

Part 1

Konchog Jigme Wangpo · Tsong Khapa

source: https://web.archive.org/web/20060308195802/http://gileht.tripod.com/Gon-chok-jik-may-wang-bo_Tenets.txt

TO READ THIS FILE SAVE IT TO DISK FIRST;
AND READ IT USING NOTEPAD OR ANY OTHER TEXT EDITOR.

Annotated translation of
Gon-chok-jik-may-wang-bo's
Precious Garland of Tenets

(Presents the principal tenets of Indian schools, both Buddhist and non-Buddhist – it details the presentations of cyclic existence and selflessness in the four schools, Vaibashika, Sautrantika, Chittamatra, and Madhyamika)

Sub-section titles are in the form: L#: [...].

These can be used to regenerate the structure using a Word Processor.

Paragraph starting with '¢(i.e. ...' are usually added comments by me.

L1: [CONTENTS] :L1

L1: [Theory: Systems of tenets] :L1

L2: [Introduction] :L2

L4: [The goal] :L4

L4: [The problem] :L4

L4: [The solution – a progressive development of wisdom] :L4

L4: [The need to study “lower views”] :L4

L4: [The genre of 'presentations of tenets'] :L4

L4: [This “Presentation of Tenets”] :L4

L3: [Format of the text [the division according to the schools of tenets] :L3

L4: [An artificial categorization into four Buddhist schools] :L4

L4: [Problems with this false categorization into four imaginary schools] :L4

L4: [How they are presented in Tibet] :L4

L3: [Topics] :L3

L4: [The four major topics used in the analysis of the four schools: definition, sub-schools, etymology, tenets] :L4

L4: [The reason for those four major topics – an analysis based on the Prasangika's frame of reference / point of view] :L4

L4: [About] Object-Possessors.] :L4

L5: [What is a person according to the four schools] :L5

L5: [Problems with this over-simplification] :L5

L4: [About] Consciousnesses.] :L4

L4: [About] Paths.] :L4

L4: [About] Fruits of the Paths.] :L4

L3: [About the author [a simplifier of the teachings] :L3

L3: [About the editions of the text used] :L3

L1: [Annotated translation of Gon-chok-jik-may-wang-bo's Precious Garland of Tenets] :L1

L2: [Guide to the text] :L2

L2: [Prologue : our own and others' presentations of tenets] :L2

L2: [1. Tenets in general] :L2

L3: [Our own and others' tenets in general] :L3

L2: [2. Short explanation of NON-BUDDHIST TENETS] :L2

L2: [[2.1 The eternalists: a permanent self] :L2

L3: [2.1.1 VAISESIKA [Particularists – based on the Vedas, theistic materialist; absolute atoms and characteristics as the principal causes of the world, God only indirectly; moral law of karma; reifying everything we can think of – whatever appear to the mind are different substantial entities; permanent self separate from the five aggregates that can be liberated attained by direct perception or knowledge of ultimate realities of Self and the universe (those two are different); dualism] :L3

L3: [2.1.2 NAIYAYIKA [Logicians – based on the Vedas, same philosophy as the Vaisheshika; four pramanas: direct perception of particular and generalities, correct inference using logical rules and universal relationships, comparison, testimony; absolute symbols & logic because this is the will of God (again an indirect role); a permanent self separate from God, and from the five aggregates; dualism; liberation is a self liberated from the body, gained by acquiring true knowledge of the soul and of all objects of experience] :L3

L3: [2.1.3 SAMKHYA [Enumerators – based on the Vedas (?), the theory part of the Yoga; materialist, atheistic (no need for a God to explain Truth and Liberation); the effect exists in its cause; a form of dualism, the separation of consciousness (individual soul) and matter (nature); the two absolute principles explaining everything; an absolute subtle primary cause for everything: the dance of prakrti and purusa; the self has to be liberated from the material world / from the illusion that it is the five aggregates] :L3

L3: [2.1.4 YOGA – based on the Samkhya & Vedanta; materialist, theistic (God is the unique purusa); from dualism (self vs. aggregates) to monism (self vs. God); the goal of the yoga is to directly realize our true nature, realize our difference with materiality (prakrti), and ultimately realize our Oneness with the Supreme Soul] :L3

L3: [2.1.5 MIMAMSAKA [Analyzers or Ritualists – taking the Vedas to be absolute truths, taking the sacrifices describe in it to be absolute “down to earth” very practical means to escape bad transmigrations by controlling the absolute causes, absolute sounds / mantras, but no complete definitive Liberation; an introduction for those who cannot understand the more complex Vedanta; but say that the devotional statements in the Vedas need to be “interpreted”] :L3

L3: [2.1.6 NIRGRANTHA [Jainas – rejecting the Vedas, materialist, atheistic; permanent self bound by karmic matter caused by non-virtuous actions of body speech & mind; purification through ascetic practices; Liberation is going somewhere like a white umbrella held upside down that is both a thing and a non-thing] :L3

L2: [2.2 The nihilists: no self at all, no karma / causality, no rebirth, no God] :L2

L3: [2.2.1 NIHILISTS or CHARVAKAS (Hedonists) – rejecting the Vedas, against religious practices, materialist, skeptic, atheist; no God, no permanent self, no karma, no causality, no rebirth, no liberation; no valid generalities / concepts / views / inferences; only direct perception is valid; some things are without cause; the theory of consciousness coming out of the material elements; the "essential nature" (svabhava) of a thing that undergoes transformation by itself] :L3

L2: [3. General exposition of BUDDHIST TENETS] :L2
 L3: [The turning of THE THREE WHEELS and the various Buddhist schools] :L3
 L3: [How each school pretends to avoid the two extremes] :L3
 L3: [Definition of a proponent of Buddhist tenets, and THE FOUR SEALS] :L3
 L2: [HINAYANA – the lesser vehicle] :L2
 L2: [4. The great exposition school – les particularistes (VAIBHASHIKA, Abhidharmists) (Vasubandhu)] :L2
 L3: [Definition] :L3
 L3: [18 Subschoools] :L3
 L3: [Etymology] :L3
 L3: [Assertions of tenets] :L3
 L4: [Assertions on the basis] :L4
 L5: [Assertions regarding objects] :L5
 L6: [The two truths] :L6
 L6: [The contaminated and the uncontaminated] :L6
 L6: [Other ancillary topics] :L6
 L5: [Assertions regarding object-possessors [subjects] :L5
 L6: [Persons] :L6
 L6: [Consciousnesses] :L6
 L7: [Prime cognitions] :L7
 L7: [non-prime consciousnesses] :L7
 L6: [Terms] :L6
 L4: [Assertions on the paths] :L4
 L5: [Objects of observation of the paths] :L5
 L5: [Objects abandoned by the paths] :L5
 L5: [Nature of the paths] :L5
 L4: [Assertions on the fruits of the paths] :L4
 L2: [5. The Sutra School – les tenants du discours (SAUTRANTIKA)] :L2
 L3: [Definition] :L3
 L3: [Subschoools] :L3
 L3: [Etymology] :L3
 L3: [Assertions of tenets] :L3
 L4: [Assertions on the basis] :L4
 L5: [Assertions regarding objects] :L5
 L6: [The two truths] :L6
 L6: [Specifically and generally characterized phenomena] :L6
 L6: [Negative and positive phenomena] :L6
 L6: [Manifest and hidden phenomena] :L6
 L6: [The three times] :L6
 L6: [The single and the different] :L6
 L6: [Similarity and difference with the Vaibhashika] :L6
 L5: [Assertions regarding object-possessors [subjects] :L5
 L6: [Persons] :L6
 L6: [Consciousnesses] :L6
 L6: [Terms] :L6
 L4: [Assertions on the paths] :L4
 L5: [Objects of observation of the paths] :L5
 L5: [Objects abandoned by the paths] :L5
 L5: [Nature of the paths] :L5

L4: [Assertions on the fruits of the paths] :L4
 L2: [MAHAYANA – the great vehicle] :L2
 L2: [6. The Mind Only School – les idéalistes, tenants de l'esprit seul (CHITTAMATRA)] :L2
 L3: [Definition] :L3
 L3: [Subschools] :L3
 L3: [Etymology] :L3
 L3: [Assertions of tenets] :L3
 L4: [Assertions on the basis] :L4
 L5: [Assertions regarding objects (like both truths exist simultaneously?)] :L5
 L5: [Assertions regarding object-possessors [subjects – like a very subtle mind that needs to be purified?]] :L5
 L4: [Assertions on the paths] :L4
 L5: [Objects of observation of the paths] :L5
 L5: [Objects abandoned by the paths] :L5
 L5: [Nature of the paths] :L5
 L4: [Assertions on the fruits of the paths] :L4
 L2: [7. THE MIDDLE WAY SCHOOL – les tenants du milieu (MADHYAMIKA)] :L2
 L3: [Definition] :L3
 L3: [Etymologies] :L3
 L3: [Subschools] :L3
 L3: [Descriptions of the individual subschools] :L3
 L2: [7.1 The autonomy school – les autonomes (MADHYAMIKA-SVATANTRIKA) [uses Syllogisms]] :L2
 L3: [Definition] :L3
 L3: [Etymology] :L3
 L3: [Subschools [idealist logicians, dualist logicians]] :L3
 L3: [Assertions of tenets] :L3
 L2: [7.1.1 Tenets of the yogic autonomy middle way school (MADHYAMIKA-SVATANTRIKA-YOGACARA) (Santaraksita, Haribhadra, Kamasila) [idealist logicians, no external objects, but consciousnesses are real conventionality]] :L2
 L4: [Assertions on the basis] :L4
 L5: [Assertions regarding objects] :L5
 L5: [Assertions regarding object-possessors [subjects]] :L5
 L4: [Assertions on the paths] :L4
 L5: [Objects of observation of the paths] :L5
 L5: [Objects abandoned by the paths] :L5
 L5: [Nature of the paths] :L5
 L4: [Assertions on the fruits of the paths] :L4
 L2: [7.1.2 Tenets of the sutra autonomy middle way school (MADHYAMIKA-SVATANTRIKA-SAUTRANTIKA) (Bhavaviveka) [dualist logicians, accept external objects are real conventionality, but reject self-cognition]] :L2
 L4: [Assertions on the basis] :L4
 L4: [Assertions on the paths] :L4
 L4: [Assertions on the fruits of the paths] :L4
 L2: [7.2 THE CONSEQUENCE SCHOOL – les conséquentialistes (MADHYAMIKA-PRASANGIKA) (Buddhapalita, Chandrakirti, Shantideva) [uses Prasanga]] :L2
 L3: [Definition] :L3
 L3: [Etymology] :L3

L3: [Assertions of tenets] :L3
L4: [Assertions on the basis] :L4
L5: [Assertions regarding objects] :L5
L6: [The manifest and the hidden] :L6
L6: [The two truths] :L6
L5: [Assertions regarding object-possessors [subjects] :L5
L6: [Persons] :L6
L6: [Awarenesses] :L6
L5: [Assertions on the paths Objects of observation of the paths] :L5
L5: [Objects abandoned by the paths] :L5
L5: [Nature of the paths] :L5
L4: [Assertions on the fruits of the paths] :L4
L1: [Appendix] :L1

L1: [Theory: Systems of tenets] :L1

-- Introduction
---- Format of the text
---- Topics
---- About the author
---- About the editions of the text used
-- Guide to the text

L2: [Introduction] :L2

Part Two is an annotated translation of an eighteenth century Tibetan text from a genre called 'presentations of tenets', which in Tibet mainly refers to delineations of the systematic schools of Buddhist and non-Buddhist Indian philosophy.

L4: [The goal] :L4

[Note: titles in bracket '[...]' have been added to this file.]

In this context, 'philosophy' is, for the most part, related with liberative concerns—the attempt to extricate oneself (and others) from a round of painful existence and to attain freedom. Focal topics and issues of these schools are presented in order to stimulate the metaphysical imagination—to encourage development of an inner faculty that is capable of investigating appearances so as to penetrate their reality.

L4: [The problem] :L4

THE BASIC PERSPECTIVE is that the afflictive emotions, such as desire, hatred, enmity, jealousy, and belligerence, that bind beings in a round of uncontrolled birth, aging, sickness, and death, are founded on misperception of the nature of persons and other phenomena. Thus, when the reality of these is penetrated and this insight is teamed with a powerful consciousness of concentrated meditation, the underpinnings of the process of cyclic existence can be removed, resulting in liberation. Also, when wisdom is further empowered through the development of love, compassion, and altruism—as well as by deeds motivated by these—the wisdom consciousness is capable of achieving an all-knowing state in

which one can effectively help a vast number of beings.

L4: [The solution – a progressive development of wisdom] :L4

Because of this basic perspective on the situation of beings trapped by false ideation in a round of suffering, reasoned investigation into the nature of persons and other phenomena is central to the process of spiritual development, though, as we have seen in Part One, it is not the only concern. Systems of tenets, therefore, are primarily studied not to refute other systems but to develop an internal force that can counteract one's own innate adherence to misapprehensions that are part and parcel of ordinary life and are not just learned from other systems and do not just arise from faulty analysis. Thus, the aim of studying schools of philosophy is to gain insight into the fact that many perspectives that are basic to ordinary life are devoid of a valid foundation and thereupon to replace these with well-founded perspectives.

The process is achieved through (i.e. the three types of wisdom)

- first engaging in HEARING great texts on such topics and getting straight the verbal presentation,
- then THINKING on their meaning to the point where the topics are ascertained with valid cognition, and
- finally MEDITATING on the same to the point where these realizations become enhanced by the power of concentration so that they can counteract innate tendencies to assent to false appearances.

L4: [The need to study “lower views”] :L4

Since it is no easy matter to penetrate the thick veil of false facades and misconceptions, it became popular in the more scholastic circles of India to investigate not just what the current tradition considered to be the best and final system but also the supposedly 'lower' systems. This provided a gradual way to approach extremely subtle topics without confusing them with less subtle ones. Within such an outlook, a tradition of comparative study of the views of the different schools of thought developed in India and became even more systematized in Tibet. That the primary concern was indeed with developing the capacity to appreciate a profound view of a high system of philosophy is evidenced by the amount of time actually spent by students probing the workings of the so-called lower schools. Since the philosophies of those schools were appreciated, they were studied in considerable detail.

L4: [The genre of 'presentations of tenets'] :L4

Because of the need to get a handle on the plethora of Buddhist systems, the genre of 'presentations of tenets' assumed considerable importance in Tibet. The main Indian precursors were texts such as the *Blaze of Reasoning* by Bhavaviveka¹ (500-570 ?)²—and the *Compendium of Principles* by the eighth century scholar Shantarakshita³ with a commentary by his student Kamalashila. Both Shantarakshita and Kamalashila visited Tibet in the eighth century and strongly influenced the direction that Buddhism took there.

// [Note: 1 This is Bhavaviveka's commentary on his *Heart of the Middle* (dbu ma snying po, madhyamakahrdaya). For a partial English translation of the latter (chap. III. 1-136), see Shotaro Iida. *Reason and Emptiness* (Tokyo: Hokuseido, 1980). For an excellent history of Indo-Tibetan Buddhism, see David L. Snellgrove, *Indo-Tibetan Buddhism: Indian Buddhists and Their Tibetan Successors* (Boston: Shambhala, 1987).]

// [Note: 2 See David Seyfort Ruegg, *The Literature of the Madhyamaka School of*

Philosophy in India (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1981), p. 61.]

// [Note: 3 de kho na nyid bsdu pa'i tshig le'ur byas pa, tattvasamgrahakarika. A translation into English is available in: G. Jha, *The Tattvasamgraha of Santiraksita with the commentary of Kamalasila*, Gaekwad's Oriental Series Vol. Ixxx and Ixxxiii (Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1937-9).]

In Tibet, the genre came to be more highly systematized, the presentations assuming a more developed structure.¹ Some of these texts are long; for instance, a lengthy text entitled *Treasury of Tenets, Illuminating the Meaning of All Vehicles* was written by the great fourteenth century scholar Long-chen-rap-jam (i.e. Longchenpa) of the Nyingma order of Tibetan Buddhism. Another, the *Explanation of 'Freedom From Extremes Through Understanding All Tenets': Ocean of Good Explanations* was authored by the great fifteenth century scholar Dak-tsang Shay-rap-rin-chen of the Sakya order. The latter criticized many of the views of the founder of the Gelugpa order, Tsong Khapa (author of the root text in Part One), for being self-contradictory and thus gave rise to the most extensive text of this genre in Tibet, written in large part as a refutation of Dak-tsang Shay-rap-rin-chen, the *Explanation of 'Tenets', Sun of the Land of Samantabhadra Brilliantly Illuminating All of Our Own and Others' Tenets and the Meaning of the Profound [Emptiness], Ocean of Scripture and Reasoning Fulfilling All Hopes of All Beings*, also known as the *Great Exposition of Tenets*, by Jam-yang-shay-bay-dor-jay Ngak-wang-dzon-dru. Jam-yang-shay-ba's text is replete with citations of Indian sources but is written, despite its length, in a laconic style (unusual for him) that can leave one wondering why certain citations are made. Perhaps this was part of the reason why the eighteenth century Mongolian scholar Jang-gya Rol-bay-dor-jay—whom Jam-yang-shay-ba, then an old man, helped to find as a child as the reincarnation of the last Jang-gya—composed a more issue-oriented text of the same genre entitled *Clear Exposition of the Presentations of Tenets, Beautiful Ornament for the Meru of the Subduer's Teaching*.

L4: [This “Presentation of Tenets”] :L4

After Jam-yang-shay-ba passed away, his reincarnation, Gon-chok-jik-may-wang-bo, became Jang-gya's main pupil. In 1733 Gon-chok-jik-may-wang-bo wrote an abbreviated version of these texts, entitled *Presentation of Tenets, A Precious Garland*, which is translated here.

// [Note: 1 For more discussion on this genre of Tibetan literature, see Katsumi Mimaki, *Bio gsal grub mtha'* (Kyoto: Universite de Kyoto, 1982), pp. 1-12, and the David Seyfort Ruegg's foreword to *Geshe Ngawang Nyima, Introduction to the Doctrines of the Four Schools of Buddhist Philosophy* (Leiden, 1970).]

In this sub-genre of brief Presentations of Tenets are earlier texts such as Jay-dzun Cho-gyi-gyel-tsen's *Presentation of Tenets*, the Second Dalai Lama Ge-dun-gya-tso's *Ship for Entering the Ocean of Tenets*, Pan-chen So-nam-drak-ba's *Presentation of Tenets, Sublime Tree Inspiring Those of Clear Mind*, Hammer Destroying the Stone Mountains of Opponents, and Drak-ba-shay-drup's *Condensed Essence of All Tenets*. A medium length *Presentation of Tenets* that also treats the other schools of Tibetan Buddhism in a somewhat biased fashion was written by Jang-gya's biographer and student, who was also a student of Gon-chok-jik-may-wang-bo, Tu-gen-lo-sang-cho-gyi-nyi-ma. His text is called *Mirror of the Good Explanations Showing the Sources and Assertions of All Systems of Tenets*.

Most likely, Gon-chok-jik-may-wang-bo chose to write such a concise text so that the general outlines and basic postures of the systems of tenets could be taught and memorized without

the encumbrance of a great deal of elaboration. For similar reasons, we chose to translate and annotate Gon-chok-jik-may-wang-bo's text in Part Two of this book in order to flesh out the theoretical topics, especially on emptiness, raised in Part One. At many places its brevity makes the issues being discussed inaccessible, and, therefore, we have added commentary both in brackets within sentences and in indented material to make the text more approachable. Our additional commentary has nearly doubled the size of the text, but we have nevertheless maintained Gon-chok-jik-may-wang-bo's basic commitment to conciseness and have not sought to elaborate in detail the controversies that exist among the Tibetan monastic colleges on almost every one of these topics. We have sought to preserve the author's aim of providing an easy avenue to grasping the issues that revolve around the nature of persons and phenomena according to this system of traditional education.

L3: [Format of the text [the division according to the schools of tenets] :L3

Gon-chok-jik-may-wang-bo's text presents the principal tenets of Indian schools, both Buddhist and non-Buddhist. He treats six renowned non-Buddhist schools very briefly and gives more detail on the four Buddhist schools and their main sub-schools.

