यैर्न बाधः क्रियते यदि ॥	If in dream the superimposition "I am in pain," caused by burning, cutting and the like, is not canceled by sentences heard at the time,
V 18.186	समाप्तेस्तर्हि दुःखस्य प्राक्क तद्बाध इष्यताम् । / न हि दुःखस्य संतानो भ्रान्तेर्वा दृश्यते क्वचित् ॥	then where, before the pain is over, should its cancellation be admitted? For a continuing stream of pain, or of the error, is never seen.
V 18.187	प्रत्यगात्मन आत्मत्वं दुःख्यस्मीत्यस्य बाधया । / दशमं नवमस्येव वेद चेदविरुद्धता ॥	If one knows the inner self as one's self by canceling "I am in pain," as the one who counted nine came to know the tenth, there is no contradiction.
V 18.188	नित्यमुक्तत्वविज्ञानं वाक्याद्भवति नान्यतः । / वाक्यार्थस्यापि विज्ञानं पदार्थस्मृतिपूर्वकम् ॥	The knowledge that one is eternally free comes from the sentence and from nothing else. Knowledge of the sentence's meaning, in turn, is preceded by the recollection of the meanings of the words.
V 18.189	अन्वयव्यतिरेकाभ्यां पदार्थः स्मर्यते ध्रुवम् । / एवं निर्दुःखमात्मानमक्रियं प्रतिपद्यते ॥	The meaning of a word is surely recalled through agreement and difference. In this way one comes to know the self as free of pain and without action.
V 18.190	सदेवेत्यादिवाक्येभ्यः प्रमा स्फुटतरा भवेत् । / दशमस्त्वमसीत्यस्माद्यथैवं प्रत्यगात्मनि ॥	From sentences such as "Being alone ...," valid knowledge of the inner self becomes clearer, just as it does from "You are the tenth."[135]
V 18.191	प्रबोधेन यथा स्वाप्नं सर्वं दुःखं निवर्तते । / प्रत्यगात्मधिया तद्वद्दुःखित्वं सर्वदात्मनः ॥	As all the pain of a dream ceases on waking, so through the notion of the inner self the self's being in pain ceases for good.
V 18.192	कृष्णलादौ प्रमाजन्म तदन्यार्थामृदुत्वतः । / तत्त्वमस्यादिवाक्येषु न त्वेवमविरोधनः ॥	With the gold pieces and the like, knowledge of another meaning arises because they cannot be softened. It is not so with sentences like "you are that," since there is no contradiction there.
V 18.193	वाक्ये तत्त्वमसीत्यस्मिञ्ज्ञातार्थं तदसिद्धयम् । / त्वमर्थं सत्यसाहाय्याद्वाक्यं नोत्पादयेत्प्रमाम् ॥	In the sentence "you are that," the word "that" has a known meaning, while the meaning of "you" is not established. Without help in establishing the meaning of "you," the sentence would not produce valid knowledge.
V 18.194	तत्त्वमोस्तुल्यनीडार्थमसीत्येतत्पदं भवेत् । / तच्छब्दः प्रत्यगात्मार्थस्तच्छब्दार्थस्त्वमस्तथा ॥	The word "are" serves to show that "that" and "you" have the same referent. The word "that" means the inner self, and "you," in the same way, means what the word "that" means.
V 18.195		

