

Chapter 5

The Five Hallmarks of Universal Non-dualism

Just as I looked for the most appropriate and unifying term for the different forms of the direct way of liberation, and came to the term ‘non-dualism’, so I have also looked for the hallmarks with which non-dualism is inextricably connected. Marks that apply for all true, radical schools of non-dualism, and which highlight how non-dualism differs from other ways. Next to ‘not-two’-ness (which is in fact a ‘non-characteristic’) and its explicit term ‘non-duality’ (*advaya* or *advaita*, or its Chinese and Tibetan equivalents, *pu-erb* and *gnyis-med*), five characteristics or hallmarks immediately came to mind. I continued to look for more, but all subsequent characteristics turned out to be another term for one of the five already found. One additional characteristic briefly emerged, that is ‘the need for a teacher’, however I soon realized that this is both a more general thing (the teacher standing central in many dualistic schools of *guru-bhakti*, surrender to the guru) as well as something specific – for this reason I have dedicated a separate chapter to this subject.

However there is a phenomenon directly connected with the need to have a teacher, which is essential to non-dualism. This is not so much characteristic in content but an essential point whereby non-dualism differs as *a way* from a number of other ways. The forms of eastern non-dualism covered in this book are distinguished by having been, until this day, transmitted from teacher to student without interruption, therefore the texts of these schools have never become dead, isolated texts. In other traditions, Christian and Gnostic mysticism for example, one cannot find such lineages of living teachings; therefore certain texts like *The Gospel of Thomas*, *The Cloud of Unknowing*, and texts from Meister Eckhart, have come to lead an

isolated existence.¹ I think that exactly this link between timeless classical texts and a continually self-renewing generation of teachers whose lessons can be traced back to these texts, is a unique phenomenon. The direct way has always been a living one, thankfully transmitted to us through living contact, whereby a 'lineage of timeless expression' continues to remain.

In thinking about a possible sixth hallmark, representative of the content of non-dualism, I came up with *unconditional*. Truth is not conditioned by anything. Truth is inherently present everywhere, in all circumstances. However, because in the texts the unconditional is mostly used in an implicit way and rarely a point of attention itself in the way the other five characteristics are, I have not included it in the list.

The five characteristics are:

1. Awareness (*chit*);
2. No-mind (& emptiness, *shûnyatâ*; conceptlessness);
3. Immediacy (*pratyaksha*);
4. Changelessness (*kûtastha*);
5. Naturalness (*sahaja*);

The first is paramount; the other four are inextricably connected with it (by mentioning the original Sanskrit terms it can be seen that these characteristics have always been present in the Great Tradition, in other words they are not a modern 'invention').

This list is of course for temporary accentuation only. In reality there is no clear demarcation between the characteristics – naming one immediately evokes the other, as will be seen in a number of quotations.

1. Awareness

The first characteristic, which you could call the basic principle of non-dualism, is the total emphasis in all expressions of non-dualism on awareness, consciousness, direct knowing and understanding. It refers to the primary fact of life, the fact that *you are*. 'You are', that is to say *you are conscious*. Everyone knows that he is, that he exists. Your own conscious presence is the only thing that cannot be denied. As to deny this you first need to be consciously present. Shankara, the founder of Advaita Vedanta, made the following now classic statement regarding this:

“And it is not possible to deny such a Self; for it is an adventitious thing alone that can be repudiated, but not so one’s own nature. The Self constitutes the very nature of the man who would deny it.”²

Descartes’ famous expression *cogito ergo sum*, ‘I think, so I am’, is in fact a limited version of Shankara’s. I call this limited, as already before a thought can arise there is conscious presence. Every thought form is a limited phenomenon arising in something that is unlimited, something that is best indicated with a word like ‘awareness’ or ‘consciousness’.³ In the New Webster Dictionary consciousness is defined as “the faculty of knowing what effects or what goes on in one’s own mind; immediate knowledge”. In this the emphasis is put on a *faculty*, something that is not yet filled in. However, in daily use the term ‘consciousness’ is mostly applied in combination with something else, to indicate that you are conscious *of something*. Consciousness *itself*, consciousness as such or awareness as such never appears as an object, resulting in it generally being overlooked.

