

(Thus:) ‘Since the daily obligatory duties (*nityakarmas*) certainly have no results when performed as a dedication to Bhagavān, therefore, in a secondary sense, they are said to be inaction. Again, the non-performance of these (*nitya-karmas*) is inaction; since this produces an evil result, therefore it is called action, verily in a figurative sense. That being so, *he who* sees inaction in the daily obligatory duties (*nitya-karmas*) owing to the absence of their results—in the same way as a cow that does not yield milk is said to be not a cow, though in reality it is so—; so also, in the non-performance of the daily obligatory duties, that is *in inaction*, he who sees action since that yields *results* such as hell etc..’

This explanation is not logical, because freedom from evil as a result of such knowledge is unreasonable, and the utterance of the Bhagavān in the sentence, ‘...by knowing which you will become freed from evil’, will be contradicted.

How?

Even if it be that liberation from evil follows from the *performance* of *nitya-karmas*, it cannot, however, follow from the *knowledge* of the absence of their results. For it has not been enjoined (anywhere) that *knowledge* of the absence of results of *nityakarmas* or the knowledge of the *nityakarmas* (themselves), leads to the result of freedom from evil. Nor has this been stated here by the Bhagavān Himself.

Hereby is refuted the ‘seeing of action in inaction’, (11) for (according to the opponent) ‘seeing of action in inaction’ has not been enjoined here (12) as a duty, but (what has been enjoined is) merely that performance of the *nityakarmas* is obligatory. Moreover, no result can accrue from the knowledge that evil arises from non-performance of *nityakarmas*. Nor even has non-performance of *nityakarmas* been enjoined as something that should be known. Besides, such results as freedom from evil, wisdom, engagement in Yog, and being a performer of all actions cannot reasonably follow from a false perception of action as inaction. Nor is this a eulogy of false perception. (13) Indeed, false perception is itself an obvious