

contrary perception of action in that actionless Self, that is in inaction, is very deep-rooted, owing to which ‘even the intelligent are confounded as to what is action and what is inaction.’ And as a consequence of the superimposition of action pertaining to the body etc. on the Self, there arise such ideas as, ‘I am an agent; this is my action; its result is to be enjoyed by me.’ Similarly, with the idea, ‘I shall remain quiet, whereby I shall be free from exertion, free from activity, and happy’, and superimposing on the Self the cessation of activities pertaining to the body and organs and the resulting happiness, a man imagines, ‘I shall not do anything; I shall sit quietly and happily.’

That being so, the Bhagavān says, ‘he who finds inaction in action,’ etc. with a view to removing this contrary understanding of man. And here in this world, though action belonging to the body and organs continues to be action, still it is superimposed by everyone on the actionless, unchanging Self, as a result of which even a learned person thinks, ‘I act.’

Therefore, *in action (karmanī)*, which is universally considered by all people to be inherent in the Self, like the perception of motion in the (stationary) trees on the bank of a river—(in that action) he who contrariwise finds the fact of inaction, like perceiving absence of motion in those trees—.

And, *in inaction (akarmanī)* in the cessation of the activities pertaining to the body and organs and ascribed to the Self in the same way that actions are ascribed—, in that action, *he who sees* action because of egoism being implicit in the idea, ‘I am happily seated quietly, without doing anything’—; he who knows thus the distinction between action and inaction, *is wise*, is learned among men; he is *engaged in Yog*, he is a yogī, and a *performer of all actions*. And he, freed from evil, attains fulfilment. This is the meaning.

This verse is interpreted by some in another way.

How?