In non-dualism the invitation is made to cease overlooking this, and to notice consciousness itself, to recognize that you *are* this consciousness, consciousness that precedes any form, any particular colour.

Why is this invitation made? Because all there is, everything that manifests itself *can* only manifest itself thanks to that which we call ‘consciousness’ or ‘awareness’. All form existing in the world exists *in* consciousness. All degrees of good and evil, all experience of freedom and lack of it exist entirely in consciousness. This implies that everything you seek, happiness for example, is to be found in consciousness – and you *are* already consciousness yourself now. The direct way of non-dualism is ‘direct’ simply because it reveals this fact to you without having you first make a detour via a longwinded search. In the Tibetan Dzogchen text *Self-Liberation Through Seeing With Naked Awareness*, where the emphasis is on mind being in fact immediate present awareness, it is said:

“To desire something other than this is just like having an elephant (at home), but searching for its tracks elsewhere. (...) Similarly if you do not understand that everything derives from the mind, it will not be possible for you to attain Buddhahood. (...) By not seeing that your own mind is actually the Buddha, Nirvana becomes obscured.”⁴

The understanding or recognition expressed in this quotation is the essential point. You can philosophize as long as you like about the ‘Buddha’ or ‘ever present awareness’ but it is only once you *see* or *recognize* this that it becomes a reality. This is seeing or recognizing of awareness – for a brief moment, as long as it is needed for the explanation, it is useful to use two different terms, and then suddenly *in* actual awareness, it becomes clear that they are one and the same. Being aware of awareness. Light sees pure light, or *seeing sees seeing*. You could say that the teachers of non-dualistic schools have always sought to keep this point completely pivotal: ‘*recognize* that you are already knowing’. Recognize, or see, that you are living constantly in this knowing or cognizing, and see that all form that you experience, including your perceptions of the outer world, *consists of this knowing*. Form has a temporary reality ‘granted’ to it the moment Awareness or Knowing as such takes on *that* specific form. Immediately afterwards

another form has ‘reality’, as Awareness has now taken on that form. That which has continuous reality is the cognizing element, Awareness, Knowing itself. The invitation is: *recognize* this.

You can recognize true non-dualism and distinguish it from other ways by the emphasis or lack of emphasis on Awareness or Consciousness as the essential point of the teaching. The fourteenth century Dzogchen teacher Longchen Rabjam expressed it in his *Chöying Dzöd* as follows: “From the higher perspective of the great perfection (Dzogchen), all views and meditations of these other approaches are considered to be for the spiritually undeveloped, for whatever is done misses the point, in that the essence of awareness is not perceived.”⁵

Exemplified in another tradition: Ch’an Buddhism only became what you could call ‘radical non-dualism’ with Hui-neng’s accent on *seeing* (*chien*) your true nature (*hsing*), the direct recognition of yourself, of your mind. By bringing recognition or insight (*chih-hui*, Chinese for *prajñā*, insight, understanding⁶) into the centre of attention, he brought about a shift of emphasis, away from a climate of meditation only (*ch’an* is the Chinese translation of *dhyāna*, meditation). He emphasized the unity of the two, insight and meditation. Thereby he removed the *method*. What is essential is immediate seeing, and this does not happen by the use of a method or a tool. The same emphasis can be found in Advaita Vedanta. In Advaita the term *jñāna* is completely pivotal: the term for understanding, insight, awareness itself; because of this Advaita is referred to by some people as ‘jñāna-yoga’. In many Advaita-texts it is emphasized that jñāna itself is all that is needed for liberation, any ‘doing’ can only lead to a continuation of suffering.

