Healing Beyond Cure
Upanishadic Selfhood, Daoist Harmony, and the Ethics of Rehabilitation

Anshula Upadhyay[1]*, Dr. Varun Gulati[2]
[1]*Assistant Professor, Shivaji College, University of Delhi, Delhi, India | Email: anshula@shivaji.du.ac.in*
[2]Secretary, Sahitya Akademi, New Delhi, India | Email: vgulati@english.du.ac.in
***Corresponding Author:** Anshula Upadhyay | Email: anshula@shivaji.du.ac.in

Introduction

आत्मा वा अरे द्रष्टव्यः श्रोतव्यो मन्तव्यो निदिध्यासितव्यः।

ātmā vā are draṣṭavyaḥ śrotavyo mantavyo nididhyāsitavyaḥ.

"The Self, dear one, is to be seen, heard, reflected upon, and deeply contemplated."

— *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* 2.4.5

There comes a moment in every physician's life when medicine reaches a boundary it cannot cross. The diagnosis is certain, the treatment has been exhausted, and the disease continues its course. At such moments the question quietly changes. It is no longer, *How do we cure this person?* It becomes, *How do we continue to care for someone whose body may never recover?* Modern palliative medicine has given this transition a name by distinguishing cure from healing. Cure seeks to remove disease; healing seeks to preserve the integrity of the person even when disease remains. Yet this distinction raises a deeper philosophical question that medicine itself cannot answer. What is the person whose integrity is being preserved?

More than two thousand years ago, the authors of the principal Upanishads approached this question without the vocabulary of hospitals, rehabilitation clinics, or terminal care. Their concern was not disease in the clinical sense but the nature of the human being who experiences birth, ageing, illness, and death. They did not ask how long life should be extended, nor did they speculate about techniques for avoiding mortality. Instead, they repeatedly returned to a more fundamental enquiry: *What, if anything, remains unchanged when everything visible changes?*

Yājñavalkya's conversation with Maitreyī is among the clearest expressions of this concern. It is striking that he does not begin by discussing the body. There is no catalogue of human faculties, no attempt to classify health and illness, no theory of anatomical perfection. His attention moves immediately to the *Ātman*, the Self that cannot be reduced to bodily existence. The sequence is philosophically significant. Before one can speak about sickness, one must first know who it is that suffers. Before one can discuss rehabilitation, one must ask what it is that is being restored.

This priority distinguishes the Upanishads from much contemporary discourse on disability. Modern disability studies has transformed the humanities by exposing the cultural production of normality and by demonstrating that social structures frequently disable more profoundly than biological impairment. Such scholarship has changed how disability is understood in law, education, architecture, literature, and ethics. Yet beneath these achievements lies a question that often remains implicit. When we defend the dignity of disabled persons, what conception of the human person grounds that dignity? Is dignity derived from rationality, autonomy, social recognition, embodied experience, or something else altogether? The Upanishads do not answer these questions in modern terms, but they insist that they cannot be avoided.

This article does not argue that the Upanishads anticipated disability studies, rehabilitation medicine, or palliative care. Such claims would collapse historical distance and diminish the integrity of both ancient and modern traditions. Instead, it proceeds from a more modest and, I believe, more fruitful assumption:

philosophical traditions frequently survive because they continue to illuminate questions that later generations formulate differently. Read alongside Daoist philosophy and classical Ayurveda, the Upanishads offer a distinctive account of personhood in which healing cannot be reduced to bodily restoration. Their enduring contribution lies not in replacing contemporary medicine but in expanding the moral and metaphysical horizon within which medicine understands the human being.

The significance of this distinction becomes apparent in one of the most frequently cited verses of the *Kaṭha Upaniṣad*:

न	**जायते**	**म्रियते**	**वा**		**विपश्चित्**
नायं	**कुतश्चिन्न**	**बभूव**	**कश्चित्**		**।**
अजो	**नित्यः**	**शाश्वतोऽयं**			**पुराणो**
न हन्यते हन्यमाने शरीरे ॥					
na	*jāyate*	*mriyate*	*vā*		*vipaścit*
nāyaṃ	*kutaścin*	*na*	*babhūva*	*kaścit*	।
ajo	*nityaḥ*		*śāśvato'yaṃ*		*purāṇo*
na hanyate hanyamāne śarīre.					

"The knower is neither born nor does it die. It has not come into being from anything, nor has anything arisen from it. Unborn, eternal, everlasting, and ancient, it is not destroyed when the body is destroyed."

The verse is commonly read as a declaration of immortality. Such a reading is correct, but incomplete. What deserves equal attention is the careful distinction it establishes between the body (*śarīra*) and the one who experiences life through the body. Yama does not deny that bodies weaken, suffer, or perish. His point is subtler. Mortality belongs to embodied existence; it does not, by itself, define the entirety of personhood. The ethical consequences of this claim are profound. If bodily alteration cannot exhaust the meaning of the person, then illness, disability, and terminal decline cannot become the final measure of human worth.

The remainder of this essay explores that possibility through a dialogue between three intellectual traditions that have rarely been placed in sustained conversation. The Upanishads provide a philosophical account of the Self, Ayurveda offers a conception of health centred upon wholeness rather than bodily perfection, and Daoist philosophy reimagines flourishing through harmony instead of mastery. Their vocabularies differ, their metaphysical commitments are not identical, and their historical contexts remain distinct. Yet all three resist the assumption that healing ends where cure becomes impossible. It is this shared refusal—not a supposed sameness, that makes their dialogue philosophically illuminating.

