

Whoever is a man of action of this kind is distinguished from the other men of action. In order to express this idea the Bhagavān says, *sah*, he; is a *sannyāsī*, monk, and a *yogī*. Sannyāsa, means renunciation. He who is possessed of this is a *sannyāsī*, a monk. And he is also a *yogī*. Yog means concentration of mind. He who has that is a *yogī*. It is to be understood that this man is possessed of these qualities. It is not to be understood that, only that person who does not keep a fire (*niragnih*) and who is actionless (*akriyah*) is a monk and a *yogī*. *Niragnih* is one from whom the fires, (69) which are the accessories of rites, have become dissociated. By *kriyā* are meant austerity, charity, etc. which are performed without fire. *Akriyah*, actionless, is he who does not have even such *kriyās*.

*Objection:* Is it not only with regard to one who does not keep a fire and is actionless that monasticism and meditateness are well known in the Vedas, Smrtis and scriptures dealing with meditation? Why are monasticism and meditateness spoken of here with regard to one who keeps a fire and is a man of action—which is not accepted as a fact?

*Reply:* This defect does not arise, because both are sought to be asserted in some secondary sense.

*Objection:* How is that?

*Reply:* His being a *monk* is by virtue of his having given up hankering for the results of actions; and his being a *man of meditation* is from the fact of his doing actions as accessories to meditation or from his rejection of thoughts for the results of actions which cause disturbances in the mind. Thus both are used in a figurative sense. On the contrary, it is not that monasticism and meditateness are meant in the primary sense. With a view to pointing out this idea, the Bhagavān says:

यं संन्यासमिति प्राहुर्योगं तं विद्धि पाण्डव ।  
न ह्यसंन्यस्तसङ्कल्पो योगी भवति कश्चन ॥२॥