2. *No-mind*

The second characteristic is that of ‘no-mind’. This term has been introduced in the West by Daisetz T. Suzuki, in his *The Zen Doctrine of*

*No-mind.*⁷ ‘No-mind’ means mind ‘empty of concepts’. You could even use ‘non-conceptuality’ as synonym for non-duality. ‘Concept’ is used here as a term for any form that our thinking can take, for all our knowledge. Ultimately therefore non-dualism comes down to ‘no-knowledge’. No-knowledge or no-mind means that it is impossible to know Truth by thinking and knowledge. Seeing this impossibility can seem like a frustration, but it is not. It is a blessing. A sigh of relief as nothing needs to be understood by the thinking mind, as nothing *can* be understood. Just as was said in the oldest Upanishad in the attempt to describe the ultimate Self: “*neti neti*, not this, not this”; no single term is able to cover it.⁸ This corresponds with what Madhyamaka Buddhists refer to as ‘emptiness’ (*shūnyatā*): the irreality of separate things, of the independent existence of something. All belief in the reality of appearances is caused by the continuation of the belief in concepts, by continuing to accept concepts as real. As soon as the blind trust in concepts is recognized and resolved, separateness and bondage is also resolved.

Every concept is a limitation, and Reality is unlimited. Every form that arises is ‘empty’ with respect to the realness of its separate existence. Recognition of this aspect of emptiness and conceptlessness gives clarity on the true nature of all phenomena, including ‘yourself’ as personality. What is important is to see that in fact all phenomena are without a past, they are always beginning right now, and therefore immaculate and new. They are already flawless, so there is no need to go back to some ‘flawless beginning’. You are bound to nothing.

Buddhists do not mean with ‘emptiness’ a blank state, or a vacuum. The term indicates that objects cannot exist *independently* (as they always arise in mutual relationship and dependency), and in fact are not concrete, no matter how ‘concrete’ empirically spoken an object is.

The Buddhist emphasis on emptiness is also an aid in avoiding certain traps in the language of Advaita Vedanta. There are elements in the Vedantic language that tend to make from matters like ‘the Absolute’

and 'the Self' a substantial entity, some sort of 'Highest Entity'. Nisargadatta Maharaj understood this very well, and therefore even made conceptlessness the trademark of his teaching. For example, one of his many statements on this essential point is: "It is a very complicated riddle. You have to discard whatever you know, whatever you have read, and have a firm conviction about That about nobody knows anything."⁹

By recognizing all phenomena, including the most subtle, as completely transparent and empty, without any value as entity, and thereby also recognizing that *not one single* doctrine or story is true, no matter how nobly written, you really experience how simple reality is. All so-called 'knowledge' is then seen as an unnecessary addition to something that is infinitely incomprehensible, open and having no origin. No-mind or no-knowledge reveals Truth, in which all phenomena spontaneously arise.

Something implied here that appears to be pure *peace*. All disputes in the field of religion come down to a struggle due to a belief in the reality of concepts and noble stories. Only the total release of all concepts and stories makes it possible for peace to become reality.

Incidentally, due to this aspect of no-mind or no-knowledge there are those who share the opinion that reading books is an impediment for liberation – after all books are a source of knowledge. Yet, this is a misunderstanding. True awareness of no-knowledge, the actual awareness that book knowledge has nothing to do with direct experience, deems books as something innocent. They offer not a single threat. The only hindrance comes from remaining entangled in concepts, and this includes the concept 'books are a hindrance'.

