

person while in the verse there is mention of time.

In the topic of devotion, the Lord declares that diverse feelings of creatures emanate from Him alone—‘bhavanti bhāvā bhūtānām matta eva pṛthagvidhāḥ’ (10/5); but here in the topic of knowledge, He declares that diverse feelings of creatures are centred in ‘Prakṛti’. It means that where there is the distinction between the real and the unreal, there all the feelings are centred in the unreal but where there is the description of the entire form of God, there all feelings emanate from Him. In the entire form, the real and the unreal—‘All is God’—‘sadasaccāham’ (9/19).



Link:—In the next verse, the Lord describes the self, to whom Brahma is attained, which has been mentioned in the preceding verse, and which in the twenty-second verse of this chapter, has been described, as detached from the body.

अनादित्वान्निर्गुणत्वात्परमात्मायमव्ययः ।

शरीरस्थोऽपि कौन्तेय न करोति न लिप्यते ॥ ३१ ॥

anāditvānnirguṇatvātparamātmāyamavyayah

śarīrastho'pi kaunteya na karoti na lipyate

O Kaunteya, the self being without beginning and without attributes, is imperishable Paramātmā (Supreme Soul), though dwelling in the body, it neither acts, nor is tainted. 31

Comment:—

'Anāditvānnirguṇatvātparamātmāyamavyayah'—As has been mentioned in the nineteenth verse also, the self is without beginning. But there prakṛti has also been called, beginningless. So what is the difference between the two? In response to this question, the Lord explains, that the self is without attributes (guṇas), and their evolutes, while prakṛti, is full of three guṇas and modifications. The self, being free from guṇas and modifications, is the imperishable and untainted Supreme Soul.

'Śarīrastho'pi kaunteya na karoti na lipyate'—The self, in spite

of dwelling in a body, neither acts nor is tainted, it remains detached, from prakṛti and is attributeless and imperishable. It is, neither a doer, nor an enjoyer. But, when It identifies Itself with a body, It assumes, that It is a doer as well as, the enjoyer of pleasure and pain. But, actually It is only an illuminator and spectator, It is never tainted, because of being a portion of the Lord. It ever rests in Him. The illuminator, here means, illumination incarnate. It is not an illuminator, in relation to the illumined.

Here the term 'Api', signifies that every embodied being, from an ant to Lord Brahmā since eternity, has been unattached and untainted, by its own intrinsic nature. He had never any identity with a body, as the two belong to two different classes. The body, being an evolute of prakṛti, remains seated in Matter, while the self being a fragment of God remains, identical with the Lord. However he may seem to be mixed up, with the body and feel identified with the body, his untaintedness, is never affected. He, ever remains untainted. He may not realize this fact, yet he undergoes no modifications. The self, did nothing, does nothing, was neither contaminated, nor gets contaminated.

Though the self, seated in prakṛti, becomes a doer and an enjoyer, yet in the twenty-first verse, the Lord announced, that the spirit seated in prakṛti, experiences pleasure and pain. While, here He declares, that the self (Spirit) in spite of dwelling in the body, is neither a doer nor an experiencer. Actually prakṛti and its evolute, body—both are one and the same. Actually, the self has no connection, either with the individual body, or the collective prakṛti. But, it assumes itself, as a doer and an experiencer, by identifying itself with a body, otherwise it is neither a doer, nor an enjoyer.

Appendix—The self is without beginning while the body has a beginning. The self is without 'guṇas' (attributes) while the body is an evolute of 'guṇas'. The self is the Supreme Soul but the body is the non-self. The self is imperishable while the body

is perishable. Therefore though an ignorant person holds that the self dwells in the body but in fact it does not rest in the body viz., it is totally detached from the body—‘na karoti na lipyate’. The reason is that the body is related with the world but the self is related with the Supreme Soul (God). Therefore the self can never abide in the body. But without paying attention to this fact, a man assumes the self to be abiding in the body.

‘Nirguṇatvāt’—Though the self is devoid of guṇas, yet it is bound by being attached to ‘guṇas’ (Gītā 13/21). Outwardly it appears that bondage is natural and salvation will be attained by making efforts. But the fact is that salvation is natural and a person himself paves the way to bondage. Guṇas are not at all related with the self but they are related with ‘Prakṛti’ (Gītā 13/23). Therefore the self is without beginning, without attributes, is the Supreme Soul, is imperishable and it neither acts nor is tainted—all this is quite natural. A striver has to realize this naturality of one’s own.

