

Commentator's argument. But Ā.G. points out that they can also form a part of the next *Objection*. In that, case, the translation of the *Objection* will be this: Can it not be that the construction of the sentence (under discussion) is—Neither doing nor making others do, he rests by depositing (*sannyasya*, by renouncing) in the body', but not 'he rests in the body by renouncing...'?—Tr.

[57] Indestructibility suggests unchangeability as well.

[58] Aṣṭ. reads '*enam tu ātmānam*, but this Self', in place of *enam svātmānam*.—Tr.

[59] Another reading is *kārya-kāraṇa-sanghāta*, aggregates formed by material elements acting as causes and effects.—Tr.

[60] It may be argued that the Self is the object of egoism. The answer is: Although the individualized Self is the object of egoism, the absolute Self is not.

[61] Namely, the needlessness of sorrow and delusion, from the point of view of the nature of things.

[62] That is, in the earlier verse.

[63] A specific rule is more authoritative than a general rule. Non-violence is a general rule enjoined by the scriptures, but the duty of fighting is a specific rule for a Ksatriya.

[64] Happy in this world as also in the other.

[65] Rites and duties like sacrifices etc. yield their results after the lapse of some time. But the Ksatriyas go to heaven immediately after dying in battle, because, unlike the minds of others, their minds remain fully engaged in their immediate duty.

[66] The context here is that of the philosophy of the supreme Reality. If fighting is enjoined in that context, it will amount to accepting combination of Knowledge and actions. To avoid