L4: [An artificial categorization into four Buddhist schools] :L4

In the order of their presentation (the list of Buddhist schools represent an ascent in order of estimation) these are:

NON-BUDDHIST SCHOOLS

- Vaisesika and Naiyayika (Particularists and Logicians)
- Samkhya (Enumerators)
- Mimamsa (Analyzers or Ritualists)
- Nirgrantha (The Unclothed, better known as Jaina)
- Charvaka (Hedonists)

FOUR BUDDHIST SCHOOLS

- Lesser Vehicle
- Great Exposition School (Vaibhasika)
- 18 sub-schools
- Sutra School (Sautrantika)
- Following Scripture (followers of Vasubandhu's own commentary on his Treasury of Manifest Knowledge)
- Following Reasoning (followers of Dignaga's Compendium of Valid Cognition (Pramanasamuchchaya) and Dharmakirti's Seven Treatises on Valid Cognition; but also asserting external objects)
- Great Vehicle
- Mind Only School (Chittamatra)
- Following Scripture (who depend on the writings primarily of Asanga and his half-brother Vasubandhu)
- Following Reasoning (who depend on what is accepted to be the main system of Dignaga's and Dharmakirti's writings)
- Middle Way School (Madhyamika)
- Autonomy School (Madhyamika-Svatantrika)
- Consequence School (Madhyamika-Prasangika)

L4: [Problems with this false categorization into four imaginary schools] :L4

The structure of four schools is itself largely an artificial creation. For instance, the so-called Great Exposition School is, in fact, a collection of at least eighteen schools that never recognized themselves as belonging to a single, over-arching school. Also, their tenets are so various (some prefiguring Great Vehicle schools) that it is extremely difficult to posit tenets common to all eighteen; thus, rather than attempting such, the Tibetan scholars who engaged in classifying systems presented representative tenets as explained in the root text of Vasubandhu's Treasury of Manifest Knowledge as if these constitute the general tenet structure of such an over-arching system, even though they are merely typical of assertions found in these eighteen sects. The pretended amalgamation into a single school is a technique used to avoid becoming bogged down in too much proliferation so that the main purpose of this genre of exegesis—the presentation of an ascent to the views of systems considered to be higher—can be effected. With respect to the Great Exposition School, therefore, it should not be thought that there is not a wide variety of opinion differing greatly from this general presentation. Strictly speaking, even the name 'Great Exposition School' should be limited to followers of the Mahavibhasha, a text of Manifest Knowledge that was never translated into Tibetan.

Also, the division of the Sutra School into those following scripture and those following reasoning is highly controversial. The former are said to be followers of Vasubandhu's own commentary on his Treasury of Manifest Knowledge, in which he indicates disagreement with many assertions of the Great Exposition School presented in his own root text. The latter—the Proponents of Sutra Following Reasoning—are said to be followers of Dignaga and Dharmakirti who (despite Dignaga's and Dharmakirti's not having asserted external objects) assert external objects—objects that are different entities from the consciousnesses perceiving them. Again, neither of these groups saw themselves as sub-divisions of a larger school called the Sutra School.

Similarly, the two sub-divisions of the Mind Only School are those following scripture—who depend on the writings primarily of Asanga and his half-brother Vasubandhu (after the latter converted to Asanga's system)—and those following reasoning—who depend on what is accepted to be the main system of Dignaga's and Dharmakirti's writings. Again, it is unlikely that these two groups perceived themselves as being subschools of a larger school. Rather, the groupings are made by way of similarities between their systems and within a wish to keep to an accepted dictum that there are only four schools of tenets.

Also, the names of the two sub-divisions of the Middle Way School—the Autonomy School and the Consequence School—were, as is clearly admitted by Tsong Khapa and his followers, never used in India. Rather, these names were coined in Tibet in accordance with terms used by Chandrakirti in his writings.

Thus, the very format of the four schools and their sub-divisions does not represent an historical account of self-asserted identities but is the result of centuries of classification of systems in India and Tibet in order to get a handle on the vast scope of positions found in Indian Buddhism.¹

// [Note: 1 For discussion of the divisions of the Middle Way School, see Peter della Santina, *Madhyamaka Schools in India* (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1986).]

(Added note: The classifications are largely (not entirely by any means) Tibetan ways of organizing the varied teachings. For instance, Tibetans use the term *Vaibhasika* to refer to the original 18 schools which include Theravada. In reality the 18 schools often had very

distinctive ideas and did not consider themselves as one. It should be pointed out that the Abhidharma teachings in Theravada are quite a bit different than those in the Abhidharmakosa. The term Vaibhasika as used by Vasubandhu is restricted to one of the 18 schools which existed in Kashmir and produced a work called the Mahavibhasa (Great Commentary). This work exists now in Chinese but was never translated into Tibetan. – From: Todd Fenner)

L4: [How they are presented in Tibet] :L4

Given this situation, the format of four schools should be used as a horizon that opens a way to appreciate the plethora of opinions, not as one that closes and rigidifies investigation. In Tibet, students are taught this four-fold classification first, without mention of the diversity of opinion that it does not include, but then over decades of study the structure of such presentations of schools of thought is gradually recognized by many students as a technique for gaining access to a vast store of opinion, a way to focus on topics crucial to authors within Indian Buddhism. The task of then distinguishing between what is clearly said in the Indian texts and what is interpretation and interpolation over centuries of Tibetan commentary becomes a fascinating enterprise for the more hardy among Tibetan scholars. The devotion to debate as the primary mode of education provides an ever-present avenue for students to challenge home-grown interpretations and affords a richness of critical commentary within the tradition that a short presentation of tenets does not convey.

L3: [Topics] :L3

L4: [The four major topics used in the analysis of the four schools: definition, sub-schools, etymology, tenets] :L4

In Gon-chok-jik-may-wang-bo's text, each Buddhist school is treated under four major topics, the last having numerous subdivisions:

- 1 Definition
- 2 Sub-schools
- 3 Etymology
- 4 Assertions of tenets
 - Assertions on the basis
 - Objects: the two truths, ...
 - Object-possessors (i.e., subjects – what is a person)
 - Persons
 - Consciousnesses
 - Terms
 - Assertions on the paths
 - Objects of observation of the paths (the main objects of meditation)
 - Objects abandoned by the paths (the main misconceptions that are abandoned through such meditation)
 - Nature of the paths (the lay-out of the paths)
 - Assertions on the fruits of the paths

First, a reader is given, for general orientation, a definition of the school, its sub-schools, and an etymology of its name. Then, the tenets of the school are introduced.

The topics considered under the heading of 'assertions of tenets' reveal the liberative orientation of the inquiry. The assertions are divided into three categories—presentations

of the basis, the paths, and the fruits of the path.

The presentation of the basis refers to assertions on classes of phenomena, which provide the basis for practicing the spiritual paths, which, in turn, produce attainments, the fruits of the path. It is clear from this order that the reason for learning philosophical positions on phenomena is to be able to practice a path in order to transform the mind from being mired in a condition of suffering to being enlightened into a state of freedom from suffering.

L4: [The reason for those four major topics – an analysis based on the Prasangika's frame of reference / point of view] :L4

The general structure of basis, paths, and fruits probably takes its lead from the emphasis in texts of the Middle Way School on three coordinated sets of twos:

- the two truths—conventional and ultimate—which are the basis
- the two practices—method and wisdom—which are the paths
- the Two Buddha Bodies—Form Bodies and Truth Body—which are the final fruits of the path.

According to the Great Vehicle,

-- taking as one's basis conventional truths, one practices the paths of method— love, compassion, and the altruistic intention to become enlightened as well the compassionate deeds that these induce—in dependence upon which one achieves the fruit of the Form Bodies of a Buddha.

-- Also, taking as one's basis ultimate truths, one practices the paths of wisdom—especially the realization of the final status of persons and phenomena, their emptiness of inherent existence—in dependence upon which one achieves the fruit of a Truth Body of a Buddha.

This threefold format of basis, path, and fruit that finds its main expression in the Great Vehicle seems to have supplied the structure for the genre of presentations of tenets for both the Lesser Vehicle¹ and the Great Vehicle.

// [Note: 1 The term 'Lesser Vehicle' (theg dman, hinayana) has its origin in the writings of Great Vehicle (theg chen, mahayana) authors and was, of course, not used by those to whom it was ascribed. Substitutes such as 'non-Mahayana', 'Nikaya Buddhism', and Theravadayana' have been suggested in order to avoid the pejorative sense of 'Lesser'. However, 'Lesser Vehicle' is a convenient term in this particular context for a type of tenet system or practice that is seen, in the tradition which provides the perspective of this book, to be surpassed—but not negated—by a higher system. The 'Lesser Vehicle' is not despised, most of it being incorporated into the 'Great Vehicle'. The monks' and nuns' vows are Lesser Vehicle as is much of the course of study in Gelugpa monastic universities— years of study are put into the topics of Epistemology (tshad ma, •prama.no), Manifest Knowledge (chos mngon pa, abhidharma), and Discipline ('dul ba, vinaya), all of which are mostly Lesser Vehicle in perspective. ('Lesser Vehicle' and 'Low Vehicle' are used interchangeably in this book.)]

Also, within the section on the basis, the emphasis on the two truths in all four schools derives from the fact that the two truths are a prime subject in the tenets of the highest school, the Middle Way School. As the great scholar Gung-tang Gon-chok-den-bay-dron-may,² who was the chief student of Gon-chok-jik-may-wang-bo, the author of our text, says,³

- the prime way that the Great Exposition School and the Sutra School delineate the meaning of the scriptures is by way of the four noble truths,
- whereas such is done by way of the three natures in the Mind Only School

-- and by way of the two truths in the Middle Way School.

Thus, the emphasis given in this presentation of tenets to the four schools' delineations of the two truths derives from the system that the author and his tradition have determined to be the highest, the Middle Way School. This is not to say that the two truths are not important topics in all four schools, for they are; rather, the two truths are not the central topic in the other schools in the way that they are in the Middle Way School.

// [Note: 2 gung thong dkon mchog bstan pa'i sgron me, 1762-1823. He wrote two biographies of Gon-chok-jik-may-wang-bo that are included in the latter's Collected Works (see the first volume).]

// [Note: 3 Beginnings of a Commentary on the Difficult Points of (Tsong Khapa's) 'Differentiation of the Interpretable and the Definitive', the Quintessence of the 'Essence of the Good Explanations' (drang nges rnam 'byed kyi dga' 'grel rtsom 'phro legs bshad snying po'i yang snying), (Sarnath: Guru Deva, 1965), 80.6-80.12 and 235.9ff.]

L4: [About] Object-Possessors.] :L4

Having presented a school's assertions on objects, the text considers object-possessors, or subjects. Simply because, in general, subjects are themselves also objects, they are a sub-class of objects, but they are treated as a distinct category within a division of objects into objects and object-possessors.

Object-possessors are treated as being of three types—

- persons (since they possess objects),
- consciousnesses (since they are aware of objects),
- and terms (since they refer to objects).

One might wonder why there is a presentation of assertions on persons if Buddhist schools advocate a view of selflessness. In this Tibetan delineation of Indian schools of Buddhism, the term 'self' in 'selflessness' refers not to persons but to an over-reified status of phenomena, be these persons or other phenomena. Consequently, even though it is said that in general 'self', 'person', and 'I' are co-extensive, in the particular context of the selflessness of persons, 'self' and 'person' are not at all co-extensive and do not at all have the same meaning. In the term 'selflessness of persons', 'self' refers to a falsely imagined status that needs to be refuted, and 'persons' refers to existent beings who are the basis with respect to which that refutation is made. All of these schools, therefore, are said to posit persons as existent phenomena, not just creations of ignorance.

L5: [What is a person according to the four schools] :L5

A question between the schools is just what a person is. According to Gon-chok-jik-may-wang-bo and his Gelugpa predecessors,

- all schools except the Middle Way Consequence School posit something from within the bases of designation of a person as being the person.
- In contrast, the Consequence School holds that even though a person is designated in dependence upon mind and body, the person is neither mind nor body, being just the I that is designated in dependence upon mind and body. (i.e. According to the consequentialists, the self is not the body, not the mind, not both, not neither. That is the Tetralemma.)

Following the lead of Chandrakirti, recognized by most as the founder of the Consequence School, Gon-chok-jik-may-wang-bo identifies, within all of the other schools, assertions

that some factor among the five aggregates of forms, feelings, discriminations, compositional factors, and consciousnesses is the person when sought analytically.

-- The Proponents of the Great Exposition, in general, are said to hold that the mere collection of the mental and physical aggregates is the person, whereas some of the five Sammitiya subschools are said to maintain that all five aggregates are the person—Gon-chok-jik-may-wang-bo's suggestion being that, for them, each of the five aggregates is the person (although the absurdity of one person being five persons would seem difficult not to notice). Another subschool, the Avantaka, is said to assert that the mind alone is the person.

-- Similarly, in the Sutra School, the Followers of Scripture are said to assert that the continuum of the aggregates is the person, whereas the Followers of Reasoning are said to maintain that the mental consciousness is the person.

-- In the Mind Only School, the Followers of Scripture hold that the mind-basis-of-all is the person, whereas the Followers of Reasoning assert that the mental consciousness is.

-- Again, in the Autonomy School, both Yogic Autonomists and Sutra Autonomists are said to assert that a subtle, neutral mental consciousness is the person that is found upon searching for it among its bases of designation.

L5: [Problems with this over-simplification] :L5

For the most part, Gon-chok-jik-may-wang-bo's delineation of what from among the person's bases of designation these schools assert to be the person is a matter of conjecture and not a reporting of forthright statements of such in these schools' own texts. Though it is clear that most of these schools (if not all) accept that persons exist, it is by no means clear in their own literature that they assert that something from within the five aggregates that are the bases of designation of a person is the person. Rather, it would seem that, as presented in the ninth chapter of Vasubandhu's Treasury of Manifest Knowledge, persons are merely asserted to be non-associated compositional factors and thus an instance of the fourth aggregate, compositional factors, without a specific identification of any of the five aggregates that are a person's bases of designation as being the person. For instance, one could quite safely say that there is not a single line in the whole of Indian Mind Only literature that explicitly presents an assertion that the mind-basis-of-all is the person that is found when sought analytically. Rather, such an assertion is deduced from the fact that the Mind Only School Following Scripture (that is to say, the followers of Asanga) asserts that the mind-basis-of-all travels from lifetime to lifetime carrying with it the karmic predispositions established by earlier actions. Bhavaviveka, on the other hand, seems openly to assert that the mental consciousness is the person, when, in response to a challenge, he says that if the opponent is attempting to establish for him that consciousness is the person, he is proving what is already established for him.² In any case, the emphasis put in Gelugpa treatises on identifying for each of these schools what, from among the five aggregates that are the basis of the designation of a person, is the person comes from their acceptance of Chandrakirti's claim to a unique assertion that nothing from among them is the person.

// [Note: 2 See Jeffrey Hopkins, Meditation on Emptiness, pp. 695-696.]

Thus, it can be seen that the very structure (basis, paths, and fruits) and the choice of topics (such as the two truths and assertions on the person) do not altogether arise from prime concerns within a particular school but are brought over from focal issues in other schools, particularly those considered to be higher. That topics of prime concern in the 'higher' schools dominate to some extent the presentation of the tenets of all four schools

is natural, given that the main aim is to draw readers into realizing the impact of the views of the 'higher' systems and is not to give isolated presentations of these schools' views or a predominantly historical account.

L4: [About] Consciousnesses.] :L4

The main focus of the tenets concerning consciousness is to identify the range of types of minds in terms of misapprehension and correct apprehension. The purpose is to provide a psychological structure for the therapeutic paths that cause a person to proceed gradually from misconceived notions about the nature of persons and other phenomena to states of mind that can counteract innate misconceptions. The liberative directionality of the over-all enterprise informs the course of the discussion, the main interest being to separate correctly perceiving from improperly perceiving consciousnesses and to identify the difference between conceptual and non-conceptual consciousnesses, the latter, when they realize selflessness, being more powerful for overcoming obstructions to liberation and to full enlightenment.

The topics of consciousness are presented in their richest detail in the chapter on the Sutra School, specifically the Sutra School Following Reasoning; correspondingly, the topic of terms is discussed most fully in the chapter on the Great Exposition School. Thus, in many respects the book is to be read cumulatively, bringing over to another system those assertions that, although they come from a different system, are concordant with its outlook. The book does not always make clear what is to be carried over and what is not; such information is, however, supplied by the oral tradition through a competent teacher.

L4: [About] Paths.] :L4

Having presented a general outline of phenomena, the basis, Gon-chok-jik-may-wang-bo presents the various schools' tenets on the spiritual paths founded on their respective assertions on the basis.

The paths are described in terms of

- the main objects of meditation,
- the main misconceptions that are abandoned through such meditation, and
- the lay-out of the paths.

In all four schools, paths are presented for Hearers, Solitary Realizers, and Bodhisattvas. It might seem, at first reading, to be surprising that even the Lesser Vehicle schools—the Great Exposition and Sutra Schools— have presentations of paths for Bodhisattvas, since Bodhisattvas are associated primarily with the Great Vehicle; however, a distinction is made between philosophical schools which are divided into Lesser Vehicle and Great Vehicle and practitioners of paths which also are divided into Lesser Vehicle and Great Vehicle. The philosophical schools are divided in this way in accordance with whether they present a selflessness of phenomena (Great Vehicle) or whether they do not (Lesser Vehicle).

-- Since the Great Vehicle tenets systems—the Mind Only and Middle Way Schools—present a selflessness of phenomena in addition to a selflessness of persons, they also speak of 'obstructions to omniscience', these being what prevent simultaneous and direct cognition of all phenomena as well as their final nature.

-- The Lesser Vehicle schools, on the other hand, do not make such a presentation even though they present Buddhahood as having an all-knowingness through which a Buddha can serially know anything, but not simultaneously.¹

// [Note: 1 As is reported in Jam-yang-shay-ba's Great Exposition of Tenets (kha 7b.2), one of the eighteen subschools of the Great Exposition School, the One Convention School (tha snyad gcig pa, ekavyavaharika), uses the convention of one instant of a Buddha's wisdom realizing all phenomena. Jam-yang-shay-ba says that they employ this convention for a Buddha's one mind realizing all phenomena; he thereby suggests that this school did not actually hold that that a Buddha has such simultaneous knowledge. Jam-yang-shay-ba may be explaining away a discrepancy in a system that emerged for the sake of easy classification.]

Even though the Lesser Vehicle schools—the Great Exposition and Sutra Schools—do not present a path leading to simultaneous and direct knowledge of all phenomena, they present the path of a Bodhisattva proceeding to Buddhahood when they relate how Shakyamuni Buddha, for instance, became enlightened.

Similarly, the Great Vehicle schools—the Mind Only and Middle Way Schools—speak, not just about how Bodhisattvas proceed on the path but also about how Hearers and Solitary Realizers, who are Lesser Vehicle practitioners, proceed on the path. In the latter case, the Great Vehicle schools are not reporting how the Lesser Vehicle schools present the path but how the Great Vehicle schools themselves present the path for those beings—Hearers and Solitary Realizers—whose prime motivation, unlike that of Bodhisattvas, is, for the time being, not the welfare of others but their own liberation from cyclic existence. Therefore, it is said to be possible for someone who is, for instance, a Middle Way Consequentialist by tenet system to be a Lesser Vehicle practitioner by motivation, in that the person has decided for the time being to pursue his or her own liberation first before becoming primarily dedicated to the welfare of others. Also, it is possible for someone who is, for instance, a Proponent of the Great Exposition to be a Great Vehicle practitioner in terms of motivation, having become dedicated to achieving the enlightenment of a Buddha in order to be of service to all beings.

L4: [About] Fruits of the Paths.] :L4

The three types of paths— Hearer, Solitary Realizer, and Bodhisattva—have different results or fruits. The first two reach fruition in liberation from cyclic existence, whereas the last reaches fruition in Buddhahood, a state free from both the obstructions to liberation from cyclic existence and from the obstructions to the all-knowingness of a Buddha, as described in the respective systems.

The map that a student gains through such a presentation ranging from the phenomena of the world through to the types of enlightenment provides a framework both for study and for practice. The world-view that emerges is of individuals bound by misconception in a round of suffering and mired in afflictive emotions counter-productive to their own welfare but also poised on a threshold of transformation. The uncontrolled course of cyclic existence is viewed as lacking a solid underpinning such that it is ready to be transformed into a patterned advance toward liberation. The starkness of the harrowing appraisal of the current situation of multi-layered pain stands in marked contrast to the optimistic view of the development that is possible. Such optimism stems from a perception that the afflictive emotions and obstructions that are the cause of misery are not endemic to the mind, but are peripheral to its nature and thus subject to antidotal influences that can remove them. The text is founded on a confidence in the mind's ability to overcome tremendous obstacles to the point where love, compassion, and altruism can be expressed in effective, continuous activity, and, therefore, it does more than just to structure Indian Buddhist systems; it structures practitioners' perception of their place in a dynamic world-view.

L3: [About the author [a simplifier of the teachings] :L3

As mentioned earlier, the author of this presentation of tenets was recognized as the incarnation of Jam-yang-shay-bay-dor-jay Ngak-wang-dzon-dru (1648-1721) and thus is known as the second Jam-yang-shay-ba. His full name, as given in the table of contents of his Collected Works,¹ is Jam-yang-shay-ba-Gon-chok-jik-may-wang-bo-ye-shay-dzon-dru, but he is better known as Gon-chok-jik-may-wang-bo. He was born in 1728 in the Amdo Province of Tibet at Nang-ra-ser-kang³ near the birthplace of Tsong Khapa, the founder of his sect, Gelugpa.

// [Note: 1 Lokesh Chandra, ed., Materials for a History of Tibetan Literature. sata-pitaka series, vol. 28-30 (New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture, 1963), Part One, p. 207.]

// [Note: 3 snang ra gser khang. This information as well as the thirteen divisions of his biography is drawn from E. Gene Smith's preface to the first volume of Gon-chok-jik-may-wang-bo's Collected Works (New Delhi: Ngawang Gelek Demo, 1971).]

