

Adhyāya - VSection - I : Verses 1 - 3

Comparison of sannyāsa and yoga.

Arjuna said :

(1) O Kṛṣṇa ! again, you mention Renunciation of Actions and Yoga Disinterested Performance of Actions (in Adhyāya IV.41 and 42 respectively). Tell me that one out of the two, which is decidedly the better.

Notes:- (1) By sannyāsa Arjuna seems to refer to Adhyāya IV.41, which mentions karmasannyāsa (41a) but which also says that actions do not 'bind' such a man if he performs them. It is on account of this fact, stated in verse, 41, that Arjuna is, in verse.42, asked to follow yoga after having his doubts solved with jñāna; so, he raises a doubt again, as to why the Lord mentions both sannyāsa and yoga again instead of telling him to practice one of the two, after deciding it Himself.

(2) Punaḥ seems to refer to the second occasion on which Kṛṣṇa's advice does not seem, to Arjuna to be definite, the first such occasion being the one stated by Arjuna at the beginning of Adhyāya III.

(3) Tad ekam brūhi. Arjuna wants only one view, decided for him by Kṛṣṇa.

Saṅkara-

The Lord mentioned the Renunciation of all actions in Adhyāya IV.41,37,33,32,24,22,21,19,18, and he mentioned yoga - (which means performance of actions) in IV.42. It is not possible for one and the same man to practise at the same time both these Renunciation and Disinterested Action as they are mutually contradictory like sṭhiti (steadiness) and gati (movement), nor has the Lord laid it down that the two are to be practised at different times. So, Arjuna has to conclude that he can do or practise only one of Renunciation and Disinterested Action; hence he wishes to know which of the two is better, because he should do what is better of the two.

Moreover, Arjuna thinks that a man ignorant of the Ātman (Anātmavid) may also practise Sannyāsa and Karma-yoga, and, as shown above, the two are mutually contradictory; so he asks Kṛṣṇa a question, desiring to know which of the two is better.

Saṅkara insists that here Arjuna asks a question as to which is the better out of sannyāsa and karmayoga, both being those practised by an anātmavid.

So, Arjuna said-

You tell me about the Renunciation of actions and, again, about yoga the practise of those actions. Tell me one of the two, desired by you, and beneficial (to me in particular) because the two cannot be practised by one and the same man at the same time.

Notes:- (1) It is strange that Sāṅkara who believes the Sannyāsa and Yoga in Adhyāya-IV to be those practised by Ātmavid, assumes that the two about which Arjuna asks a question in Verse-1 are those practised by an Anātmavid. Of course, he gives arguments to prove that there is no possibility of sannyāsa and yoga being practised by Ātmavid.

(2) Sāṅkara is also wrong in saying that Arjuna wants to know which of sannyāsa and yoga is better for him. He adds me kataracchreyah and mamasreyovāptih; but the verse does not support him.

(3) Sāṅkara, elsewhere, admits the possibility of yoga being practised by a jñānin like Janaka or Kṛṣṇa. So, he could have taken a comparison of that yoga with the sannyāsa of jñānin to be the topic here. He has taken verse 1 as referring to sannyāsa in IV 41 which, according to Sāṅkara deals with jñānaśhita-sannyāsa.

Srī Bhagavān said:

(2) Renunciation and Disinterested Action (Yoga) through action (Karman) are both of them (directly) the bringer of the highest Bliss (nihsreyasakarau). But out of the two, the karma-yoga is better than the Renunciation of action.

Notes:- (1) Nihśreyasakarau is an adjective which proves that both the sannyāsa and karmayoga mentioned here are those of the jñānin 'the sage'.

(2) Viśiṣyate- The reason why karmayoga is superior to sannyāsa is karmayogastuti. So has to add jñānotpatti-hetutvena to nihśreyasakarau in the verse, and kevalāt to karmasannyāsāt; kevalāt means jñānarahitāt.

(3) According to Śaṅkara, 'viśiṣyate' is a stuti; so that as a matter of fact karmayoga is not superior to 'jñāna-sahitasannyāsa' but if we do not make these ~~these~~ additions and modifications, we can get a simple correct statement in the verse, as we have given above.

(3) He who neither hates (a failure of his efforts) nor desires (a success of the same), should be known as a perpetual ascetic (nitya-sannyāsin) because he who is free from the pairs of opposites (lābha and a-lābha, jaya and a-jaya, śīta and uṣṇa, siddhi and a-siddhi, i.e., who is equal minded to them), is O, Mighty-armed One! easily released from bondage of actions he does)

Note:- (1) 'Nityasannyāsin' one who is a sannyāsin before and after he gives up the performance of actions. Even if he continues doing disinterested actions, he is a sannyāsin.

(2) 'dveṣṭi kāmksati' is a 'dvandva'. To be equal-minded in

"opposites" is the characteristic of a yogin.

(3) Sukham bandhāt pramucyate - His actions do not bind him.

Śrī Sāṅkara does not differ.

Section II - Verses 4 - 7

Comparison of Sāṅkhya and Yoga on the -
one hand and sannyāsa on the other hand.

(4) Children, not sages, speak of sāṅkhya (Disinterested -
Action regarding the War 'sāṅkhya') and Yoga (Disinterested -
Action in general) as different; he who has properly resorted
to even one of the two, gets the fruit.

Notes:- (1) Here the contrast of yoga and sannyāsa is the topic
of discussion, but the author seems to compare
sāṅkhya and yoga on the one hand with sannyāsa on the
other.

(2) "Sāṅkhya" does not seem sannyāsa; there is no verse
in the Gītā, to show that sāṅkhya is sannyāsa.

