

word 'Chaitra' will only bring the recollection (which is not a Pramāṇa) of Chaitra. The knowledge of 'existing at a certain place' will only fall under the category of Pramāṇa. If Chaitra was not seen before, the statement will not convey any particular information about Chaitra. Inference or verbal communication can only convey general and partial information.

(4) Outcome—Result of the perceptual process. Vijñāna-bhikṣu says it is the 'effect of Vṛtti as Karaṇa'. In illustrating the expression 'the self's awareness of this modification' he says that it is like the cognition of 'I am knowing the pot'. But that kind of cognition might be of two kinds. In direct apprehension, the perception is of 'This is a pot' or 'The pot exists'. But as it contains a reference to the subject, it can be analytically expressed as 'I am seeing the pot'. Again, while seeing a pot one feels 'I am seeing a pot'. The first awareness, viz. of 'the pot exists' is primarily unreflective perception and the second one, viz. of 'I am seeing the pot' is predominantly reflective perception. The first 'This is a pot' or 'the pot exists' is direct perception. In that direct perception there function three ideas—'I', 'the pot' and 'seeing', but when the pot is being seen then it is felt only that the pot exists; and the seer, the act of seeing and the object seen are not felt in separation. The knowledge of 'I am the seer' being absent, and the presence only of the pot being felt, the seer implied in the 'I-feeling' and the apprehended 'pot' appear to be undifferentiated. This has been stated already in the 4th Sūtra. The mental modification due to direct perception may last for a moment and may be followed by its 'current'. But when the perceptual modification concerning 'a pot' arises, then it is not differentiated as 'I am seeing the pot', there is only the feeling that the 'pot' is present. In knowing the pot, the seer behind it is present; that is why the seer can be said to exist in an undifferentiated form in the awareness of the pot though as a matter of fact they are really different.

This can be understood in another way. All knowledge is a transformation of Ahaṁkāra or 'Me-feeling'. Of these, perceptual knowledge is the transmutation of the 'Me-feeling' due to the action of an external object. Therefore, knowledge of a pot is only a modification of the 'Me-feeling'. But the seer is