I. The Body That Changes and the Self That Does Not

One of the quiet assumptions of modern medicine is that the body tells the truth about the person. Clinical examination begins with what can be seen: movement, sensation, reflexes, respiration, memory, speech. Even when medicine acknowledges emotional and social well-being, the body remains its principal point of departure. This emphasis is understandable. Disease leaves traces upon tissue, nerves, muscles, and organs. The physician cannot ignore what the body reveals. Yet the question that concerns the Upanishads lies elsewhere. They ask whether the body, however carefully observed, can ever reveal the whole truth about the human being.

This question is not introduced through abstract speculation. It appears within ordinary experiences of loss and impermanence. Yājñavalkya speaks to Maitreyī because he is preparing to renounce household life. Naciketas questions Yama because he has encountered death. Uddālaka instructs Śvetaketu because knowledge has made him proud rather than wise. In each case philosophy begins where familiar certainties begin to fail. The body ages. Wealth disappears. Learning proves incomplete. Relationships end. These experiences are not treated as interruptions to philosophical inquiry; they are its beginning.

Among the principal Upanishads, the *Taittirīya Upaniṣad* offers perhaps the most subtle account of embodiment. Rather than defining the human being through a single principle, it presents the well-known

doctrine of the **pañca kośa**, the five "sheaths" or layers through which human existence is experienced. The text begins with the most visible dimension:

अन्नाद् वै प्रजाः प्रजायन्ते।
याः काश्च पृथिवीं श्रिताः।
अथो अन्नेनैव जीवन्ति।
अथैनदपियन्त्यन्ततः॥

annād vai prajāḥ prajāyante,
yāḥ kāś ca pṛthivīṃ śritāḥ;
atho annenaiva jīvanti,
athainad apiyanty antataḥ.

"From food, indeed, all creatures are born; by food they live; into food they finally return."
(*Taittirīya Upaniṣad* 2.2.1)

The opening is striking for its simplicity. The body is neither dismissed nor spiritualised. It is acknowledged as material, nourished by the earth, sustained through food, and destined to return to the elements from which it came. There is no embarrassment about dependence. Human life begins in vulnerability and remains dependent upon forces beyond individual control. Hunger, nourishment, decay, and death belong to the ordinary rhythm of existence.

Yet the Upanishad refuses to stop there. The body formed from food—the **annamayakośa**—is only the outermost layer of personhood. Beneath it lies **prāṇa**, the vital principle; beneath *prāṇa* lies *manas*, the mind that gathers perception and memory; beyond mind stands *vijñāna*, discriminative understanding; finally comes *ānanda*, not happiness in an emotional sense, but the fullness that belongs to realised being. The movement is not spatial but philosophical. Each layer reveals something true about the human person while refusing to identify any single layer with the whole.

For contemporary discussions of disability this progression deserves careful attention. Modern societies often classify persons according to the visible capacities of the body—whether one can walk without assistance, hear conversation, read printed text, remember names, or perform tasks independently. Such classifications have practical significance, particularly within medicine and public policy. The Upanishadic analysis does not deny their importance. It asks a different question: **what remains of the person when one of these capacities changes?**

The answer is not given through argument alone but through the architecture of the text itself. The movement from the *annamayakośa* to the *ānandamayakośa* gradually loosens the reader's attachment to any single description of the human being. The body is real, but it is not exhaustive. The mind is indispensable, but it too changes. Even knowledge, highly prized throughout the Upanishads, is surpassed. The person is never reducible to what can be observed at a particular moment.

This refusal to reduce identity to function has important ethical consequences. Disability, chronic illness, or terminal decline undoubtedly transform the conditions of everyday life. They alter how one moves through the world, how one is perceived by others, and often how one understands oneself. The Upanishads never suggest otherwise. Their contribution lies in resisting a subtler temptation: the temptation to allow altered function to become the final definition of the individual. To identify the whole person with the condition of the body is, from the Upanishadic perspective, a philosophical mistake before it becomes a social injustice.

The *Kaṭha Upaniṣad* returns to this point through a metaphor that has shaped Indian philosophical reflection for centuries. Yama tells Naciketas:

आत्मानं रथिनं विद्धि शरीरं रथमेव तु।
बुद्धिं तु सारथिं विद्धि मनः प्रग्रहमेव च॥

ātmānaṃ rathinaṃ viddhi śarīraṃ ratham eva tu;
buddhiṃ tu sārathiṃ viddhi manaḥ pragraham eva ca.

"Know the Self as the lord of the chariot, the body as the chariot itself; know the intellect as the charioteer and the mind as the reins."
(*Kaṭha Upaniṣad* 1.3.3)
The image is often interpreted as a lesson in self-control, but its philosophical significance extends further. A chariot may be damaged without ceasing to carry its passenger. It may move swiftly, slowly, or with difficulty. Its condition influences the journey, yet the traveller is not identical with the vehicle. Yama's metaphor therefore preserves two truths simultaneously. The body matters profoundly; without it, earthly life cannot be lived. Yet the body does not exhaust the identity of the one who lives through it.
The distinction is especially relevant when rehabilitation is considered. Clinical rehabilitation often begins by asking what function has been lost and how much of that function can be recovered. The question is necessary. The Upanishads would not reject it. They would simply insist that another question precedes it. **Who is the one whose function is being restored?** If the answer remains confined to muscular strength, neurological integrity, or sensory capacity, rehabilitation risks becoming the repair of mechanisms rather than the care of persons.
This perspective also illuminates why the Upanishads speak so sparingly about bodily perfection. They are deeply interested in discipline, diet, meditation, and ethical conduct, yet remarkably uninterested in ideal anatomy. The body is valued because it enables the pursuit of knowledge, action, and liberation. It is not valued because it conforms to an abstract standard of physical excellence. Human dignity therefore cannot fluctuate according to bodily condition. Such dignity rests upon a deeper understanding of personhood that survives every alteration the body undergoes.
It is at precisely this point that Ayurveda enters the conversation. If the Upanishads ask who the person is, Ayurveda asks how that person may live well within the inevitable conditions of embodied existence. The two traditions speak different languages, yet they meet in a shared conviction that health cannot be measured solely by the condition of the body. The physician and the philosopher begin from different concerns, but both refuse to mistake the visible for the whole.