(3) Labhate phalam. The sāṅkhya was nisthā of the ksatriyas
who waged a war disinterestedly. So they would get a
two-fold phala;

(a) they fought with the idea that they would get
either of the two, viz., the heaven or the earth

(Haṭvā prāpsyasi svargam jitvā vā bhoksyase mahim;))
they were not attached to either of these two; and

(b) again, as they fought disinterestedly; ~~so~~ ultimately they would be freed from all bondage usually caused - by the action of fighting performed with attachment ; and hence they would get Moksa. The former position - of the sāmkhyas is mentioned in Gītā II 37-38; the - latter is stated in Gītā II 38 and also here V.4-5) .

Sānkara-

("It is just that the phalas of sannyāsa and karmayoga, which are to be performed by different persons, should be - different; both cannot lead to the highest Bliss." To this a reply is given)-

Children, not Sages, speak of sāmkhya and yoga as of different phalas (prthak); he who has properly resorted to even one of sāmkhya and yoga gets the phala of both. (The phala of both is the same, viz., the highest Bliss).

(Q. Having begun with the words "sannyāsa" and "karmayoga" how does the author of the Gītā state here the identity of goal of "sāmkhya" and "yoga", which is not the subject matter here?

Answer - This doṣa (aprakṛtaprakṛiyā) does not occur here. Arjuna had asked a question with regard to kevala sannyāsa - and kevala karmayoga. The Lord, however, gave a reply (in verses 2-3) without losing the context of Arjuna's question, and, in verses 4-5, having added to Arjuna's query His own intended theme (svābhipretam ca viśeṣam - samyojya), as in the latter case "sāmkhya" and "yoga"

would be synonyms of jñānasahitasannyāsa and jñānopāyasambuddhitvādiyuktah karmayogah, respectively. This is the Lord's view; hence there is no aprakṛta-prakriyā).

- Notes: 1. Śrī Saṅkara's meaning of sāṅkhya is not at all guaranteed by the Gītā and hence he is himself puzzled here.
2. There is no authority earlier than that Śrī Saṅkara for interpreting sāṅkhya as jñānasahitasannyāsa. In fact it does not mean sannyāsa at all. This will be seen from Bha. Gī. Adh. II. verses 11-38 and, here also from 'tu' in verse 6 of this Adhyāya where sannyāsa is contrasted with both yoga and sāṅkhya. Even Śrī. Tilaka is misled by Śrī Saṅkara's interpretation of sāṅkhya. It is very likely that Śrī Saṅkara's predecessor did not take sāṅkhya as sannyāsa.
3. In my opinion verses 4-5 do not speak of 'aprasuta' matter, because yoga of which karmayoga is an aspect is here contrasted with sannyāsa. And because sāṅkhya being, in the days of the Gītā, generally mentioned along with yoga, with the idea of contrasting it - (sāṅkhya) also with sannyāsa. Not only karmayoga but any other yoga also was in the days of the Gītā contrasted with yoga, because the principal contrast was that between yoga and sannyāsa, and karmayoga etc., were only aspects of "Disinterested Action". For this reason we have yoga in verses 4-6, though the word 'karmayoga' occurs in verses 1-3. The mention of sāṅkhya along with yoga seemed usual and natural in the days of the Gītā, because sāṅkhya was also 'Disinterested Action' (of war, of course). Otherwise

the Gītā would not mention sāṁkhya here at all.

5. That place which is reached through various Sāṁkhya- (i.e., aspects of the sāṁkhya, Adh.II.11-38 and Adh.XVIII. 13-17) nisthās is reached also by means of various Yogas (i.e., karmayoga and other aspects of yoganisthā, mentioned in the various Adhyāyas of the Gītā). He who sees Sāṁkhya-teaching (Sāṁkhyanisthā) and Yoga-teaching (Yoganisthā) as one and the same, sees (truly).

Notes: 1. Sāṁkhyaiḥ yogaiḥ - The Gītā mentions many yogas, or, more exactly, many aspects of yoga, as is clear from the titles of the various Adhyāyas. Also, when the Gītā says, 'ananyenaiva yogena', it seems to mean that 'one aspect of yoga should not in practice be mixed up with another'. The Gītā mentions more than one Sāṁkhya or many aspects of Sāṁkhya; the aspect of Sāṁkhya in Adh.II. that in verses 4-5, and the one in Adh.XVIII. verses 13-17 are mutually slightly different. In Sāṁkhya-teaching of Adh.XVIII. verses 13-17 the soul is one of the five joint-kartr, so it is a peculiar variety of the Sāṁkhya-Disinterested Action (Adh. XVIII.13-17). ~~@@@~~

Ekam sāṁkhyam ca yogam ca = Yoga teaching and the Sāṁkhya-teaching are really one and the same in many points, both being Disinterested Action.

Sāṁkhya is the Disinterested Action of War; yoga is any Disinterested Action. This expression (Ekam - sāṁkhyam...) occurs in the Gītā and in the later portion of the MBh. with slightly different meanings.

Saṅkara-

That place (called Mokṣa) which is reached by sannyāsins (sāṁkhyaiḥ jñānanisthaiḥ = sannyāsibhiḥ) is also reached (through the knowledge of the Reality and the attainment of Ren/unciation) by Yogins (who perform their duties as a means to jñāna without aiming at the fruit, having decided them to the Lord. He who looks upon Sāṁkhya and Yoga as one and the same (because they lead to the same result) sees the truth.

Notes:- (1) Saṅkara-sāṁkhyaiḥ = jñānanisthaiḥ sannyāsibhiḥ. But this is not guaranteed by any verse in the Gītā.

(2) Yogaiḥ - How can yoga mean yogin?

