

Nor even is It differentiated by Its qualities, since Consciousness is free from qualifications. And the Bhagavān will speak of desires etc. (cf. 13.6 etc.) as the attributes of the aggregate of body and organs, and will also say, 'Being without beginning and without qualities' (13.31). Nor even are there the ultimate distinctions which can create differentiation in the Self, (61) because there is nothing to prove that these ultimate distinctions exist in every body.

Hence, *samam brahma*, Brahman is the same and one. *Tasmāt*, therefore; *te*, they; *sthitāḥ*, are established; *brahmani*, in Brahman Itself. As a result, not even a shade of defect touches them. For they have no self-identification in the form of perceiving the aggregate of body etc. as the Self.

On the other hand, that statement (Gau. Sm. 17.20) refers to the man who has self-identification in the form of perceiving the aggregate of body, (organs) etc. as the Self, for that statement—'A sacrificer incurs sin by not adoring equally one who is an equal, and by adoring equally one who is not equal to himself', pointedly refers to persons who are the objects of adoration. It is indeed seen that in worship, charity, etc. the determining factors are the possession of such special qualities as being 'a knower of Brahman', 'versed in the six auxiliary branches of Vedic learning', and 'versed in the four Vedas'. But Brahman is bereft of association with all qualities and defects. This being so, it is logical that they are established in Brahman. And 'adoring an equal, ... an unequal,' etc. has reference to men of action. (62) But this subject under consideration, beginning from 'The embodied man ... having given up all actions mentally' (13) to the end of the chapter, is concerning one who has given up all actions.

Since the Self is Brahman which is without blemish and is the same (in all), therefore—

न प्रहृष्येत् प्रियं प्राप्य नोद्विजेत्प्राप्य चाप्रियम् ।  
स्थिरबुद्धिरसंमूढो ब्रह्मविद्ब्रह्मणि स्थितः ॥ २० ॥