

something which is the substratum of all imagination, and which is neither a cause nor an effect.

- [35] In the empirical experience, 'A blue lotus', there are two awarenesses concerned with two entities, viz. the substance (lotus) and the quality (blueness). In the case of the experience, 'The pot is real', etc. the awarenesses are not concerned with substratum and qualities, but the awareness of pot, of cloth, etc. are superimposed on the awareness of 'reality', like that of 'water' in a mirage.
- [36] The coexistence of 'reality' and 'pot' etc. are valid only empirically—according to the non-dualists; whereas the coexistence of 'blueness' and 'lotus' is real according to the dualists.
- [37] This last sentence has been cited in the footnote of Ā.Ā.—Tr.
- [38] Even when a pot is absent and the awareness of reality does not arise with regard to it, the awareness of reality persists in the region where the pot had existed.

Some read *nanu* in place of *na tu* ('But, again'). In that case, the first portion (No,...since...adjective. So,...relate?) is a statement of the Vedāntin, and the *Objection* starts from *nanu punah sadbuddheh*, etc. So, the next *Objection* will run thus: 'May it not be said that, when nouns like pot etc. are absent, the awareness of existence has no noun to qualify, and therefore it becomes impossible for it (the awareness of existence) to exist in the same substratum?'—Tr.

- [39] The relationship of an adjective and a noun is seen between two real entities. Therefore, if the relationship between 'pot' and 'reality' be the same as between a noun and an adjective, then both of them will be real entities. So, the coexistence of reality with a non-pot does not stand to reason.
- [40] Here the Ā.Ā. adds '*tathā dhana-nāśe apyevam*, similar is the case even with regard to loss of wealth.'—Tr.