Before Nisargadatta's era the term 'empty' was experienced by most non-Buddhists as a knotty affair. It was considered as nihilistic, an inhospitable 'nothingness', something that destroys everything leaving nothing to remain. Even in the Buddhist community, the sole

reduction of everything to emptiness was at a certain point (probably around the fourth century) experienced as insufficient, as something that did not completely correspond with reality. So the emphasis on ‘consciousness only’ came into being, as it was seen that emptiness could only be experienced as ‘empty’ when there is *knowing* of this fact, consciousness or awareness illuminating this. Tibetan Buddhist Dzogchen, influenced by both traditions, combined the two emphasises into one inseparable whole. The inseparability of cognizance and emptiness is the Dzogchen designation for our essential nature. In my view, you could in fact call the two characteristics, Awareness and No-mind the two ‘main characteristics’ in our list of five.¹⁰

3. *Immediacy*

Every form of radical non-dualism can be referred to as ‘the direct way’. By this is meant that pure Awareness is independent of any activity occurring over time, and independent of any means by which you could reach a goal. Your true being is already present, and the invitation is to recognize this *im-mEDIATE-ly*, right now. Any postponement of this is a protective measure against Reality.

The aspect of immediacy first dawned in the West with the introduction of Zen Buddhism in the 1920’s, and particularly during the 50’s when it received a certain degree of popularity. Stories referring to ‘sudden enlightenment’ (*tun-wu*; Japanese: *tongo, satori*) induced by Zen masters placing all emphasis on ‘now’, and encouraging students to speak and act *from there*, made a deep impression. Until that moment all teachings in the West were of a gradual nature, a slow development towards something. Because all personal factors seem stuck to us like a sort of glue, a shock is sometimes required to recognize that this glue is non-existent. In the shock, recognition of our ‘original face’ as it is called in Zen, can occur, being an expression for our true nature that precedes the

personality. Together with the characteristic ‘no-mind’, emphasis on the immediate has evoked such expressions in Zen as, “Whether you’re facing inward or facing outward, whatever you meet up with, just kill it! If you meet a Buddha, kill the Buddha.”¹¹ Seeing immediately, so that you no longer remain under the influence of an idea.

Though usually expressed less spectacularly, the same emphasis is to be found in Advaita Vedanta. The experience of real inseparability with the Absolute is referred to as *pratyaksha* or *aparoksha*. As long as it remains indirect, *paroksha* (literally: ‘out of sight’), there is still the possibility to ponder, theorize and therefore the possibility of uncertainty, of doubtfulness. When all indirectness has fallen away, what remains is unambiguous, doubtless openness. It is immediate awareness, direct recognition. The difference between recognizing and thinking is to be found in the immediate, the direct.

Padmapada, a student of Shankara from the eighth century, wrote of *aparoksha*: “Immediacy or self-evidence (*aparoksha-tâ*) as such is always one and the same in different acts of awareness and perception. (...) Experience itself, which is of the nature of immediacy, is one and the same with regard to all individuals, and it must ultimately be identical with the self-luminous ‘witness’ or self”¹²

The essential meaning of immediacy is also valid in the field of emotions. Whatever emotion comes up, you can experience it *directly*. Pure feeling, with no holding onto the story of the emotion. Because in this totally direct experience there is no restraint of emotion, the story is no longer experienced as real and the stuck togetherness of the components in the story is recognized as not real. Because the emotion is no longer distinguishable as an emotion apart, the directness of feeling as such cuts through the need to explain or the familiarity with the past, and so the emotion resolves in its own nature.

This is also the emphasis in Dzogchen. Emotions are not transformed, no correction is made. Direct recognition of the true nature of a

specific emotion present is something that is compared to a drawing on still water, which unaided immediately fades into the totality of the water. Water does not go ‘into action’ in order to erase the drawing. Another comparison used in Dzogchen is that of snowflakes falling onto a hot iron plate or stove. The snowflakes immediately disappear as soon as they touch the stove.