The first Jam-yang-shay-ba had returned to Am-do from Central Tibet in 1707 at age fifty-nine and founded a monastic university to the southeast of Gum-bum, the monastic university built in 1588 at the site of Tsong Khapa's birthplace. Jam-yang-shay-ba's new institution was called Drashikyil (Auspicious Circle),⁴ and his reincarnation, Gon-chok-jik-may-wang-bo, became the presiding lama of that monastery. The latter's biography, written by his chief student Gung-tang Gon-chok-den-bay-dron-may,¹ is divided into thirteen parts:

- birth: 1728.
- childhood: 1728-1732.
- first vows: 1733-1741.
- installation on Jam-yang-shay-ba's throne at Drashikyil Monastic University: 1742-1744.
- studies in eastern Tibet and final ordination: 1744-1752.
- studies in Central Tibet at Gomang College of Drebung Monastic University: 1752-1759.
- teaching in the monasteries of Am-do Province: 1759-69.
- visit to China: 1769-1772.
- travels in Eastern Tibet to propagate the Buddha's teaching: 1771-1784.
- mission to Central Tibet: 1784-1786.
- return from Central Tibet to Am-do Province and his contributions to the Buddha-Doctrine in summary form: 1786-1791.
- death and funeral monuments: 1791.
- reincarnation and recognition: 1792-1798.

// [Note: 4 bkra shis 'khyil. According to Geshe Thupten Gyatso of the Tibetan Buddhist Learning Center in New Jersey, the monastery was named after the place, which, in turn, was named after a spring in the area that had this name.]

// [Note: 1 gung thang dkon mchog bstan pa'i sgron me, 1762-1823. This long biography is found in Gon-chok-jik-may-wang-bo's Collected Works, Volume One. It is followed by a short verse biography by the same author. The two together fill the entire volume. See also Khetsun Sangpo, Biographical Dictionary of Tibet and Tibetan Buddhism (Dharamsala: Library of Tibetan Works and Archives, 1973), vol. V, pp.661-676. For other references and a two-page biography, see Katsumi Mimaki, Le Grub mtha' rnam bzag rin chen phren ba de dKon mchog 'jigs med dban po (1728-1791), Zinbun, number 14 (The Research Institute for Humanistic Studies, Kyoto University), p. 56, and A.I. Vostrikov, Tibetan Historical

Literature, Soviet Indology Series No. 4 (tr. H.C. Gupta), (Calcutta: 1970), p. 90 n. 294.]

J.F. Rock gives a brief biographical sketch from Chinese sources:²

~ [The Emperor] Ch'ien-lung conferred on him the title Fu-fa Ch'an-shih Hu-t'u-k'u-t'u. He was born of an illustrious family in the Lang-jan village in the district of Jih-kung of the present T'ung-jen hsien of Ch'ing-hai [i.e., Am-do] Province. When he came to head the lamasery the latter began to prosper. He set up various regulations and institutions and the buildings were perfected. The relation between the lamasery and the population surrounding it was adjusted once for all. He visited Peking and Lhasa twice. He had political talent and was a diplomat. He had two brothers; one was loyal and brave, the other had the gift of eloquence; he depended on them and trusted them as his left and right hand, and they in turn helped him much. He was the author of eleven works [or, more accurately, seventy-eight works in eleven volumes]. Of him there is also a biography. He lived to reach sixty-four years.

// [Note: 2 The Amney Ma-chhen Ftenge and Adjacent Regions (Rome: 1956), p. 41, as cited in Lokesh Chandra, ed., Materials for a History of Tibetan]

Gon-chok-jik-may-wang-bo was the chief student of the Mongolian scholar Jang-gya Rol-bay-dor-jay who, residing in Beijing for most of his life, became the lama of the Ch'ien-lung Emperor—the latter being Jang-gya's classmate and friend during childhood in Beijing. Jang-gya conducted Gon-chok-jik-may-wang-bo's ceremony for full ordination in 1749, and Gon-chok-jik-may-wang-bo visited Beijing twice, receiving final ordination and teachings from Jang-gya Rol-bay-dor-jay, whose high connections undoubtedly strengthened his student's effectiveness at Drashikyil Monastic University. Among the eleven volumes of Gon-chok-jik-may-wang-bo's Collected Works, the first five and last two are mostly biographies—the two mentioned above of himself by Gung-tang Gon-chok-den-bay-dron-may, two more esoteric biographies of himself by another of his students, two biographies of Jam-yang-shay-ba, brief biographies of the former incarnations of Jang-gya Rol-bay-dor-jay, a biography of the Reincarnate Drak-yap Chung-tsang Gel-sang-tup-den-wang-chuk, a biography of Long-dol La-ma Ngak-wang-lo-sang, a history of the Gum-bum Monastery, a two-volume biography of the Third Panchen Lama Lo-sang-bel-den-ye-shay, an historical account of the Jo-nay Translation of the Treatises⁵ beginning with Shakyamuni Buddha's appearance in the world and including presentations of the spread of Buddhism in India, Shambhala, China, Khotan, and Mongolia as well as an account of the House of Jo-nay, an unfinished history of the Gelugpa sect, and an unfinished biography of Tsong Khapa's student Kay-drup Ge-lek-bel-sang.

Gon-chok-jik-may-wang-bo's philosophical works begin with volume six; first is a condensation of his predecessor's long treatise on Chandrakirti's Supplement to Nagarjuna's 'Treatise on the Middle', which, despite being a condensation, is still lengthy (242 folios). Next is the brief work on tenets translated here; written in 1773, it is in the same general genre as Jam-yang-shay-ba's Great Exposition of Tenets, but it cannot be considered a condensation of the latter; rather, it belongs to a subgenre of short presentations of tenets for the sake of initial study. As will be pointed out in notes to the translation, Gon-chok-jik-may-wang-bo evinces an independence of spirit, sometimes following neither his previous incarnation, Jam-yang-shay-ba, nor his teacher, Jang-gya Rol-bay-dor-jay.

// [Note: 5 Literature, Part One, p. 49. We have added the bracketed material.]

Other philosophical works include condensations of Jam-yang-shay-ba's texts on the four

concentrations and four formless absorptions, on Maitreya's Ornament for Clear Realization, and on Vasubandhu's Treasury of Manifest Knowledge. In addition to a commentary on Aryashura's Jatakamala, Gon-chok-jik-may-wang-bo also authored several works on tantric topics, etc.

The general tenor of Gon-chok-jik-may-wang-bo's works is one of simplification, providing access to a body of material, established by his predecessor, Jam-yang-shay-ba, that many have found inaccessible due to complicated detail and meticulous citation of sources. Just as these qualities of his predecessor's works make them valuable tools for scholars with the time to pursue such elaboration of detail, Gon-chok-jik-may-wang-bo's works provide a more approachable avenue to gaining a broad picture which can then be filled in with details from other sources.

L3: [About the editions of the text used] :L3

SEVEN EDITIONS OF GON-CHOK-JIK-MAY-WANG-BO'S PRESENTATION OF TENETS, A PRECIOUS GARLAND were used in making this translation:

-- A block-print edition from La-brang in twenty-six folios reproduced by photo-offset in The Collected Works of dkon-mchog-'jigs-med-dban-po, Vol. 6, (New Delhi: Ngawang Gelek Demo, 1972), pp. 485-535. This is referred to as 'Collected Works'. It is a photographic reproduction of the Drashikyil Monastic University xylographic prints, which were provided to Ngawang Gelek Demo by Ven. Kushok Bakula, member of parliament from Ladakh. It is possible that this edition represents the original edition in the author's Collected Works.

-- A block-print edition in thirty-two folios from the Lessing collection of the rare book section of the University of Wisconsin Library which is item 47 in Leonard Zwilling, Tibetan Blockprints in the Department of Rare Books and Special Collections (Madison; the University of Wisconsin-Madison Libraries, 1984). This is a Peking edition, item number 96 in the Catalogue of the University of Tokyo. The colophon indicates that the publication was put together by A-gya Ho-tok-tu upon requests from members of the College of Philosophy of Yong-gon. It is referred to as the 'Peking edition'. The text has Chinese in the right margins and has an extra colophon.

-- A fixed type edition in seventy-six pages printed in pamphlet form in South India (Mundgod: Lo-sel-ling Press, 1980. This is referred to as the 'Gomang 1980 edition'. It was carefully prepared from three editions in response to two error-laden editions made in India (the next two items).

-- A fixed type edition in seventy-eight pages prepared in pamphlet form in India that attempted to improve on Gon-chok-jik-may-wang-bo's text without attribution of the changes (Dharamsala: Shes rig par khang, 1967). This is referred to as the 'Dharamsala 1967 edition'. Its successful and unsuccessful imaginative attempts to improve on the edition given in item 5 (most likely without the assistance of any other edition) are cited in the notes to the translation.

-- A photo-offset edition of a hand-written copy of seventy-nine pages reproduced in India in pamphlet form for use in teacher training (Dharamsala: Teaching Training, no date). This is referred to as the 'Teacher Training edition'; it was most likely printed in the early 1960's. It suffers greatly from miscopying but undoubtedly was useful to the refugee community during the early period after the escape to India in 1959.

-- A block-print edition in twenty-eight folios obtained in 1987 from Gomang College on the outskirts of Hla-sa, printed on blocks that most likely pre-date the Cultural Revolution. It may be the Central Tibetan edition mentioned as one of the three from which item three was made, but the colophon is the same as item 1. It is referred to as the 'Tibet Gomang 1987 edition'.

-- A critical edition by Katsumi Mimaki, *Le Grub mtha' rnam bzag rin chen phren ba de dkon mchog 'jigs med dban po* (1728-1791), *Zinbun*, number 14 (The Research Institute for Humanistic Studies, Kyoto University), pp. 55-112. This is referred to as the 'Mimaki edition'.¹

// [Note: 1 Mimaki used eight editions, as listed on p. 60 of his edition; of these, four are found among our seven; the Collected Works edition (item 1) is the first in his list, the Peking edition (item 2) is the third in his list, the Dharamsala 1967 edition (item 4) is the fifth in his list, and the Teacher Training edition (item 5) is the sixth in his list. Mimaki's seventh text is an almost identical reprint of his sixth. Mimaki's edition is excellent even though he has given too much prominence to the Dharamsala 1967 edition (item 4) which contains within it many accretions that are clearly intended to improve the text but are not founded on any edition.]

Given the difficulties with the fourth and fifth editions, the translation mainly follows the texts of the other five editions, with the Collected Works edition and the Peking edition (i.e., the xylograph from the Lessing Collection at the University of Wisconsin), being the basis. Significant variations in readings of all seven editions are cited in the notes, as are significant emendations to the first three editions.

L1: [Annotated translation of Gon-chok-jik-may-wang-bo's Precious Garland of Tenets] :L1

L2: [Guide to the text] :L2

-- PROLOGUE - Our Own and Others' Presentations of Tenets

-- CHAPTER 1: Tenets in General

A. NON-BUDDHIST SCHOOLS [see other file]

-- CHAPTER 2: Short Explanation of Non-Buddhist Tenets

---- ETERNALISTS (adhering to a view of a permanent self, generally different than the five aggregates, and than God)

----- VAISESIKA [Particularists]

----- NAIYAYIKA [Logicians]

----- SAMKHYA [Enumerators] [Yoga]

----- MIMAMSAKA [Analyzers or Ritualists] [Vedanta] [Hinduism]

----- NIRGRANTHA [Jainas]

---- NIHILISTS (adhering to a view of no self at all, no karma, no rebirth, no causality, no God)

----- LOKAYATA [Charvaka, Hedonists]

---- [Refutation of the non-buddhist views – pointers to other texts]

B. BUDDHIST SCHOOLS

-- CHAPTER 3: General Exposition of Buddhist Tenets

---- The turning of the Three Wheels and the various Buddhist schools

---- How each school pretends to avoid the two extremes of existence (eternalism) and non-existence (nihilism)

---- Definition of a proponent of Buddhist tenets, and the four seals: all Buddhist systems—Vaibhashika, Sautrantika, Chittamatra, and Madhyamika—propound the four seals. But each of the Buddhist schools has its own particular interpretation of these four.

B.1 – HINAYANA (lesser vehicle)

-- CHAPTER 4: THE GREAT EXPOSITION SCHOOL – Vaibhashika

---- Definition: Person propounding Lesser Vehicle tenets who does not accept self-cognizing consciousness and who asserts external objects as being truly established. – Abhidharmists.

---- Subschoools

---- Etymology

---- Assertions of Tenets

----- Assertions on the Basis (REALISTS)

----- assertions regarding objects : the two truths; the contaminated and uncontaminated; other ancillary topics

----- assertions regarding object-possessors: persons; consciousnesses; terms: assert an inexpressible person

----- Assertions on the Paths

----- objects of observation of the paths

----- objects abandoned by the paths

----- nature of the paths

----- Assertions on the Fruits of the Paths

-- CHAPTER 5: THE SUTRA SCHOOL – Sautrantika

---- Definition: Person propounding Lesser Vehicle tenets who asserts the true existence of both external objects and self-cognizing consciousness.

---- Subschoools

---- Etymology

---- Assertions of Tenets

----- Assertions on the Basis (DUALISTS)

----- assertions regarding objects: the two truths, specifically and generally characterized objects, negative and positive phenomena, manifest and hidden phenomena, the three times, the single and the different

----- assertions regarding object-possessors: persons, consciousnesses, terms

----- Assertions on the Paths

----- objects of observation of the paths

----- objects abandoned by the paths

----- nature of the paths

----- Assertions on the Fruits of the Paths

B.2 – MAHAYANA (great vehicle)

-- THE MIND ONLY SCHOOL – Chittamatra / Yogacara CHAPTER SIX

---- Definition: Person propounding Buddhist tenets who asserts the true existence of other-powered natures but does not assert external objects.

---- Subschoools

---- Etymology

---- Assertions of Tenets

----- Assertions on the Basis (IDEALISTS)

----- assertions regarding objects

----- assertions regarding object-possessors

----- Assertions on the Paths
----- objects of observation of the paths
----- objects abandoned by the paths
----- nature of the paths
----- Assertions on the Fruits of the Paths

-- THE MIDDLE WAY SCHOOL – Madhyamika CHAPTER SEVEN

---- Definition: Person propounding Buddhist tenets who asserts that there are no truly existent phenomena, not even particles. (i.e. not external, not internal; not persons, not phenomena)

---- Etymologies

---- Subschoools

---- Descriptions of the Individual Subschoools:

L2: [Prologue : our own and others' presentations of tenets] :L2

[Obeisance]

~ The snowy mountain of [Buddha's] two marvellous collections of merit and wisdom was melted by the warmth of his compassion.

~ The stream gathered in a circle on the earth of the spontaneous Truth Body and split into the rivers of the four schools of tenets.

~ The successive waves of his deeds extended into space, and the childlike Forders were frightened.

~ May the chief of Subduers, the great lake Manasarowar, the harbor of millions of Conqueror Children who are hooded dragons, prevail.

~ Obeisance to the regent of the Conqueror, the undaunted protector,¹

~ To the union of all the wisdom of the Conquerors, Manjughosha,²

~ To the honorable Nagarjuna and Asanga who were prophesied by the Conqueror,

~ And to the second Conqueror, Tsong Khapa³ and his spiritual sons, Gyel-tsap and Kay-drup.⁴

// [Note: 1 Maitreya is the Buddha of the next era and thus the 'regent' of the 'Conqueror', or Buddha, of this era, Shakyamuni Buddha. Though many persons can achieve Buddhahood during any particular era, only one Buddha appears within the context of displaying the twelve deeds of a Buddha.]

// [Note: 2 Also known as Manjushri.]

// [Note: 3 tsong kha pa bio bzang grags pa, 1357-1419. For a short biography, see the Life and Teachings of Tsong Khapa, edited by Robert A. F. Thurman (Dharamsala: Library of Tibetan Works and Archives, 1982), pp. 4-39.]

// [Note: 4 Gyel-tsap-dar-ma-rin-chen (rgyal tshab dar ma rin chen, 1364-1432) and Kay-drup-gay-lek-bel-sang (mkhas grub dge legs dpal bzang, 1385-1438). For a short biography of the latter, see the introduction to Tenzin Gyatso and Jeffrey Hopkins, The Kalachakra Tantra: Rite of Initiation for the Stage of Generation (London: Wisdom Publications, 1985), pp. 139-145.]

[Promise of Composition and Exhortation to Listen]

- ~ If a presentation of tenets is understood, one sees all the different attributes of the outer [i.e., non-Buddhist] and inner [i.e., Buddhist] teachings
- ~ And takes on the aspect of the best of propounders among countless scholars.
- ~ What wise person would cast aside the effort to differentiate the principles of our own and others' tenets,
- ~ A white banner, known to be marvellous, raised by an unbiased being!⁵
- ~ Therefore, condensing all the good explanations of excellent beings,
- ~ I will briefly put forth a presentation of tenets
- ~ In order to provide for those whose lot is similar to mine.¹
- ~ Those who seek clear understanding should listen respectfully.

// [Note: 5 The unbiased being is the author himself, Gon-chok-jik-may-wang-bo.]

// [Note: 1 The author humbly implies that those wiser than he is would not need such a book.]

Moreover, persons who are not looking for material goods and respect in this life, nor for poetry, but who seek liberation from the depths of their hearts must work at the means of understanding the correct view of selflessness. For, no matter how much you have internalized love, compassion, and the altruistic aspiration to enlightenment, if you are without THE PROFOUND VIEW OF SELFLESSNESS, you are unable to remove the root of suffering.

~ Love is the wish that all sentient beings be joined with happiness. Compassion is the wish that all sentient beings be separated from suffering. The altruistic aspiration to enlightenment is the wish to attain Buddhahood in order to help all sentient beings. In order to carry out these three wishes, one must overcome the cause of suffering which is the ignorance that misconceives the nature of persons and of other phenomena.

The foremost venerable great Tsong Khapa says [in his Three Principal Aspects of the Path]:²

9.

If you do not have the wisdom realizing the way things are,
Even though you have developed the thought definitely to leave cyclic existence
As well as the altruistic intention, the root of cyclic existence cannot be cut.
Therefore work at the means of realizing dependent-arising.

// [Note: 2 lam gtso rnam gsum. This text forms the basis of the first part of this book.]

Hence, in order to remove faulty views and to delineate the gradation of coarse and subtle selflessnesses, I will give a brief explanation of our own and others' presentations of tenets.

This explanation has two parts:

- a general teaching and
- a detailed explanation.

L2: [1. Tenets in general] :L2

L3: [Our own and others' tenets in general] :L3

The expression 'tenets' (grub mtha', siddhanta) is not my own fabrication because it was mentioned in Buddha's scriptures.

The Descent into Lanka Sutra¹ says:

- ~ My doctrine has two modes,
- ~ Advice and tenets.
- ~ To children I speak advice
- ~ And to yogis, tenets.

// [Note: 1 lung kar gshegs pa, larikavatara. For an English translation of this sutra, see D.T. Suzuki, The Lankavatara Sutra (London: Routledge, 1932). A Sanskrit edition is available in Saddharmalankavatasutram, P.L.Vaidya, ed. Buddhist Sanskrit Texts No.3. (Darbhanga: Mithila Institute, 1963); also: Bunyiu Nanjio, ed. Bibl. Otaniensis, Vol.1. (Kyoto: Otani University Press, 1923).]

Further, there are two types of persons: those whose minds have not been affected by tenets and those whose minds have been affected by tenets.

-- Those whose minds have not been affected by tenets seek only the pleasures of this life with an innate awareness that, since they have never studied a systematic presentation, neither investigates nor analyses.

-- Those whose minds have been affected by tenets have studied some system such that within citing scripture and reasoning they propound a way of establishing a presentation of the three—bases, paths, and fruits—which is established for the perspective of their own understanding [though not necessarily true in fact].

Furthermore, the etymology for 'tenet' (grub mtha', siddhanta) is as follows:

-- a tenet [literally, an established conclusion] is a thesis decided upon and established in reliance upon scripture and/or reasoning and which, from the perspective of one's mind, will not be forsaken for something else.

As Dharmamitra's Clear Words, A Commentary on (Maitreya's) 'Ornament for Clear Realization' says:

~ Tenet' [established conclusion] signifies one's own established assertion within being demonstrated by reasoning and scripture. Because one will not pass beyond this assertion, it is a conclusion.

Schools of tenets are divided into two types, Outsider [non-Buddhist] and Insider [Buddhist]. There is a difference between mere Outsiders and Insiders because

-- persons who go for refuge to the Three Jewels from the depths of their hearts are Insiders,

-- and persons who go for refuge from the depths of their hearts to a god of the transient world without turning their minds toward the Three Jewels are Outsiders.

~ The Three Jewels are Buddha, the dharma or realizations of selflessness and abandonments of obstructions that protect one from suffering as well as the teachings of these, and the sangha or community of Buddha's followers. These are 'jewels' because they are precious and difficult to find. The Tibetan term literally means 'superior rarity'; the three are superior because, possessing perfect attributes, they are similar to a wish-granting jewel; they are rare because these perfect attributes are seen only by one

having a great mass of merit.

