unchanging Knower of the field, then they will not crave for enjoyment or action with the idea, 'May this be mine.' Enjoyment and action are mere perversions. This being so, the ignorant man engages in action owing to his desire for results. On the other hand, in the case of an enlightened person who has realized the changeless Self, engagement in action is impossible because of the absence of desire for results. Hence, when the activities of the aggregate of body and organs cease, his withdrawal from action is spoken of in a figurative sense.

Some may have this other kind of learnedness: 'The Knower of the field is Bhagavān Himself; and the field is something different and an object of knowledge to the Knower of the field. But I am a mundane being, happy and sorrowful. And it is my duty to bring about the cessation of worldly existence through the knowledge of the field and the Knower of the field, and by continuing to dwell in His true nature after directly perceiving through meditation Bhagavān, the Knower of the field.' And he who, understands thus, and he who teaches that 'he (the taught) is not the Knower of the field,' and he who, being under such an idea, thinks, 'I shall render meaningful the scriptures dealing with the worldly state and Liberation'—is the meanest among the learned. That Self-immolator, being devoid of any link with the traditional interpreters of the purport of the scriptures, misinterprets what is enjoined in the scriptures and imagines what is not spoken there, and thereby himself becoming deluded, befools others too. Hence, one who is not a knower of the traditional interpretation is to be ignored like a fool, though he may be versed in all the scriptures.

As for the objection that, if Bhagavān be one with the knower of the field, He will then become a mundane being, and that, if the knowers of the fields are one with Bhagavān, then from the non-existence of mundane beings will follow the absence of the mundane state,—these two objections have been refuted by admitting Knowledge and ignorance as having different characteristics.

Objection: How?