

the injunction to renounce is only for one who desires the world that is the Self, and who is devoid of hankering (for anything else).

Now, if the intention of the Bhagavān were the combination of Knowledge with Vedic rites and duties, then this utterance (of the Bhagavān) (3.3) about the distinction would have been illogical. Nor would Arjuna's question, 'If it be Your opinion that wisdom (Knowledge) is superior to action (rites and duties)...,' etc. (3.1) be proper. If the Bhagavān had not spoken earlier of the impossibility of the pursuit of Knowledge and rites and duties by the same person (at the same time), then how could Arjuna falsely impute to the Bhagavān—by saying, 'If it be Your opinion that wisdom is superior to action....'—(of having spoken) what was not heard by him, namely the higher status of Knowledge over rites and duties? Moreover, if it be that the combination of Knowledge with rites and duties was spoken of for all, then it stands enjoined, ipso facto, on Arjuna as well. Therefore, if instruction had been given for practising both, then how could the question about 'either of the two' arise as in, 'Tell me for certain one of these (action and renunciation) by which I may attain the highest Good' (3.2)? Indeed, when a physician tells a patient who has come for a cure of his biliousness that he should take things which are sweet and soothing, there can arise no such request as, 'Tell me which one of these two is to be taken as a means to cure biliousness'! Again, if it be imagined that Arjuna put the question because of his non-comprehension of the distinct meaning of what the Bhagavān had said, even then the Bhagavān ought to have answered in accordance with the question: 'The combination of Knowledge with rites and duties was spoken of by Me. Why are you confused thus?' On the other hand, it was not proper to have answered, 'Two kinds of steadfastness were spoken of by Me in the days of yore,' in a way that was inconsistent and at variance with the question.

Nor even do all the statements about distinction etc. become logical if it were intended that Knowledge was to be combined with rites and duties enjoined by the Smrtis only. Besides, the accusation in the sentence, 'Why then do you urge me to horrible action' (3.1)