135 Chandogya Upanishad 6.2.1: "In the beginning, my dear, this was being alone, one only, without a second."

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
	दुःखित्वात्प्रत्यगात्मत्वं वारयेतामुभावपि । / एवं च नेति नेत्यर्थं गमयेतां परस्परम् ॥	The two together keep the inner self apart from being in pain, and so, each through the other, they convey the meaning "not this, not this."
V 18.196	एवं तत्त्वमसीत्यस्य गम्यमाने फले कथम् । / अप्रमाणत्वमस्योक्त्वा क्रियापेक्षत्वमुच्यते ॥	When the result of "you are that" is understood in this way, how can one call it no means of knowledge and say that it depends on action?
V 18.197	तस्मादाद्यन्तमध्येषु कुर्वित्येतद्विरोध्यतः । / न कल्प्यमश्रुतत्वाच्च श्रुतत्यागोऽप्यनर्थकः ॥	Therefore an injunction to "do" should not be supposed at the beginning, the end or the middle, since it would conflict with the sentence and is not stated there. To abandon what is stated is also pointless.
V 18.198	यथानुभूयते तृप्तिर्भुजेर्वाक्यान्न गम्यते । / वाक्यस्य विधूतिस्तद्वद्गोशकृत्पायसीक्रिया ॥	Just as satisfaction is experienced from eating and is not understood from a sentence, so the removal of pain by a sentence is like turning cow dung into milk pudding.
V 18.199	सत्यमेवमनात्मार्थवाक्यात्पारोक्ष्यबोधनम् । / प्रत्यगात्मनि न त्वेवं सरयाप्राप्तिवदध्रुवम् ॥	True: a sentence whose meaning is something other than the self gives only indirect understanding in this way. But it is not so with the inner self, and the knowledge is not uncertain, as with reaching the Sarayu.[136]
V 18.200	स्वयंवेद्यत्वपर्यायः स्वप्रमाणक इष्यताम् । / निवृत्ताविदमः सिद्धः स्वात्मनोऽनुभवश्च नः ॥	Let it be accepted that the self is its own means of knowledge, another way of saying that it is known by itself. For us, the experience of one's own self is established once the "this" has been removed.
V 18.201	बुद्धीनां विषयो दुःखं नो यस्य विषया मताः । / कुतोऽस्य दुःखसंबन्धो दृशेः स्यात्प्रत्यगात्मनः ॥	Pain is an object of the intellect's cognitions. How could pain be connected with the inner self, the seeing, which is held to have no objects?
V 18.202	दृशिरेवानुभूयेत स्वेनैवानुभवात्मना । / तदाभासतया जन्म धियोऽस्यानुभवः स्मृतः ॥	Awareness that sees is experienced by itself alone, its very nature being experience. The arising of a cognition as its reflection is what is called its experience.
V 18.203	अशनायादिनिर्मुक्तः सिद्धो मोक्षस्त्वमेव सः । / श्रोतव्यादि तवेत्येतद्विरुद्धं कथमुच्यते ॥	"You yourself are liberation, already achieved, free of hunger and the rest"—and also "You must hear," and so on. How can such contradictory things be said?[137]
V 18.204	सेत्स्यतीत्येवं चेत्तत्स्याच्छ्रवणादि तदा भवेत् । / मोक्षस्यानित्यतैव स्याद्विरोधे नान्यथा वचः ॥	If you say it should be "It will be achieved," then hearing and the rest would have a place, but liberation would then be impermanent. So there is a contradiction, and the statement cannot be taken in any other way.

