

The reflection of a face being seen in a mirror, etc., that is, in various kinds of mirrors, has no separate being apart from the actual face. Even though the reflection of a face is certainly not a real object, still, the reflections appear to be different from the actual face as well as from each other because of the different conditioning adjuncts.

तथा च उपाधिगतमलिनत्वादिधर्मैः मलिनत्वादिधर्मकाः प्रतीयन्ते । तद्वत्
मुखाभासकवत् चिदाभासकः आत्मनः प्रतिबिम्बो धीषु बुद्धिषु दृश्यमानो जीव
इत्युच्यते यः, सोऽहमात्मा जीवास्ते उपाधिभेदात् भिन्नाः प्रतिभासन्ते ।

*tathā ca upādhiगतamalinatvādidharmaiḥ malinatvādidharmakāḥ pratīyante
| tadvat mukhābhāsakavat cidābhāsakah ātmanah pratibimbo dhīṣu
buddhiṣu dṛśyamāno gīva ityucyate yaḥ so'hamātmā jīvāste upādhibhedāt
bhinnāḥ pratibhāsante |*

And, similarly, attributes such as dirtiness appear [to belong to the actual face] because of the attributes such as dirtiness that obtain in the conditioning adjunct [the mirror, etc.]. Like that, like the reflection of the face, the reflection of consciousness, the reflection of the Self, who is being seen in each mind, is called the *jīva*. I am that Self. These *jīvas* appear to be different due to the different conditioning adjuncts.

उपाधिगतसुखदुःखादिभिश्च सुखदुःखादिमन्तश्च प्रतिभासन्ते । उपाध्यश्च
व्यवस्थितरूपा एवेति सुखदुःखादीनामैकात्म्यपक्षे व्यवस्था युक्तैवेति नायमात्मभेदः
शक्यो व्यवस्थापयितुम् । श्रुतिश्चैकात्म्यमेव प्रतिपादयति – ‘एकमेवाद्वितीयं ब्रह्म’
इति ।

*upādhiगतasukhaduḥkhādibhiṣca sukhaduḥkhādīmantaśca pratibhāsante |
upādhyasca vyavasthitarūpā eveti sukhaduḥkhādīnāmaikātmypakṣe*

*vyavasthā yuktaiveti nāyamātmabhedah śakyo vyavasthāpayitum |
śrutiścaikātmyameva pratipādayati ekamevādvitīyam brahma iti |*

They appear to have happiness and sadness, etc. because of the happiness and sadness, etc. obtaining in the conditioning adjuncts (*upādhis*). And it is the conditioning adjuncts alone who have different states of experience (*vyavasthitarūpā*), thus, in the view of oneness [the nonduality of the Self] the individual experiences (*vyavasthā*) of happiness and sadness, etc. alone is proper; thus it is not a difference of selves that brings about separate states of experience. And the *śruti* reveals oneness alone: “There is one non-dual Brahman alone.”

आत्मभेदपक्षे तु इयं सुखदुःखादिव्यवस्था नोपपद्यते । तथा हि -- प्रतिशरीरम्
आत्मानो भिन्नाः ते च सर्वे प्रत्येकं सर्वगता इति आत्मभेदवादिनो मन्यन्ते । तत्र
सर्वेषां सर्वगतत्वात् सर्वसंनिधौ सुखादिकमुत्पद्यमानं विशेषहेतोरभावात्
कथमेकस्यैव तत् सुखादिकम् , न सर्वेषाम् इत्यवधारयितुं शक्यते । अथ यत्
सम्बन्धिना कार्यकरणसंघातेन सुखादिकं जन्यते , तस्यैव तदित्यभिधीयते इति ;
तन्न, कार्यकरणसंघातस्यापि सर्वात्मसंनिधावुत्पद्यमानस्य विशेषहेतोरभावादेव
कथमेकात्मसंबन्धित्वमिति ।

*ātmabhedapakṣe tu iyaṁ sukhaduḥkhādivyavasthā nopapadyate |tathā hi
pratiśarīram ātmāno bhinnāḥ te ca sarve pratyekaṁ sarvagatā iti
ātmabhedavādinō manyante | tatra sarveṣāṁ sarvagatatvāt sarvasannidhau
sukhādikamutpadyamānaṁ viśeṣahetorabhāvāt kathamekasyaiṅva tat
sukhādikam na sarveṣāṁ ityavadhārayitum śakyate | atha yat sambandhinā
kāryakaraṇasaṅghātena dukhādikaṁ janyate tasyaiṅva tadityabhidhīyate iti
tanna kāryakaraṇasaṅghātasyāpi sarvātmasannidhāvutpadyamānasya
viśeṣahetorabhāvādeva kathamekātmāsambandhitvamiti |*

Whereas, regarding the argument of different selves, this explanation of happiness and sorrow is not tenable. To explain--those who believe that there are different selves (*ātmabhedahvādinah*) think that there is a different self in each body and each one of them is all pervasive. There, because all of them are all pervasive, the happiness, sadness, etc. would be taking place in the presence of all of them (selves), because there is no way to separate them. How can it be concluded that that [the experience of] happiness, etc. is for one Self alone and not for all. [There is no logic to establish this difference.] If it be said that the happiness, etc., which is produced by the body-mind complex (*kāryakaraṇasaṅghāta*) with which it is connected belongs to that [body-mind complex] alone, that cannot be, because there is no logic to establish distinctly separate experiences for the body mind complex, as it is also taking place in the presence of every self, thus, how can there be a connection with one self alone.

