

तदेतच्चित्तमसंख्येयाभिर्वासनाभिरिव चिद्वीकृतमपि परार्थं परस्य भोगाप-
वर्गार्थं न स्वार्थं संहत्यकारित्वाद् गृह्यवत् । संहत्यकारिणा चित्तेन न स्वार्थेन
भवितव्यम्, न सुखचित्तं सुखार्थं, न ज्ञानं ज्ञानार्थम्, उभयमप्येतत्परार्थं—यच्च
भोगेनापवर्गेण चार्थेनार्थवान्पुरुषः स एव परः । न परः सामान्यमात्रं, यत्तु
किञ्चित्परं सामान्यमात्रं स्वरूपेणोदाहरद्वैनाशिकस्तत्सर्वं संहत्यकारित्वात्परार्थ-
मेव स्यात् । यस्त्वसौ परो विशेषः स न संहत्यकारी पुरुष इति ॥ २४ ॥

From what else is (this separate identity of Puruṣa from the mind) established ?

**That (The Mind) Though Variegated By Innumerable
Subconscious Impressions Exists For Another As
It Acts Conjointly. 24.**

That mind though diversified with countless Vāsanās, works for another, *i.e.* for the experience or emancipation of another, not for itself, because like a house (1) it results from the assemblage of many forces. A mind which is essentially an assemblage cannot work on its own to serve its own interests. A happy mind does not enjoy the happiness. In a wise mind the wisdom is not for the emancipation of the mind. Both these are for serving somebody else. He who is enriched by the fruits of experience or emancipation, is someone different. That other is not of the same variety as momentary perceptions. That other which the Vaināśikas mention in general terms as the perceiver must also be serving the interest of another, in that it behaves like an assemblage. The particular entity, which is above perception and is not a name only nor behaves like an assemblage, is Puruṣa.

(1) The all-embracing mind is coloured with countless Vāsanās. They are the outcome of the latent impressions of feelings derived through countless enjoyments and sorrows undergone in countless previous births, which lie stored up in the mind. That mind is working in the interest of another, because it works as an assemblage. Anything that is not simple or is the outcome