

performance of actions and relinquishment of actions, ought to be undertaken, not the other.

Thinking thus and with a view of knowing the one that is more commendable, Arjuna said, 'O Krishna, You speak of renunciation of actions,' etc.

*Objection:* Is it not that in the verses quoted above, the Bhagavān, intent on elaborating steadfastness in Knowledge, spoke of renunciation of all actions for a knower of the Self, but not for one ignorant of the Self? And consequently, since performance of actions and their renunciation are meant for different persons, therefore the question with a view to knowing the preference of one over the other does not become logical.

*Reply:* It is true that from your point of view the question is not rational. We say that, on the other hand, the question is certainly justifiable from the questioner's (Arjuna's) standpoint.

*Objection:* How?

*Reply:* In the foregoing passages the emphasis is on the renunciation of actions (not on the agent), because it was intended by the Bhagavān to present that as a duty. But it is impossible to undertake that (renunciation) as a duty unless there is an agent to do so. Therefore, from one point of view, even he who has not realized the Self becomes approved as fit for renunciation. On the other hand, it is not intended that renunciation. On the other hand, it is not intended that renunciation has to be undertaken only by a knower of the Self.

To Arjuna, who thus thinks that even an ignorant person is entitled to both performance of actions and their renunciation, there is mutual contradiction between the two as shown above. And if one of the two has to be undertaken, the more commendable one has to be preferred, not the other. In this way, the question with the intention of knowing the more commendable one is not unjustifiable. From an ascertainment of the meaning of the answer, too, it is understood that the questioner's intention is just this.