(3) Saṅkara has to add paramārtha-jñāna-sannyāsa-prāptidvārena.

(6) (Thus, Sāṁkhya and yoga are One). But sannyāsa (which is opposed to both) is difficult because both sāṁkhya and yoga are safe and easy to be attained while sannyāsa is hard to attain unless (one tries to reach it) through yoga "Disinterested-Action". A sage who has become unattached (yuktah) by means of Disinterested Action (yoga) gains Brahman not after delay.

Notes:- (1) Here sāṁkhya and yoga are contrasted with sannyāsa. As 'sāṁkhya' is identified with 'yoga' in verse 4-5; and as yoga (or karmayoga) and sannyāsa were the topic in hand in verse 1-3, sāṁkhya was introduced incidentally

and hence sāmkhya is not mentioned separately from yoga in verse 6. Sāmkhya means "Disinterested, performance of the Action of fighting." Yoga = Disinterested performance of all actions of all castes and stages of life.

- (2) 'Vidvatsannyāsa' may be reached by vividiṣāsannyāsa; i.e., from the very beginning a man may take to sannyāsa; so he will reach vidvatsannyāsa through vividiṣāsannyāsa. This form of spiritual advance is very difficult and hence dangerous. On the contrary, a man may begin with yoga, here 'sādhanyoga' and after getting perfection in yoga he may take to sannyāsa. This is not so difficult as the form of sannyāsa through sañnyāsa.
- (3) But as compared with both these forms of spiritual advancement, the third possible form viz., the stage of 'phalayoga' attained through sādhanyoga, is the best, because it would easily and without delay lead to Brahmaprāpti "na cireṇa" is the point to be noticed.

Sānkara-

(Arjuna-Well, then, according to verse 5 as interpreted by Sānkara, sannyāsa is superior to yoga. Then, why did you tell me that karmayoga is superior to karma-sannyāsa in verse-3? Kṛṣṇa- Here the reason for that with reference to 'kevala karma sannyāsa' and 'karmayoga', you had asked me, "which of the two is better?"

In harmony with your question I replied: "karmayoga is superior to karmasannyāsa; that was without any reference to jñāna". But I intend to convey by sāṅkhya the sense of jñānāpekṣaḥ sannyāsaḥ; and that one is the real paramāṛthayoga. But the Vedic karmayoga is in a secondary sense called sannyāsa (in verses 4-5 by saying "sāṅkhya and yoga are one"), because this Vedic yoga is a step or means to that (real) yoga = sāṅkhya.

How is the Vedic yoga leads to sāṅkhya i.e., sannyāsa? Hear - "But (pāramāṛthika) sannyāsa (renunciation) is difficult to be obtained without the help of yoga (Vedic karmayoga). Sage possessing Vedic karmayoga dedicated to the Lord and devoid of the desire for its rewards, gets without delay paramārtha sannyāsa (Brahma in the verse means prākṛtā sannyāsa or sāṅkhya because Brahma and sannyāsa are both paramārthajñāna). Hence I told you, "karmayoga is superior").

Notes: 1. Śrī Sāṅkara's method of interpretation, as revealed in his Bhāṣya on this verse, is highly objectionable.

2. He says that 'abhiprāya' of Śrī Kṛṣṇa in using the word Brahma (v.6) and its synonym sannyāsa (in verses 4-5) is different from his use of sannyāsa (the same word) in verses 2-3. In order to defend his statement about Śrī Kṛṣṇa's abhiprāya, he says that Arjuna's had a peculiar 'abhiprāya' in asking the question in verse 1 of this Adhyāya. According to Śrī Sāṅkara karmayoga is superior to jñānarahita-sannyāsa.

This is said in verses 2-3, according to him karmayoga is a means (and therefore inferior) to sannyāsa. This is in v.6.

3. He takes sāṅkhya to mean sannyāsa, though sāṅkhya and yoga are clearly said to be the same, yoga - according to him, being a means to sannyāsa (in these very verses 4.6).

4. He takes Brahman to mean sannyāsa and gives an argument (paramārthajñānalakṣaṇatvāt) and a quotation from Nā.Upa.II.18.

5. As a result he mixes both the arguments in v.6 for the superiority of yoga to sannyāsa viz.,

- i. sannyāsa without the help of yoga is difficult to be reached;
- ii. if a man continued to practise yoga after going through the first stage of yoga as a sādhana; he gets Brahman without delay.

7. He who is free from all attachment (yukta) through the practice of Disinterested Action (yoga), whose mind is purified, whose mind is conquered, who has conquered his senses, and whose soul has become the soul of all beings is not stained even though (instead of taking to sannyāsa after finishing the stage of sāadhanayoga) he is doing (all his duties).

Notes: 1. Yoga in yogayukta is the phalayoga.

2. Sarvabhūtātmanabhūtātma - The yogin here possesses the highest.

Sankara-

(But when this sage is possessed of yoga as a means for the attainment of), samyagdarsana having his mind purified and his body and senses conquered, and whose inner soul has become the soul of all from Brahmā to a straw,-he, there (Tatra, in that stage), though doing all his duties (for the sake of giving guidance to the people) is not stained.

Note:- (1) In verse-6 as well as in verse-7 the "Yogayukta" is named and described. So the interpretation of both the verses should apply to the yogayukta.

(2) Sankara seems to regard sarvabhūtātma-bhūtātma as the important word in verse-7 and believes that yoga in yogayukta is the sādhana yoga and it leads to the samyagdarsana and makes the yogin sarvabhūtātma - bhūtātma " (verse-7-c).

Api - I have already pointed out that 'api' is a mild form of expressing the preference for yoga over sannyāsa.

