

Objection: May it not be that this renunciation of all actions, as stated by the Bhagavān, is with regard to a dying man, not one living?

Vedāntin: No, because (in that case) the specific statement, ‘The embodied man ... continues happily in the town of nine gates’ (ibid.) will become illogical since it is not possible for a dead person, who neither acts nor makes others act, (56) to rest in that body after renouncing all actions.

Objection: Can it not be that the construction of the sentence (under discussion) is, ‘(he rests) by depositing (*sannyasya*, by renouncing) in the body’, (but) not ‘he rests in the body by renouncing...’?

Vedāntin: No, because everywhere it is categorically asserted that the Self is changeless. Besides, the action of ‘resting’ requires a location, whereas renunciation is independent of this. The word *nyāsa* preceded by *sam* here means ‘renunciation’, not ‘depositing’. Therefore, according to this Scripture, viz. the *Gītā*, the man of realization is eligible for renunciation, alone, not for rites and duties. This we shall show in the relevant texts later on in the context of the knowledge of the Self.

And now we shall speak of the matter on hand: As to that, the indestructibility (57) of the Self, has been postulated. What is it like? That is being said in, ‘As after rejecting worn-out clothes,’ etc.

वासांसि जीर्णानि यथा विहाय
नवानि गृह्णाति नरोऽपराणि ।
तथा शरीराणि विहाय जीर्णा-
न्यन्यानि संयाति नवानि देही ॥ २२ ॥

22. As after rejecting worn-out clothes a man takes up other new ones, likewise after rejecting worn-out bodies the embodied one unites with other new ones.