

the fluctuations revealed to the Seer were sometimes unknown, then the Seer would not have been a perpetual absolute Seer but changeable. In other words, fluctuations become known on contact with the Seer. If it were seen that there was contact with the Puruṣa but the fluctuations were not known, then the Puruṣa would have been a Seer and a non-Seer, *i.e.* mutable.

भाष्यम्—स्यादाशङ्का चित्तमेव स्वाभासं विषयाभासं च भविष्यति अग्निवत्—
न तत्स्वाभासं दृश्यत्वात् ॥ १८ ॥

यथेतराणोन्द्रियाणि शब्दादयश्च दृश्यत्वान्न स्वाभासानि तथा मनोऽपि प्रत्ये-
तव्यम् । न चाग्निरत्र दृष्टान्तः, न ह्यग्निरात्मस्वरूपमप्रकाशं प्रकाशयति,
प्रकाशश्चायं प्रकाश्यप्रकाशकसंयोगे दृष्टः, न च स्वरूपमात्रेऽस्ति संयोगः । किञ्च
स्वाभासं चित्तमित्यग्राह्यमेव कस्यचिदिति शब्दार्थः, तद्यथा स्वात्मप्रतिष्ठमाकाशं
न परप्रतिष्ठमित्यर्थः । स्वबुद्धिप्रचारप्रतिसंवेदनात्सत्त्वानां प्रवृत्तिर्दृश्यते क्रुद्धोऽहं
भौतोऽहम्, अमुत्र मे रागोऽमुत्र मे क्रोध इति, एतत्स्वबुद्धेरग्रहणे न
युक्तमिति ॥ १८ ॥

Doubt may arise that the mind is self-illuminating and also illuminator of objects like fire (but)—

**It (Mind) Is Not Self-Illuminating Being An
Object (Knowable). 19.**

As the other sense-organs and things like light and sound, are not self-illuminating being knowables or objects, mind is also to be understood as such. In this case fire is not an appropriate example because fire does not illumine its true unilluminated self. The illumination caused by fire is the outcome of contact between the illuminer and the illuminated. That has no connection with the real nature of the fire. Moreover, if it is said that mind is self-illuminating, it will mean that the mind is not knowable by anything else, as when we say that the Ākāśa is self-supporting it means that Ākāśa is not supported by anything else. But mind is a knowable because from a