II. To Be *Svastha*: Ayurveda and the Meaning of Healing

The Upanishads ask what a human being is. Ayurveda asks what it means for that human being to flourish. The questions are different, yet they cannot be separated. A physician who knows everything about disease but nothing about the person who suffers it remains incomplete. Likewise, a philosophy that speaks of liberation while neglecting the realities of pain, ageing, and bodily vulnerability risks becoming detached from ordinary life. Classical Indian thought rarely allows such a division. The enquiry into health proceeds alongside the enquiry into selfhood, each correcting the excesses of the other.
This relationship becomes visible in a single Sanskrit word: **svastha**.
The term is ordinarily translated as "healthy." The translation is convenient, but it conceals more than it reveals. Sanskrit compounds often preserve philosophical assumptions that disappear when rendered into English. *Svastha* is one such example. The word joins *sva*—"one's own," "the self," "that which belongs to oneself"—with *stha*, "to stand," "to remain," "to be established." The healthy person is therefore not simply one whose body functions efficiently. He or she is literally **one who abides in oneself**.
This etymology is more than linguistic curiosity. It reveals that Ayurveda does not begin with pathology. It begins with orientation. Health is first understood as a condition of inhabiting one's own being with stability. Disease may disturb that stability, but disease alone cannot explain it. The physician seeks not merely to suppress symptoms but to restore a way of being in which body, mind, perception, and self are no longer estranged from one another.
The classical definition preserved in the *Caraka Saṃhitā* expresses this understanding with remarkable precision:
समदोषः समाग्निश्च समधातुमलक्रियः ।
प्रसन्नात्मेन्द्रियमनाः स्वस्थ इत्यभिधीयते ॥

samadoṣaḥ samāgniś ca samadhātu-malakriyaḥ |
prasannātmendriya-manāḥ svastha ity abhidhīyate ||

"One whose doṣas are in equilibrium, whose digestive fire is balanced, whose tissues and excretory functions operate harmoniously, and whose self, senses, and mind remain serene is called healthy."
(*Caraka Saṃhitā*, Sūtrasthāna 9.4)

The verse has become familiar through repeated quotation, yet familiarity often obscures its philosophical originality. Modern discussions of Ayurveda frequently cite the passage as evidence that Indian medicine was "holistic." While this description is broadly accurate, it is also insufficient. It leaves unexplored the question of *why* the definition takes precisely this form.

The first hemistich concerns physiological balance. *Doṣa*, *agni*, *dhātu*, and *mala* belong to the language of the body. Their equilibrium is indispensable because life unfolds through embodied existence. Yet Caraka does not end here. Had physiology alone defined health, the verse could have concluded after the first line. Instead, it turns unexpectedly towards another triad: **ātman**, **indriya**, and **manas**.

This shift deserves closer attention.

The sequence is not arbitrary. *Manas*, the mind, gathers impressions, remembers, doubts, and deliberates. *Indriya*, the senses, mediate the body's encounter with the world. *Ātman*, however, is neither another organ nor another psychological faculty. It belongs to an altogether different order of discourse. By placing these three together, Caraka quietly refuses the fragmentation that characterises much later medical thought. The patient cannot be divided into isolated compartments because the disturbance of one dimension inevitably alters the others.

The adjective that governs the entire expression is equally revealing: **prasanna**.

The word is often translated as "pleasant," "cheerful," or "content." None of these translations fully captures its range. In classical Sanskrit, *prasanna* also suggests clarity after disturbance, stillness after agitation, transparency after confusion. A river becomes *prasanna* when its waters settle and allow the riverbed to be seen. The sky becomes *prasanna* when clouds disperse. Applied to the self, senses, and mind, the word evokes not excitement but lucidity. Health is therefore imagined less as exuberance than as composure.

Such composure cannot be manufactured through pharmacology alone. Medicine may reduce pain, correct imbalance, or restore bodily function, but serenity belongs to another dimension of healing. The distinction is subtle but significant. Caraka does not oppose medicine to inner life. Rather, he insists that neither is complete without the other.

This understanding has striking implications for rehabilitation. Contemporary rehabilitation medicine often distinguishes between impairment, activity, and participation. The restoration of movement remains important, yet clinicians increasingly recognise that recovery also depends upon confidence, family relationships, emotional resilience, and the capacity to imagine a future. These insights are commonly presented as recent developments within patient-centred care. Without collapsing historical differences, it is difficult not to notice that Caraka's definition already resists reducing health to bodily performance alone.

At this point, caution is necessary. It would be historically inaccurate to claim that Ayurveda anticipated modern rehabilitation science. Such claims flatten two very different intellectual traditions into one another. The value of the *Caraka Saṃhitā* lies elsewhere. It reminds us that medicine has not always understood health as the efficient functioning of biological mechanisms. There have existed other medical imaginations—imaginations in which healing concerns the restoration of meaningful life rather than the repair of isolated organs.