Section - III : Verses : 8 - 13

Description of Yogayukta (Yuktah)

The Unattached One, the Yogin. His
Methods of Yoga.

(8-9) "I am doing nothing at all", so should think the unattached one (yuktah), who knows the truth, and who, while

seeing, hearing, touching smelling, eating, moving, sleeping, breathing, speaking, giving, grasping, opening and also closing the eyes, is holding that the senses are acting on the objects of senses.

Notes-(1) Note the word yukta in this verse, which corresponds to yogayukta in the preceding two verses. The words yuktaḥ and ayuktaḥ and the word yoginaḥ occur in - verse-12 and verse-11. All this shows that here the word yogayukta is the most important one, as it shows that the yogayukta is the topic here.

(2) Naiva kiñcit karomīti manyeta' shows that we 'want Indriyāni indriyārtheṣu pravartante; vartante in verse 9. d is equal to pravartante. ©

(3) Cf. Śabdādīn viśayānanye indriyāgniṣu juhvatī in verse 26•B. The method of "Disinterested Action" in verse 8-9 is the same as in IV 26•B, Except that in IV 26-B the method is presented as a śradhā.

Sāṅkara -

(This sarvabhūtātma bhūtātma does nothing in reality (na cāsau paramārthataḥ karoti & translation^{is} as above)

Sāṅkara: This 'tatvavid' who sees absence of action on his part during, and in the actions of his body and senses is religiously fit (adhikāraṇ) only for 'sarvakarmasannyāsa' because he realizes absolute non-existence of action. For, a man who believing the

mirage to be water, has started towards it to drink water, does not continue his effort to drink water in the same place even after knowing the total absence of water there.)

our Note:- The verse is intended to describe a 'Yogin' a man doing all the actions without any attachment. But Saṅkara by his additional remarks tries to conclude that this type of man at once becomes and should become an ascetic.

(10) He who, having placed all actions in Brahman, performs (them) having given up attachment (to actions and their rewards), is not stained with any sin (involved in his performance of his duties, like the sins of which Arjuna was afraid) just as a leaf of the lotus is not stained by water.

Notes:- (1) Brahmanyādhāya karmāni. This expression means that the Yogin in question traces all action to Brahman and performs them, thinking that it is Brahman who actually acts. So, 'Brahmanyādhāya' should not be interpreted as 'having dedicated all actions to Brahman'.

(2) If we adopt the Yajñe method, the yoga method in this verse (10) will correspond to Brahmārpanam... Brahmakarma-samādhinā, IV, 24.

Saṅkara-

(But) he (who, ignorant of the truth and active in Karma-yoga) performs actions, having deposited them to Īsvara (and) having abandoned attachment (even to the fruit in the -

form of Mokṣa) is not stained with sin, just as a leaf of the lotus with water.

Notes:- (1) Śaṅkara seems to make much of the absence of a word like sarvabhūtātma-bhūtātma or 'tattvavid' in this verse (10). But, as a matter of fact, the Gītā requires only one characteristic, viz., that of non-attachment, in all its methods of yoga "Disinterested Action". The Gītā is not keen on having any philosophical back-ground for some of its yogas. If the Yogin has attained non-attachment, he is assured of eternal Peace or Mokṣa, e.g., in verse #12 of this very Adhyāya. So, the interpretation based upon the absence of a word like 'tattvavid' in this verse is not correct. It should also be noticed that Śaṅkara takes notice of the absence of a word like tattvavid in this verse though he himself explains Brahmanyādhāya karmāṇi as Īṣvare niksīpya tadarthaṃ bhṛtya ēva svāmyarthaṃ sarvāṇi karmāṇi, this attitude of Śaṅkara reveals his belief that the feeling of the devotee who dedicates his duties to the Lord, as does a servant to his master, is only a primary step and still the higher step of knowing the tattva remains to be reached. He gives only a secondary place to Bhakti.

(11) Having abandoned attachment Yogins (followers of the Disinterested Action) perform action, for the purification of the self, thinking that (lit. by means of only) the body, the mind, the intellect, even the senses only are doing everything.

Notes:- (1) The instrumental forms of kāyena manasā buddhyā and indriyaiḥ should be interpreted by "thinking that - the body, senses only work", and they themselves do nothing. The actions which can be done by means of the body, the mind are understood by the Yogins to to be actually done by the body, etc. I suggest this translation in the light of such sentences as - indriyāni indriyārthasu vartanta iti dhārayan (V.9).

(2) Kevalaiḥ, though given with indriyaiḥ only, should be taken with kāyena manasā and buddhyā also. Kevala excluded the jīva or Ātma of the agent; Cf. Kevala in

Tatraivam sati kartāramātmānam kevalam tu yah
paśyatyakṛta buddhitvāna sa paśyati durmatih.
(XVIII 16)

(3) Kāyena etc. refer to the actions predominantly done by the body, etc.

(4) Ātmāsuddhaye - the purification of the mind. There are two stages of yoga (Disinterested Action) itself, the sādhana yoga leads to Ātmāsuddhi etc. the phala yoga leads to naisthikī śānti as stated in Cf. the next verse. After finishing the training by the sādhana yoga, the yogin becomes yukta and he may then take to sannyāsa or continue as a yogin and do actions for lokasaṅgraha.

to the action done.

3. Śrī Śaṅkara rightly points out that 'kevala' should be taken with each of 'kāyena' and 'manasā' etc. words.
4. Yoginah is interpreted by Śrī Śaṅkara as karminah. But yoginah mean those who do their duties without any attachment at all. It does not mean merely karminah.
5. Śrī Śaṅkara's remarks at the end, 'tatraiva tavādhi-kārah iti kuru karmaiva' would mean that Arjuna is asked to practise yoga as a step to sannyāsa. But, as a matter of fact Arjuna is addressed to stick to karman even after Ātmajñāna or after saṅgatyāga stage is gone through.