136 The Sarayu, a river in northern India, here stands for something known only by report.
137 Free of hunger and the rest: Brihadaranyaka Upanishad 3.5.1. "You must hear" refers to Brihadaranyaka 2.4.5, where the self is to be heard about, reflected on and meditated upon.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
V 18.205	श्रोतृश्रोतव्ययोर्भेदो यदीष्टः स्याद्भवेदिदम् । / इष्टार्थकोप एव स्यान्न युक्तं सर्वथा वचः ॥	If a difference between the hearer and what is to be heard were accepted, this could be so. But that would overturn the intended meaning, so the statement makes no sense at all.
V 18.206	सिद्धो मोक्षोऽहमित्येवं ज्ञात्वात्मानं भवेद्यदि । / चिकीर्षुर्यः स मूढात्मा शास्त्रं चोद्घाटयत्यपि ॥	If someone has known himself as "I am liberation, already achieved" and still wants to do something, he is deluded, and he undermines the scripture as well.
V 18.207	न हि सिद्धस्य कर्तव्यं सकार्यस्य न सिद्धता । / उभयालम्बनं कुर्वन्नात्मानं वञ्चयत्यपि ॥	For there is nothing to be done by one who has achieved, and one who still has something to do has not achieved. Whoever holds on to both deceives himself.
V 18.208	सिद्धो मोक्षस्त्वमित्येतद्वस्तुमात्रं प्रदर्श्यते । / श्रोतुस्तथात्वाविज्ञाने प्रवृत्तिः स्यात्कथं त्विति ॥	"You are liberation, already achieved" only shows how things really are. But when the hearer does not know that it is so, how is he to set about anything?
V 18.209	कर्ता दुःख्यहमस्मीति प्रत्यक्षेणानुभूयते । / कर्ता दुःखी च मा भूवमिति यत्नो भवेत्ततः ॥	"I am an agent, I am in pain" is experienced by perception. From that comes the effort, "May I not be an agent, may I not be in pain."
V 18.210	तद्विज्ञानाय युक्त्यादि कर्तव्यं श्रुतिरब्रवीत् । / कर्तृत्वाद्यनुवादेन सिद्धत्वानुभवाय तु ॥	For that knowledge, scripture has said that reasoning and the rest must be undertaken. It restates agency and the rest, but only so that what is already achieved may be experienced.
V 18.211	निर्दुःखो निष्क्रियोऽकामः सिद्धो मोक्षोऽहमित्यपि । / गृहीत्वैव विरुद्धार्थमादध्यात्कथमेव सः ॥	Having grasped "I am free of pain, without action, without desire—liberation, already achieved," how could he take up anything of contrary meaning?
V 18.212	सकामः सक्रियोऽसिद्ध इति मेऽनुभवः कथम् । / अतो मे विपरीतस्य तद्भवान्वक्तुमर्हति ॥	How is it that I experience myself as having desires, as acting, as not yet achieved? Please, sir, explain this to me, who am the opposite of that.
V 18.213	इहैव घटते प्रश्नो न मुक्तत्वानुभूतये । / प्रमाणेन विरोधी यः सोऽत्रार्थः प्रश्नमर्हति ॥	A question is fitting here, but not about the experience of being free. What deserves a question here is whatever conflicts with a means of knowledge.
V 18.214	अहं निर्मुक्त इत्येवं सदसीत्यन्यमानजः । / प्रत्यक्षाभासजन्यत्वाद्दुःखित्वं प्रश्नमर्हति ॥	The knowledge "I am free" arises from another means of knowledge, "you are being." It is being in pain that deserves the question, since it is produced by what merely looks like perception.
V 18.215	पृष्टमाकाङ्क्षितं वाच्यं दुःखाभावमभीप्सितम् । / कथं हीदं निवर्तेत दुःखं सर्वात्मना मम ॥	What is asked and wanted must be answered: the absence of pain that is sought. "How can this pain of mine cease completely?"
V 18.216	इति प्रश्नानुरूपं यद्वाच्यं दुःखनिवर्तकम् । / श्रुतेः स्वात्मनि नाशङ्का प्रामाण्ये सति विद्यते ॥	What is to be said in answer to such a question is what removes pain. Since scripture is a means of