The distinction becomes especially important when cure is no longer possible. A patient living with advanced motor neuron disease may never regain muscular strength. Another recovering from spinal injury may permanently depend upon assistive technology. An older person with progressive dementia gradually loses capacities that no therapy can fully restore. If health is identified exclusively with normal bodily function, each of these lives appears condemned to perpetual incompleteness.

Caraka offers another possibility. The individual may remain physically unwell while still recovering something essential. Relationships may deepen. Fear may lessen. The mind may regain tranquillity. The senses may rediscover delight in music, fragrance, touch, or prayer. The self may become *prasanna* even where disease remains. Such healing does not replace medical treatment; it exceeds the limits within which treatment alone can operate.

It is perhaps here that Ayurveda approaches Daoist philosophy most closely—not through shared doctrines, but through a shared suspicion of perfection. Neither tradition imagines life as the elimination of all vulnerability. Both recognise that existence unfolds through rhythms that cannot be mastered by force. The task is not to escape change but to inhabit it wisely. The physician restores balance where possible; the sage learns how to remain fully human when balance can no longer be preserved indefinitely. The *Daodejing* expresses this insight with characteristic simplicity:

人法地，地法天，天法道，道法自然。

rén fǎ dì, dì fǎ tiān, tiān fǎ dào, dào fǎ zìrán.

"Human beings follow the earth. The earth follows heaven. Heaven follows the Dao. The Dao follows what is so of itself."

(*Daodejing*, Chapter 25)

The verse does not prescribe passivity. It reminds the reader that flourishing begins by recognising the patterns within which life already unfolds. Health, whether understood through Caraka or Laozi, is therefore not conquest but attunement. It is less a victory over the body than a reconciliation with the conditions through which embodied life is lived.

III. Harmony and the Broken Body: A Daoist Reading of Rehabilitation

One of the persistent assumptions of modern culture is that health culminates in control. A healthy body is expected to be productive, efficient, self-sufficient, and capable of overcoming limitation through discipline or technology. Illness interrupts this ideal. Disability unsettles it. Terminal disease exposes its limits altogether. Beneath these experiences lies an unspoken conviction that the body ought to obey the will and that failure to do so represents a loss of human completeness. Neither the Upanishads nor the Daoist classics begin from such an assumption.

The *Daodejing* repeatedly directs attention towards what appears weak, yielding, or incomplete. These are not marginal images within the text; they form its philosophical centre. Water, valleys, infants, uncarved wood, empty vessels—Laozi consistently privileges what resists the pursuit of domination. The point is not that weakness is inherently superior to strength. Rather, what seems weak often reveals a deeper capacity to endure because it remains responsive to change.

This insight is expressed with particular elegance in one of the best-known chapters of the *Daodejing*:

天下莫柔弱於水，而攻堅強者莫之能勝。

tiānxià mò róuruò yú shuǐ, ér gōng jiānqiáng zhě mò zhī néng shèng.

"Nothing in the world is softer and weaker than water, yet nothing surpasses it in overcoming what is hard and strong."

(*Daodejing*, Chapter 78)

The image has often been read politically or ethically, but it also speaks to embodiment. Water possesses no fixed shape of its own. It does not resist the vessel into which it is poured, yet it gradually wears away stone itself. Laozi's point is neither sentimental nor mystical. Life persists through adaptation rather than rigidity. The body that survives is not always the strongest but often the one most capable of responding to changing circumstances.

This image invites reflection upon rehabilitation in a way that modern clinical language rarely does. Rehabilitation is frequently imagined as recovery of what has been lost—a return to previous movement, speech, memory, or independence. Such restoration is undoubtedly possible in many cases, and medicine rightly pursues it. Yet countless lives do not follow this narrative. Individuals living with progressive neurological disorders, congenital impairments, or permanent injuries cannot simply return to an earlier

bodily condition. Their future depends not upon recovering the past but upon discovering new forms of participation in the world.

Laozi's water does not return to its source. It continues its journey by changing shape. This distinction is philosophically significant. Adaptation is not resignation. It is a form of intelligence that refuses to measure life solely by what has been lost. Rehabilitation, understood in this sense, becomes less an act of restoring normality than of cultivating new possibilities within altered conditions.

The *Zhuangzi* develops this insight even more radically. Unlike many philosophical traditions that celebrate physical perfection, the *Zhuangzi* repeatedly places figures with visibly unusual bodies at the centre of its narratives. They are not introduced as objects of pity, nor are their bodies miraculously transformed. Instead, their bodily difference becomes the occasion for questioning conventional standards of usefulness and value.

Among the most striking examples is **Shu the Cripple (支離疏)**. His body is described in deliberately unsettling detail: his chin sinks towards his navel, his shoulders rise above his head, and his limbs appear profoundly asymmetrical. By ordinary social standards, he would seem the very image of incapacity. Yet Zhuangzi presents him without ridicule. Precisely because his body does not conform to conventional expectations, he escapes military conscription and survives while others perish. His life unsettles every assumption that visible perfection guarantees human flourishing.

The episode should not be romanticised. Zhuangzi does not imply that bodily impairment is desirable or that suffering possesses intrinsic spiritual value. Rather, he questions the standards through which societies decide whose lives count as successful. Utility, he suggests, is itself a historically contingent judgement. The body dismissed as useless may disclose possibilities invisible to those who worship efficiency alone.

The Upanishads arrive at a similar conclusion through another philosophical route. Their concern is not social usefulness but the nature of the Self. Yet the ethical consequence proves unexpectedly close. If personhood cannot be identified with bodily appearance, then the body cannot become the final criterion by which human worth is measured. Laozi approaches the problem through natural transformation; Yājñavalkya approaches it through metaphysical enquiry. Both refuse to grant ultimate authority to visible form.

