

*Reply:* Here the answer is: It is pointless to ask, 'In whom is ignorance experienced?'

*Objection:* How?

*Reply:* If ignorance be perceived (by you), then you perceive its possessor as well. Moreover, when that possessor of ignorance is perceived it is not reasonable to ask, 'In whom is it perceived?' For, when an owner of cattle is seen, the question, 'To whom do the cattle belong', does not become meaningful.

*Objection:* Well, is not the illustration dissimilar? Since, the cattle and their owner are directly perceived, their relation also is directly perceived. Hence the question is meaningless. Ignorance and its possessor are not directly perceived in that manner, in which case the question would have been meaningless.

*Reply:* What will it matter to you if you know the relation of ignorance with a person who is not directly perceived as possessed of ignorance?

*Opponent:* Since ignorance is a source of evil, therefore it should be got rid of.

*Reply:* He to whom ignorance belongs will get rid of it!

*Opponent:* Indeed, ignorance belongs to myself.

*Reply:* In that case, you know ignorance as also yourself who possess it?

*Opponent:* I know, but not through direct perception.

*Reply:* If you know through inference, then how is the connection (between yourself and ignorance) known? Surely it is not possible for you the knower to have at that time (90) the knowledge of the relation (of the Self) with ignorance which is an object of knowledge; (91) because the cognizer is then engaged in cognizing ignorance as an object. Besides, there cannot be someone who is a (separate) cognizer of the relation between the knower and ignorance, and a separate cognition of that (relation), for this would lead to infinite