In the previous chapter reference was made to *Tshigsum Nedek*, the ‘Three Statements that Strike the Essential Point’ (by Garab Dorje, who introduced Dzogchen into Tibetan Buddhism, probably during the seventh century). It is one of the most powerful and influential texts in Dzogchen. You could say that Dzogchen on the whole is based on the first of these Three Statements. The first Statement says: “One is introduced directly to one’s own nature.”¹³ The second and third Statements are really commitments on the first, and you can say the same of all further Dzogchen-teachings. *First* the direct recognition of your true nature, and then the rest. In this way any tendency to create a gradual path, a climb to the Almighty-High is prevented. The important point is immediate awareness of Reality, so that the training (to integrate this recognition into daily life) is based completely on Reality. For me this is true for all forms of radical non-dualism.

4. Changelessness

Many original schools of Buddhism looked upon the term ‘changeless’ as a pertinent untruth, one of the fundamental mistakes of Hinduism. All that is real, so they concluded, is a succession of very short moments of change. Though the term ‘changeless’ was occasionally used to describe *nirvâna*, this always indicated an end-state, which could only ever be reached by following an array of instructions.¹⁴ This changed however, mostly due to the acknowledgement in subsequent Mahayana Buddhism of something referred to as ‘Buddha nature’. Buddha nature is described as inherently present, always and unchanging, the essential nature of every sentient being. Although the

manifestation of this may know growth, growth toward full Buddhahood, the Buddha nature itself is not subject to change. The ‘growth’ in the manifestation is not an enlargement of something, but an evaporation of the clouding or covering of something. Buddha nature is the most direct reference to *Dharmakâya*, the changeless Absolute, the essence of all form, timelessness without any possibility to differentiate or change. Tulku Ugyen, one of the greatest Dzogchen teachers of the twentieth century, referred to the benefits of recognizing the changeless: “The perceiver, which in essence is empty cognizance (...), is not impermanent. Otherwise, what would be the use of pursuing buddhahood, if it was impermanent and would only be lost again?”¹⁵ In countless places the Dzogchen teachings emphasize the permanent character of Buddha nature.

Also in Zen many statements exist referring to the changeless. For example the seventeenth-century Japanese master Bankei: “The place in which there’s no difference in the hearing of those sounds is the Unborn, the Buddha-mind, and it’s perfectly equal and absolutely the same in each one of you. (...) You see, you are always unborn”¹⁶

In Advaita Vedanta the Changeless has become something like the corner stone of talking about reality. Training the power of discernment is about seeing the difference between that which is real and unreal, or between that which is constant (*nitya*) and inconstant (*anitya*). Something is real only if it is always real. The above Sanskrit term *nitya* is often translated as ‘eternal’. Is eternal the right word for what is meant here? The word can have a strange effect – something that we cannot experience or see and having something to do with ‘sometime’, is still some kind of an idea. ‘Changeless’ in the sense of ‘constant’, is perceivable in the current experience. Shankara, the founder of Advaita, described liberation as being already the case, therefore not needing to be acquired. He said it is already eternally the case. Eternal (*nitya*) not in the sense that something is or becomes eternal through change, like a transformation (*parinâmi-nitya*;

comparable to the above described *nirvâna* as ‘sometime later attainable changelessness’), but in the sense that it undergoes no single change (*kâtastha-nitya*). It is unchangingly permanent in an absolute sense, ever content and self-effulgent by nature.¹⁷ *Kâtastha* is an essential term in Advaita, it points to our essential nature. It means ‘as a rock’, ‘as granite’, truly unassailable.

How is it possible to speak of ‘the changeless’? We are referring here to something that is not an object, something that is impossible to perceive. Everything that can be perceived has a beginning and an end and therefore undergoes change. But that which is objectless is not ‘something’, and therefore has no trace of a beginning, no birth. You are looking *from* it already, and that is just the same as from where you just looked. It has undergone no change in the meantime. That from where you look is an unassailable source, always fresh, clean, unspoiled and unchanged awareness.