12. The man, perfect in Disinterested Action (yuktah), having abandoned the fruit of actions, attains the eternal Peace; the man, not perfect in Disinterested Action, attached to fruit, is bound by doing things out of a desire for the reward.

Note:1. Karmaphalatyāga, if achieved through jñāna or without it, directly leads to naisthikī sānti or Perfection (Mokṣa).

Śaṅkara:

The translation would be the same as of ours.

Note:1. Sāntim āpnoti naisthikīm — Here Śrī Śaṅkara adds sattvasuddhi-jñānaprāpti-sarvakarmasannyāsa-jñānanisthākramena. In my opinion this addition of big sentence is unwarranted.

13. The man (dehī) with self-control (vasī), having mentally renounced (sannyasya) all actions sits happily in the city with nine door neither acting (kurvan) nor causing anybody to act (kārayan).

Notes: 1. In Bha.Gī.Adh.II.v.48 and v.50 two descriptions or definitions of Yoga are given. These are very important definitions of Yoga according to my opinion. According to Adh.II.50 Yoga is the mental renunciation of action itself rather than its fruit, while according to Adh.II.v.48 Yoga is the abandonment of the phala rather than the mental renunciation of action. The verses of the Gītā adopt both these descriptions of Yoga. The present verse of this Adhyāya (v.13) follows the definition of Yoga in Adh.II.v.50. Sarvakarmāni manasā sannyasya is the mental renunciation of all actions, which are actually being done.

2. This mental renunciation (manasā sarvakarmanām sannyāsah) may be attained through jñāna or without it. The verse does not say anything about it.

Sankara:

(But) the man (who sees the Reality), having control (over his senses), having renounced all ('nitya', 'naimittika', 'kāmya', and 'pratisiddha') actions through discrimination (manasā = vivekabuddhyā) happily gets the perception that he is sitting (āste-dehe āste iti pratyaya upapadyate) in the city with nine doors (as in a house), (this cognition of "I sit in the body" being

due to prārabdhaphalakarṃasāṃskārasaṃnuvṛttiḥ) neither himself doing anything, not making his body and senses do any thing.

- Notes: 1. Śrī Saṅkara introduces this verse with yastu paramārthadarśī. Thus, he makes a distinction between the subject (ajñā) of the preceding (v.12) of this Adhyaya and that (jñānin) of this verse (13). This is not warranted by the text.
2. Śrī Saṅkara explains in his commentary on Adh.II. v.21 the word manasā and here also by the same way. Śrī Saṅkara cannot appreciate the Gītā's yoga in its aspect as the mental renunciation of all actions.
3. Note Śrī Saṅkara's expression of 'sarva' in 'sarva-karmāni'. It should mean all actions of varna and āśrama (?)
4. Note once Śrī Saṅkara's interpretation of this verse is in conflict with his own interpretation of verses like the following, where also the expression 'manasā sannyasya' occurs. (Vide Gītā Adh.III.v.30, III.7, and XVIII.v.57.)

Section - IV : Verses 14 - 19

Philosophical basis of Yoga (Disinterested Action):
Svabhāva not Prabhu or Brahman, the origin of action.

14. The Lord creates for the world neither the state of being one who acts (kartrtva), not actions, not the union of actions and its result. But the Nature makes all activities.

Notes:- (1) "Svabhāva" is a Principle responsible for all activities and its result. Svabhāva does not create kartr-tva in a man; but svabhāva itself acts; therefore the verse says 'svabhāvah pravartate', 'the Nature acts'.

(2) In Bha. Gītā. XVIII. 41-44, 47 we are told how the actions done by the four castes are classified according to the gunas born of svabhāva.

(3) The gunas are sattva Rajas and Tamas. Elsewhere in the Gītā we are told that all actions in all ways are being done by the gunas (constituents) of the prakṛti.

Prakṛteḥ kriyamānāni gunaiḥ karmāṇi sarvaśah,
Ahaṁkāra vimūdhātmā kartāhamitmanyate. (III-27).

So svabhāva and prakṛti seem to be the same.

Sāṅkara-

The individual soul (Prabhuh = Ātma) creates neither his own agency (by saying to himself, "do this"), nor (karmāṇi) the objects (viz. the chariot, the pot, the palace, etc.) nor also the union of a man who has done an object like a chariot etc. with its fruit. But the Svabhāva, (which is of the nature of Nescience, called prakṛti-Māyā) does all activity (that of doing, as well as that of making other do some thing).

Notes:- (1) Note Sāṅkara's interpretation of (Prabhuh - The soul), kartr-tva (the inspiration to act) karmāṇi (objects like Ratha etc.)

Karma phalasaṃyoga and svabhāva (avidyā-lakṣaṇā prakṛti).

(15) The Lord (Vibhu) accepts neither the sin (such as is involved in the performance of one's duties) of any body nor even his merit. The knowledge (of a man) is covered by ignorance (wrong knowledge); so, the people are deluded.

Notes:- (1) According to one method of yoga, a man should do all his duties, good and bad, dedicating them to the Lord, thinking they originate from Him (Cf. Bha.Gī.XVIII-46) In place of this method of yoga, this Adhyāya (V.14-15) advocates the method of svabhāva being the origin of activity (pravṛtti).

(2) The ajñāna here is the belief that God receives the pāpa and sukṛta of the people. So, it is not the ajñāna of Śāṅkara vedānta.