This convergence becomes particularly illuminating when considered alongside contemporary disability theory. Rosemarie Garland-Thomson has argued that disability emerges through the encounter between bodily variation and social expectations rather than through bodily difference alone. Tom Shakespeare similarly cautions against reducing disability either to biology or to society, insisting that both dimensions remain inseparable. These arguments transformed modern disability studies because they exposed the limitations of earlier medical models. Yet the Daoist and Upanishadic traditions invite a further question. Why should bodily variation diminish human value in the first place? Their answer is neither legal nor political. It is philosophical. Human dignity cannot rest upon characteristics that every body eventually loses.

The ageing body makes this point with particular force. Strength declines, memory falters, eyesight weakens, and movement becomes uncertain. Ageing, in this sense, universalises vulnerability. Disability is no longer experienced as the condition of a particular minority but as one expression of the destiny shared by all embodied beings. Laozi repeatedly returns to this rhythm of emergence and decline, not to inspire despair but to cultivate a different measure of wisdom. What endures is not physical mastery but the capacity to remain in harmony with transformation itself.

It is therefore unsurprising that neither Daoism nor the Upanishads imagines healing as the recovery of an ideal body. Both traditions recognise the body as indispensable. Neither despises material existence. Yet both quietly resist the assumption that bodily perfection constitutes the highest human good. Healing concerns something larger than anatomy. It concerns the restoration of meaningful relation—with oneself, with others, and with the order of life within which every body inevitably changes.

This distinction acquires its greatest urgency when medicine reaches its limits. The physician may no longer be able to cure, yet care does not cease. Rehabilitation may no longer restore function, yet life continues to ask for meaning. It is precisely here that Daoist harmony and Upanishadic selfhood begin to illuminate one another. Both suggest that the deepest work of healing begins not after suffering has disappeared but when the person learns to inhabit suffering without allowing it to become the whole truth of one's existence.

IV. Healing Beyond Cure: Terminal Illness and the Recovery of Personhood

There is perhaps no circumstance in which the distinction between cure and healing becomes more visible than terminal illness. Modern medicine has transformed countless diseases that once meant certain death into conditions that can now be treated, managed, or even cured. Yet every advance in therapeutic science has also revealed a limit beyond which medicine cannot proceed. There remains a point at which treatment no longer restores the body, although care remains not only possible but necessary. It is here that philosophy enters the conversation—not to replace medicine, but to ask what medicine alone cannot answer.

What does it mean to heal someone whose body cannot recover?

The question is easily misunderstood because contemporary language often treats healing and curing as interchangeable. They are not. A tumour may disappear while fear remains. A fractured bone may unite while grief continues to shape a life. Conversely, an individual whose disease can no longer be reversed may nevertheless find reconciliation with family, recover trust in others, rediscover meaning, or approach death with remarkable serenity. Such experiences do not constitute cures. Yet few would deny that they belong to healing.

The Upanishads approach this distinction from an entirely different direction. They are not medical texts, nor do they attempt to describe the clinical management of illness. Their concern is more fundamental. They ask what, if anything, remains whole when the body itself becomes fragile.

It is no coincidence that one of the most profound philosophical conversations in the *Kaṭha Upaniṣad* takes place in the house of Death. Naciketas is not rewarded with secret knowledge because he seeks immortality in the ordinary sense. He is rewarded because he refuses to mistake longevity for wisdom. Yama first offers him wealth, children, kingdoms, music, and long life. Each offer is politely declined. Naciketas recognises that every gift remains vulnerable to time.

Yama therefore says:

श्वोभावा मर्त्यस्य यदन्तकैतत्
सर्वेन्द्रियाणां जरयन्ति तेजः।

śvobhāvā martyasya yad antakaitat
sarvendriyāṇāṃ jarayanti tejaḥ.

"All pleasures are fleeting, O Death; they wear away the vigour of the senses."

(*Kaṭha Upaniṣad* 1.1.26)

The verse is often read as an argument for renunciation. Yet it may also be understood as a reflection upon impermanence itself. Yama is not condemning bodily life. He is reminding Naciketas that every bodily achievement remains finite. Strength fades. Beauty changes. Memory weakens. Even the senses, through which the world first becomes known, gradually lose their sharpness. None of these changes is presented as a moral failure. They belong to the condition of embodiment.

This recognition has profound implications for rehabilitation. Much contemporary healthcare continues to operate, often necessarily, within the language of restoration. Treatment aims to recover lost function, reduce pain, and extend life. These remain indispensable goals. Nevertheless, terminal illness reveals that restoration cannot always be the measure of successful care. When cure becomes impossible, medicine confronts a philosophical rather than merely technical question. What remains worth restoring?

The Upanishads answer by returning to the distinction between the changing body and the witnessing Self. This distinction should never be interpreted as indifference towards bodily suffering. The texts acknowledge grief with extraordinary seriousness. The death of loved ones, the fear of mortality, and the

uncertainty of existence provide the very setting within which many of their conversations unfold. Their claim is not that suffering is unreal. Their claim is that suffering does not possess the final word about human identity.

This perspective acquires unexpected resonance within contemporary palliative care. Cicely Saunders, whose work transformed the modern hospice movement, famously argued that suffering is experienced by the whole person rather than by the diseased organ alone. Physical pain, emotional distress, fractured relationships, spiritual anxiety, and social isolation intertwine in ways that cannot be separated by clinical diagnosis. Her notion of "total pain" does not deny the importance of medicine; it insists that medicine alone cannot encompass the entirety of human suffering.

