

केचित् बुद्ध्यादीनामात्मत्वं मन्यन्ते ; तान्प्रत्याह --

kecit buddhyādīnāmātmatvaṁ manyante tānpratyaḥa

Some think that the intellect, etc. is the Self. To them he says--

मनश्चक्षुरादेर्वियुक्तः स्वयं यो

मनश्चक्षुरादेर्मनश्चक्षुरादिः ।

मनश्चक्षुरादेरगम्यस्वरूपः

स नित्योपलब्धिस्वरूपोऽहमात्मा ॥ ५ ॥

manaścakṣurāderviyuktaḥ svayaṁ yo

manaścakṣurādermanaścakṣurādiḥ ।

manaścakṣurāderagamyasvarūpaḥ

sa nityopalabdhisvarūpo'hamātmā ॥ 5 ॥

Itself free from the mind and senses, the one who is the mind of the mind and eye of the eye, etc., whose nature cannot be objectified by (is not accessible to) the mind and the senses, I am that Self whose nature is timeless consciousness. (5)

मनश्चक्षुरादेः मनआदेः चक्षुरादेश्च वियुक्तः पृथग्भूतः यः सोऽहमात्मेति संबन्धः ।

मनश्चक्षुराद्युपादानेन तदन्तर्गतत्वात् शरीरमपि उपात्तं द्रष्टव्यम् । एतेन शरीरादपि

वियुक्त इति लक्ष्यते । तथा च गुरुः -- 'बुद्धीन्द्रियशरीरेभ्यो भिन्न आत्मा विभुर्ध्रुवः ।

नानारूपः प्रतिक्षेत्रमात्मा वृत्तिषु भासते' इति ।

*manaścakṣurādeḥ manaādeḥ cakṣurādeśca viyuktaḥ pṛthagbhūtaḥ yaḥ
so'hamātmēti sambandhaḥ | manaścakṣurādyupādānena tadantargatatvāt
śarīramapi upāttaṁ draṣṭavyam | etena śarīrādapi viyukta iti lakṣyate |
tathā ca guruḥ buddhīndriyaśarīrebhyo bhinna ātmā vibhurdhruvaḥ |
nānārūpaḥ pratikṣetramātmā vṛttiṣu bhāsate iti |*

I am that Self who is separate from the mind, etc. (*mana adhi*) and eyes, etc (*cakṣurādi*),—this is the [syntactical] connection. By mentioning the mind and eyes, etc. (*manaścakṣurādi*) the body also is to be included because it falls within that group. By this, it is implied that the Self is free from the body, also. In like manner, the *guru* [verse is not in Gaudapada's Karika an have not found in Sankara's works] states: "The Self, which is separate from the mind, organs, and body is changeless and all-pervasive. It manifests in many forms and, as the Self in every body, it shines in every thought form."

कथं मनश्चक्षुरादिकस्य प्रकाशकस्य उपरि अयमात्मा प्रकाशकः, मनआदेः
चक्षुरादेः कथं वियुक्तः इत्यत आह -- स्वयमिति । स्वयं य आत्मा मनश्चक्षुरादेः
मनश्चक्षुरादिः मनश्चक्षुरादिकस्य प्रकाशकस्य मनश्चक्षुरादिः प्रकाशकः ,
प्रकाशकत्वगुणयोगात् ; अयमर्थः -- यथा बाह्यस्य घटादेः प्रकाशको मनश्चक्षुरादिः
ततो व्यतिरिच्यते, तथा , आन्तरस्यापि मनश्चक्षुरादेः प्रकाशकः आत्मा ततो
व्यतिरिच्यत इति निश्चीयते । अत एव मनश्चक्षुरादीनाम् अनात्मत्वमिति सिद्धं
ज्ञेयादन्यो ज्ञाता भवति ।

*kathaṁ manaścakṣurādikasya prakāśakasya upari ayamātmā prakāśakaḥ
mana ādeḥ cakṣurādeḥ kathaṁ viyuktaḥ ityata āha svayamiti | svayaṁ ya
ātmā manaścakṣurādeḥ manaścakṣurādiḥ manaścakṣurādikasya
prakāśakasya manaścakṣurādiḥ prakāśakaḥ prakāśakatvagunaḥyogāt*

ayamarthaḥ yathā bāhyasya ghaṭādeḥ prakāśako manaścakṣurādiḥ tato vyatiricyate tathā āntarasyāpi manaścakṣurādeḥ prakāśakaḥ ātmā tato vyatiricyata iti niścīyate | ata eva manaścakṣurādīnām anātmatvamiti siddham jñeyādanyo jñātā bhavati |

How can the Self be the illuminator over and above the mind and sense organs which are themselves illuminators; how can it be separate from the mind and eyes, etc. There he says: *svayamiti*. The Self who is itself (*svayam*) the eye of the eye and mind of the mind (*manaścakṣurādeḥ manaścakṣurādiḥ*); that is, the illuminator of the illuminators, because it is the illuminating content of the [seemingly] luminous mind and senses [*prakāśakatvagunayogāt*]. This is the meaning--Just as the mind, eyes, etc. are separate from the external objects which they illumine, such as a pot, etc.; so also, it is clear that, internally, the Self which is the illuminator of the mind and eyes, etc. is separate from them. And from this, it is established that that there is no Selfhood (*anātmatvam*) for the mind, senses, etc.: the knower is other than the known.

ननु आत्मनोऽपि ज्ञेयत्वात् अनात्मत्वं प्रसज्यते इत्यत आह --

मश्चक्षुरादेरगम्यस्वरूपः प्रकाशस्वभावः । तथा च श्रुतिः -- 'यतो वाचो निवर्तन्ते अप्राप्य मनसा सह' इति ।

ata eva manaścakṣurādīnām anātmatvamiti siddham jñeyādanyo jñātā bhavati | nanu ātmano'pi jñeyatvāt anātmatvam prasajyate ityata āha maścakṣurāderagamyasvarūpaḥ prakāśasvabhāvaḥ | tathā ca śrutīḥ yato vāco nivartante aprāpya manasā saha iti |

Doubt: This argument would lead to the conclusion that the Self, because of being known, is also *anātma*, not-Self [thus there would be no Selfhood at all.] To answer this he says: It cannot be objectified by

the mind, eyes, etc.; it shines by its own nature (*prakāśasvabhāva*).
And supporting this, the *Śruti* states: “That from which speech
together with the mind returns, having not reached.”