- ~ Maitreya's Sublime Continuum of the Great Vehicle explains the epithet 'jewel' thus:
- ~ Because of appearing rarely, because of being without defilement,
- ~ Because of having power, because of being ornaments of the world,
- ~ Because of being just superior, and because of being changeless,
- ~ [They are called] Superior Rarities [Jewels].

- ~ The actual objects of refuge are
- ~ -- the abandonments and realizations, specifically true cessations and true paths—the third and fourth noble truths—because these are what one practices in order to gain liberation and omniscience.
- ~ -- The teacher of refuge is Buddha,
- ~ -- and the friends helping one to refuge are the community, which here refers to at least four ordinary monks or nuns or refers to one Superior.

~ The definition of Outsiders as 'persons who go for refuge from the depths of their hearts to a god of the transient world without turning their minds toward the Three Jewels' does not seem to be adequate since Charvakas (Hedonists or Nihilists) are proponents of Outsider tenets (and hence Outsiders) but they do not necessarily go for refuge to a god of the transient world. The definition of a proponent of Outsiders' tenets given in the next chapter, however, appears to be adequate.

Also, there is a DIFFERENCE BETWEEN OUTSIDER AND INSIDER proponents of tenets because they differ from three points of view: teacher, teaching, and view.

OUR OWN BUDDHIST SCHOOLS have three distinguishing traits:

- They have a teacher who has extinguished all faults and completed all good qualities.
- Their teachings are not harmful to any sentient being.
- They assert the view that the self is empty of being permanent, unitary, and independent.

THE OTHERS' SCHOOLS possess three distinguishing traits that are the opposite of those:

- Their teachers have faults and have not completed their good qualities.
- They have teachings that harm and injure sentient beings.
- They assert the view that a permanent, unitary, independent self does exist.

¢(i.e. Since everything is relative, the first two points mean nothing.)

~ This indicates not that all the teachings of Outsiders are harmful to sentient beings, but that some teachings from each of their schools are harmful. For example, the teaching of animal sacrifice is harmful to beings, as are extreme ascetic practices. Also, the teaching of a permanent, unitary, independent self fortifies the innate sense of self that prevents liberation from cyclic existence.

~ It is questionable whether Charvakas (Hedonists or Nihilists) assert a permanent, unitary, independent self. Thus, the third qualification seems to refer not to all non-Buddhist schools but to those propounding an extreme of permanence. From the Buddhist perspective, the Charvakas propound an extreme of nihilism.

L2: [2. Short explanation of NON-BUDDHIST TENETS] :L2

The definition of a proponent of Outsiders' tenets is:

- ~ a person who is a proponent of tenets, does not go for refuge to the Three Jewels, and asserts that there is a [perfect] teacher other than the Three Jewels.
- ~ There are endless divisions of Outsiders; briefly, however, they are widely known to consist of five Schools of Philosophers—
 - ~ -- Vaishnava,
 - ~ -- Aishvara,
 - ~ -- Jaina,
 - ~ -- Kapila [Samkhya],
 - ~ -- and Barhaspatya [Charvaka].
- ~ They are also set forth as the six fundamental schools,
 - ~ -- Vaisesika,
 - ~ -- Naiyayika,
 - ~ -- Samkhya, [& Yoga]
 - ~ -- Mimamsaka, [& Vedanda & Hinduism]
 - ~ -- Nirgrantha [Jaina], and
 - ~ -- Lokayata [Charvaka]. (+ Refutation in general)

The first five of these hold views of ETERNALISM, and the last holds a view of NIHILISM.

¢(i.e. Those two extreme positions – of a permanent self, or of no self at all – is what is going to be refuted by the various reasonings of the Madhyamika. Their positions about whether the self is the same or different than the five aggregates – most Followers adopt the second position – will also be refuted. Also their positions about self-causation or other-causation, and about the existence of atoms, real characteristics or generalities, real methods, real sounds / words, real karma, ... dualism, monism, realism, idealism, nihilism ... and God. In short, the various reasonings cover them all in a more systematic way. That is what has to be realized here.)

L2: [[2.1 The eternalists: a permanent self] :L2

L3: [2.1.1 VAISESIKA [Particularists – based on the Vedas, theistic materialist; absolute atoms and characteristics as the principal causes of the world, God only indirectly; moral law of karma; reifying everything we can think of – whatever appear to the mind are different substantial entities; permanent self separate from the five aggregates that can be liberated attained by direct perception or knowledge of ultimate realities of Self and the universe (those two are different); dualism] :L3

¢(i.e. Vaisesika : Kanada. -- The Atomic School - System of particulars. Elements. Alchemy and chemistry. -- Vaisesika engages the method of nyaya or logic in a deeper analysis of the predicament of material existence by showing that the visible material forms to which we are all so attached ultimately break down into invisible atoms. – Rejected by Vedanta because: They say that atoms, therefore, are the immediate material cause of creation; their initial movement and combination into dyads is the remote material cause.

¢-- They relied too much on the reification of the atoms, characteristics and relation rules

(like universal laws).

¢-- A form of dualism: asserting that both self (individual soul and God) and substance exist. They were not materialists in the modern sense of the term, unless we are talking about some deist-materialists. A universe composed of atoms, but governed by God's will, who also make sure that there is retribution for good and bad actions (as in the law of karma). An eternal self, soul, that can be liberated. A self that is different, separate from the aggregates. Liberation is gained by doing the good things, and abandoning the bad things. Note: Things exist and have real universal characteristics; "Non-existence exist". "A sound which is a quality of space". "There is a whole that is a separate entity from the parts".)

The Vaisesikas [Particularists] and the Naiyayikas [Logicians] are followers of the sage Kanada and the Brahmana Akshipada respectively. Although these two schools differ a little in the features of some of their assertions, their general tenets do not differ.

Both the Vaisesikas and the Naiyayikas assert that all objects of knowledge [i.e., all phenomena] are included among six categories of existents.

~ These are substance, quality, activity, generality, particularity, and inherence.

~ The first category, substance, is divided into the nine types: earth, water, fire, air, space, time, direction, self, and mind.

~ The second category, quality, has twenty five types: (1) form, (2) taste, (3) smell, (4) touch, (5) sound, (6) number, (7) dimension, (8) separateness, (9) conjunction, (10) disjunction, (11) otherness, (12) non-otherness, (13) consciousness, (14) pleasure, (15) pain, (16) desire, (17) hatred, (18) effort, (19) heaviness, (20) moisture, (21) heat, (22) oiliness, (23) momentum, (24) merit, (25) demerit. A quality has four features: (1) it depends on a substance, (2) it does not possess other qualities, (3) it does not act either as a cause of inherence or as a cause of non-inherence, (4) it does not depend on a sign, that is, a quality does not depend on another quality as a proof for its existence but is a proof for the existence of a substance.

~ The third category, activity (i.e. action, karma), has five types; lifting up, putting down, contraction, extension, and going.

~ The fourth category, generality, is the common cause of designating terms and engaging the mind in a similar way with regard to a class of phenomena.

~ The fifth category, inherence, (particularity / uniqueness) is a phenomenon which is the conjunction of a base and that which is based on it; it is a different entity from both the base and that which is based on it.

~ The sixth category, inherence, is a phenomenon which is the conjunction of a base and that which is based on it; it is a different entity from both the base and that which is based on it.

~ [Note: some list a seventh one: non-existence.]

[i.e. PATH:] They assert that ablutions, initiations, fasts, sacrifice, burnt offerings, and so forth are the paths of liberation. Through having meditatively cultivated yoga in accordance with the quintessential instructions of a guru, yogis come to know the self as a factuality other than the senses and so forth and thereby see reality,¹ understanding the nature of the six categories of existents. At that time, they know the self to be an all-pervasive entity but lacking activity. They do not accumulate any virtuous or

non-virtuous actions or the predispositions those establish.² Because they do not accumulate new actions and extinguish old ones, the self separates from the body, senses, awareness, pleasure, pain, desire, hatred, and so forth, and does not assume a new body and senses. Thereby, the continuum of births is severed like a fire that has consumed its fuel. [i.e. Liberation] When the self is alone [without any of its nine qualities—desire, hatred, effort, pleasure, pain, consciousness, virtue, non-virtue, and activity]—this is said to be the attainment of liberation.

// [Note: 1 de kho na nyid, tattva; this term often is also translated as 'suchness' or 'thatness'.]

// [Note: 2 Karma (las) has the two senses of actions themselves and the predispositions that those actions establish in the mind.]

L3: [2.1.2 NAIYAYIKA [Logicians – based on the Vedas, same philosophy as the Vaisheshika; four pramanas: direct perception of particular and generalities, correct inference using logical rules and universal relationships, comparison, testimony; absolute symbols & logic because this is the will of God (again an indirect role); a permanent self separate from God, and from the five aggregates; dualism; liberation is a self liberated from the body, gained by acquiring true knowledge of the soul and of all objects of experience] :L3

¢(i.e. Nyaya : Gautama -- The School of Logic - Proof of right perception -- powerful system of logic -- Nyaya sets up the rules of philosophical debate and identifies the basic subjects under discussion: the physical world, the soul, God and liberation. – Rejected by Vedanta because: they rely on logic rather than on scriptural testimony in defending their theories. Some Vedic statements assert the oneness of the Lord and His energies and others assert the difference. The validity of both viewpoints must be accepted, understood and explained by a true Vedic philosopher. Logicians accept only the Vedic statements of difference, which is like accepting only half a hen.

¢-- They relied too much on the reification of logic.)

L3: [2.1.3 SAMKHYA [Enumerators – based on the Vedas (?), the theory part of the Yoga; materialist, atheistic (no need for a God to explain Truth and Liberation); the effect exists in its cause; a form of dualism, the separation of consciousness (individual soul) and matter (nature); the two absolute principles explaining everything; an absolute subtle primary cause for everything: the dance of prakriti and purusa; the self has to be liberated from the material world / from the illusion that it is the five aggregates] :L3

¢ (i.e. Samkhya : Kapila -- The Sankhya School - System of numbers. The materialistic school. The theory of the seven states of matter or prakriti -- analytical cosmology -- analysis of matter and spirit -- the theory of causation, the concept of prakriti (the unconscious principle) and purusa (the conscious principle), the evolution of the world, the concept of liberation, and the theory of knowledge -- Sankhya develops this analytical process further to help the soul become aloof to matter.

¢-- Atheistic, they relied too much on causality. Pushing the duality of the spirit and matter.)

The Samkhyas [Enumerators] are followers of the sage Kapila. They assert that all objects of knowledge are enumerated in twenty-five categories.³

~ According to Bhavaviveka's Blaze of Reasoning⁴ they maintain that one is liberated through understanding the ramifications of this enumeration.

// [Note: 3 Whether those Samkhyas who assert that the deity Ishvara supervises the creation assert only twenty-five objects of knowledge or whether they assert that Ishvara is a twenty-sixth is unclear.]

// [Note: 4 Blaze of Reasoning, a Commentary on the 'Heart of the Middle Way' (dbu ma'i snying po'i 'grel pa rtog ge 'bar ba, madhyamakahrdayavrttitarkajvala), as cited in Ngak-wang-bel-den's Annotations, stod 63b.3.]

The twenty-five categories are the self, principal, the great one, I-principle, five subtle objects, eleven faculties, and five elements. The five subtle objects are visible forms, sounds, odors, tastes, and tangible objects. The eleven faculties are the five mental faculties, the five action faculties, and intellectual faculty. The five mental faculties are those of the eye, ear, nose, tongue, and skin. The five action faculties are speech, arms, legs, anus, and genitalia. The five elements are earth, water, fire, wind, and space.

In chart form, the twenty-five categories are:²

- person (bdag, purusa) [or self, consciousness, conscious self, mind, sentience, knower of the field]
- fundamental nature (gtso bo, prakrti) [or nature, principal, universality, general principal]
- intellect (bio, buddhi), or great one (chen po, mahat)
- I-principle (nga rgyal, ahamkara)
- (a) I-principle dominated by motility (rajas')
- (b) I-principle dominated by darkness (tamos)
- (c) I-principle dominated by lightness (sattva)

Five subtle objects or potencies of objects which evolve from the I-principle dominated by darkness:

- visible forms (gzugs, rupa)
- sounds (sgra, sabda)
- odors (dri, gandha)
- tastes (ro, rasa)
- tangible objects (reg bya, sprastavya).

Eleven faculties which evolve from the I-principle dominated by lightness:

Five mental faculties

- eye (mig, caksus)
- ear (rna ba, srota)
- nose (sna, ghrana)
- tongue (Ice, rasand)
- body or skin (pags pa, sparsana).

Five physical faculties or action faculties

- speech (ngag, vac)
- arms (lag pa, pani)
- legs (rkang pa, pdda)
- anus (rkub, pdyu)
- genitalia (doms, upastha).

One intellectual faculty

-- Intellectual faculty (yid, manah) the nature of which is both mental and physical.

Five elements:

-- earth (sa, prthivl) which evolves from the odor potency

-- water (chu, dp) which evolves from the taste potency

-- fire (me, tejas) which evolves from the visible form potency

-- wind (rlung, vayu) which evolves from the tangible object potency

-- space (nam mkha', akasa) which evolves from the sound potency.

// [Note: 2 This list is adapted from Jeffrey Hopkins, *Meditation on Emptiness*, (London: Wisdom Publications, 1983), pp. 322-323.]

From among these twenty-five categories, the person or self is asserted to be [just] consciousness [because it is not an aggregation of particles]. The remaining twenty-four are asserted to be matter because they are aggregations [of particles]. The person and the principal [or fundamental nature] are ultimate truths [because they are non-manifest objects of knowledge]. The others are asserted to be conventional truths.

Furthermore, these twenty-five categories are included in only four types:

-- that which is a cause but not an effect;

-- that which is both a cause and an effect;

-- that which is an effect but not a cause;

-- and that which is neither a cause nor an effect.

~ 'Cause' here has the sense of a source, an evolvent, or, as it is called in the citation below, a nature. An 'effect' is a transformation, an evolute.

-- The fundamental nature is a cause but not an effect.

-- The intellect, the I-principle, and the five subtle objects are both causes and effects.

-- The remaining sixteen [the eleven faculties and the five elements] are effects but not causes.

-- The person is neither a cause nor an effect.

Moreover, this is as is explained in Ishvarakrsna's Tantra:

~ The fundamental nature is not a transformation.

~ The seven—the great one and so forth—are natures and transformations.

~ Sixteen are transformations.

~ The person is not a nature and not a transformation.

'Fundamental nature', 'general principal', and 'principal' are synonyms. The fundamental nature is asserted to be an object of knowledge that possesses six distinguishing characteristics.

-- It is the agent of actions because it is the agent of virtue and non-virtue.

-- It is unborn and permanent because it does not disintegrate or dissolve into anything else.

-- It is unitary because it is partless.

-- It is only an object and not an object-possessor, i.e., subject, because it is without realization and consciousness and because it is the object of enjoyment of the person.

-- It pervades all animate and inanimate objects, such as cause and effect, because it pervades all transformations.

-- It is unmanifest and is an equilibrium of the three qualities: activity, lightness, and

darkness.

Person, self, consciousness, and basic mind are mutually inclusive and synonymous.

The mode of production of the remaining twenty-three is the following. Whenever the person generates a desire to enjoy objects, the fundamental nature [recognizes this desire, unites with the person, and] creates manifestations such as sounds.

~ According to the non-theistic Samkhyas all manifest objects whatsoever are transformations of the fundamental nature.

~ The theistic Samkhyas assert that the varieties of environments and animate beings are not produced from the fundamental nature alone because it is mindless and that which is mindless is not capable of overseeing production. For, without an overseer, the initiation of an effect is not possible. The person is not suitable to be the overseer because at that time, before the transformation of the fundamental nature, there is no knowledge since the intellect has not yet been produced, and without determination by the intellect there is no realization of objects. Therefore, through the mutual dependence of the great god Ishvara and the fundamental nature, the varieties of effects are produced. When, from among the three qualities that dwell in the entity of the fundamental nature, the quality of activity increases in strength, this acts as the cause of Ishvara's issuing forth all animate beings and environments. When lightness increases in strength, this acts as the cause of their duration. When darkness increases in strength, this acts as the cause of their disintegration. Therefore, although Ishvara and the fundamental nature, which are the two causes that produce all manifest phenomena, always exist, serial production, duration, and disintegration of effects are admissible because the three—activity, lightness, and darkness—increase and diminish serially.

The great one arises from the principal [i.e., the fundamental nature]. 'Intellect' and 'great one' are synonyms. The intellect is considered to be like a two-sided mirror which reflects the images of objects from the outside and the image of the person from the inside.

~ The intellect 'empowers' the senses, and it apprehends the objects that the senses apprehend; these objects are then known by the person. The person is consciousness, and the intellect is a material entity wherein consciousness mixes with the senses, which are matter. The person is then mistakenly confused with the senses; this error must be corrected in order to attain liberation.

From the intellect, the I-principle is produced; it has three divisions: the activity dominated I-principle, the lightness dominated I-principle, and the darkness dominated I-principle. From the first [the activity dominated I-principle] the five subtle objects are produced, and the five elements are produced from these [see chart, pp. 159-161]. From the second [the lightness dominated I-principle] the eleven faculties are produced. The third [the darkness dominated I-principle] is said to be the motivator of the other two.

~ This presentation accords with that of Tsong Khapa and his student Gyel-tsap; however, Avalokitavrata, an Indian scholar known for his Explanatory Commentary on (Bhavaviveka's) 'Lamp for (Nagarjuna's) "Wisdom"', names the darkness dominated I-principle as the producer of the five subtle objects and the activity dominated I-principle as the motivator of the other two I-principles.

// [Note: The Samkhyas assert that one cycles in cyclic existence through the force of ignorance that mistakes the fundamental nature, which is like a blind man with good legs,

and the person, which is like a cripple with good eyesight, to be one and thereupon does not understand that transformations are manifested by the fundamental nature. When, in dependence on hearing the quintessential instructions of a guru, one fully generates definite knowledge that the transformations are only manifestations of the fundamental nature, one gradually separates from attachment to objects. At that time, through relying on the concentrations, the clairvoyance of the divine eye is generated. The fundamental nature, when it is seen by this clairvoyant consciousness, is flushed with shame like another's wife [that is, like a mistress when seen by the wife]; it gathers its transformations [and disappears]. The fundamental nature then dwells alone [separate from the self] with the result that all appearances of conventional phenomena disappear for the mind of the yogi. The person then abides without enjoying objects and without action; at that time, liberation is attained.]

L3: [2.1.4 YOGA – based on the Samkhya & Vedanta; materialist, theistic (God is the unique purusa); from dualism (self vs. aggregates) to monism (self vs. God); the goal of the yoga is to directly realize our true nature, realize our difference with materiality (prakrti), and ultimately realize our Oneness with the Supreme Soul] :L3

¢(i.e. Yoga : Patanjali -- The School of Yoga - Union -- The rule of daily life. Mysticism -- the discipline of self-realization. -- Through yoga, the soul awakens its innate spiritual vision to see itself beyond the body.

¢-- A theistic branch of Samkhya. They shared the obsession of the Samkhya on causality, but were still theistic. They explained the divergence with the Vedic scripture by saying that those had to be interpreted and should not be taken literally. Pushing the duality of the spirit and matter.)

L3: [2.1.5 MIMAMSAKA [Analyzers or Ritualists — taking the Vedas to be absolute truths, taking the sacrifices described in it to be absolute “down to earth” very practical means to escape bad transmigrations by controlling the absolute causes, absolute sounds / mantras, but no complete definitive Liberation; an introduction for those who cannot understand the more complex Vedanta; but say that the devotional statements in the Vedas need to be “interpreted”] :L3

¢(i.e. Mimamsa : Jaimini -- The School of Ceremonial Ritual - Religion. Worship of the devas or Gods. -- mostly deals with ritual portion of the Vedas, believing that sutras/verses without corresponding ritual/Yajna is incomplete and thus do not yield desired effect -- science of fruitive work. -- Karma-mimamsa directs the soul to the goals of Vedic ritualism. ¢-- They relied too much on the theory of karma.)

The Mimamsakas [Analyzers or Ritualists] are followers of Jaimini. They maintain that whatever appears in the Vedas is self-produced [because the Vedas were not made by anyone].

~ In explaining why the Mimamsakas hold the Vedas to be valid, Bhavaviveka's Heart of the Middle Way says:

~ Because of degeneration [which occurs on account of] the faults of desire and so forth,

~ The words of persons are always false.

~ Because the Vedas were not made by persons,

~ They are held to be valid sources of knowledge.
~ Thus, from their point of view, the scriptures of the Samkhyas, Vaisheshikas, Nirgranthas, Nihilists, Buddhists, and so forth are false because they were made by persons.²

// [Note: 2 Jam-yanag-shay-ba's Great Exposition of Tenets, ka 42b.8.]

They make the exaggeration that what appears in the Vedas is reality, and, thereupon, they assert that sacrifices and so forth [which are revealed in the Vedas] are the only way to attain a high condition of life [in the future].

