

form of evil! How can it bring about liberation from another evil? Surely, darkness does not become the remover of darkness!

*Opponent:* Well, the seeing of inaction in action, or the seeing of action in inaction—that is not a false perception.

*Vedāntin:* What then?

*Opponent:* It is a figurative statement based on the existence or the non-existence of results.

*Vedāntin:* Not so, because there is no such scriptural statement that something results from knowing action as inaction and inaction as action, even in a figurative sense. Besides, nothing particular is gained by rejecting what is heard of (in the scriptures) and imagining something that is not. Further, it was possible (for the Bhagavān) to express in His own words that there is no result from the *nityakarmas*, and that by their non-performance one would have to go to hell. Under such circumstances, what was the need of the ambiguous statement, ‘He who sees inaction in action,’ etc., which is misleading to others?

This being the case, such an explanation by anyone will be clearly tantamount to imagining that statement of the Bhagavān as meant for deluding people. Moreover, this subject-matter (performance of *nityakarmas*) is not something to be protected with mystifying words. It is not even logical to say that the subject-matter will become easy for comprehension if it is stated again and again through different words. For, the subject-matter that was stated more clearly in, ‘Your right is for action alone’ (2.47), does not need any repetition. And everywhere it is said that whatever is good and ought to be practised deserves to be understood; anything purposeless does not deserve to be known. Besides, neither is false knowledge worth acquiring nor is the semblance of an object presented by it worth knowing.

Nor even can any evil, which is an entity, arise from the *non-performance* of *nityakarmas*, which is a non-entity, for there is the statement, ‘Of the unreal there is no being’ (2.16), and (in the