

anything whatsoever—just as the knowledge that fire is hot and luminous is irremovable—, since (Self-)realization is inseparable from its result (that is cessation of ignorance).

Besides, the Vedic texts enjoining rites (and duties) etc. are not invalid, because they, through the generation of successively newer tendencies by eliminating the successively preceding tendencies, are meant for creating the tendency to turn towards the indwelling Self. (269) Although the means be unreal (in itself), still it may be meaningful in relation to the truth of the purpose it serves, as are the eulogistic sentences (*arthavāda*) (270) occurring along with injunctions. Even in the world, when it becomes necessary to make to child or a lunatic drink milk etc. it is said that it will help growth of hair (271) etc.! Before the dawn of Knowledge, the (ritualistic) Vedic texts concerned with a different situation (272) are also as valid in themselves as are direct perception etc. occurring due to Self-identification with the body etc. On the other hand, as for your view ‘The Self, though inactive by Itself, acts through Its mere proximity; and that itself constitutes agentship of the Self in the primary sense. Just as it is well known that a king, though not himself engaged in a battle, is, merely by virtue of his being in charge, said to be fighting when his soldiers are fighting, and that he is victorious or defeated; similarly, as the commander of an army acts through his mere orders, and it is seen that the results of the actions accrue to the king or to the commander; or, just as the actions of the priests are ascribed to the sacrificer,—in that very manner the actions done by the body etc. ought to be of the Self because the result of those actions accrues to the Self. And, as the agentship of a magnet which, in fact, is not active, is attributed to it in the primary sense because it causes a piece of iron to move, similar is the agentship of the Self’—that is wrong, since it will amount to an inactive entity becoming an agent.

*Objection:* May not agentship be of various kinds?

*Reply:* No, for in the case of the ‘king’ and others it is seen that they have agentship even in the primary sense. As for the king, he fights even through his personal engagement. And he has agentship