

though objects of knowledge, belong to the Self which is the knower?

*Reply:* No, since there arises the contingency of (the Self) becoming devoid of consciousness! If qualities such as happiness, sorrow, delusion, desire, etc. of the body etc., which are the field and are objects of knowledge, indeed belong to the knower, then it will be necessary to explain the particular reason why some of the qualities of the object of knowledge—the field—superimposed through ignorance belong to the Self, while decrepitude, death, etc. do not. (On the contrary) it is possible to infer that they (happiness etc.) do not pertain to the Self, since, like decrepitude etc., they are superimposed on the Self through ignorance, and because they are either avoidable or acceptable.

This being so, the mundane state, consisting of agentship and enjoyership pertaining to the objects of knowledge, is superimposed on the knower through ignorance. Hence, nothing of the knower is affected thereby—in the same way as nothing of the sky is affected by the superimposition of surface, dirt, etc. (on it) by fools. Such being the case, not the least touch of the mundane state is to be apprehended with regard to the almighty (81) Bhagavān, the Knower of the field, even though He exists in all the fields. For it is nowhere seen in the world that anybody is benefitted or harmed by a quality attributed to him through ignorance.

As for the statement that the illustration is not equally applicable—that is wrong.

*Objection:* How?

*Reply:* Because what is intended as common between the illustration and the thing illustrated is merely the superimposition through ignorance. There is no disagreement as to that. However, as for your contention that the illustration fails with regard to the Knower, that too has been shown to be inapt by citing the example of decrepitude etc. (82)