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
		knowledge in its own right, there is no doubt about it.
V 18.217	तस्मादात्मविमुक्तत्वं प्रत्याययति तद्वचः । / वक्तव्यं तत्तथार्थं स्याद्विरोधेऽसति केनचित् ॥	Therefore that statement makes known that the self is free, and what is to be said must have that meaning, so long as nothing contradicts it.
V 18.218	इतोऽन्योऽनुभवः कश्चिदात्मनो नोपपद्यते । / अविज्ञातं विजानतां विज्ञातारमिति श्रुतेः ॥	No other experience of the self than this is possible, for scripture speaks of it as "not understood by those who understand" and as "the knower."[138]
V 18.219	त्वंपदार्थविवेकाय संन्यासः सर्वकर्मणाम् । / साधनत्वं व्रजत्येव शान्तो दान्तानुशासनात् ॥	For discriminating the meaning of the word "you," the renunciation of all actions does become a means, because of the teaching "calm, controlled."[139]
V 18.220	त्वमर्थं प्रत्यगात्मानं पश्येदात्मानमात्मनि । / वाक्यार्थं तत आत्मानं सर्वं पश्यति केवलम् ॥	One should see the meaning of "you," the inner self, as the self within oneself. Then one sees the meaning of the sentence: the self alone, as everything.
V 18.221	सर्वमात्मेति वाक्यार्थे विज्ञातेऽस्य प्रमाणतः । / असत्त्वे ह्यन्यमानस्य विधिस्तं योजयेत्कथम् ॥	When he has understood through the means of knowledge the meaning of the sentence, "All is the self," and no other means of knowledge remains for him, how could an injunction engage him?
V 18.222	तस्माद्वाक्यार्थविज्ञानान्नोर्ध्वं कर्मविधिर्भवेत् । / न हि ब्रह्मास्मि कर्तेति विरुद्धे भवतो धियौ ॥	Therefore, once the meaning of the sentence is known, there can be no further injunction to action. For the two contradictory cognitions, "I am *brahman*" and "I am an agent," do not occur together.
V 18.223	ब्रह्मास्मीति च विद्येयं नैव कर्तेति बाध्यते । / सकामो बद्ध इत्येवं प्रमाणाभासजातया ॥	This knowledge, "I am *brahman*," is not canceled by the notions "I am an agent," "I have desires," "I am bound," which spring from what only looks like a means of knowledge.
V 18.224	शास्त्राद्ब्रह्मास्मि नान्योऽहमिति बुद्धिर्भवेद्दृढा । / यदा युक्ता तदैवधीर्यथा देहात्मधीरिति ॥	From scripture, the understanding "I am *brahman*, I am no other" should become firm. Only when it is established is it knowledge, as firm as the notion that the self is the body.
V 18.225	सभयादभयं प्राप्तस्तदर्थं यतते च यः । / स पुनः सभयं गन्तुं स्वतन्त्रश्चेन्न हीच्छति ॥	One who has gone from the fearful to the fearless, and has striven for that, does not wish to go back to the fearful if he is free to choose.
V 18.226	यथेष्टाचरणप्राप्तिः सन्यासादिविधौ कुतः । पदार्थाज्ञानबुद्धस्य वाक्यार्थानुभवार्थिनः । अतः सर्वमिदं सिद्धं यत्प्रागस्माभिरीरितम् ॥	How could license to act as one pleases follow from the injunction of renunciation and the rest, for one who has become aware of his ignorance of the meaning of the words and seeks to experience

138 Kena Upanishad 2.3; Brihadaranyaka Upanishad 3.4.2: "You cannot know the knower of knowing."
139 Brihadaranyaka Upanishad 4.4.23: the knower becomes "calm, controlled, withdrawn, patient and collected."

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
		the meaning of the sentence? Therefore all that we have said before is established.
V 18.227	यो हि यस्माद्विरक्तः स्यान्नासौ तस्मै प्रवर्तते । / लोकत्रयाद्विरक्तत्वान्मुमुक्षुः किमितीहते ॥	One who has turned away from a thing does not act for its sake. Since he has turned away from the three worlds, why would one who seeks liberation strive for anything?
V 18.228	क्षुधया पीड्यमानोऽपि न विषं ह्यत्तुमिच्छति । / मृष्टान्नध्वस्ततृड् जानन्नामूढस्तज्जिघत्सति ॥	Even one tormented by hunger does not want to eat poison. One whose hunger has been taken away by fine food will certainly not want to eat it, if he knows it for what it is and is not deluded.
V 18.229	वेदान्तवाक्यपुष्पेभ्यो ज्ञानामृतमधूत्तमम् । / उज्जहारालिवद्यो नस्तस्मै सद्गुरवे नमः ॥	Homage to the true teacher who, like a bee, gathered for us the finest honey, the nectar of knowledge, from the flowers that are the sentences of the Upanishads.

