

किन्तत्स्यात्, संवध्यमानं च पुनश्चित्तेन कुत उत्पदेत । ये चास्यानुपस्थिता भागास्ते चास्य न स्युः, एवं नास्ति पृष्ठमित्युदरमपि न गृह्येत । तस्मात् स्वतन्त्रोऽर्थः सर्वपुरुषसाधारणः स्वतन्त्राणि च चित्तानि प्रतिपुरुषं प्रवर्तन्ते, तयोः सम्बन्धादुपलब्धिः पुरुषस्य भोग इति ॥ १६ ॥

Some say that an object is born with perception because it is enjoyed by perception, *e.g.* happiness etc. are objects of experience and are born when experienced ; so also sound etc., being objects of experience are also born when experienced. Thus by refuting the general perceptibility of objects they try to establish the non-existence of a substance (substratum) in past or future. (That view is not supported by this Sūtra.)

Object Is Not Dependent On A Mind Because If That Were So, Then What Will Happen When It Is Not Cognised By A Mind ? (1). 16.

If an object were dependent on one mind, then what will happen to it when that mind is inattentive or closed and does not concern itself with the nature of the object ? Because then it will not be the object of any other mind nor will be noticed by any other mind. If it again comes into touch with the mind (from which it was said to be born) wherefrom will it come ? On this line of argument there cannot be any unknown part (by a particular perceiver) of an object. For example, in ordinary parlance when we speak of the absence of the back it is implied there is no belly also. If therefore there is no unknown part, the known part and the perception thereof also become unrealities. That is why it must be admitted that an object has distinct entity common to all, and minds are also distinct and peculiar to each individual. The realisation arising out of the contact of these two is the experience of an object by a person.