

ultimate knower, is neither Buddhi nor the senses but the Puruṣa which is beyond them. Hence Buddhi serves the purpose of, or is the object of, another, while Puruṣa exists for his ownself, *i.e.* He is the enjoyer. This point will be further discussed in the fourth part of the book.

(4) The third argument on this subject is that Buddhi is in itself unconscious while Puruṣa is pure consciousness or consciousness itself. Buddhi is mutative. What mutates has activity, *i.e.* manifestation and non-manifestation, and so is composed of three Guṇas. The three Guṇas are the ingredients of all objects, and object is synonymous with insentience. Thus Buddhi has the three Guṇas and is insentient. Puruṣa is the Seer beyond the three Guṇas, therefore, conscious. There is no other thing beyond the Seer and the seen, the conscious and the unconscious. Therefore that which is not the 'seen' or knowable, is conscious and that which is not the seer is unconscious. As it has the property of manifesting (by the reflection of Puruṣa) and of having assured cognition, Buddhi is composed of the Guṇas, because manifestation is the property of Sattva and where there is Sattva, there are also Rajas and Tamas. As it has the three Guṇas as its stuff, Buddhi is unconscious.

(5) Puruṣa is not similar to Buddhi—this is established. Moreover it is not altogether distinct from Buddhi, because though pure, *i.e.* beyond Buddhi, it oversees the cognition or modifications of Buddhi. The overseeing of the modifications of Buddhi is called knowledge of self and nonself. The mutating part or ingredient of knowledge and its cause in the shape of overseeing by the Puruṣa, appear as identical in the process of knowledge. The flow of knowledge is going on always, that is why the misconception of regarding Puruṣa and cognitive Buddhi as identical, is always going on.

The question might then arise: 'Who perceives the identification of Buddhi and Puruṣa?' The reply is "By the 'I'-sense—the Ego or knower." By what modification is it cognised? 'By misapprehension and by memory of latent impressions of that.' In other words, all ordinary knowledge is erroneous. When there is the erroneous idea of the identity of Buddhi and Puruṣa, then is formed the idea of 'I know'. Thus the