CHAPTER 19: APPLYING THE REMEDY

The self urges the mind to calm, since duality is imagined and the self is unborn.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
V 19.1	प्रयुज्य तृष्णाज्वरनाशकारणं चिकित्सितं ज्ञानविरागभेषजम् । / न याति कामज्वरसंनिपातजां शरीरमालाशतयोगदुःखिताम् ॥	Whoever applies the cure that destroys the fever of craving, the medicine of knowledge and dispassion, does not fall into the misery of being joined to garland after garland of hundreds of bodies, the misery that comes from the delirious fever of desire.[140]
V 19.2	अहं ममेति त्वमनर्थमीहसे परार्थमिच्छन्ति तवान्य ईहितम् । / न तेऽर्थबोधो न हि मेऽस्ति चार्थिता ततश्च युक्तः शम एव ते मनः ॥	Thinking "I" and "mine," you strive for what is useless, and others hold that what you strive for is for the sake of another. But you have no awareness of any purpose, and I have no wants. So calm alone is fitting for you, mind.[141]
V 19.3	यतो न चान्यः परमात्सनातनात्सदैव तृप्तोऽहमतो न मेऽर्थिता । / सदैव तृप्तश्च न कामये हितं यतस्व चेतः प्रशमाय तेऽधिकम् ॥	Since I am not other than the supreme, the eternal, I am always content, and so I want nothing. Always content, I desire no benefit. Strive, mind, for your own calm; that is better for you.
V 19.4	षड्ऊर्मिमालाभ्यतिवृत्त एव यः स एव चात्मा जगतश्च नः श्रुतेः । / प्रमाणतश्चापि मया प्रवेद्यते मुधैव तस्मान्न मनस्तवेहितम् ॥	The one who has passed beyond the chain of the six waves is, as scripture teaches, the self of the world and of us, and I know it through the means of knowledge. So your striving, mind, is in vain.[142]
V 19.5		When you are calm, there is no notion of difference, the notion through which the world falls

140 In this closing chapter the self addresses the mind. In Indian medicine *saṃnipāta* is a grave fever in which all three bodily humors are disturbed at once.

141 Sāṃkhya holds that the mind and the rest of nature act for the sake of spirit (*puruṣa*).

142 The six waves are hunger, thirst, grief, delusion, old age and death, beyond which the self is said to stand (Brihadaranyaka Upanishad 3.5.1).

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
	त्वयि प्रशान्ते न हि चास्ति भेदधीर्यतो जगन्मोहमुपैति मायया । / ग्रहो हि मायाप्रभवस्य कारणं ग्रहाद्विमोके न हि सास्ति कस्यचित् ॥	into delusion by illusion. Grasping is the cause of what springs from illusion, and once there is release from grasping, illusion exists for no one.
V 19.6	न मेऽस्ति मोहस्तव चेष्टितेन हि प्रबुद्धतत्त्वस्त्वसितो ह्यविक्रियः । / न पूर्वतत्त्वोत्तरभेदता हि नो वृथैव तस्मान्न मनस्तवेहितम् ॥	Your activity causes me no delusion, for I am awake to reality, unbound and free of change. For us there is no difference between an earlier reality and a later one. So your striving, mind, is in vain.
V 19.7	यतश्च नित्योऽहमतो न चान्यथा विकारयोगे हि भवेदनित्यता । / सदा प्रभातोऽहमतो हि चाद्वयो विकल्पितं चाप्यसदित्यवस्थितम् ॥	Since I am eternal, I am never otherwise, for to be joined with change would mean impermanence. I am always shining, and so I am without a second. It stands settled that what is imagined is unreal.
V 19.8	अभावरूपं त्वमसीह हे मनो निरीक्ष्यमाणे न हि युक्तितोऽस्तिता । / सतो ह्यनाशादसतोऽप्यजन्मतो द्वयं च चेतस्तव नास्तितेष्यते ॥	Mind, your nature here is nonexistence: examined by reason, you are found not to exist. For what is does not perish, and what is not is not born. So the duality that belongs to you, mind, is held not to exist.
V 19.9	द्रष्टा च दृश्यं च तथा च दर्शनं भ्रमस्तु सर्वस्तव कल्पितो हि सः । / दृशेश्च भिन्नं न हि दृश्यमीक्ष्यते स्वपन्प्रबोधेन तथा न भिद्यते ॥	Seer, seen and seeing—this whole error is imagined by you. Nothing seen is ever perceived apart from seeing. Nor, in the same way, is the dreamer made different by waking.
V 19.10	विकल्पना वापि तथाद्वया भवेदवस्तुयोगात्तदलातचक्रवत् । / न शक्तिभेदोऽस्ति यतो न चात्मना ततोऽद्वयत्वं श्रुतितोऽवसीयते ॥	Imagining too would be without a second in the same way, since it has no connection with anything real, like the circle traced by a whirling firebrand. Since there is no difference of powers, and none from the self, nonduality is established from scripture.[143]
V 19.11	मिथश्च भिन्ना यदि ते हि चेतनाः क्षयस्तु तेषां परिमाणयोगतः । / ध्रुवो भवेद्भेदवतां हि दृष्टतो जगत्क्षयश्चापि समस्तमोक्षतः ॥	If conscious beings were different from one another, they would surely perish, being limited in extent, as we see with things that differ. And when all were liberated, the world too would come to an end.
V 19.12	न मेऽस्ति कश्चिन्न च सोऽस्मि कस्यचिद्यतोऽद्वयोऽहं न हि चास्ति कल्पितम् । / अकल्पितश्चास्मि पुरा प्रसिद्धितो विकल्पनायाः द्वयमेव कल्पितम् ॥	Nothing is mine, nor am I anyone's, since I am without a second, and what is imagined does not exist. I am not imagined, since I am established before imagining. Only duality is imagined.
V 19.13	विकल्पना चाप्यभवे न विद्यते तदन्यदित्येव मतो न नास्तिता । / यतः प्रवृत्ता न वचाविकल्पना पुरा प्रसिद्धेर्न च तद्विकल्पिता ॥	Imagining does not exist in the unborn. It is held to be other than that, yet that is not nonexistence. That from which imagining proceeds is beyond speech, and since it is established before imagining, it is not itself imagined.
V 19.14	असद्वयं ते च ह यद्यदीष्यते न दृष्टमेत्येव न चैव नास्तिता । / यतः प्रवृत्ता सदसद्विकल्पना विचारवद्वापि तथाद्वयं च सत् ॥	For you, duality is unreal: whatever is supposed never actually comes to be seen. Yet it is not mere

