

hence, their existence need not be considered separately with regard to the householders. So, when it is said that those other than the householders cannot have Liberation from Knowledge alone, it is to be understood that they attain Liberation through Knowledge combined with duties prescribed by the Smrtis.—Tr.

- [5] The *Jabala Upanisad* says: ‘After completing (the stage of) Celibacy, one should become a householder; from householder-ship he should become an anchorite (lit. a forest-dweller), and then become a mendicant. Or, if it happens otherwise, one should espouse monasticism even from the stage of Celibacy, or from his house (that is from the stage of the Householder), or from the forest’ (see Jā. 4.1). The first sentence speaks of successive progress towards monasticism, and the second speaks of optional adoption of monasticism.

Combination of Knowledge with action may be of two kinds, *krama-samuccaya* and *saha-samuccaya*. *Krama-samuccaya* is where an aspirant embraces monasticism by gradually passing through the different stages of life. This is an indirect combination of Knowledge with action (rites and duties). Śankarācārya is ready to concede this in the case of some people. There is also the other alternative of *saha-samuccaya*, where Knowledge is sought to be directly combined with action. Śankarācārya rejects this standpoint totally. The *Jābāla* first speaks of *krama-samuccaya*, and then, by holding that one can become a monk from any stage of life, it rejects *saha-samuccaya*. Besides, there is the Upanisadic text, ‘*yadahareva virajet tadahareva pravrajat*, one should renounce the very moment he acquires detachment’ (Jā. 4). Ā.G. quotes a Smṛti which, too, says, ‘One should have recourse to the stage of life to which he is inclined.’—Tr.

- [6] The references to these quotations from the Ma. Nā. are numbered according to C.P.U. According to the Ma. Nā.