Although separated by history, language, and intellectual purpose, Saunders' insight bears an intriguing resemblance to the anthropological assumptions of both the Upanishads and Ayurveda. None of these traditions confines the person to the body alone. The body matters profoundly, but it is never the whole story. Healing therefore extends beyond physiology because personhood itself extends beyond physiology.

The *Caraka Saṃhitā* quietly anticipates this broader horizon in its understanding of medical responsibility. The physician is repeatedly reminded that treatment requires discernment as much as technical knowledge. Not every disease can be cured; not every intervention serves the patient's welfare. The measure of good medicine lies not in relentless intervention but in wise judgement. Such restraint is not therapeutic failure. It is itself an ethical accomplishment.

Laozi approaches the same truth through another image. Again and again the *Daodejing* returns to the valley. Valleys do not compete with mountains, yet rivers inevitably flow towards them. Their strength lies precisely in receptivity.

江海所以能為百谷王者，以其善下之。

jiāng hǎi suǒyǐ néng wéi bǎi gǔ wáng zhě, yǐ qí shàn xià zhī.

"The rivers and seas become the rulers of the hundred valleys because they are skilled at remaining below them."

(*Daodejing*, Chapter 66)

Humility, in Laozi, is never weakness. It is openness to reality as it unfolds rather than as one wishes it to be. Read alongside palliative care, the image acquires fresh significance. The physician who accompanies a dying patient cannot command the body to recover. Yet care continues through attentive presence, honest conversation, relief of suffering, and respect for the patient's own way of inhabiting the final stages of life. Healing survives precisely because it has ceased to depend upon cure.

The convergence between these traditions should not be exaggerated. The Upanishads seek liberation through knowledge of the Self; Daoism seeks harmony with the *Dao*; contemporary palliative care develops within secular clinical institutions. Their metaphysical commitments differ profoundly. Nevertheless, each challenges the assumption that the value of care ends where the possibility of cure disappears. In different languages, each reminds us that the person remains greater than the condition of the body.

If this insight has contemporary significance, it lies not in proving that ancient Asian philosophies anticipated modern medicine. Such claims mistake historical continuity for philosophical dialogue. Their significance lies elsewhere. They enlarge the moral imagination through which medicine understands its own task. They remind us that rehabilitation cannot always restore function, but it may still restore relationship; that treatment cannot always prolong life, but it may still preserve dignity; and that healing, at its deepest, concerns not the conquest of mortality but the recovery of the person whose life retains meaning even in the presence of death.

V. The Ethics of Remaining Human

Every philosophy of healing eventually reaches a point beyond which no further technique can proceed. Medicine may prolong life, relieve pain, replace joints, transplant organs, and increasingly intervene at the molecular level of disease. Yet none of these achievements resolves the oldest question that illness places before human beings. When the body changes beyond recovery, who is the person that remains?

The persistence of this question explains why the language of rehabilitation has gradually expanded during the last century. Rehabilitation no longer refers simply to restoring muscles weakened by injury or retraining limbs after neurological damage. Increasingly, it speaks of participation, dignity, belonging, and quality of life. These developments represent an important correction to earlier biomedical models. Nevertheless, they often leave one assumption untouched. The success of rehabilitation continues to be measured, explicitly or implicitly, by the degree to which the body approaches an ideal of normal function.
The traditions examined in this essay invite another possibility. They suggest that rehabilitation may be understood not as the recovery of an ideal body but as the recovery of meaningful life. This distinction appears deceptively modest. In reality, it transforms the ethical foundations of care.
Yājñavalkya's instruction to Maitreyī illustrates the point with remarkable subtlety. After declaring that the Self must be heard, reflected upon, and contemplated, he continues:

आत्मनस्तु कामाय सर्वं प्रियं भवति।

ātmanas tu kāmāya sarvaṃ priyaṃ bhavati.

"It is for the sake of the Self that everything becomes dear."

(*Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* 2.4.5)

The statement is easily misunderstood if read through modern individualism. Yājñavalkya is not claiming that human beings love others only out of self-interest. Rather, he proposes that every genuine relationship presupposes a shared participation in the reality of the Self. The value of another person therefore cannot depend upon utility, productivity, or bodily capacity. Relationships are possible because personhood precedes function.
This philosophical claim quietly undermines one of the deepest anxieties experienced by those living with chronic illness or disability. Serious illness often alters how individuals understand themselves. Activities once taken for granted become difficult or impossible. Employment may cease. Dependence upon others increases. Social identity gradually shifts. Beneath these practical changes lies a more painful question, seldom spoken aloud: *Am I becoming less of the person I once was?*
The Upanishads respond neither with optimism nor with denial. They do not promise that suffering will disappear or that lost capacities will inevitably return. Instead, they refuse to identify the person with those capacities in the first place. To lose a faculty is not to lose oneself. The distinction may appear metaphysical, yet its ethical consequences are immediate. If identity exceeds function, then dependence cannot become the opposite of dignity.
Daoist philosophy approaches the same difficulty through an entirely different sensibility. Laozi seldom speaks of the self in metaphysical terms. His attention remains fixed upon the rhythms of the natural world. Yet he repeatedly questions the assumption that human flourishing requires domination, control, or permanence. The sage succeeds precisely because he abandons the desire to master every circumstance.
The image of water returns once again, not because it offers a poetic ornament but because it embodies a philosophical method. Water never ceases to be itself because it enters a new vessel. It adapts without surrendering its nature. The image becomes especially meaningful when read alongside lives altered by illness. The body may require a wheelchair rather than walking, a prosthesis rather than a limb, assisted communication rather than speech, or palliative care rather than curative treatment. None of these changes abolishes personhood. They require new forms of living, not a diminished claim to humanity.
It is here that the contemporary distinction between cure and care acquires its fullest significance. Cure aims at eliminating disease. Care concerns the person who continues to live, whether disease disappears or not. Rehabilitation belongs fundamentally to the second category. Its deepest task is not the production of normal bodies but the restoration of lives capable of relationship, purpose, and hope.
The Upanishads provide a philosophical vocabulary for this insight by distinguishing the Self from the changing conditions of embodiment. Daoism provides another by understanding harmony as responsiveness rather than mastery. Ayurveda contributes a third by defining health through equilibrium