143 A burning stick whirled in the dark looks like a ring of fire. It is a stock image for a false appearance.

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
		nonexistence. That from which the imagining of being and non-being proceeds is, like inquiry itself, likewise without a second, and real.
V 19.15	सदभ्युपेतं भवतोऽपकल्पितं विचारहेतोर्यदि तस्य नास्तिता । / विचारहानाच्च तथैव संस्थितं न चेन्न दृष्टं नितरां सदिष्यते ॥	If the being you accept is something you have imagined, then, since inquiry is what reveals it, it does not exist, and when inquiry is abandoned it remains just as it was. If it were not so, it would not be seen. What is real is held to be real absolutely.
V 19.16	असत्समं चैव यदित्यपीति चेदनर्थवत्त्वात्खरशृङ्गतुल्यता । / अनर्थवत्त्वं त्वसतीह्यकारणं न चैव तस्मान्न विपर्ययेऽन्यथा ॥	If you say that it is just like the unreal, like a donkey's horn, because it serves no purpose: having no purpose is no ground in the case of the unreal, and so it is none in the reverse case either. It is not otherwise.[144]
V 19.17	असिद्धितश्चापि विचारकारणाद्वयं च तस्मात्प्रसृतं च मायया । / श्रुतेः स्मृतेश्चापि तथा हि युक्तितः प्रसिध्यतीत्थं न तु युज्यतेऽन्यथा ॥	And since duality is not established by what gives rise to inquiry, it has spread out from that through illusion. This is established in this way by scripture, by tradition and by reasoning, and it cannot be otherwise.
V 19.18	विकल्पनाच्चापि विधर्मकं श्रुतेः पुरा प्रसिद्धेश्च विकल्पितोऽद्वयम् । / न चेति नेतीति यथा विकल्पितं निषिध्यतेऽत्राप्यविशेषसिद्धयै ॥	According to scripture, the nondual differs in nature from imagining, and since it is established before imagining, it is not imagined. Just as what is imagined is denied by "not this, not this," so here too it is denied, to establish what is without distinctions.
V 19.19	अकल्पितेऽप्येवमजेऽद्वयेऽक्षरे विकल्पयन्तः सदसच्च जन्मभिः । / स्वचित्तमायाप्रभवं च ते भवं जरां च मृत्युं च नियान्ति संततम् ॥	In what is thus unimagined, unborn, without a second and imperishable, they imagine being and non-being through births. So they go on and on into becoming, old age and death, which spring from the illusion of their own minds.
V 19.20	भवाभवत्वं तु न चेदवस्थितिर्न चास्य चान्यस्थितिजन्म नान्यथा । / सतो ह्यसत्त्वादसतश्च सत्त्वतो न च क्रियाकारकमित्यतोऽप्यजम् ॥	If it has neither being nor non-being, it has no state, and no birth from another state; it cannot be otherwise. For the real does not become unreal, nor the unreal real, and there are no action and factors of action. For this reason too it is unborn.
V 19.21	अकुर्वदिष्टं यदि वास्य कारकं न किंचिदन्यन्नु नास्त्यकारकम् । / सतोऽविशेषादसतश्च सच्च्युतौ तुलान्तयोर्यद्वदनिश्चयान्न हि ॥	If you hold that its causal factor does nothing, then there is nothing else, for surely there is no factor that does not act. Since being would then not differ from non-being, being could not fall away from itself, just as nothing is decided between the two pans of a balance.
V 19.22		If you do not accept that being and non-being turn into each other, how could there be becoming