5. *Naturalness*

The fifth characteristic of universal non-dualism is naturalness (*sahaja*). Generally what is meant with the term ‘natural’ is that although you can on the direct way indeed speak of a training, this has nothing to do with a training involving willpower, or forcing yourself to go in a particular direction. The just quoted Tulku Urgyen referred to this with: “Since this training is not an act of meditating, why worry about whether our mediation was good or not good? This is a training in not meditating, a training in naturalness, in letting be.”¹⁸

Well, you may think that this naturalness is a fine description of ‘the sage who spontaneously does everything without ‘doing’’, but what about the training: can such a thing really be natural? Is this natural not just another end result?

I see this as an essential point in radical non-dualism. Admittedly, it is only on the total realisation of your true nature that you can speak of

‘being established once and for all in the natural state’, but training in the true sense is a training of the intuitive recognition of this natural state, and *abiding* in that. It is giving expression, in a spontaneous way, to the ever-present Buddha nature. This training only happens once seeking has come to an end. Everything happens as it happens, naturally, spontaneously.

In fact naturalness is the same as *effortlessness*: that word could also be used to describe the fifth characteristic. There is nothing to acquire in non-dualism, your essential nature is all that there is, it has never been absent, and is always free. Intuitive understanding of this brings about a deep relaxation. There is nothing to improve, nothing to change, you simply have *to allow* the manifestation to happen, so that That which is constantly the case can become clearer and clearer.

Everything in non-dualism revolves around the natural state. This is the state where nothing is experienced as ‘special’ any more, no peak experience, far off or high states. It is the stateless state. Everything is full of what the Tibetans call ‘the same taste’ (*ro-snyoms*). Whatever the object of experience is, the experience itself always has the same taste. That is the taste of naturalness.

The point of naturalness highlights clearly the difference between radical non-dualism and other ways. A devotee of Ramana Maharshi once told the story of a meeting with a student of an advanced yogi. They sat waiting together until the yogi was ready to give a talk; this was to depend on how long the yogi would remain in *samâdhi*, that is to say in the state of total absorption in objectlessness. At one point the student of the yogi asked: “At what times is your Bhagavan in *samâdhi*?” At this the Ramana devotee could not suppress a burst of laughter. “There is no schedule for *jñâni*’s [people who have realized their natural state]. They do not go into samadhi or come out of it at specific times. Bhagavan is always in the *sahaja*-state, the natural state.”¹⁹

This chapter has been written in an attempt to create a framework for talking about non-dualism and liberation, to sharpen the view of it, and to provide a certain basis for communication about the current forms of it. In short you could summarize this chapter with the following five-fold definition of non-dualism:

‘Natural, Immediate Awareness of Constant No-mind.’

The point of going into detail of the characteristics in this chapter is to demonstrate that the diverse ‘true’ ways have had a correcting effect on each other – something that is worth paying attention to. These corrections or modifications often concerned essential themes, demonstrating from the highest perspective why it is not always justified to listen to *anyone* who has something to say on this. On further definition it becomes increasingly clear what exactly the differences are with other ways based on the limitations of the mind and belief in the ultimate reality of time, place and gradualness. This clarity can also arise in assessing a new teacher or teaching, by asking the question: are all five characteristics present? If one is lacking, this may indicate that something essential is missing. The five characteristics can be viewed as something akin to the bench-marks discussed at the end of chapter 3.

In emphasizing the three mainstreams of *advaya* (Advaita, Ch’an and Dzogchen) it is important to highlight in which sense each stream *contributes something essential*. These essential contributions deem it ‘useful’ to keep each of the three streams in sight; by doing so an appreciation can be gained of non-dualism in the most full, least sectarian sense of the word. In what way do they essentially complement each other, and where do they correct each other? In the following, sixth, chapter I go into more detail of the corrections between the Vedantic and both Buddhist ways.

That chapter 6 along with chapter 7 can be seen as an elaboration of the theme of the five characteristics. Chapter 6 continues on No-mind

and Changelessness, and chapter 7 expands on Awareness and the remaining two characteristics. Chapter 8 discusses the five characteristics showing the radical, timeless character of non-dualism in its historical context.

