

the idea of the Self being an agent, the object of an action, or an indirect agent, is the result of ignorance. Also, the Self being changeless, the fact that such agentship etc. are caused by ignorance is a common factor in all actions without exception, because only that agent who is subject to change instigates someone else who is different from himself and can be acted on, saying, 'Do this.'

Thus, with a view to pointing out the absence of fitness for rites and duties in the case of an enlightened person, the Bhagavān (55) says, 'He who knows this One as indestructible,' 'how can that person,' etc.—thereby denying this direct and indirect agentship of an enlightened person in respect of all actions without exception. As regards the question, 'For what, again, is the man of enlightenment qualified?', the answer has already been given earlier in, 'through the Yog of Knowledge for the men of realization' (3.3). Similarly, the Bhagavān will also speak of renunciation of all actions in, 'having given up all actions mentally,' etc. (5.13).

*Objection:* May it not be argued that from the expression, 'mentally', (it follows that) oral and bodily actions are not to be renounced?

*Vedāntin:* No, because of the categoric expression, 'all actions'.

*Objection:* May it not be argued that 'all actions' relates only to those of the mind?

*Vedāntin:* No, because all oral and bodily actions are preceded by those of the mind, for those actions are impossible in the absence of mental activity.

*Objection:* May it not be said that one has to mentally renounce all other activities except the mental functions which are the causes of scriptural rites and duties performed through speech and body?

*Vedāntin:* No, because it has been specifically expressed: 'without doing or causing (others) to do anything at all' (5.13).