This high condition of life is asserted to be liberation only from bad transmigrations [not liberation from all transmigrations in cyclic existence]. Moreover, there is no liberation that extinguishes all suffering; this is because defilements subsist in the nature of the mind [and, therefore, to eliminate defilements would be to eliminate the mind]. Also, there is no omniscience because objects of knowledge are limitless. Hence, the Mimamsakas also propound that there is no true speech [of persons; only the Vedas are true].

// [Note: Buddhists assert the true speech of one who has abandoned all defilements and become omniscient.]

L3: [2.1.6 NIRGRANTHA [Jainas – rejecting the Vedas, materialist, atheistic; permanent self bound by karmic matter caused by non-virtuous actions of body speech & mind; purification through ascetic practices; Liberation is going somewhere like a white umbrella held upside down that is both a thing and a non-thing] :L3

The Nirgranthas [Jainas] are followers of Rishabha Jina. They assert that all objects of knowledge are included in nine categories: life, contamination, restraint, wearing down, bond, action, sin, merit, and liberation.

Life is self; it is the same size as a person's body. Its nature is such that its entity is permanent, but its states are impermanent. Contamination is virtuous or non-virtuous action because on account of actions one falls into cyclic existence. Restraint is what ceases contaminations because [on account of it] actions are not newly accumulated. Wearing down is exhaustion of previously accumulated actions [i.e., karmic matter] by way of asceticism, such as not drinking liquids, physical hardships, and so forth. A bond is a wrong view. Actions are of four types: [the determiners of the general] experience in a later life, of name, of lineage, and of life-span. Sin is non-virtue. Merit is virtue.

Liberation is the following: By resorting to deeds of asceticism such as going naked, not speaking, the five fires [fires in front, back, on both sides, and the sun above] and so forth, all previous actions [accretions of karmic material] are consumed [and liberation, a state that lacks all contaminations of good and bad actions, is attained]. Because actions are not newly accumulated, one goes to a place that is at the top of all worlds, called Consummation of the Worlds. It is like a white umbrella held upside down, white like yogurt and the esculent white water lily, the size of four million five hundred thousand yojanas. Because this place has life, it is a thing; because it is free from cyclic existence, it is also a non-thing. This place is called liberation.

Rishabha Jina said:

~ Jina explains that liberation

~ Has the color of snow, the incense flower,
~ Cow's yogurt, frost, and pearl,

// [Note: The shape of a white umbrella.]

L2: [2.2 The nihilists: no self at all, no karma / causality, no rebirth, no God] :L2

L3: [2.2.1 NIHILISTS or CHARVAKAS (Hedonists) – rejecting the Vedas, against religious practices, materialist, skeptic, atheist; no God, no permanent self, no karma, no causality, no rebirth, no liberation; no valid generalities / concepts / views / inferences; only direct perception is valid; some things are without cause; the theory of consciousness coming out of the material elements; the "essential nature" (svabhava) of a thing that undergoes transformation by itself] :L3

The Lokayatas [or Charvakas (Hedonists)] say that one does not come to this life from a previous life because no one perceives previous lives.

Since among Lokayatas there are also Meditators who clairvoyantly perceive a limited number of past lives, the reference here is to the Dialectician¹ Lokayatas.

// [Note: 1 rtog ge pa, tarkika. See Jeffrey Hopkins, Meditation on Emptiness, p. 328. Gon-chok-jik-may-wang-bo's failure to mention the Meditators is a deviation from the presentation of this school by Jam-yang-shay-ba, his previous incarnation, who, in his Great Exposition of Tenets, makes a clear differentiation between the two types of Nihilists (ka 21b.4):

Because it is explained that some assert and some do not assert cause and effect, gods, and so forth,

It is mistaken [to hold that all Nihilists] say that former and future lives are totally non-existent and that there are only three transmigrations, and so forth.]

From an adventitious body a mind is adventitiously established, just as light is adventitiously established from the adventitious existence of a lamp.

Also, one does not go to a future life from this life because body and mind are one entity and, therefore, when the body perishes, the mind also perishes. For example, when a stone is destroyed, a design on the stone is likewise destroyed.

Thus, this [system] maintains that all objects of comprehension [all existents] are necessarily specifically characterized [i.e., directly perceived] phenomena and all valid cognitions are necessarily direct valid cognitions. This is because they do not accept that generally characterized [i.e., only inferentially perceived] phenomena or inferential valid cognitions exist.

Some Ayatas assert that all phenomena [whose causes cannot be directly perceived] arise from their own nature, causelessly.

They say:

~ The rising of the sun, the running downwards of a river,
~ The roundness of peas, the sharpness of thorns,

- ~ The 'eyes' of peacock feathers and so forth—all phenomena
- ~ Arise from their own nature, without being made by anyone.

Stanza between sections:

- ~ A rung on the ladder to the city of liberation
- ~ Is the understanding and abandoning
- ~ Of all types of Outsiders' tenets,
- ~ Which are fords to extremes of bad views.¹

// [Note: 1 The author is making a pun based on the term 'Forders' (mu stegs pa, tirthika), which is another name for non-Buddhists. They call themselves 'Torders' because, from their own viewpoint, they have a ford (stegs) to the end (mu), i.e., to liberation; the author, however, identifies the end (mu) as an extremist view.]

L2: [3. General exposition of BUDDHIST TENETS] :L2

L3: [The turning of THE THREE WHEELS and the various Buddhist schools] :L3

The King of the Shakyas, a peerless teacher, initially generated an attitude of dedication to attaining highest enlightenment for the sake of all sentient beings. Then, [in order to actualize this wish] he amassed the collections of merit and wisdom for three countless aeons. Finally, in the vicinity of Bodhgaya, he became perfectly enlightened.

-- At Varanasi he turned the wheel of doctrine of the four noble truths for the five good ascetics [who had previously practiced asceticism with him].

-- Then, on Vulture Peak [so called because it is shaped like a heap of vultures] he turned the wheel of doctrine of characterlessness [that is, phenomena's not possessing establishment by way of their own character].

-- Then, at Vaishali and other places, he extensively turned the wheel of doctrine of good differentiation.

~ The third wheel is called the wheel of good differentiation because it differentiates well between what is and is not established by way of its own character.

~ -- The fundamental idea of the first wheel was that all phenomena without exception are established by way of their own character as the referents of conceptual consciousnesses and that in this respect there is no cause for differentiation among them.

~ -- The fundamental idea of the second wheel was that all phenomena without exception are not established by way of their own character and that in this respect there is no cause for differentiation among them.

~ -- When Buddha was questioned about the apparent conflict between these two teachings, he taught the third wheel in which he explained that thoroughly established natures, that is, emptinesses, and other-powered natures, such as houses, trees, and persons, are established by way of their own character, but that imputational natures, such as uncompounded space, cessations, and phenomena's being the referents of conceptual consciousnesses, are not established by way of their own character. Thus, the third wheel is the teaching that differentiates well what is and is not established by way of its own character.

~ This way of categorizing the three wheels of doctrine is found in the Sutra

Unravelling the Thought.

~ -- It says that the first wheel consists of teachings of the four noble truths and the like, which were taught for the sake of trainees of the Lesser Vehicle;
~ -- that the second wheel consists of the Perfection of Wisdom Sutras and the like, which were taught for the sake of trainees of the Great Vehicle;
~ -- and that the third wheel, which includes the Sutra Unravelling the Thought itself, was taught for the sake of both Lesser Vehicle and Great Vehicle trainees.

~ The Sutra Unravelling the Thought teaches that the third wheel is the highest and most direct. However, this teaching is for Proponents of Mind Only;

~ THE CONSEQUENCE SCHOOL, WHICH IS CONSIDERED BY MOST TIBETAN ORDERS TO BE THE HIGHEST SYSTEM OF TENETS AND WHICH FOLLOWS THE SECOND WHEEL, HOLDS THAT THIS PRESENTATION OF THE THREE WHEELS ITSELF REQUIRES INTERPRETATION.

All inferior proponents of tenets, the six teachers of the Forders and so forth were quelled by Buddha's magnificence; and his precious teaching, a source of help and happiness, flourished and spread widely. Later on, commentators explained individually the thought of the three wheels, and thus the four schools of tenets arose.

Of these four,

-- the two schools that propound [truly existent external] objects [the Great Exposition School and the Sutra School] follow the first wheel.

¢(i.e. Using the same tools / skillful means as the Indian non-buddhist schools based on the Vedas: renunciation, morality, decomposition into elementary components, direct perception of essential characteristics, logical inference, syllogism, yoga.)

-- The Proponents of Non-Entityness [Proponents of the Middle Way School] follow the second wheel; (i.e. Who affirm that all phenomena without exception are not established by way of their own character)

-- and the Yogic Practitioners [Proponents of Mind Only] follow the third wheel. (i.e. Who accept the true establishment of some existent objects – enough to justify their tools: apparent logic, syllogism, direct perception, ...)

All four schools make definitive presentations of the three—basis, paths, and fruits—following their respective wheels.

The number of schools of tenets that follow our teacher is definitely four: the two Lesser Vehicle schools, Great Exposition School and Sutra School, and the two Great Vehicle schools, Mind Only School and Middle Way School.

The order of the schools, as presented by almost all orders of Tibetan Buddhism, is, from top to bottom:

-- GREAT VEHICLE

---- Middle Way School

----- Consequence School

----- Autonomy School

---- Mind Only School

----- Followers of Reasoning

----- Followers of Scripture

-- LESSER VEHICLE

---- Sutra School

----- Followers of Reasoning

----- Followers of Scripture

---- Great Exposition School - eighteen subschools

This is so because it is said that there is no fifth system of tenets apart from these four and that there is no fourth vehicle apart from the three vehicles [Hearer, Solitary Realizer, and Bodhisattva vehicles].

Vajragarbha's Commentary on the Condensation of the Hevajra Tantra 1 says:

~ It is not the Subduer's thought that a fourth [vehicle]

~ Or a fifth [school of tenets] exists for Buddhists.

// [Note: 1 The Hevajra Tantra itself has been translated by David L. Snellgrove in The Hevajra Tantra, A Critical Study, (London: Oxford University Press, 1959), Parts 1 and 2.]

L3: [How each school pretends to avoid the two extremes] :L3

When the [other] Buddhist schools—the Autonomy, Mind Only, Sutra, and Great Exposition Schools—are weighed by the Consequence School, they are all found to fall to extremes of permanence and annihilation. However, the Autonomists and below each maintain that their own system is a middle [way school] because they claim that they assert a middle free from the two extremes of permanence and annihilation. Moreover, each of the four schools of tenets has a different way of avoiding the extremes of permanence and annihilation.

~ To hold an extreme of permanence is to superimpose existence on what actually does not exist, as in holding that a unitary and independent self exists.

~ To hold an extreme of annihilation is to deny the existence of something that actually does exist, as in holding that there is no liberation from cyclic existence or that phenomena do not exist at all.

-- The Proponents of the Great Exposition (Hinayana - Vaibhashika)

---- maintain that they avoid the extreme of permanence because [they assert that] when an effect is produced, its causes cease.

---- They say that they also avoid the extreme of annihilation because [they assert that] an effect arises after the termination of a cause.

-- The Proponents of Sutra (Hinayana - Sautrantika)

---- say that they avoid the extreme of annihilation through asserting that the continuum of a compounded phenomenon exists continuously.

~ For example, they assert that when a table is burned, even though the continuum of similar type of the compounded phenomenon— namely the continuum of a specific table—is severed, a continuation of the substance is not severed because ashes remain.

---- The Proponents of Sutra maintain that they are also free from the extreme of permanence because [of their assertion that] compounded phenomena disintegrate from moment to moment.

-- The Proponents of Mind Only (Mahayana - Chittamatra)

---- say that they avoid the extreme of permanence by [asserting that] imputational natures do not truly exist.

---- They say that they also avoid the extreme of annihilation through [asserting] the true existence of dependent natures.

-- The Proponents of the Middle Way School (Mahayana - Madhyamika)

---- maintain that they are free from the extreme of annihilation because [they assert] the conventional existence of all phenomena.

---- They consider that they are free from the extreme of permanence because [they assert that] all phenomena whatsoever are without ultimate existence.

Although those tenets of the lower schools that are not shared by the higher schools are refuted by the higher schools of tenets, an understanding of the lower views is an excellent method for gaining an understanding of the higher views. Therefore, you should not despise the lower tenets just because you hold the higher tenets to be superior.

L3: [Definition of a proponent of Buddhist tenets, and THE FOUR SEALS] :L3

THE DEFINITION OF A PROPONENT OF BUDDHIST TENETS IS:

~ a person who asserts the four seals which are the views testifying that a doctrine is Buddha's.

THE FOUR SEALS ARE:

-- All compounded phenomena are impermanent.

-- All contaminated things are miserable.

-- All phenomena are selfless.

-- Nirvana is peace.

~ Each of the Buddhist schools has its own particular interpretation of these four. The following interpretation is accepted by all four schools:

~ -- Compounded phenomena are things such as chairs and tables that are produced in dependence on an aggregation of major and minor causes.

~ -- Uncompounded phenomena are phenomena such as space that are not produced in dependence on major or minor causes. (i.e. But still dependent on the mind & labeling.)

~ -- Contaminated things are those phenomena that are under the influence of contaminated actions and afflictive emotions.

~ -- Phenomena are selfless in the sense that they are empty of being a permanent, unitary, independent self or of being the objects of use of such a self. (i.e. But that is not enough. They are also empty of inherent existence, of existing on their own, independently of the mind, and of the labeling, of their respective conceptual interdependent opposite.)

~ -- Nirvana is peace because peace is not bestowed by Indra, or anyone else, but is achieved by one's own individual passing beyond the afflictions of desire, hatred, and ignorance.

Objection: In that case, the Vatsiputnyas [a subschool of the Great Exposition School] would not be proponents of Buddhist tenets because they assert a self of persons.

Answer: There is no such fallacy because the self that they assert is a self-sufficient,

substantially existent self whereas the selflessness of the four seals refers to the absence of a permanent, unitary, independent self and that [selflessness] is asserted even by the five Sammitiya schools [—the Vatsiputriyas being one of the five—although they do assert an inexpressible self].

~ In his Great Exposition of Tenets Jam-yang-shay-ba, who is identified as Gon-chok-jik-may-wang-bo's previous incarnation, does not accept that the Vatsiputriyas assert a self-sufficient, substantially existent person because they, like the other Proponents of a Person, hold that the person is inexpressible as either substantially existent or imputedly existent, or as the same as or different from the aggregates, whereas a self-sufficient, substantially existent person is necessarily able to stand by itself separate from the aggregates. Thus, although Gon-chok-jik-may-wang-bo agrees with Jam-yang-shay-ba that the selflessness mentioned in the four seals refers to 'the absence of a permanent, unitary, independent self, he does not agree with Jam-yang-shay-ba's position that the Vatsiputriyas do not assert a substantially existent person. In holding that the Vatsiputriyas assert a substantially existent person, Gon-chok-jik-may-wang-bo is probably following his teacher, Jang-gya-bo is bay-dor-jay, who, in his Presentation of Tenets, gives a long refutation of Jam-yang-shay-ba on this topic. However, Gon-chok-jik-may-wang-bo does not accept Jang-gya's conclusion that the Vatsiputriyas, though Buddhist, are not actual proponents of Buddhist tenets. Gon-chok-jik-may-wang-bo maintains that they are actual proponents of Buddhist tenets by holding—as does Jam-yang-shay-ba, as mentioned above— that the selflessness indicated in the four seals refers to 'the absence of a permanent, unitary, independent self. In this way, Gon-chok-jik-may-wang-bo does not agree completely with either his previous incarnation, Jam-yang-shay-ba, or with his teacher Jang-gya; his critical stance devoid of partisan allegiance is typical of much of his and many others' scholarship and stands in contrast to the work of some scholars whose main aim, it seems, is to uphold their own College's assertions.

L2: [HINAYANA – the lesser vehicle] :L2

L2: [4. The great exposition school – les particularistes (VAIBHASHIKA, Abhidharmists) (Vasubandhu)] :L2

¢(Note: See also the descriptions in Hopkins's Meditation on Emptiness, and Guy Newland's Appearance and reality, and in other articles at the end of this file.)

The presentation of the tenets of the Proponents of the [great exposition school] is in four parts: definition, subschools, etymology, and assertions of tenets.¹

// [Note: 1 Herbert V. Guenther also has translated this and the remaining chapters in Buddhist Philosophy in Theory and Practice (Baltimore: Penguin, 1972).]

L3: [Definition] :L3

THE DEFINITION OF A PROPONENT OF THE GREAT EXPOSITION IS:

~ a person propounding Lesser Vehicle tenets who does not accept self-cognizing consciousness and who asserts external objects as being truly established.

~ This definition must be qualified because it does not exclude Proponents of Sutra Following Scripture, who also do not assert self-cognizing consciousness but assert truly established external objects. A self-cognizing consciousness is, roughly speaking, a mind's awareness of itself simultaneous with its awareness of an object.

L3: [18 Subschools] :L3

There are three groups of Proponents of the Great Exposition: Kashmiris, Aparantakas, and Magadhas.

~ There are generally renowned to be eighteen subschools divided, according to various accounts, from two, three, or four basic subschools.¹

// [Note: 1 For an excellent discussion of the subschools, see Andre Bareau, *Les sectes bouddhiques du Petit Vehicule* (Saigon: 1955). For a brief presentation of the modes of division, see Jeffrey Hopkins, *Meditation on Emptiness*, pp. 713-719.]

L3: [Etymology] :L3

There is reason for calling the master Vasumitra a 'Proponent of the Great Exposition' [or a 'Proponent of the Particularist School'] because he propounds tenets following the Great Detailed Exposition and because he propounds that the three times [past, present, and future objects] are particulars [or instances] of substantial entities.

~ Their assertions on the three times are discussed in more detail below.

L3: [Assertions of tenets] :L3

This section has three parts: their assertions on the basis, paths, and fruits.

L4: [Assertions on the basis] :L4

This section has two parts: assertions regarding objects and assertions regarding object-possessors [subjects].

~ A subject (or object-possessor) can be an object of another consciousness, and thus all phenomena, including subjects, are included within objects.

L5: [Assertions regarding objects] :L5

This system asserts that all objects of knowledge are included within five basic categories:

- appearing forms,
- main minds,
- accompanying mental factors,
- compositional factors not associated [with either minds or mental factors],
- and uncompounded phenomena.

~ Forms (1) are of eleven types: the five sense objects, the five sense powers, and non-revelatory forms. The five sense objects are: (1) colors and shapes, (2) sounds, (3) odors, (4) tastes, and (5) tangible objects. The five sense powers are: (6) eye sense, (7) ear sense, (8) nose sense, (9) tongue sense, and (10) body sense. Nonrevelatory forms are, for example, the subtle form of the absence of a vow as in the case of the subtle form of non-virtuous deeds that a butcher would always possess even when not actually engaged in killing.

~ A main mind (2) is a consciousness apprehending the general object, such as an eye consciousness apprehending a table.

~ Mental factors (3) accompany main minds and apprehend the particulars of an object, for example, the pleasantness or unpleasantness of a table. Ten mental factors accompany all main minds: feeling, intention, discrimination, aspiration, contact, intelligence,

mindfulness, mental engagement, interest, and stabilization.

~ Illustrations of compounded phenomena (4) that are not associated with minds or mental factors are the four characteristics of compounded phenomena: production, aging, duration, and disintegration. Etymologically speaking, these are phenomena that are not associated (Idan min, viprayukta) with minds or mental factors; more specifically, they are neither form nor consciousness and thus are a separate category.

~ Moreover, these five objects are 'things'. The definition of a thing is: that which is able to perform a function. Existent, object of knowledge, and thing are mutually inclusive [i.e., whatever is the one is the other].⁵

~ Uncompounded phenomena (5) are considered to be permanent things; forms, consciousnesses, and non-associated compositional factors [which are neither form nor consciousness] are considered to be impermanent things.

// [Note: 5 don gcig, ekartha. 'Mutually inclusive' does not indicate that these are necessarily just different names for the same thing, as would be the case with synonyms (ming gi mam grangs); rather, it indicates that whatever is the one is necessarily the other—they are mutually pervasive.]

~ Among the four Buddhist tenet systems, only this system asserts that a permanent phenomenon such as uncompounded space is able to perform a function and thus is a thing. For instance, the lack of obstructing contact that space affords performs the function of allowing movement to take place. Since both permanent and impermanent phenomena are asserted to be 'things' in this system, functionality is not limited to producing causal sequences; instead, as with uncompounded space, functionality can refer to allowing or opening the way for something to happen.

All things are necessarily substantially established, but they are not necessarily substantially existent.

~ It is clear that if something is substantially existent, this does not necessitate that it is a substance, since impermanence is substantially existent but not a substance.

~ Rather, to be substantially existent means (in accordance with the definition of an ultimate truth given below) that when the object is either broken physically or mentally divided into parts, the awareness of that object is not cancelled.

This is so because they assert that

- ultimate truths and substantial existents are mutually inclusive
- and that conventional truths and imputed existents are mutually inclusive.

There are divisions of objects into the two truths and into the contaminated and uncontaminated. Also [with regard to this discussion of objects] there is a teaching of other ancillary topics.