Śāṅkara -

(But in reality (paramārthatastu)) the Lord accepts neither the sin of any (devotee) nor his merit (like pūjā (worship), yāga (a sacrifice), dāna (a gift), homa, etc.) (Why does, then, the devotee offer pūja, etc. to the Lord?) Discriminating knowledge is covered by Ignorance; therefore worldly people are deluded.

Note:- (1) Śāṅkara has taken verse 14 as dealing with 'what happens on account of avidyā', i.e., with vyavahāra the relative standpoint in his system; he takes v.15 as dealing with paramārtha the absolute standpoint'.

(2) He adds bhaktasya to kasyacit.

(3) He takes sukṛta as pūjādilakṣaṇa and yāgadāna homādika which the devotee offers to the Lord. But it will be seen that sukṛta and pāpa refer to the caste duties - which are 'good' (in the case of Brāhmaṇa) and sinful (in the case of a cāṇḍāla). (See verse-18.)

(16) But jñāna 'knowledge' like the Sun, reveals that Supreme One, to them whose own ignorance is dispelled by jñāna.

Note:- Śaṅkara takes Ātmanah as ātma viśayakam ajñānam.
Otherwise he only gives literal paraphrase.

(17) Persons whose sins (involved in the daily duties) are washed away by jñāna, attain 'non-return to this world' - (Mokṣa) with their mind on that supreme one, sharing the nature of that one (tadātmānah Cf. kāmātmānah), established in that one, and devoted to that one.

Note:- (1) Apunarāvṛtti - a word for Mokṣa, which the author may have coined of "na sa punarāvartate" (CA Upa. VIII-15-1) 'he does not return to the world' Cf. yasmin gatāḥ na nivartanti bhūyah' (Adhyāya XV-4b)

Śaṅkara- He takes kalmaṣa as pāpādisamsāra-kāraṇadoṣa. He does not connect kalmaṣa with the 'sin' which is connected closely with the starting point of the Gītā.

(18) Sages look equally on a Brāhmaṇa adorned with learning and modesty, (and) a cow, (useful in a sacrifice whose actions may appear to be sāttvika), an elephant (useful in a war, whose actions are Aājasa), and even on a dog and an out-caste'. (whose actions are tāmasa), because their actions are really the actions of the Svabhāva, and not their own, as stated in v.14).

Śāṅkara-The sages see the unchanging one (sama = ekam avikriyam Brahma). (not touched by sāttvādi guna and by saṃskāras born of sāttvādi gunas) in Brāhmaṇa who is vidyāvinayasampanna, Sāttvika and a cow, (who is madhyama and Aājasa), and an saṃskārahīna, an elephant, a bitch and an out caste, which last three are extremely kevala tāmasa.

Note:- (1) Notice that Śāṅkara takes this verse as teaching the identity of the soul and Brahman. He takes 'sama' in samadarsin as Brahman. I have taken 'sama' as equally and I have suggested that the actions of Brahmaṇa - gauh, Hastin, svan, and svapāka should not be the cause of distinguishing between these, -according to this verse. This verse emphasises the fact that their actions are not theirs, but of the Svabhāva which acts in them.

(19) Even here on earth the wordly existence is overcome by those whose mind is fixed in the equality of all beings (from Brāhmaṇa to svapāka, i.e. on the absence of any distinction among them based upon their actions), because Brahman is impartial (sama) to all beings (Brāhmaṇa to svapāka) and free

from the fault (of creating the kartr̥tvakarmāni and karmaphala-samyoga of the beings). Therefore, those (who look equally upon Brāhmaṇa, Gau, Hastin, Śvan and Śvapāka) are firmly fixed in Brahman.

- Notes:- (1) The verse should be studied in the particular context. 'Sāmya' would mean the sāmya of Brāhmaṇa and others upto śvapāka, based upon the knowledge that the difference in their actions is due to svabhāva which itself really does all actions of Brāhmaṇa, etc.
- (2) This knowledge of svabhāva being the kartr̥ convinces a man that Brahman has not created the actions of man and does not also receive back actions if and when people return actions to Brahman, thinking that they originate from it. Thus Brahman is not responsible for creating action of Brāhmaṇa, śvapāka etc. It is 'nirdoṣa' and sama-impartial. If Brahman has created the actions, it would be regarded as kind to Brāhmaṇa and cruel to śvapāka. Thus, Brahman would be blamed with vaisamyā and nairghr̥ṇyā.
- (3) As the sages who look upon Brāhmaṇa, Gau, Hastin, śvan and śvapāka equally, know that Brahman is nirdoṣa and sama, they (the sages) are Brahmaṇi sthitāḥ 'firmly established in Brahman.'

(4) 'The conquering of the world or creation' (jaya of sarga) means "overcoming birth and death" i.e., Mokṣa.

Śaṅkara-(Those sages who see Brahman in Brāhmaṇa, etc. are not to be blamed, because) those whose mind is firm in Brahman 'the state of being equal' (sāmya = Samabhāva = Brahman) (in all beings), have conquered birth (Sarga = Janma) while (they live here) in this very world, because Brahman which being present in those, having defects, (is believed to be itself defective), is not touched by those defects (nirdoṣam = taddoṣaiḥ aspraṣṭam) (nor is Brahmasvaguṇabhedabhinnam, because it is nirguṇa). Therefore, those sages are firm in Brahman, (So, even an iota of defect does not touch the śamadaraśinah = panditāḥ; because they are dehādī-saṅghātātmadarśanābhimanarahitāḥ) (Śaṅkara adds that the smṛti-sāstra which lays down and teaches distinction among Brāhmaṇa, Gauḥ, Hastin, Śvan, and Śvapāka refers to karmināḥ "those who do their duties", while the Gītā sāstra which teaches the same Brahman as the one to be realized in all these is sarvakarma-sannyāsi-visayaḥ. Hence, he says, the Gītā is not in conflict with the smṛtis of Manu and others). From verse-13 upto the end of the adhyāya the text deals with sarvakarmasannyāsa.