As while residing in a house, we are different from the house, so are we (the self) assuming to be dwelling in the body, different from the body.

‘Na karoti na lipyate’—The self neither acts nor is tainted—this fact is not a result of any spiritual practice, but it is so by nature. It means that in the self there is no doership-enjoyership—it is self-evident. It needs no effort viz., nothing is to be done for it. It means that doership and enjoyership are not to be wiped out but they are not to be accepted in the self; but a striver has to realize their absence because in fact they are not in the self. Therefore a striver should realize that he is neither a doer nor an enjoyer. Realization of freedom from doership and enjoyership in the self (disinterestedness and freedom from the sense of mine) is liberation from the worldly bondage. In the Gītā, this point has been declared in this way that the memory is gained—‘naṣṭo mohah smṛtirlabdḥā’ (18/73).

If the self is not the doer and enjoyer, then who is the doer and

enjoyer? Let us reflect upon it. First think over—who is a doer? The body is not the doer because it is perishing every moment. Mind, intellect, citta (faculty of reflection) and ego—these four are instruments which are called internal instruments (antaḥkaraṇa). This ‘antaḥkaraṇa’ is also not the doer because the instrument depends upon the doer but the doer is independent—‘svatantraḥ kartā’ (Pāṇi. chap. 1/4/54). An instrument is very helpful in the accomplishment of an action (task)—‘sādhakatamaṁ karaṇam’ (Pāṇi. chap. 1/4/42). Therefore without the instrument an action is not accomplished at all. As a pen does not write independently but that is merely an instrument for writing which depends upon the writer (doer). Therefore an instrument is not a doer and a doer is not an instrument. Secondly if there is doership in the instrument, why does the self feel happy and sad? If the instrument is happy and sad, what harm does it cause us? The true self is also not the doer because ‘I’ness is the evolute of ‘Prakṛti’, then how is this ‘I’ness possible in the self which transcends ‘Prakṛti’? Had there been doership in the self, it would have never been destroyed because the self is imperishable. Therefore here the Lord negated doership in the self—‘na karoti’.

In the eighteenth chapter also the Lord declares, “He who assumes the self as the doer, that man of perverse understanding does not see right because his mind is not pure” (Gītā 18/16). In fact he who is an enjoyer (experiencer) (who becomes happy and sad) is a doer.

Now let us reflect upon—who is an enjoyer? The enjoyer is neither real nor unreal. The real can’t be an enjoyer because the real lacks nothing—‘nābhāvo vidyate sataḥ’; while the enjoyership comes to an end—‘na lipyate’. The unreal can also not be an enjoyer because the unreal has no existence—‘nāsato vidyate bhāvaḥ’. In the unreal there is no consciousness. Therefore in the unreal there can’t be even an imagination of enjoyership. It means that doership and enjoyership are neither in the real nor in the unreal. In the union of the real and the unreal also there is neither doership nor enjoyership; because as the union of the

day and the night is impossible, so is the union of the real and the unreal impossible. Therefore doership and enjoyership are merely assumed—'kartāhamiti manyate' (3/27). When a striver discriminately, totally renounces attachment to the body viz., wipes out the sense of 'I' and 'mine' (which is actually not there), then he remains neither a doer nor an enjoyer but only a divine entity remains. In this way a striver, having realized the absence of doership and enjoyership in him, is liberated viz., he does not remain a doer or an enjoyer (experiencer) but remains the Pure Self (Divine Entity).

'Na karoti na lipyate'—The Lord has explained and discussed this expression in the thirty-second and thirty-third verses of this chapter.



Link:—How is the self dwelling in the body, not tainted?

The answer ensues:—

यथा सर्वगतं सौक्ष्म्यादाकाशं नोपलिप्यते ।

सर्वत्रावस्थितो देहे तथात्मा नोपलिप्यते ॥ ३२ ॥

yathā sarvagataṁ sauksmyādākāśaṁ nopalipyate
sarvatrāvasthito dehe tathātmā nopalipyate

As the all-pervading ether is not tainted because of being subtle, so the self (ātmā) permeated everywhere in the body, is not tainted. 32

Comment:—

[In the previous verse, the Lord explained by the expression 'Na karoti' (neither acts), that the self is a non-doer, while by the expression 'Na lipyate' (nor is tainted), He explained that the self, is not an experiencer. But here in this verse, first He explains, how the self, is a non-experiencer, while in the next verse, He will explain how the self, is a non-doer. Why has He changed the order? The answer is, that a man performs actions in order to, receive its fruit. So, first he thinks of the reward,