L6: [The two truths] :L6

THE DEFINITION OF A CONVENTIONAL TRUTH IS:

~ a phenomenon which is such that when it is broken up or mentally separated into individual parts, the awareness apprehending that object is cancelled.

A clay pot and a rosary are illustrations of conventional truths because, if a clay pot is

broken with a hammer, the awareness apprehending that object as a clay pot is cancelled; and, if the beads of a rosary are separated, the awareness apprehending that object as a rosary is cancelled.

~ With respect to the term 'illustration', the Sanskrit term *laksya* also translates into Tibetan as *mtshon bya*, 'definiendum'. In the triad of definition, definiendum, and illustration, the definition of a thing (*dnegos po*, *bhava*), for example, is: that which is capable of performing a function. The definiendum is thing. An illustration is a pot. As can readily be seen, the definiendum and an illustration are markedly different.

~ Technically speaking:⁵ An illustration is defined as: that which serves as a basis for illustrating the appropriate definiendum by way of its definition. ... [An illustration] cannot be such that understanding [it] ...effectively serves as understanding all of the essential characteristics of the illustrated object. That is, in order to be a valid illustrator (*mtshon byed*) of something, a phenomenon must be such that although someone might have realized the illustration, that person would not necessarily have realized that which it illustrates. For instance, a gold pot is a proper illustration of a functioning thing because it is a functioning thing and merely through having ascertained a gold pot with valid cognition, one would not necessarily have ascertained functioning thing itself with valid cognition. ... A gold pot indicates functioning thing by way of being able to perform a function; thus, it illustrates or demonstrates the meaning of functioning thing.

~ On the other hand, a gold pot is not a proper illustration of a pot because, although it is a pot, if someone has ascertained a gold pot with valid cognition, that person must have ascertained pot with valid cognition. It is not possible for one to know the meaning of a gold pot and not know the meaning of pot.

// [Note: 5 Daniel Perdue, *Debate in Tibetan Buddhist Education* (forthcoming from Snow Lion Publications), Part 3, pp. 12ff.]

// [Note: 1 Tsong Khapa speaks to this issue in his *Ocean of Reasoning, Explanation of* (Nagarjuna's) 'Treatise on the Middle Way' (*dbu ma rtsa ba'i tshig le'ur byas pa shes rob ces bya ba'i rnam bshad rigs pa'i rgya mtsho*), (Sarnath, India: Pleasure of Elegant Sayings Printing Press, no date), 141.14-141.20.]

THE DEFINITION OF AN ULTIMATE TRUTH IS:

~ a phenomenon which is such that when it is broken up or mentally separated into individual parts, the consciousness apprehending that object is not cancelled.

Illustrations of ultimate truths are

- directionally partless particles,
- temporally partless moments of consciousness,
- and uncompounded space.

¢(i.e. Like the old Indian pre-Buddhist schools, they first define their ultimate absolute view / theory, and then define all the required concepts and paths in order to be consistent as much as possible with this theoretical goal. And then do their best to explain all the contradictions with various extras. And they claim that this is all based on the absolute truth as directly seen by an arhat or by the Buddha.)

~ In this system, the smallest units of matter are asserted to be directionally partless, but this does not mean that they are partless in general; even the smallest

particle has factors relating to its production, duration, and cessation and factors relating to the production of effects, and so forth. Similarly, the smallest temporal unit of consciousness is temporally partless but is not partless in general; for example, one instant of an eye consciousness can have many parts that apprehend the various colors of a tile floor.

For, Vasubandhu's Treasury of Manifest Knowledge says:²

- ~ A thing which is such that, if broken or mentally separated into others [i.e. parts],
- ~ An awareness of it no longer operates,
- ~ Such as a pot or water, is conventionally existent.
- ~ [All] others are ultimately existent.

~ Since a single minute particle of water is an ultimate truth, Vasubandhu's reference must be to a quantity of water, such as in a cup or even a river.

// [Note: 2 chos mngon pa'i mdzod, abhidharmakosa; VIA: yatra bhinnena tadbuddhiranyapohe dhiya ca tat/ ghatambuvat samvrtisat paramarthasadanytha //]. For a Sanskrit edition, see Abhidharmakosa & Bhasya of Acarya Vasubandhu with Sphutartha Commentary of Acarya Yasomitra, Swami Dwarikadas Shastri, ed., Bauddha Bharati Series no.5. (Banaras: Bauddha Bharati, 1970). For a translation into French, see Louis de La Vallee Poussin, L'Abhidharmakosa de Vasubandhu (Paris: Geuthner, 1923-31). Vasubandhu flourished around 360 C.E.]

Therefore, it is asserted that conventional truths are not ultimately established, although they are truly established. This is because this system asserts that all things are necessarily truly established.

L6: [The contaminated and the uncontaminated] :L6

THE DEFINITION OF A CONTAMINATED OBJECT IS:

- ~ a phenomenon that is amenable to the increase of contaminations from the point of view of being either an object of observation or an [afflicted] concomitant.

The five mental and physical aggregates are illustrations of contaminated objects.

- ~ However, not all phenomena included in the five mental and physical aggregates are illustrations of contaminated phenomena because, for instance, true paths—the fourth of the four noble truths—are included in the five aggregates but are not contaminated objects.

~ A table, for example, is a contaminated phenomenon not because it possesses the afflictive emotions of desire, hatred, or ignorance but because it can act as an object of observation that increases those afflictive emotions, especially desire, in the perceiver. An afflicted concomitant can be an afflicted main mind that accompanies afflicted mental factors or an afflicted mental factor that accompanies an afflicted main mind or other afflicted mental factors. An illustration is the mental factor of desire that accompanies the perception of an attractive object and could increase the afflictive emotions of the main mind and other mental factors accompanying it.

- ~ All phenomena that are contaminated objects from the viewpoint of being afflicted concomitants are also contaminated from the viewpoint of being objects of observation because they can increase afflictive emotions in other beings who take cognizance of them, or they can increase one's own afflictive emotions if one should take cognizance of them at a later time, as in the case of desire. However, all phenomena that are contaminated objects

from the viewpoint of being objects of observation are not necessarily contaminated from the viewpoint of being afflicted concomitants, such as an attractive table which could never be an afflicted concomitant because it is not a mind or a mental factor.

THE DEFINITION OF AN UNCONTAMINATED OBJECT IS:

~ a phenomenon that is not amenable to the increase of contaminations from the viewpoint of being either an object of observation or a mental concomitant.

¢(i.e. This assumes that the “uncontaminated objects” are absolute pure and that when there is direct perception of them then it is absolutely perfect. So there is belief in inherently existing objects and inherently existing direct perception here.)

True paths and uncompounded phenomena are illustrations, for, Vasubandhu's Treasury of Manifest Knowledge says, 'Except for true paths, all compounded phenomena are contaminated'; and, 'The uncontaminated consists of true paths and the three uncompounded phenomena.'

~ When true paths are objects of observation or mental concomitants, they destroy contamination and do not increase it. Uncompounded space as an object of observation cannot destroy contamination, but does not increase it.

~ The three uncompounded phenomena are: non-analytical cessations, analytical cessations, and uncompounded spaces. A non-analytical cessation is a cessation that occurs as a result of the incompleteness of the conditions for its production, such as the lack of hunger at the time of intensely concentrating on conversation. Once the moment has passed, the fact that one had no desire for food at that time will never change, and for this reason, its cessation is said to be permanent. An analytical cessation is an eradication of an obstruction such that it will never occur again, as in the case of a complete cessation forever of a particular type of desire through meditation on the four noble truths.

All contaminated objects are to be abandoned, for [even] the two paths of accumulation and preparation,³ are to be abandoned.

// [Note: ³ More literally, the latter is translated as 'path of connection' or 'path of linking' since it connects or links the practitioner to the path of seeing.]

~ The paths of accumulation and preparation are not actual antidotes to afflictive emotions and thus do not eliminate them; they are virtues of common beings and, therefore, suitable to increase desire.

The path of seeing is completely uncontaminated.

~ The path of seeing consists solely of direct contemplation of the four truths and occurs only in one meditative session; thus, it is only uncontaminated.

¢(i.e. This assumes that the “Four Truths” are absolute pure truths and that when there is direct perception of them then it is absolutely perfect. So there is belief in inherently existing objects and inherently existing direct perception here.)

Paths of meditation and paths of no more learning both have instances of contaminated and uncontaminated paths.

~ On both the path of meditation and the path of no more learning there are instances when yogis cultivate worldly paths, such as the eight absorptions, for the sake of increasing their mental capacity. These worldly paths are paths of meditation. They are

contaminated from the viewpoint of being objects of observation because, through taking cognizance of them, afflictive emotions not only are not eliminated but also are suitable to increase in the sense that someone could become desirous of these states. One who has attained the path of no more learning no longer has any afflictive emotions; therefore, training in the eight absorptions could not increase afflictive emotions for that person, but these worldly paths could increase the desire of others who notice them. Worldly paths in the continuum of one who has attained the path of no more learning are, therefore, contaminated from the viewpoint of being objects of observation but not from the viewpoint of being afflicted concomitants because they themselves are not afflicted in the sense that desire, for instance, is afflicted.

All superior paths are necessarily uncontaminated (i.e. by definition; the whole path is defined in terms of being ultimately able to directly see some absolute truths; and the absolute truths are defined as that which is directly seen at the end of the path. So they are circularly defined.), but the paths in the continuum of a Superior are not necessarily uncontaminated. This is because a path that is in the continuum of one on the path of meditation and has the aspect of reflecting on the peacefulness [of higher levels] and the coarseness [of the present level] is contaminated [as in the case of generating the eight absorptions in their mundane form].

~ All Buddhist schools, except the Great Exposition School and the Sutra School Following Scripture, maintain that a superior path and a path in the continuum of a Superior are mutually inclusive—whatever is the one is the other. The Great Exposition School, however, states the example of one who meditates on the advantages of the First Concentration, such as peacefulness and long life, and on the disadvantages of the Desire Realm, such as coarseness, ugliness, and short life, in order to do away with manifest desire for the objects of the Desire Realm. By meditating thus, a yogi can attain a higher state of concentration and can suppress manifest afflictive emotions, but cannot get rid of the seeds of the afflictive emotions. Many non-Buddhists attain their 'liberation' through this means; however, because of the fault of not destroying the seeds of desire by means of analytical cessation, such 'liberation' is only temporary. In the specific case mentioned in the text, the meditator is a Superior on the path of meditation. On this path, those of greater intelligence simultaneously rid themselves of the afflictive emotions together with their seeds, level by level in nine stages (see chart p. 213). However, the Superiors being discussed here are of duller faculties and suppress manifest afflictive emotions first by means of a worldly path, which can serve to increase afflictive emotions in the ways mentioned earlier. Only afterwards do they go on to rid themselves of the seeds of those afflictive emotions.

L6: [Other ancillary topics] :L6

The three times [past, present, and future objects] are asserted to be substantial entities because the Proponents of the Great Exposition maintain that a pot exists even at the time of the past of a pot and that a pot exists even at the time of the future of a pot.

~ Yesterday's pot exists today as a past pot. The past of a thing occurs after its present existence, that is, after its present existence has passed. Tomorrow's pot exists today as a future pot. The future of a thing occurs before its present existence, that is, when its present existence is yet to be. Today's pot exists as a present pot today.

Although they assert that both negative phenomena and positive phenomena exist, they do not

accept the existence of non-affirming negatives because they assert that all negatives are necessarily affirming negatives.

~ A positive phenomenon such as a table does not require the explicit negation of its being non-table in order for that table to appear to a conceptual consciousness, but a negative phenomenon such as non-table entails an explicit negation of table in order for it to appear to a conceptual consciousness. The Proponents of the Great Exposition consider that there is always something affirmative about a negative because their system always deals with substantially established entities. This emphasis on substantiality sets in relief the tendency of the higher schools to become less and less substance oriented, and these variations are especially significant as regards the schools' different modes of arriving at their interpretations of emptiness.

The Kashmiri Proponents of the Great Exposition accord with the Proponents of Sutra in asserting that the continuum of consciousness is the base that connects actions (las, karma) with their effects.

~ Every Buddhist system has to deal with the issue of providing for an uninterrupted base to connect karmic cause with karmic fruit. The Kashmiris say that the continuum of the mental consciousness is the base that allows the continued chain of actions and their fruits to prevail from life to life. This is because the mental consciousness, unlike the other five consciousnesses, functions even in deep sleep and in the meditative absorption of cessation.

All Proponents of the Great Exposition, except for the Kashmiris, assert that a compositional phenomenon that is neither form nor consciousness is the base that connects actions with their fruits. This is an obtainer and a 'non-wastage' which is like a seal that guarantees a loan [preventing the loan from becoming a loss to the lender].

Both this system and the Consequence School assert that actions of body and speech have form.

~ The other Buddhist systems assert physical and verbal actions (las, karma) to be mental. Proponents of the Great Exposition and Consequentialists reason that speech is sound and that sound is form; therefore, speech is form. Also, there is coarse and subtle form. Speech that has coarse form is, for example, that heard when a person speaks. Speech that has subtle form is, for example, the pure speech manifested by a monk who, even when silent, is keeping a vow not to speak lies and so forth. Although unheard by either himself or others, it nevertheless exists. Examples of bodily actions that have subtle form are the ethical deeds of a Superior in meditative equipoise. These would not be seen by others, but could be seen by someone with high clairvoyance, such as a Buddha.

~ The Proponents of Sutra, Proponents of Mind Only, and Autonomists maintain that actions of body and speech are actually mental factors of intention.

All compounded phenomena are necessarily impermanent but do not necessarily disintegrate moment by moment, for the Proponents of the Great Exposition assert that following production there is the activity of duration, and then the activity of disintegration occurs.

~ All Buddhist schools agree that coarse impermanence is the production of a thing such as a table, its lasting for a period of time, and finally its disintegration such as its being consumed by fire. Buddhist schools also assert a subtle impermanence that, except for

developed yogis, is not accessible to direct experience. For example, death, which is an instance of coarse impermanence, is clearly experienced, but the momentary aging of a person, which is a subtle impermanence, is not.

~ The Proponents of the Great Exposition differ from the other Buddhist schools in asserting that the factors of production, abiding, aging, and disintegration are external to the entity that undergoes these. All other systems hold that production itself is a cause or sufficient condition for disintegration; disintegration begins with, and not after, the very first moment of production. In all systems except the Great Exposition School, that which is produced is that which abides and that which disintegrates. This is because production is understood to be the arising of a new entity due to certain causes; abiding is the continued existence of that type of entity; disintegration is its quality of not lasting a second moment; and aging is the factor of its being a different entity from the entity of the previous moment. In this way, the four can occur simultaneously. The Great Exposition School, however, asserts that the factors of production, duration, aging, and disintegration act on the object and occur in series, one after the other.

L5: [Assertions regarding object-possessors [subjects] :L5

This section has three parts: [the Great Exposition School's] assertions regarding persons, consciousnesses, and terms.

~ Every consciousness has an object and thus is an object-possessor. Every name or term expresses a meaning that is its object, and thus is an object-possessor. Every person possesses objects and is an object possessor in this sense.

L6: [Persons] :L6

The mere collection of the mental and physical aggregates that are its basis of imputation is an illustration of a person.

~ 'Illustration of a person' refers to what is found upon analyzing what a person is. Thus, even the subschools of the Great Exposition School which hold that there is no substantially existent person assert that the mere collection of mind and body is the person.

The mere collection of the mental and physical aggregates that are its basis of imputation is an illustration of a person.

~ There is controversy on whether this means that they assert that each of the five aggregates individually can be an illustration of a person or whether only all five together can.

The Avantakas assert that the mind alone is an illustration of a person.

L6: [Consciousnesses] :L6

This section has two parts: the [Great Exposition School's] assertions regarding prime cognitions and assertions regarding non-prime consciousnesses.

'Consciousness' is used here as a general term referring both to minds and mental factors.

L7: [Prime cognitions] :L7

There are direct prime cognitions and inferential prime cognitions

¢(i.e. The reasoning of suitable establishment. How to arrive at non-deceptive knowledge about the way things really are: non-deceptive direct perception (that is non-conceptual), and non-deceptive inference (in dependence on a reason in which all the three modes are complete). These could be applied to each of the Two Truths. – from a resume of Mipham’s Sword of Prajna.)

~ Buddhist psychological terms that signify a consciousness that perceives an object are often rendered in English by words such as 'perception' or 'cognition' which tend to indicate either the act or object of perception and cognition rather than the agent. Therefore, it is important to remember that these terms are understood as referring to the perceiving consciousness, the cognizing consciousness as agent.

With regard to direct prime cognitions, they assert

- sense direct perceptions,
- mental direct perceptions,
- and yogic direct perceptions [such as direct cognitions of the four noble truths and their sixteen attributes, impermanence and so forth].
- They do not accept self-cognition as a direct perception.

~ Sense direct perceptions are the five sense consciousnesses.

~ For a brief discussion of mental direct perceptions, see the next chapter.

~ Self-cognition refers to a consciousness that is non-dualistically aware of a consciousness. Roughly speaking, it is that part of a consciousness which is aware of its own cognizing activity; all systems that accept this type of consciousness assert that it is the same entity as the consciousness that it knows and that it cognizes the consciousness in a non-dualistic manner. For this reason, self-cognition is rejected by the Proponents of the Great Exposition, Proponents of Sutra Following Scripture, Sutra Autonomists, and Consequentialists, for they maintain that agent and object would be confused if such existed. The other schools assert the existence of self-cognition mainly on the basis of common experience in which the seer of an object is remembered as well as the object that was seen, thus showing that the subjective element is registered in awareness. For, if the subjective element were not experienced, there would be no memory of the subjective side of a cognition.

[Unlike the other schools] the Proponents of the Great Exposition assert that a sense direct prime cognition is not necessarily a consciousness because a physical eye sense is a common locus of being matter [not consciousness], of being a perception, and of being a prime cognition.

~ They do not assert that a sense power alone can perceive an object, nor do they assert that a sense consciousness alone is capable of doing so. They maintain that the two together perceive an object; and consequently they, unlike all other Buddhist schools, assert that both sense powers and sense consciousnesses are perceivers.

They assert that a sense consciousness comprehends its object nakedly, without taking on the aspect of that object. Also, they assert that even a physical eye sense power which is the base [of an eye consciousness] perceives form, for they say that if a consciousness alone were the seer, then one would see forms that are obstructed by walls and so forth.

~ Because a consciousness does not have form, it is not obstructed by form; however, because the support of the eye consciousness is a physical sense power, the seer also

incorporates form and so is obstructed by form.

A mind and its mental factors are asserted to be different substantial entities.

~ A mind and its accompanying mental factors are each instances of consciousness and possess five similar qualities. An example of this is an inferential consciousness cognizing that a sound is an impermanent thing. Here the main mind is a mental consciousness, and the accompanying mental factors include the ten omnipresent factors: feeling, intention, discrimination, aspiration, contact, intelligence, mindfulness, mental engagement, interest, and stabilization. The five qualities that this mind and its accompanying mental factors share are: (1) they have the same basic object, the sound; (2) they have the same 'aspect object', the impermanent sound; (3) they have the same sense as their base, namely, the mental sense which is a previous moment of the mental consciousness; (4) they are simultaneous; (5) their entities are the same in number—the mental consciousness is only one and the feeling, for instance, that accompanies it is only one. Only the Proponents of the Great Exposition say that a mind and its mental factors are different substantial entities; the other schools assert that they are the same entity.

L7: [non-prime consciousnesses] :L7

Non-prime consciousnesses are wrong consciousness and so forth.]¹

~ There are five types of consciousness that are not new and/or incontrovertible cognitions: wrong consciousness, doubt, subsequent cognition, correctly assuming consciousness, and a consciousness to which an object appears without being noticed (see the next chapter).

// [Note: 1 This line (gnyis pa ni tshad min gyi shes pa la log shes sags yod do) is missing in the Collected Works edition (501.4), the Peking edition (lOa.5), the Gomang 1980 edition (23.14), and the Tibet Gomang 1987 edition (8b.4) but is in the Dharamsala 1967 edition (23.10) and the Teacher Training edition (23.7), from which it is incorporated into Mimaki (80.10). The Gomang 1980 edition (2.6) reports that the line has unnecessarily been added and does not appear in any of the three editions that they used. We agree that the line is a later addition for the sake of symmetry and completeness, and thus we have included it but in brackets since it clearly was not in the original.]

L6: [Terms] :L6

Mere sounds in general are divided into two types, sounds arisen from elements conjoined with consciousness and sounds arisen from elements not conjoined with consciousness. An example of the first is the voice of a sentient being. An example of the second is the sound of a river.

Sounds arisen from elements conjoined with consciousness and sounds arisen from elements not conjoined with consciousness are each divided into two types: sounds that intentionally indicate meaning to sentient beings and sounds that do not intentionally indicate meaning to sentient beings.

