

‘Since by seeing equally the Bhagavān who is present alike everywhere (he does not injure the Self by the Self, therefore he attains the supreme Goal)’ (13.28), etc.

And as for reason, there is the text, ‘Men avoid snakes, tips of *kuśa*-grass as also wells when they are aware of them. Some fall into them owing to ignorance. Thus, see the special result arising from knowledge’ (Mbh. Śā. 201.17).

Similarly, it is known that an unenlightened person, who identifies himself with the body etc. and who practises righteousness and unrighteousness under the impulsion of attachment and aversion, takes birth and dies. It cannot be reasonably denied by anyone that, those who see the Self as different from the body etc. become liberated as a result of the cessation of righteous and unrighteous conduct, which depends on the destruction of attachment and aversion.

This being so, the Knower of the field, who in reality is Bhagavān Himself, appears to have become a mundane Ātman owing to the various adjuncts which are products of ignorance; as for instance the individual Ātman becomes identified with the body etc. For it is a well-known fact in the case of all creatures that their self-identity with the body etc. which are not-Self is definitely caused by ignorance. Just as, when a stump of a tree is firmly regarded as a man, the qualities of a man do not thereby come to exist in the stump, nor do the qualities of the stump come to the person, similarly the property of consciousness does not come to the body, nor those of the body to consciousness. It is not proper that the Self should be identified with happiness, sorrow, delusion, etc., since they, like decrepitude and death, are equally the products of ignorance.

*Objection:* May it not be said that this is not so, because of dissimilarity? The stump and the man, which are verily *objects of perception*, are superimposed on each other through ignorance by their perceiver. On the other hand, in the case of the body and the Self, the mutual superimposition occurs verily between a *knower* and an *object of perception*. Thus, the illustration is not equally applicable. Therefore, may it not be that the properties of the body,