Note:- (1) Śaṅkara takes verse 18 as teaching the identity of the jīva and Brahman and, hence, he takes verse 19 as telling as that the Gītā's view of jīva Brahmanoh abhedah is not in conflict with the Dharmaśāstra's view of varṇāśramabheda for this he says that these verses of the Gītā teach sannyāsa while the Dharmaśāstra teach the performance of karma. In my opinion

Verse-19 says that the yogin those who do actions believing that actions belong to svabhāva and who look upon people of good and bad professions equally are Brahmani sthitāḥ. It also asserts that Brahman is not responsible for the good and bad deeds of beings, just as beings themselves are not responsible for the same.

Section - V : Verses - 20 - 29

Behaviour of a Yogin (Follower of Disinterested-Action) based upon the Yoga - method taught in this Adhyāya.

(20) (A yogin doing all deeds without attachment), with firm intellect, (that all actions are done by svabhāva), not bewildered (as regards the performance of his duties), knowing Brahman (to be impartial and free from the doṣas of vaiṣamya - and nairghrṇya) (and) himself residing in Brahman (like the sages described in verse-19) would not be delighted having got priyam (what he likes) (as the result of his actions) and would not be defected having got apriyam (what he does not like) as his result of his actions.

Note:- (1) Here, i.e., from this verse onwards, the samadarsin is himself described as a yogin.

(2) Prāpya - having got as the result of his daily actions.

(3) Priya and apriya, what he (the yogin) would like to have and what he would not like to have.

Sāṅkara-

He should not be delighted having got what he likes and should not be disgusted, having got what he dislikes. - (Really, there is no possibility of his getting anything he likes or anything he does not like. Tasya priyāpriyaprāpya-sambhavāt). He would have intellect free from doubt (that there is one Ātman devoid of all defects, in all beings), he would be free from delusion, he would know Brahman, and he would renounce all actions (Brahmani sthitāḥ = akarmakṛt - sarvakarmasannyāsītyarthah).

Note:-(1) Note that Sāṅkara takes this verse as dealing with sannyāsin.

(2) Note also his explanation that the man dealt with in this verse really does not meet with priya and apriya.

(21) He whose mind is not attached to external contacts and who gets Bliss within himself, gets inexhaustible happiness, with his mind disciplined with non-attachment (yukta) through the help of Brahmayoga Disinterested Action achieved through (realization that) Brahman (is not responsible for the actions and their rewards).

Note:- (1) Note the emphasis in the verse on not giving up external contacts but on not being attached to them, and on turning within one's self.

(2) Brahmayoga - Vide our translation.

Saṅkara -

(The sannyāsin,) with his mind not attached to objects of senses which are external, gets the happiness which is within himself (Ātmani yatsukham tad vindati ityeta). He, with his mind quiet i.e., busy (yuktah = samāhitah = tasmin vyāpṛtah) with concentration or ecstasy (yoga = samādhi) in Brahman, gets (aśnute = vyāpnoti) endless bliss.

Note:- (1) Saṅkara takes yoga as samādhi, yukta as samāhita and here as vyāpṛta. So, "the sannyāsin practises the pātañjala yoga," and gets Bliss. - In fact yoga and yukta are words which clearly prove that the topic here is a yogin and not a sannyāsin.

(22) The wise one (budhah) does not take delight in enjoyments born of contact (saṁsparśa), because such enjoyments are nothing else about sources (causes) of unhappiness, being - possessed of a beginning and an end (i.e., being anitya).

Saṅkara-1- Translation would be the same.

2- Na ramate is interpreted by Saṅkara as "indriyāni-nivartayet".

3- Eva in duḥkhaṇonaya eva.

4- Yathā cchaloke tathā paraloke (ti gamyate eva śabdāt. But "eva" would rather mean that the author does not hold the view that Brahmasparśa can at least give -

some temporary happiness or misery mixed with happiness.

(23) He, who is able to endure just here on earth, before he is liberated from the body, the force born from desire (kāma) and anger, is one disciplined with non-attachment (yuktaḥ), he is a really happy man.

Śaṅkara-

He explains "sa yuktaḥ" by "sa yogī" (He is a yogin).

(24) That yogin (a follower of Disinterested Action), He who is happy within himself who has joy within who has illumination within only, attains Peace in (Brahman), having become Brahman.

Notes:- (1) Here the word "Yogin" should be noticed.

(2) This verse also emphasises the fact of a yogin being not attached to external objects.

(3) "Brahmanirvāṇam" is one of the many expressions used in the Gītā for the state of Mokṣa. The Gītā does not insist on a fixed terminology for the state of mokṣa. It seems to give an option to its reader as regards the belief in the nature of mokṣāvasthā.

(4) The use of nirvāṇa in Brahmanirvāṇa shows that the Gītā was written before the word "nirvāṇa" became a special word of Buddhism. So, the Gītā is earlier than Buddhism.

- (5) Brahmabhūta-according to the Gītā a soul can attain identity with Brahman in this very life.
- (6) But after becoming Brahman, there is a further progress, according to the Gītā, e.g. Adhyāya-XVIII-54.

Brahmabhāva and Brahmanirvāna are a lower state than that of Bhagavad-bhakti-prāpti. According to Śāṅkara "Brahmabhūta" is itself the highest state. The translation of the verse would be the same according to Śāṅkara.

- (25) Rsis, with their sins destroyed, their duality (dvaidhā) cut-off, their mind controlled, devoted to the good of all beings, get peace in Brahman.

