Vişaya means 'of which Puruşa is the object'. Buddhi of which Puruşa is the object or receiver always appears like the knower, while Buddhi of which the objects are sound etc. sometimes appears as known and sometimes as unknown. As Puruşa makes Buddhi its object or exhibits it, so Buddhi also makes Puruşa its object, i.e. knows its basic exhibitor as 'I am the seer'. Thus the expression 'Puruşa is the object of Buddhi' and 'Buddhi is the object of Puruşa' mean almost the same.

In brief, the objects of Buddhi, i.e. sounds etc. which are shown by Buddhi, being known at one time and not known at another, knowledge of sound at one time becomes a different knowledge, at another, this indicates the mutability of Buddhi. On the other hand, the Buddhi of which Purusa is the object, i.e. which shows the Purusa (the conception 'I know myself') never becomes 'I do not know myself'. As long as there is Buddhi it will be 'I know myself'. Buddhi indicating 'I do not know myself' is an unreal, unimaginable thing. Therefore, the exhibition of Purusa is ever manifest and it is never unmanifest or unknown. Thus He is an immutable manifestation or unconditioned Awareness. When Buddhi is not there or is hid, it will not be manifested. That also is a mutation of Buddhi. That will not affect the illuminer in the least, Buddhi by its intrinsic power of activity is shown to the illuminer. When that is not done, nothing happens to the illuminer, only the Buddhi remains unmanifest.

Buddhi coloured by objects assumes different forms after the objects, while that relating to Puruṣa becomes like 'I know myself' but never 'I do not know myself'. That is why the real knower indicated by it is immutable. 'I am the knower'—this idea is Buddhi relating to Puruṣa. If it could be shown or even imagined that this form of Buddhi is ever 'not known' then Puruṣa would have been known and unknown, i.e. mutable.

The idea 'I' is directly receptive, while 'I was' or 'I shall be' is reflective. Memory, wish etc. are reflective. Reflection cannot take place without a reflector. That which in the shape of consciousness produces cognisance is the reflector. No cognition is imaginable without such a reflector, because every cognition is a reflected one. Therefore, any cognition unperceived by the Buddhi, whose object is its reflector, the