Chapter 5 Notes

1. The fourteenth-century texts of Meister Eckhart were ‘discovered’ (by Franz Baader) not before 1840, and published in 1857. The *Gospel of Thomas* is known since 1956 only. *The Cloud of Unknowing* is an anonymous English scripture from the second half of the fourteenth century, which never has resulted into a ‘School of Unknowing’.

2. *Brahma-Sûtra-Bhâsya of Srî Sankarâcârya*. Translated by Swami Gambhirananda. Calcutta: Advaita Ashrama, 1965; p. 455. This is verse II. 3. 7, almost literally repeating I. 1. 4 at p. 36.

3. The English terms *awareness* and *consciousness* are often used in different schools of non-dualism for different levels. The fact that the one school is using the one term as the higher of the two and another school the other way around gives me the freedom to consider the terms rather exchangeable here.

4. John Reynolds, *Self-Liberation Through Seeing With Naked Awareness*. Barrytown, NY: Station Hill, 1989; p. 22, 23 and 60.

5. This is in Longchenpa’s own commentary, *Lungki Terdzöd*. In *A Treasure Trove of Scriptural Transmission*. Translated by Richard Barron. Junction City, CA: Padma, 2001; p. 97.

6. I consider it an error to use the word ‘wisdom’ for this *prajñâ* or *chih-hui*.

7. Daisetz T. Suzuki, *The Zen Doctrine of No-mind*. London: Rider, 1949. The term ‘no- mind’ is the translation of the Chinese *wu-hsin*; this term is exchangeable with *wu-nien*, ‘no-thought’. Suzuki’s own term ‘the Unconscious’ for this is rather

awkward and misleading.

8. *Bṛihad-âraṇyaka Upaniṣad*, III. 9. 26. See Bibliography.

9. *Prior to Consciousness*. Durham, NC: Acorn Press, 1985; p. 32.

10. Also in Ch'an the emphasis on this combination can be found. Ninth-century teacher Tsung-mi, quoting his own teacher, said: "True awareness (*chen-chih*) can only be seen (*chien*) in no-thought (*wu-nien*)." Peter N. Gregory, *Tsung-mi and the Sinification of Buddhism*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1991; p. 246.

11. Statement of Lin-chi (known later in Japan as Rinzai). Burton Watson (transl.), *The Zen Teachings of Master Lin-chi*. Boston: Shambhala, 1993; p. 52.

12. In *Pañchapâdika*, X. 24 and 19. Quoted in Wilhelm Halbfass, *India and Europe*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 1988; p. 391.

13. Translated by John Reynolds in *The Golden Letters*. Ithaca, NY: Snow Lion, 1996; p. 39.

14. See for instance *Dhammapada*, verse 225: "The sages (...) go to the unchanging place, where, having gone, they sorrow no more." *The Dhammapada*. Translated by Irving Babbitt. New York: Oxford University Press, 1936. Ed. of 1965; p. 36.

15. *As It Is*; Vol. 2. Translated by Erik Pema Kunsang. Boudhanath: Rangjung Yeshe, 2000; p. 105.

16. Norman Waddell, *The Unborn*. San Francisco: North Point, 1984; p. 88.

17. *Brahma-Sûtra-Bhâsya of Srî Sankarâcârya*. Translated by Swami Gambhirananda. Calcutta: Advaita Ashrama, 1965; p. 28. See also the summary translation in Karl Potter (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies. Advaita Vedânta up to Samkara and His Pupils*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1981; p. 125.

18. *As It Is*; Vol. 1. Translated by Erik Pema Kunsang. Boudhanath: Rangjung Yeshe, 1999; p. 212.

19. David Godman (ed.), *The Power of the Presence*; Part Two. Boulder, CO: Avadhuta, 2001; p. 83-84.