rather than perfection. Each tradition arrives independently at a common ethical intuition. Human beings are not exhausted by the condition of their bodies.

This conclusion should not be mistaken for a rejection of medicine. Nothing in these traditions diminishes the value of surgery, pharmacology, rehabilitation science, or technological innovation. On the contrary, bodily care is repeatedly affirmed as an indispensable human responsibility. What they resist is the temptation to allow clinical success to become the sole measure of healing. Medicine restores the body whenever it can. Philosophy reminds us why the body is worth restoring. When restoration proves impossible, philosophy also reminds us why the person remains worthy of care.

Such an understanding carries particular importance in societies increasingly shaped by longevity. Medical advances have enabled many individuals to live for decades with chronic neurological conditions, congenital disabilities, advanced cancers, and progressive degenerative diseases. The ethical challenge is therefore no longer confined to extending life. It concerns the cultivation of lives that remain meaningful within altered bodily conditions. Rehabilitation, in this broader sense, becomes an ongoing practice of preserving personhood amid change.

The convergence explored throughout this essay does not erase the substantial differences separating the Upanishads, Ayurveda, and Daoist philosophy. Their conceptions of ultimate reality, liberation, and the cosmos remain historically and philosophically distinct. Comparative philosophy serves neither tradition well when it dissolves difference into a vague category of "Eastern wisdom." The value of comparison lies elsewhere. It reveals how independent intellectual traditions may illuminate a shared human problem without surrendering their individuality.

That shared problem is neither disability nor terminal illness alone. It is the fragility of embodied existence itself. Every human life, whether marked by illness or by health, eventually encounters dependence, vulnerability, ageing, and mortality. Disability therefore appears not as the exception to the human condition but as one expression of its universal horizon. The philosophical traditions considered here invite us to begin from that recognition rather than from the illusion of permanent bodily perfection.

Healing, then, cannot be understood simply as the opposite of disease. Nor can rehabilitation be reduced to the restoration of function. Both concern the recovery of a life capable of meaning, relationship, and inward composure even where bodily completeness remains unattainable. It is in this sense that the Upanishads, Ayurveda, and Daoism continue to speak to contemporary debates. They do not replace medicine. They remind medicine that every body it treats already belongs to a person whose dignity exceeds every clinical description.

Conclusion

Healing Beyond Cure

The distinction between cure and healing is often presented as a practical insight emerging from contemporary medicine. Physicians learn that not every disease can be eradicated, rehabilitation specialists recognise that not every function can be restored, and palliative care reminds us that compassionate treatment continues long after curative intervention has reached its limits. Yet beneath these clinical realities lies a question that medicine itself cannot finally answer. *What is the human being whose life medicine seeks to preserve?*

The Upanishads approach this question by refusing to identify the person with the body alone. This refusal should not be mistaken for contempt towards embodiment. On the contrary, the body is honoured as the indispensable condition through which human beings learn, act, love, and pursue liberation. It is fed, protected, disciplined, and cared for precisely because it matters. What the Upanishads resist is the further assumption that bodily condition exhausts human identity. Ageing, illness, disability, and death undoubtedly transform the circumstances of life; they do not define the entirety of the one who lives through them.

Ayurveda extends this insight into the sphere of healing. Health is not described as anatomical perfection or physiological efficiency but as a state in which body, senses, mind, and self remain in harmony. The

physician therefore treats more than disease. The task of medicine is not only to remove pathology whenever possible but to restore balance wherever it has been disturbed. Such a conception allows healing to continue even where cure has become impossible. It recognises that suffering is experienced by persons rather than by organs alone.

Daoist philosophy reaches a comparable horizon through another intellectual path. Laozi and Zhuangzi neither deny bodily vulnerability nor seek mastery over it. Instead, they cultivate attentiveness to transformation itself. Water does not lament that it cannot remain ice; the valley does not envy the mountain because it lies below it. Their strength consists precisely in their capacity to receive change without surrendering their own nature. Human flourishing, from this perspective, lies not in resisting every alteration that life imposes but in learning how to dwell wisely within those alterations.

These traditions remain irreducibly different. The Upanishads seek knowledge of the *Ātman*; Daoism seeks attunement to the *Dao*; Ayurveda pursues the equilibrium necessary for embodied life. Their metaphysical commitments should neither be merged nor simplified. Yet comparison becomes fruitful because each confronts the same human reality from its own philosophical horizon. All three recognise that vulnerability belongs not to a marginal category of people but to the shared condition of embodiment itself.

The implications of this recognition extend beyond disability studies and beyond the philosophy of medicine. Contemporary societies frequently organise themselves around ideals of productivity, autonomy, and uninterrupted function. Within such frameworks, dependence easily appears as failure, and bodily decline as a loss of personhood. The traditions examined here offer a quieter, though no less radical, alternative. They ask whether dignity has ever depended upon bodily perfection. If the answer is no, then rehabilitation cannot be measured solely by the restoration of physical capacity. Its deeper purpose is the restoration of meaningful participation in life, whether through renewed relationships, recovered hope, inner composure, or the rediscovery of one's place within a larger order of existence.