अथ यत्कर्मवशात्कार्यकरणसंघातस्योत्पत्तिः, तस्यैव असौ कार्यकरणसंघात इति विशेषहेतुरिति चेत् ; न, कर्मणोऽपि सर्वात्मसंनिधावुत्पद्यमानस्य सर्वात्मसंबन्धित्वेन तज्जनितकार्यकरणसङ्घातस्यापि सर्वात्मसंबन्धित्वात् तज्जनितस्य सुखदुःखादेरपि सर्वात्मसंबन्धित्वमिति सुखादिकस्य नानात्मपक्ष एव न व्यवस्थितिः ।

atha yat karmavaśātkāryakaraṇasaṅghātasyotpattiḥ tasyaiḥ asau kāryakaraṇasaṅghāta iti viśeṣaheturiti cet na karmaṇo'pi sarvātmasannidhāvutpadyamānasya sarvātmasambandhitvena tajjanitakāryakaraṇasaṅghātasyāpi sarvātmasambandhitvāt tajjanitasya sukhaduḥkhāderapi sarvātmasambandhitvamiti sukhādikasya nānātmapakṣa eva na vyavasthitih |

Next, if you give as the special reason [for the individual experiences of happiness and sorrow] that the birth of the body-mind complex (*kāryakaraṇasaṅghāta*) is due to the force of karma of the one who has this body-mind complex, to that also, we say no. Because karma, also, taking place in the presence of every self, is connected to every self; and because the body-mind complex which is born of that [karma] is connected to every self, the happiness and sorrow also, which is born of that [body-mind complex], is also connected to every self. Thus, on the side of many selves, there can be no individual experience of happiness, etc.

पूर्वपूर्वकार्यकरणसंघातस्य कमपिक्षायां च अनवस्थादोषः । अनादित्वेन
 अनवस्थादोषपरिहारश्च अन्धपरम्परेति । श्रुतिरपि नानात्मपक्षं प्रतिषेधति – ‘नेह
 नानास्ति किञ्चन’ इति । अतः साधूक्तम् एकमिति ॥

*pūrvapūrvakāryakaraṇasaṅghātasya karmāpekṣāyāṁ ca anavasthādoṣaḥ |
 anādītoena anavasthādoṣaparihāraśca andhaparampareti | śrutirapi
 nānātmapakṣaṁ pratiṣedhati neha nānāsti kiñcana iti | ataḥ sādḥūktam
 ekamiti ||*

And when there is dependence on karma for each body-mind complex that has come into being, each one preceding the other, that leads to the logical fallacy of infinite regress (*anavasthādoṣa*). And, if you say the solution to the defect of infinite regress is that it is beginningless, that is the fallacy of *andhaparamparā*. The *śruti* also negates the idea of many selves—“There are not many here.” Thus, therefore, it is correct to say the Self is one.

नन्वेवं सति आत्मनः सुखदुःखादिसंबन्धाभावात् बन्धो नास्ति ; बन्धाभावाच्च मोक्षाभावः ; बद्धो हि मुच्यते नाबद्ध इति ; तथा चिदाभासस्यापि बन्धमोक्षौ न विद्येते , अवस्तुत्वात् ; तस्य बुद्धेरपि विनाशित्वात् बन्धमोक्षयोरभावः ; ततश्च मोक्षशास्त्रमनर्थकमापन्नम् इत्यत आह --

nanvevaṁ sati ātmanah sukhaduḥkhādisambandhābhāvāt bandho nāsti; bandhābhāvācca mokṣābhāvaḥ; baddho hi mucyate nābaddha iti; tathā cidābhāsasyāpi bandhamokṣau na vidyete avastutoāt; tasya buddherapi vināśitoāt bandhamokṣayorabhāvaḥ; tataśca mokṣaśāstramanarthakamāpannam ityata āha --

Doubt: If this is so, then there can be no bondage because the Self has no connection with pleasure and pain, etc.; and since there is no bondage, there is no liberation either, for the bound person is liberated, not the unbound. So too, bondage and liberation cannot be for the reflected consciousness (*cidābhāsa*) because it is unreal (*avastu*). Nor can there be bondage and liberation for the intellect (*buddhi*), because it is perishable by nature. [I understand this to mean that because the thought-modifications that make up the *buddhi* are constantly changing, bondage and liberation are not an issue for the *buddhi*.] And therefore, the *śāstra* for liberation (*mokṣa-śāstra*), itself, becomes meaningless. Keeping all this in mind, he says:

यथा दर्पणाभाव आभासहानौ

मुखं विद्यते कल्पनाहीनमेकम् ।

तथा धीवियोगे निराभासको यः

स नित्योपलब्धिस्वरूपोऽहमात्मा ॥ ४ ॥