~ An example of a sound arisen from elements conjoined with consciousness that intentionally indicates meaning is the spoken expression 'house'. An example of a sound arisen from elements conjoined with consciousness that does not intentionally indicate meaning is the sound of a spontaneous hiccup. An example of a sound arisen from elements not conjoined with consciousness that intentionally indicates meaning is the sound of the great

drum in the Heaven of the Thirty-Three which conveys the message of impermanence and so forth to its listeners. An example of a sound arisen from elements not conjoined with consciousness that does not intentionally indicate meaning is the sound of an ordinary running brook.

Sound that intentionally indicates meaning to sentient beings, sound that reveals meaning through speech, and expressive sound are mutually inclusive. Sound that does not intentionally indicate meaning, sound that does not reveal meaning through speech, and non-expressive sound are mutually inclusive.

~ This requires qualification because there are sounds that intentionally indicate meaning to sentient beings, such as the sound of the drum in the Heaven of the Thirty-Three, but do not reveal meaning through speech.

The word of Buddha and the treatises are both asserted to be entities that are collections of letters, stems, and words. They are accepted as generic images of sounds and as non-associated compositional factors.⁴ Therefore, one wonders whether in this system matter and non-associated compositional factors are not mutually exclusive.

~ About the word of Buddha, Vasubandhu's Treasury of Manifest Knowledge says:

~ Those eighty thousand bundles of doctrine

~ Which were spoken by the Subduer

~ Are names and are included among [non-associated] compositional factors.

~ Since names are sounds and sounds are material forms, it appears that the Proponents of the Great Exposition assert that the words of Buddha are both material and non-associated compositional factors.⁶

~ An apparent complication is that Gon-chok-jik-may-wang-bo has interpreted Vasubandhu's reference to 'names' as generic images of sounds, which are not material. Also, if 'names' are merely generic images of sounds, it could be asked whether the Proponents of the Great Exposition assert that the sounds heard from the mouth of Buddha, which are forms and thus material phenomena, are not the word of Buddha, for the word of Buddha would be comprised of the generic images of the sounds that appeared to Buddha's mind before he expressed the particular sounds. For instance, before one says the word 'tree' the generic image of the sound 'tree' first appears, and then the sound is spoken. This image of the sound 'tree' is asserted to be a non-associated compositional factor and thus neither form (matter) nor consciousness. One might then wonder whether the Proponents of the Great Exposition would say that the sounds heard from the mouth of Buddha are not the word of Buddha.

// [Note: 4 *Idan min 'du byed, viprayuktasamskara*. In the other systems, generic images are not asserted to be non-associated compositional factors, which are impermanent, but instead are asserted to be permanent; for discussion, see the next chapter.]

// [Note: 6 As Ngak-wang-bel-den's Annotations for (Jam-yang-shay-ba's) 'Great Exposition of Tenets' (*dnegos*, 48.1) says, it is difficult to posit that something could be both obstructive (*thogs bcas*) due to being material and unobstructive (*thogs med*) due to being a non-associated compositional factor. Gon-chok-jik-may-wang-bo is most likely taking his lead from Jam-yang-shay-ba's Great Exposition of Tenets (*kha* 13b.l) where he indicates just such an assertion.]

L4: [Assertions on the paths] :L4

This section has three parts: the Great Exposition School's assertions regarding the objects of observation of the paths, objects abandoned by the paths, and the nature of the paths.

L5: [Objects of observation of the paths] :L5

The objects of observation are the sixteen attributes of the four truths, impermanence and so forth.

- ~ There are four attributes to each of the four truths.
- ~ -- The attributes of the first, true sufferings, are impermanence, misery, emptiness, and selflessness.
- ~ -- The attributes of the second, true origins, are cause, origin, strong production, and condition.
- ~ -- The attributes of the third, true cessations, are cessation, pacification, auspiciousness, and definite emergence from a portion of the obstructions.
- ~ -- The attributes of the fourth, true paths, are path, suitability, achievement, and deliverance.

Subtle selflessness and subtle selflessness of persons are asserted to be mutually inclusive.

- ~ All selflessnesses are either of persons or of phenomena, and since the Proponents of the Great Exposition do not assert a selflessness of phenomena, for them a subtle selflessness is necessarily a selflessness of persons.

The subtle selflessness of persons is asserted to be a person's emptiness of being substantially existent in the sense of being self-sufficient. From among the eighteen subschools of the Great Exposition School, the five Sammitiya subschools do not assert that a person's emptiness of being substantially existent in the sense of being self-sufficient is the subtle selflessness because they consider that a substantially existent or self-sufficient person exists.³

// [Note: 3 See the end of the previous chapter (pp. 177-178) for discussion of the author's partial agreement and partial disagreement with Jam-yang-shay-ba on this issue.]

The Proponents of the Great Exposition do not assert a presentation of coarse and subtle selflessnesses of phenomena because they hold that all established bases [i.e., such as mind, body, house, and so on] have a self of phenomena [that is, they truly exist and have a difference of entity of subject and object].

- ~ When the Proponents of the Great Exposition speak of a subtle self of persons, they mean a person that is seen as having a character different from the mental and physical aggregates. This definition of 'self' applies only to persons because phenomena are not conceived this way. Therefore, within the context of their own perspective, it is possible for the Proponents of the Great Exposition to maintain the existence of a self of phenomena, such as their true existence, and to deny the existence of a self of persons.

L5: [Objects abandoned by the paths] :L5

There are TWO TYPES OF IGNORANCE TO BE ABANDONED through the path: afflictive ignorance and non-afflictive ignorance.

- The first, afflictive ignorance, mainly prevents the attainment of liberation.

Illustrations of afflictive ignorance are a consciousness conceiving a self of persons and

the three poisons [desire, hatred, and ignorance] which arise on account of this conception, as well as their seeds.

-- Non-afflictive ignorance mainly prevents the attainment of all-knowingness. Illustrations of non-afflictive ignorance are the four causes of non-knowingness, such as the non-afflictive obstruction that is the ignorance of the profound and subtle qualities of a Buddha.

~ The other three causes of non-knowingness are ignorance due to the distant place of the object, ignorance due to the distant time of the object, and ignorance due to the nature of the object, such as the subtle details of the relationship of karmic causes with their effects. The all-knowingness mentioned here is not a Buddha's quality of omniscience as it is understood by the Great Vehicle tenet systems. All-knowingness here simply means that if a Buddha thinks about objects, seen or unseen, a Buddha will know those things one by one. The Great Vehicle tenet systems, however, assert that a Buddha can know all things simultaneously and instantaneously, without exerting any effort of thought. The Proponents of the Great Exposition do not accept such omniscience, and, therefore, they do not assert obstructions to omniscience; they merely distinguish between afflictive and non-afflictive ignorance. The Great Vehicle tenet systems distinguish between an ignorance that is an afflictive obstruction and a non-afflictive ignorance that is an obstruction to omniscience.

With respect to the obstructions, aside from obstructions to liberation and non-afflictive ignorance, the Proponents of the Great Exposition do not accept the designation 'obstructions to omniscience'.

L5: [Nature of the paths] :L5

With respect to the paths of the three vehicles [Hearer, Solitary Realizer, and Bodhisattva] they assert a presentation of the five paths—path of accumulation, path of preparation, path of seeing, path of meditation, and path of no more learning.

However, they do not accept the exalted wisdoms of the ten [Bodhisattva] grounds.¹

// [Note: 1 sa, bhumi. These are ten stages or levels that, according to the Great Vehicle tenet systems, begin with the path of seeing. They are called 'grounds' because, just as the earth or ground is the basis of all the forests and so forth that depend on it, they serve as bases for the production of a Bodhisattva's increasingly marvelous qualities.]

They assert that the first fifteen of the sixteen moments of forbearance and knowledge constitute the path of seeing, and that the sixteenth moment, which is called subsequent knowledge of the path, is [the beginning of] the path of meditation [see chart, next page].²

~ The path of seeing is the time when direct cognition of the four noble truths first occurs. The paths of forbearance are so called because one develops facility, or non-fear, with respect to the object of meditation; they are also called uninterrupted paths because they lead without interruption into paths of release in the same meditative sitting. These paths of release are the paths of knowledge, or the knowledge that certain afflictive emotions have been abandoned.

// [Note: 2 Among the seven editions of the text used, five (Collected Works, 503.2; Peking edition, 11a.4; Gomang 1980 edition, 26.5; Tibet Gomang 1987 edition, 9b.1; and Mimaki, 81.20) read sgom lam yin la whereas two (Teacher Training edition, 25.17 and Dharamsala 1967 edition, 26.3) read sgom lam yin pas. Both make sense since the latter would mean that since they hold that the sixteenth moment marks the beginning of the path of

meditation, the sixteen must be serially generated. The former, however, most likely represent the original reading.]

They assert that the generation [of these sixteen moments] occurs no other way than serially [one step at a time], like a goat walking over a bridge.

~ They envision the process in this way: The four noble truths are the objects contemplated on the path of seeing. For each noble truth there is a path of forbearance and a path of knowledge in relation to the Desire Realm; there is also a path of subsequent forbearance and a path of subsequent knowledge in relation to the higher realms, the Form and Formless Realms which are here included in one category. When meditators complete the paths of the first truth in relation to the Desire Realm, they then pass on to the paths of the first truth in relation to the Form and Formless Realms. The sixteenth moment is the time of entering the path of meditation. Other schools say that the eight forbearances can occur simultaneously and that the eight knowledges can occur simultaneously.

True paths are not necessarily consciousnesses because the Proponents of the Great Exposition maintain that the five uncontaminated mental and physical aggregates are true paths.

~ Except for the Great Exposition School and the Sutra School Following Scripture, all schools assert that true paths are consciousnesses. The Proponents of the Great Exposition include within true paths the five mental and physical aggregates at, for example, the time of the fifteenth moment of the path of seeing. However, it is not the case that every instance of the five aggregates included within a Superior's continuum is a true path and hence uncontaminated. The point is that there are instances of each of the aggregates that are true paths and thus uncontaminated. These uncontaminated phenomena are those associated with a Superior's uncontaminated path. Illustrations are a Superior's mental consciousness, the accompanying mental factors of feeling and discrimination, the subtle forms which restrain certain faults and which naturally arise whenever a Superior is in meditative equipoise in an uncontaminated path, and the predispositions established by this path. All these are uncontaminated objects and are truth paths.

L4: [Assertions on the fruits of the paths] :L4

Those of the Hearer lineage become familiar with the sixteen attributes [of the four noble truths], impermanence and so forth, during three lifetimes or more. By relying on the vajra-like meditative stabilization of the Hearer path of meditation, they finally abandon the afflictive obstructions by ceasing their obtaining causes [the potentialities that cause one to have those afflictive emotions].

~ A 'vajra' (rdo rje, literally, 'foremost of stones') is a diamond which, being viewed as unbreakable, is a suitable metaphor for a meditative state that is able to overcome the final object of abandonment.

They then manifest the fruit of becoming a Foe Destroyer.

On the great path of accumulation² and below, rhinoceros-like Solitary Realizers practice the realization that the person is empty of substantial existence in the sense of being self-sufficient. They do this in conjunction with amassing a collection of merit for one hundred great aeons and so forth; and then, in one sitting, they actualize the stages from the heat level of the path of preparation through to and including the path of no more learning.

// [Note: 2 The path of accumulation is divided into three periods—small, middling, and great.]

~ Solitary Realizers are those who have met with teachers and listened to their teaching of the doctrine in previous lives but in their final life live in the Desire Realm peacefully and by themselves, like a rhinoceros. They do not meet with teachers or study doctrine in that life. Great Vehicle tenet systems also assert another type of Solitary Realizers who meet and study with a teacher early in their final lifetime but later achieve their goal alone.

~ According to the Great Exposition School, Solitary Realizers, having accumulated merit for one hundred great aeons over the path of accumulation, pass in one meditative sitting through the four levels of the path of preparation—heat, peak, forbearance, and supreme mundane qualities—and then the paths of seeing, meditation, and no more learning.

Furthermore, the Proponents of the Great Exposition assert the existence of types of Foe Destroyers who degenerate, etc., because there are Lesser Vehicle Foe Destroyers who fall from their abandonment [of the obstructions] and their realizations [of the four truths], whereupon they become Stream Enterers.

~ The Proponents of the Great Exposition maintain that there are five types of fallible Foe Destroyers and a sixth type who is not capable of degeneration. Only this sixth type would be considered an actual Foe Destroyer by the other schools.

With respect to Hearers, they enumerate a presentation of the twenty members of the spiritual community along with the eight Approachers and Abiders; however, they do not assert that anyone simultaneously [abandons the afflictive emotions].

The twenty members of the spiritual community represent a classification of the location and number of lives remaining for practitioners on the way to attaining the fruits of Stream Enterer, Once Returner, Never Returner, and Foe Destroyer.

~ The Eight Approachers and Abiders are beings who are approaching to or abiding in the fruits of Stream Enterer, Once Returner, Never Returner, or Foe Destroyer. The four Abiders refer to persons who have fully accomplished, or who abide in, these fruits. A Stream Enterer is one who will never again be reborn as a hellbeing, hungry ghost, or animal. A Once Returner will be reborn once more in the Desire Realm. A Never Returner will never be born again in the Desire Realm. A Foe Destroyer has overcome the afflictive emotions and thus is completely liberated from cyclic existence.

~ Cyclic existence is divided into three realms and nine levels. The first level is the Desire Realm. The next four levels are the four divisions of the form realm, called the Four Concentrations. The last four levels are divisions of the Formless Realm. Each level has nine series of obstacles that are to be abandoned; big big, middle big, and small big; big middle, middle middle, and small middle; big small, middle small, and small small (see chart next page). Thus, if trainees proceed serially, they have to pass through eighty-one steps, that is, through a series of nine steps on each of the nine levels.

~ Simultaneous abandonment refers to the simultaneous overcoming or abandoning of, for example, each of the big big of the nine levels. Thus, one who passes through the path of meditation with simultaneous abandonment has only nine steps to accomplish instead of eighty-one. The Proponents of the Great Exposition do not accept any such simultaneous abandonment.

They maintain that the eight types of Approachers and Abiders are necessarily Superiors.

~ This means that even Approachers to the fruit of Stream Enterer have attained the path of seeing, from which point they are no longer ordinary beings but Superiors. Other systems maintain that an Approacher to the fruit of Stream Enterer is on the path of preparation.

Bodhisattvas [such as Shakyamuni] complete their collections [of merit and wisdom] over three periods of countless great aeons during the path of accumulation. Having done this, they achieve the causes of the excellent marks [of a Buddha] over one hundred aeons, and then, in their final life vanquish the array of demons¹ at twilight while seated beside the tree of enlightenment. At midnight, while in meditative equipoise, they actualize the three paths of preparation, seeing, and meditation. Later, just prior to dawn, they actualize the path of no more learning [and become a Buddha].

// [Note: 1 literally, demons that are children of gods.]

Therefore [from among the twelve deeds of a Buddha] they consider that the taming of the demons at twilight and the preceding deeds are performed when a common being and that the three Bodhisattva paths of preparation, seeing, and meditation are all only meditative equipoise [because they occur only during meditative sitting]. Of the twelve deeds, the first nine are asserted to be the deeds of a Bodhisattva, and the last three are asserted to be the deeds of a Buddha.

~ The twelve deeds are: descent from the Joyous Pure Land, conception, birth, mastery of the arts, sporting with the retinue, renunciation, asceticism, meditation under the tree of enlightenment, conquest of the array of demons, becoming a Buddha, turning the wheel of doctrine, and nirvana (death).

The Proponents of the Great Exposition assert that a wheel of doctrine² is necessarily a path of seeing and that a verbal wheel of doctrine is necessarily a wheel of doctrine of the four truths.

// [Note: 2 The Gomang 1980 edition (2.15) points out that the word *rtogs pa'i* ('realizational'), as found in the Dharamsala 1967 edition (28.2), does not appear in any of the three editions that they used and is a later addition. Following the Dharamsala 1967 edition, the clause would read, 'a realizational wheel of doctrine is necessarily a path of seeing.' Mimaki (82.19) accepts this new reading, duly noting its origin, but we think it best to avoid incorporating into Gon-chok-jik-may-wang-bo's text what are clearly modern accretions by an editor who thought to improve the text. The phrase appears in none of the other editions used by Mimaki or us.]

The Proponents of the Great Exposition assert that the Seven Treatises of Manifest Knowledge were spoken by Buddha [and written down by Foe Destroyers]. They say that Buddha's word is always literal.⁴ Apart from the eighty thousand bundles of doctrine, they do not assert a presentation of eighty-four thousand bundles of doctrine.

// [Note: 4 Again, Gon-chok-jik-may-wang-bo disagrees with his previous incarnation, Jam-yang-shay-ba, who cogently holds (Great Exposition of Tenets, kha 13b.2) that this is true only of some Proponents of the Great Exposition and that others hold that there are both definitive and interpretable passages among Buddha's word.]

This is because Vasubandhu's Treasury of Manifest Knowledge says:

~ Those eighty thousand bundles of doctrine

~ Which were spoken by the Subduer ...

~ The doctrine is arranged into bundles like wheat that has been cut and bound at harvest time. A bundle signifies a teaching of variable length which, if thoroughly realized, is capable of overcoming one affliction. Those schools asserting eighty-four thousand bundles say that there are twenty-one thousand bundles for each of the three afflictive emotions—desire, hatred, and ignorance—and a fourth bundle of twenty-one thousand for the three of these together.

The place where Bodhisattvas actualize enlightenment during their last lifetime is definitely just the Desire Realm; therefore, the Proponents of the Great Exposition do not assert a presentation of a Heavily Adorned Highest Pure Land or an Enjoyment Body.

~ According to the Great Vehicle systems, a Highest Pure Land is where an immortal Enjoyment Body resides and preaches the Great Vehicle path to Bodhisattvas on the path of seeing and above. Ordinary beings are not found in this type of pure land although they do exist in the pure lands of Emanation Bodies. Most Great Vehicle systems also hold that Bodhisattvas attain full enlightenment in a Highest Pure Land.

Not only this, but they also do not accept omniscience [because they only assert all-knowingness, as mentioned above].

All Foe Destroyers of the three vehicles have a nirvana with remainder because they assert that when one attains a nirvana without remainder there is a severing of the continuum of consciousness, like the extinction of a flame.³ Hence, they assert that there are three final vehicles.

// [Note: 3 The simile is of an flame that goes out because of the exhaustion of it fuel; the comparison is not made to blowing out a flame.]

Some propound that the Teacher [Buddha] merely withdrew a creation of his body from the sight of certain trainees when he passed from suffering [entered parinirvana, that is, at the time of his 'death'] and did not actually pass from suffering [or completely vanish]. This is similar to a confusion of fish and turnips.

~ Fish and turnips are both long and white but clearly different. For this reason, they are used metaphorically to indicate an absurd state of confusion. The author appears to hold that it is inconsistent for proponents of a system—that asserts a complete severance of the continuum of consciousness in a nirvana without remainder—to assert that such did not actually happen upon Shakyamuni Buddha's death. Jam-yang-shay-ba⁴ speaks of just such an assertion as being reported by a transmission stemming from Atisha. Gon-chok-jik-may-wang-bo seems to question even the existence of such an assertion, as does Jam-yang-shay-ba's annotator, Ngak-wang-bel-den, but Jam-yang-shay-ba cogently makes reference, albeit briefly, to the mere fact of the eighteen subschools (and thus a wide variety of opinion) and to the presence of supportive scripture, but he does not cite it.

// [Note: 4 See Jam-yang-shay-ba's Great Exposition of Tenets, kha 12b.5.]

Buddha Superiors have abandoned all sufferings and their origins without exception, and yet, it is not contradictory that true sufferings exist within their continuum. This is because when all afflictive emotions that take true sufferings as their objects are abandoned, this is posited as the abandonment of true sufferings.

~ When all afflictive emotions have been removed, even if one still possesses true sufferings in one's continuum, they do not give rise to afflictive emotions, and thus from this perspective it is said that all true sufferings have been abandoned.

A Buddha's physical body is included in the same lifetime as the physical base of a Bodhisattva on the path of preparation. Therefore, they assert that this body is not a Buddha Jewel [an object of refuge] although it is Buddha.

~ In this system Bodhisattvas are said to pass from the path of preparation to the path of no more learning in one meditative sitting; therefore, when they achieve Buddhahood, their body is the same body with which they, as Bodhisattvas, began the path of preparation. Since it is still an ordinary body, it cannot be an immaculate Buddha Jewel. Many scholars also say that a Buddha's body is not Buddha because it is a true suffering.¹

// [Note: 1 This is the opinion of Jam-yang-shay-ba, whose Great Exposition of Tenets (kha I5a.7) says, The form aggregate [of a Buddha] is not that [i.e., Buddha]; Buddha is only the qualities of non-learning/ (gzugs phung de min songs rgyas mi slob chos).]

The Buddha Jewel is asserted to be the wisdom of extinction [of the obstructions] and the wisdom [that the obstructions] will never be produced again which exist in the mental continuum of a Buddha.

~ When one takes refuge or bows down to the Buddha Jewel, one bows not to the Buddha's body but to the Buddha's wisdom. With regard to the two wisdoms, the degenerating types of Foe Destroyer attain only the wisdom of extinction of afflictive emotions; they do not attain the wisdom of the future non-production of the afflictive emotions.