This perspective becomes most compelling at the bedside of those for whom medicine can no longer promise cure. A person living with advanced dementia, metastatic cancer, a progressive neurological disorder, or irreversible spinal injury may never recover the body once possessed. To describe such lives only in terms of loss is to mistake biological limitation for human identity. The Upanishads, Ayurveda, and Daoism together resist this mistake. They remind us that while bodies inevitably change, the moral claim of the person does not diminish with bodily decline. Care therefore remains meaningful even where cure has failed because the value of the person has never depended upon the success of treatment alone.

The dialogue between these traditions does not ask contemporary medicine to abandon scientific knowledge, nor does it propose that ancient philosophies contain hidden forms of modern rehabilitation science. Its contribution is more modest and, perhaps for that reason, more enduring. It enlarges the conceptual horizon within which healing is understood. It reminds us that medicine is ultimately practised not upon bodies in isolation but upon persons whose lives exceed every diagnosis.

Yājñavalkya's instruction to Maitreyī, with which this essay began, therefore returns with renewed force. The Self is to be heard, reflected upon, and deeply contemplated not because the body is unimportant, but because the body alone cannot answer the question of who suffers, who hopes, who loves, and who remains worthy of care. Healing begins with that recognition. Cure may restore the body. Rehabilitation may restore participation. Philosophy, at its deepest, restores the meaning of the person for whom both cure and rehabilitation exist.

References

Primary Sources

Ames, Roger T., and David L. Hall. 2003. *Dao De Jing: A Philosophical Translation*. New York: Ballantine Books.

Caraka. 1981–1994. *Caraka Saṃhitā*. Edited and translated by P. V. Sharma. 4 vols. Varanasi: Chaukhambha Orientalia.

Laozi. 2003. *Dao De Jing*. Translated by Roger T. Ames and David L. Hall. New York: Ballantine Books.

Olivelle, Patrick, trans. 1998. *The Early Upaniṣads: Annotated Text and Translation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Suśruta. 1981. *Suśruta Saṃhitā*. Translated by G. D. Singhal et al. Varanasi: Chaukhambha Sanskrit Pratishthan.

Zhuangzi. 2020. *The Complete Writings of Zhuangzi*. Translated by Brook Ziporyn. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing.

Indian Philosophy

Deutsch, Eliot. 1969. *Advaita Vedānta: A Philosophical Reconstruction*. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press.

Halbfass, Wilhelm. 1988. *India and Europe: An Essay in Understanding*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Matilal, Bimal Krishna. 1986. *Perception: An Essay on Classical Indian Theories of Knowledge*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rambachan, Anantanand. 2006. *The Advaita Worldview: God, World, and Humanity*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Radhakrishnan, Sarvepalli. 1953. *The Principal Upaniṣads*. London: George Allen & Unwin.

Daoist Studies

Ames, Roger T. 1998. *Wandering at Ease in the Zhuangzi*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Hall, David L., and Roger T. Ames. 1995. *Anticipating China: Thinking through the Narratives of Chinese and Western Culture*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Ivanhoe, Philip J. 2002. *The Daodejing of Laozi*. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing.

Kohn, Livia. 2009. *Daoism and Chinese Culture*. 3rd ed. Cambridge, MA: Three Pines Press.
Roth, Harold D. 1999. *Original Tao: Inward Training and the Foundations of Taoist Mysticism*. New York: Columbia University Press.
Ziporyn, Brook. 2012. *Ironies of Oneness and Difference: Coherence in Early Chinese Thought*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Ayurveda and Medical Humanities

Cassell, Eric J. 2004. *The Nature of Suffering and the Goals of Medicine*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Dash, Bhagwan, and R. K. Sharma. 2001. *Caraka Saṃhitā*. Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office.
Wujastyk, Dominik. 2003. *The Roots of Ayurveda*. 3rd ed. London: Penguin Classics.
Zysk, Kenneth G. 1991. *Asceticism and Healing in Ancient India: Medicine in the Buddhist Monastery*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Zimmermann, Francis. 1987. *The Jungle and the Aroma of Meats: An Ecological Theme in Hindu Medicine*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Disability Studies

Davis, Lennard J., ed. 2017. *The Disability Studies Reader*. 5th ed. New York: Routledge.
Garland-Thomson, Rosemarie. 1997. *Extraordinary Bodies: Figuring Physical Disability in American Culture and Literature*. New York: Columbia University Press.
Kittay, Eva Feder. 1999. *Love's Labor: Essays on Women, Equality, and Dependency*. New York: Routledge.
Mitchell, David T., and Sharon L. Snyder. 2000. *Narrative Prosthesis: Disability and the Dependencies of Discourse*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
Shakespeare, Tom. 2018. *Disability: The Basics*. London: Routledge.
Siebers, Tobin. 2008. *Disability Theory*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Palliative Care and Rehabilitation

Frank, Arthur W. 2013. *The Wounded Storyteller: Body, Illness, and Ethics*. 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Gawande, Atul. 2014. *Being Mortal: Medicine and What Matters in the End*. New York: Metropolitan Books.
Saunders, Cicely. 2003. *Watch with Me: Inspiration for a Life in Hospice Care*. Lancaster: Observatory Publications.
World Health Organization. 2001. *International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health (ICF)*. Geneva: World Health Organization.