Notes:- (1) Sarvabhūtahiteratāh "indicates that the Rsis here are probably yogins doing their duties for the sake of - lokasaṅgraha.

- (2) Dvaidhā might mean 'doubts' or 'duality'.

- (3) Śāṅkara takes Rsayah as sannyāsinaḥ and as sarvabhūtahiteratāh as ahimsakāḥ.

- (26) The peace in Brahman lies near to the ascetics (yatis), who are separated from desire and anger, whose mind is - controlled, who have known Ātman.

Note:- (1) Though verse 24 and probably verse-25 also refer to the yogin, verse-26 clearly mentioned yatis ascetics. This would mean that both the yogin and the yati can attain Brahmanirvāṇa. I am not inclined to interpret 'Yogin' as or sannyāsin as a man with the sannyāsa - manovṛtti or manasā sannyāsa. According to the Gītā the perfect man can be either a yogin or a sannyāsin. This is also the case in the Gītā's descriptions of the perfect man in Adhyāya-VI, (Yogin), XII (Bhakta), XIV (Guṇātīta). But, it must also be noted that the Gītā prefers a yogin to a sannyāsin. And this preference is mentioned in the Gītā in a variety of ways. Note that just as both sannyāsa (IV-41) and Yoga (IV-42) were mentioned at the end of Adhyāya IV, so also, here, at the end of Adhyāya V, both the Yogin and the yati are mentioned. The Gītā does not object to sannyāsa, though it prefers yoga.

Śaṅkara-explains abhitah as ubhayatah jīvatām mrtānāmca yatīnām. According to Śaṅkara Verse-26 and 24 mention samyagdarsana - nisthānām sannyāsinām sadyomuktiḥ (vide Śaṅkara's introduction - to verse-27).

(27-28) That sage (muniḥ) who, having kept out (of himself) the external contacts, having kept the eye only between the two eye-brows, have made the out-going breath and the incoming breath equally moving in the interior of the two nostrils (- a method of controlling desire and anger?), has his senses, mind,

intellect controlled, is devoted to Mokṣa, and whose desire, fear and anger have disappeared, is ever nothing else but - released (muktaḥ).

Notes:- (1) The two verses do not mention a word like Yogin or yati. The word muni does not mean a sannyāsin by - itself. But some practice of yoga dealing with - prānāpānagati is mentioned in verse-27, and, if my contention that in the Gītā the yoga Disinterested Action is not distinguished from yoga, 'some kind of control of the mind' known to the Gītā, is correct I am inclined to suggest the verses 27 and 28 should be taken as dealing with yoga (Disinterested Action, not distinguished from yoga some kind of control of the mind), not with sannyāsa. Verse 29 also deals - with yoga (bhoktāraṃ yajñatapasām).

(2) The side of control of mind, in the sense or connotation of yoga is introduced in verse-27, as just an introduction of the topic of Adhyāya VI-Sāṅkara also says that verses 27-28-29 are sūtrasthāniya of which Adhyāya VI is a Bhāṣya.

(3) When a man has a desire (icchā), fear (bhaya) and anger (krodha) we do find that his prāṇa and apāna do not move equally in the interior of his nostrils. So, by controlling the movement of prāṇa and apāna it is possible to control icchā, bhaya and krodha.

Similarly 'keeping the eye between the eye-brows' may be also a method of controlling icchā, bhaya, krodha. Dāsgupta says in (page 447-449) @ History of Indian Philosophy.

Sāṅkara takes the word muni in verse-27 as sannyāsin. He does not explain what is meant by "keeping the eye between the eye-brows" or by making the prāna and apāna move equally in the nostrils. But in his introduction to verse-27 he says that Adhyāya VI deals with the details of Dhyānayoga which is an antarāṅga an internal "subordinate means" to samyagdarsana. Sāṅkara says 'bahihkrtvā' means not thinking of bāhyān sparsān. It may mean not attached to bāhyān sparsān.

(29) Having known Me the Enjoyer of sacrifice and austerity, the great Lord (Mahesvara) of all people and the friend of all beings, the (Yogin) attains Peace.

Notes:- (1) This verse seems to have been specially placed here in order to impress upon the reader that the Bhakti - element also may work in the Yogin along with jñāna and karman. The verse makes the Lord bhoktr of the Yogin's yajñas and tapas and the suhrd (friend) of all beings. The jñāna in this Adhyāya is the jñāna of Lord being not the origin of kartrtva or karma of the beings. Still, the Lord would enjoy yajñas (either the Vedic one or that of the Gītā IV) and tapas if performed to please the Lord. This Bhakti element may be combined by the yogin with his jñāna and karman.

- (2) As yajña is mentioned here, the topic of the verse would be a yogin of the type of Adhyāya IV, where various yajñas of the yogins are described.

Saṅkara-

Having known Me the Enjoyer of yajñas and tapas in the capacity of the performer (kartrrūpena) or the deity (devatārūpena) (of the yajña and tapas), the great Lord of all world, the friend of all beings, he (the sannyāsin) - attains peace.

Note:- (1) "Yajñānām tapasām ca kartrrūpena bhoktāram = would mean that the performer and the Lord are one or identical. This would lead to jīveparamātmanoh abhedah; and such a doctrine would be in conflict with the view of "sarvabhūtānām suhrdam (sarvapratyaya-sākṣiṇam). The Lord being present in the heart of all beings is described as the bhoktr of their deeds e.g., in Bha.Gī.XIII-22.

The title of this Adhyāya is sannyāsayoga "Disinterested-performance of Actions based upon their mental Renunciation," as taught in verses like 3-8, particularly 13. Sannyāsa as described in II-50 leads to yoga, "Disinterested Action".

*

*