	SANSKRIT	ENGLISH
	न चेत्स इष्टः सदसद्विपर्ययः कथं भवः स्यात्सदसद्व्यवस्थितौ । / विभक्तमेतद्व्यमप्यवस्थितं न जन्म तस्माच्च मनो हि कस्यचित् ॥	while being and non-being stay fixed? These two remain apart and fixed. So, mind, there is no birth for anything.
V 19.23	अथाभ्युपेत्यापि भवं तवेच्छतो ब्रवीमि नार्थस्तव चेष्टितेन मे । / न हानवृद्धी न यतः स्वतोऽसतो भवोऽन्यतो वा यदि वास्तिता तयोः ॥	Even granting becoming, since you want it, I tell you: your activity does nothing for me, for I have neither loss nor gain. Nor can the nonexistent come to be, whether from itself or from another, even if the two were granted to exist.
V 19.24	ध्रुवा ह्यनित्याश्च न चान्ययोगिनो मिथश्च कार्यं न च तेषु युज्यते । / अतो न कस्यापि हि किंचिदिष्यते स्वयं च तत्त्वं न निरुक्तिगोचरम् ॥	Whether permanent or impermanent, things are not joined to one another, and no effect of one upon another is possible among them. So nothing is held to belong to anything, and reality itself lies beyond the reach of words.
V 19.25	समं तु तस्मात्सततं विभातवद्व्याद्विमुक्तं सदसद्विकल्पितात् । / निरीक्ष्य युक्त्या श्रुतितस्तु बुद्धिमानशेषनिर्वाणमुपैति दीपवत् ॥	Therefore the wise one, having seen through reasoning and from scripture that which is the same, ever shining, free of the duality imagined as being and non-being, attains complete *nirvāṇa*, like a lamp.[145]
V 19.26	अवेद्यमेकं यदनन्यवेदिना कुतार्किकाणां च सुवेद्यमन्यथा । / निरीक्ष्य चेत्थं त्वगुणग्रहोऽगुणं न याति मोहं ग्रहदोषमुक्तितः ॥	The One cannot be made an object by one who knows nothing other than it, yet bad reasoners readily think they know it as something else. One who sees it thus, and does not grasp at qualities, does not fall into delusion about what is without qualities, being free of the fault of grasping.
V 19.27	अतोऽन्यथा न ग्रहनाश इष्यते विमोहबुद्धेर्ग्रह एव कारणम् । / ग्रहोऽप्यहेतुस्त्वनलस्त्वनिन्धनो यथा प्रशान्तिं परमां तथा व्रजेत् ॥	There is no other way for grasping to end. Grasping alone is the cause of a deluded mind. When grasping itself is left without a cause, one reaches the highest peace, as a fire without fuel goes out.
V 19.28	विमथ्य वेदोदधितः समुद्धृतं सुरैर्महाब्धेस्तु यथा महात्मभिः । / तथामृतं ज्ञानमिदं हि यैः पुरा नमो गुरुभ्यः परमीक्षितं च यैः ॥	Homage to the teachers who long ago drew up this nectar of knowledge, churning it from the ocean of the Veda as the great-souled gods drew the nectar from the great ocean, and who saw the highest.[146]

144 A donkey's horn is the stock example of something that does not exist at all.
145 *nirvāṇa*: literally "blowing out," as of a lamp; here the complete stilling of the round of rebirth.
146 In the myth, the gods churned the ocean of milk to obtain *amṛta*, the nectar of immortality.