Similarly, because Learner Superiors [those on the paths of seeing and meditation] are beings who have contamination, they are not considered to be the Community Jewel although they are of the spiritual community. It is the true paths in the mental continuum of Learner Superiors which are asserted to be the Community Jewel. There also is a presentation of the Doctrine Jewel because nirvanas and true cessations in the continuums of Hearers, Solitary Realizers, and Buddhas are all Doctrine Jewels.

~ A nirvana refers to the true cessation of all afflictive emotions, whereas a true cessation can be a cessation of any affliction, such as any one of the eighty-one abandonments on the path of meditation.

// [Note: 1 In the Peking edition (12b.5) read rgyud kyi for rgyud kyi in accordance with the other six editions used—Collected Works (505.4), Teacher Training edition (29.11), Gomang 1980 edition, 29.13, the Dharamsala 1967 edition (29.16), the Tibet Gomang 1987 edition (10b.4), and Mimaki (83.13).]

Stanza between sections:

~ May the youthful with clear minds enjoy
~ This festival of fresh ambrosia of eloquence,
~ Taken from the ocean of the system of the Great Exposition
~ With the golden vessel of my mind's analysis.

L2: [5. The Sutra School – les tenants du discours (SAUTRANTIKA)] :L2

¢(Note: See also the descriptions in Hopkins's Meditation on Emptiness, and Guy Newland's Appearance and reality, and in other articles at the end of this file.)

The presentation of the tenets of the Proponents of Sutra is in four parts: definition, subschools, etymology, and assertions of tenets.

L3: [Definition] :L3

THE DEFINITION OF A PROPONENT OF SUTRA IS:

~ a person propounding Lesser Vehicle tenets who asserts the true existence of both external objects and self-cognizing consciousness.

~ This definition must be qualified because it does not take into account Proponents of Sutra Following Scripture, who do not assert self-cognizing consciousness. Also, the definition is perhaps subject to a more general fault. According to Jam-yang-shay-ba, external objects are not limited to material objects or even to impermanent phenomena but include permanent phenomena such as uncompounded space. Since permanent phenomena are not held, in the Sutra School Following Reasoning, to be truly established and since, when a category contains both permanent and impermanent phenomena, permanence predominates, external objects in general cannot be said to be truly established according to the system of the Sutra School Following Reasoning.¹ Still, there is general agreement in all branches of the Sutra School that impermanent external objects are truly established.

// [Note: 1 A-ku Lo-dro-gya-tso (a khu bio gros rgya mtsho), a follower of Jam-yang-shay-ba, finds fault with the definition from both of these points of view. A-ku Lo-dro-gya-tso says that Gon-chok-jik-may-wang-bo, in setting the definition of a Proponent of Sutra this way, is following the old textbook literature of the Gomang College of Drebung Monastic University by Gung-ru Cho-jung (gung ru chos 'byung) whose works were supplanted by Jam-yang-shay-ba's. For this discussion, see A-ku Lo-dro-gya-tso, Commentary on the Difficult Points of (Tsong Khapa's) 'The Essence of the Good Explanations, Treatise Differentiating Interpretable and Definitive Meanings': A Precious Lamp (drang ba dang nges pa'i don rnam par 'byed pa'i bstan bcos legs bshad snying po'i dka' 'grel rin chen sgron me), (Delhi: Kesang Thabkhes, 1982), 105.4 and 104.1.]

Proponents of Sutra and Exemplifiers are mutually inclusive [i.e., whoever is the one is the other].

L3: [Subschools] :L3

There are two types of Proponents of Sutra—Proponents of Sutra Following Scripture and Proponents of Sutra Following Reasoning.

-- The former are [mainly] Proponents of Sutra who follow Vasubandhu's Treasury of Manifest Knowledge

-- and the latter are [mainly] Proponents of Sutra who follow Dharmakirti's Seven Treatises on Prime Cognition.

L3: [Etymology] :L3

There are reasons for their being called Proponents of Sutra and Exemplifiers. They are called 'Proponents of Sutra' because they propound tenets chiefly in reliance on the Supramundane Victor's sutras without following the Great Detailed Exposition. They are

called 'Exemplifiers' because they teach all doctrines by way of examples.

L3: [Assertions of tenets] :L3

This section has three parts: their assertions on the basis, paths, and fruits.

L4: [Assertions on the basis] :L4

This section has two parts: assertions regarding objects and assertions regarding object-possessors.

L5: [Assertions regarding objects] :L5

The definition of an object is: that which is suitable to be known by an awareness.

The definition of an object of knowledge is: that which is suitable to be an object of an awareness. Object, existent, object of knowledge, and established base are mutually inclusive.

Objects are divided

- into the two truths;
- into specifically characterized and generally characterized phenomena;
- into negative phenomena and positive phenomena;
- into manifest phenomena and hidden phenomena;
- into the three times;
- and into the single and the different.

L6: [The two truths] :L6

THE DEFINITION OF AN ULTIMATE TRUTH IS: a phenomenon that is able to bear reasoned analysis

from the point of view of whether it has its own mode of subsistence without depending on imputation by terms or conceptual consciousnesses. [Functioning] thing, ultimate truth, specifically characterized phenomenon, impermanent thing, compounded phenomenon, and truly existent phenomenon are mutually inclusive.

THE DEFINITION OF A TRUTH-FOR-AN-OBSCURED[-AWARENESS] IS: a phenomenon that only exists

through being imputed by a conceptual consciousness. Non-functioning phenomenon, truth-for-an-obscured[-awareness], generally characterized phenomenon, permanent phenomenon, uncompounded phenomenon, and false existent are mutually inclusive.

THERE ARE ETYMOLOGIES FOR THE TWO TRUTHS. Uncompounded space is called a truth-for-the-obscured because it is a truth for an obscured awareness. 'Obscured' here refers to a conceptual consciousness, which is called obscured because it is obstructed from the direct perception of specifically characterized phenomena.

~ An uncompounded space, i.e., an absence of obstructive contact, cannot be cognized directly; it is cognized only by a conceptual consciousness. A conceptual consciousness is said to be obscured because it cannot perceive impermanent things directly; it can perceive them only through the medium of conceptual images.

However, this is only an etymology [and not a definition, because it is too wide].

Everything that is a truth for a conceptual consciousness, that is, for an obscured awareness, is not necessarily a truth-for-the-obscured. This is because a pot, for example,

which is an illustration of an ultimate truth, is also a truth for a conceptual consciousness, that is, for an obscured awareness. Furthermore, although a self of persons and a permanent sound, for instance, are truths for conceptual consciousnesses, that is, for obscured awarenesses, these do not exist even conventionally.

A pot is called an ultimate truth because it is a truth for an ultimate awareness. This ultimate awareness is a consciousness that is not mistaken with regard to its appearing object.¹

// [Note: 1 An 'appearing object' is not just the object that appears to a consciousness because it is asserted that a pot, for instance, appears to a conceptual consciousness apprehending a pot but a pot is not the appearing object of that consciousness. The 'appearing object' of a conceptual consciousness is a 'meaning generality' (or conceptual generic image) of the object.]

~ A conceptual consciousness is always mistaken with respect to its appearing object, i.e., a generic image, because a generic image of a house, for instance, appears to be an actual house. Hence, even an inferential conceptual consciousness, such as a consciousness that realizes the impermanence of a house, is mistaken with regard to its appearing object, the image of a house; however, it is not mistaken with regard to its conceived object or object of engagement, which is the impermanence of the house and which it conceives correctly. A direct prime cognition, however, is not mistaken with regard to either its appearing object or its object of engagement. Direct prime cognitions are the ultimate consciousnesses that are referred to by the word 'ultimate' in the term 'ultimate truth'.

~ The appearing object of a conceptual consciousness is a generic image, an image from memory, an imaginary construct, or in some cases an after-image of an object apprehended by a sense consciousness. This generic image is the same entity as the conceptual consciousness itself.

~ The conceived object of an inferential cognition is not a generic image of an object, but the actual object itself. For example, when one realizes the subtle impermanence of a chair, the appearing object is a generic image of the impermanence of a chair, and the conceived object is the actual impermanence of a chair, but it is apprehended or gotten at through the medium of a generic image. When one perceives the image of the horns of a rabbit, the appearing object is a generic image of the horns of a rabbit; however, the conceived object, actual horns of a rabbit, does not exist. This distinction between 'appearing object' and 'conceived object' is made only with regard to conceptual consciousnesses.

~ The generic image of fire, for instance, in a given person's mind operates in the identification of the many fires that the person perceives; therefore, that image is 'generic'. Another person would have a different image of fire, the form of which might depend on the initial identification of fire made in the present life. Thus, generic images are not general or universal in the sense that one image serves for all beings. Also, a person's generic image might shift during his or her lifetime. Thus, a generic image is an imputation by a conceptual consciousness; it does not exist in and of itself and, therefore, is not a specifically characterized phenomenon and not impermanent. Though permanent, a generic image does not eternally exist, available for occasional usage by beings, nor does it exist eternally in individual minds, sometimes noticed and sometimes unnoticed. Rather, a generic image which represents the elimination of everything that is not a particular object

is formed at some time and then dwells in latency until the proper conditions are assembled, such as a person's catching sight of a fire. At that time, a conceptual consciousness is produced with a generic image as its appearing object. The generic image seems to be the actual object even if it is understood not to be the actual object, much as a mirror image of a face can be said to seem to be a face even if one continuously understands that it is not a face. In this sense, consciousnesses that have generic images as their appearing objects are said to be mistaken.

~ Generic images are permanent, have parts, and are individual for each sentient being. They should not be confused with the permanent, partless, independent universals of other philosophical systems. The permanence of a generic image is that of occasional permanence. Another example of an occasional permanence is the space associated with a physical object. When the object is destroyed, the space is no longer suitable to be designated. Also, the space associated with the object does not change moment by moment and thus cannot be called impermanent. It is an occasional permanence because it does not exist forever and yet it does not disintegrate momentarily as do all impermanent phenomena.

~ Generic images are not just images of memory that are used for the identification of objects. They are also after-images. For instance, it is said that when one actually sees an object, the object manifest before one is a specifically characterized phenomenon. An eye consciousness is produced in the image of the object, much as if a tiny mirror inside the orb of the eye were reflecting an object. The object—for example, a table—exists one moment previous to the eye consciousness that is produced in its image; nevertheless, the table of the preceding moment is the object of the eye consciousness because nothing intervened between the moment of the object and the moment of the eye consciousness that apprehends the object. The specifically characterized phenomenon, table, is therefore perceived directly. If a mental consciousness is produced through the influence of that eye consciousness, the mental consciousness has one moment of direct perception of the object and thus for that moment is a mental direct perception. In all succeeding moments the appearing object is a generic image that is an after-image.

This way of presenting the two truths is the system of the Sutra School Following Reasoning. The Sutra School Following Scripture asserts a presentation of the two truths that accords with that of the Great Exposition School.

L6: [Specifically and generally characterized phenomena] :L6

The definition of a specifically characterized phenomenon is: a phenomenon that is ultimately able to perform a function. A pot is an illustration of a specifically characterized phenomenon.

The definition of a generally characterized phenomenon is: a phenomenon that is ultimately unable to perform a function. Uncompounded space is an illustration of a generally characterized phenomenon. Imputed phenomena, such as generality and instance, one and different, mutually exclusive and related, and so forth, are generally characterized phenomena; however, something that is any of these is not necessarily a generally characterized phenomenon. This distinction should be made.

~ For example, one itself is a generally characterized object, but one pot is a specifically characterized object because it exists by way of its own specific nature. When we refer to a pot and say, 'It is one,' that oneness is not a phenomenon that exists by way of its own specific nature because from another point of view the designation 'different'

can be applied as, for example, when we refer to the pot as being different from a table. The designations 'one' and 'different' are dependent on imputation by conceptuality; and, therefore, although they might have their base in a specifically characterized phenomenon, they themselves are generally characterized phenomena.

~ The terms svalaksana and samanyalaksana, which here mean 'specifically characterized phenomenon' and 'generally characterized phenomenon', are also sometimes used with a different meaning. They then refer to 'exclusive characteristic' and 'general characteristic'. An example of an exclusive characteristic is the definition of consciousness—that which is luminous and knowing; impermanence, on the other hand, is a general characteristic of consciousness that is shared with other compounded phenomena which are not consciousnesses, such as forms.

L6: [Negative and positive phenomena] :L6

The definition of a negative phenomenon is: an object that is realized through the explicit elimination of an object of negation.

~ Because objects of knowledge are being divided into the negative and the positive, 'negative' here does not refer to the act of negation. It refers to an object that is the negative, or absence, of an object of negation. For example, a negative object such as non-cow is not an act of negation nor either a statement of negation or what is negated. Non-cow is known through explicitly eliminating cow and thus is a negative phenomenon. Non-cow includes all phenomena other than cow—house, fence, person, and so forth. (Although cow is not non-cow, when one says or thinks 'cow', conceptuality does not need explicitly to eliminate non-cow, and thus cow is a positive phenomenon.)

Negative object and exclusion-of-the-other are mutually inclusive.

~ In 'exclusion-of-the-other, the 'other' is the object negated.

There are two types of negative phenomena, non-affirming negatives² and affirming negatives.

The definition of a non-affirming negative is: an object realized by an awareness that explicitly realizes [that negative object] within the context of only eliminating its negated element. An example is Brahmins' not drinking beer.

~ The statement that Brahmins should not drink beer indicates a non-affirming negative because only the negated element, drinking beer, is eliminated, and nothing, no other type of food or drink, for example, is affirmed in its place. Though Brahmins, being humans, must drink something, Brahmins' not drinking beer does not imply this in place of the negation of drinking beer. Also, Brahmins, though existent, are not implied in place of the negation of the object of negation; Brahmins are the base of the negation.

// [Note: 2 med dgag, prasajyapratishedha. The two types of negations seem to have their origin among the Mimamsakas, who used the terms to refer to types of injunctions—when something was just forbidden and when something positive was implied in place of what was forbidden. See J.F. Staal, 'Negation and the Law of Contradiction in Indian Thought' (London, Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, Vol. XXV: Part 1, 1962), especially pp. 56-66.]

The definition of an affirming negative is: [a negative that] implies some other phenomenon, whether a positive phenomenon or another affirming negative [or both], in place of the negation of its own negated element by the awareness that explicitly realizes it. An example

is the fat Devadatta's not eating food during the daytime.

~ In this case, the negation of eating food during the daytime implies that Devadatta, given his corpulence, eats at night.

The definition of a positive phenomenon is: a phenomenon that is not realized through the explicit elimination of its own negated element by the awareness explicitly realizing it. An example is a pot.

~ When a conceptual consciousness knows or identifies a pot, it is not necessary for it explicitly to eliminate non-pot.

L6: [Manifest and hidden phenomena] :L6

The definition of a manifest phenomenon is: an object that is explicitly realized by a direct prime cognition.

~ In all systems except the Consequence School, a prime cognition is both new and non-delusive. The second moment of prime cognition is no longer new, and thus is a subsequent cognition, a non-prime cognition.

Manifest phenomenon and [functioning] thing are mutually inclusive.

~ From the point of view of direct cognition all functioning things are manifest phenomena.

The definition of a hidden phenomenon is: an object that is explicitly realized by an inferential prime cognition. Hidden phenomenon and object of knowledge are mutually inclusive.

~ From the point of view of conceptually, all objects of knowledge, including functioning things, are hidden phenomena because conceptuality cannot perceive them directly; it can perceive them only through the medium of a generic image. Therefore, in this system, manifest phenomenon and hidden phenomenon are not mutually exclusive. All manifest phenomena are hidden phenomena, but all hidden phenomena are not manifest phenomena; for example, uncompounded space can only be cognized conceptually by sentient beings (i.e., non-Buddhas) and thus is not a manifest phenomenon.

L6: [The three times] :L6

The definition of a pastness [of an object] is: that state of destructedness [which exists] in the next period after the time of an object—the object being a [functioning] thing that is other [than its own pastness].

~ For example, the time of the existence of a pencil—which is an existent that is other than the phenomenon of the state of destruction of the pencil—is its own time of existing as a pencil, say for three months. Let us say that at the end of the three months it was burned. The pencil's next period begins with its burning, its destruction. The destructedness of the pencil is then unchangeable, and since it does not disintegrate moment by moment, the destructedness, or pastness, of the pencil is said to be permanent.

The definition of the futureness of an object is: that state of non-production of a [functioning] thing—which is other [than its future]—in some time and place, due to the non-completion of subsidiary causes, although the main cause for its production is present.

~ The futureness of an object comes into being when that object's main cause is present but the object itself is not present; therefore, the futureness of an object exists prior to the present of that object. The futureness of an object is a mere absence that is due to the non-completion of contributing causes; hence, the Sutra, Mind Only, and Autonomy Schools hold that a futureness—as well as a pastness—are not functioning things but are permanent, non-disintegrating. For the Consequence School, they are functioning things and impermanent.

The definition of a present object is: that which has been produced and has not ceased.

A pastness and a futureness are both permanent [because they are mere absences and do not undergo momentary change].

~ There are two types of permanence, occasional permanence and non-occasional permanence. An occasional permanence, such as the pastness of a table, depends upon the destruction of the table, but once the destruction occurs, the pastness of the table—which is the state of its having ceased—exists unchangeably. General uncompounded space, which is a lack of obstructive contact, is a non-occasional permanence; it exists forever unchangeably without a beginning, although the uncompounded space associated with a specific object comes into existence with that object and goes out of existence with its destruction.

Present object and [functioning] thing are mutually inclusive. Moreover, these features should be known: the pastness of a thing occurs after that thing; the futureness of a thing occurs prior to that thing.

L6: [The single and the different] :L6

The definition of the single is: a phenomenon that is not diverse. An example is a pot.

The definition of the different is: those phenomena that are diverse. An example is pillar and pot.

~ The single is what appears as single to a conceptual consciousness. For example, pot is single; also pot and pot are single because the term is the same and the meaning is the same. The different are what appear to a conceptual consciousness to be different. Pillar and pot are obviously different, from the point of view of both the terms and their meanings. However, dog and its Tibetan equivalent khyi are different, even though their meaning is the same because the terms themselves are different. The mention of 'dog' does not necessarily evoke 'khyi' for a conceptual consciousness; therefore, the two are different, but not different entities. Similarly, product and impermanent thing are mutually inclusive—whatever is the one is the other—but different.

~ Dog and pot are different and mutually exclusive because there is no one thing that is both a pot and a dog. However, dog and pot are not a dichotomy, that is, a set that includes all phenomena, because if something is not a pot, it is not necessarily a dog. Permanent phenomenon and impermanent phenomenon are a dichotomy because, if something exists, it must be either one or the other.

~ Product and pot are different, are not mutually inclusive, i.e., whatever is the one is not necessarily the other, are not mutually exclusive (since something such as a copper pot can be both a product and a pot), and are not a dichotomy.

~ The mutually inclusive are always the same entity, but they are different within this sameness of entity. Mutually exclusive phenomena such as a table and its color can be the same entity but different within this sameness of entity. Mutually exclusive phenomena such

as dog and pot are simply different entities.

Phenomena that are different entities are necessarily different isolates.¹

~ For example, dog and pot are different entities and different isolates. 'Isolates' are conceptually isolatable factors.

// [Note: 1. The Teacher Training edition (35.9) should be corrected to kyis khyab from kyis ma khyab in accordance with the Ngawang Gelek Collected Works edition (509.3), etc.]

However, different isolates are not necessarily different entities because product and impermanent thing [which are mutually inclusive] are one entity but different isolates.

~ The isolate of product is identified as opposite from being one with product, and the isolate of impermanent thing is identified as opposite from being one with impermanent thing. Product and impermanent thing are the same entity, since they are mutually inclusive, but are different isolates, since for a conceptual consciousness the one term does not evoke the other.

L6: [Similarity and difference with the Vaibhashika] :L6

Furthermore, they assert directionally partless particles and temporally partless moments of consciousness in accordance with the Proponents of the Great Exposition.

~ Proponents of the Great Exposition and Proponents of Sutra Following Scripture assert these as ultimate truths because they are irreducible, whereas the Proponents of Sutra Following Reasoning assert them as ultimate truths because they are ultimately capable of performing the function of creating effects.¹

// [Note: 1 This comment has been added in accordance with the thought of the author, Gon-chok-jik-may-wang-bo. Some contemporary followers of Jam-yang-shay-ba, however, hold that, within the Sutra School, only the Sutra School Following Scripture asserts that directionally partless particles and temporally partless moments of consciousness exist; they maintain that the Sutra School Following Reasoning, being followers of Dignaga and Dharmakirti, refute the existence of such partless phenomena.]

However, the Proponents of Sutra are not similar to the Proponents of the Great Exposition in all respects because the Proponents of the Great Exposition assert that all existents are substantially established [as having their own autonomous entity that is not dependent on conceptuality] whereas the Proponents of Sutra do not accept this. Also, both the Proponents of the Great Exposition and the Consequentialists assert that non-revelatory forms are fully qualified forms, but the Proponents of Sutra, Proponents of Mind Only, and Autonomists do not accept these as fully qualified forms.

~ Certain forms are called non-revelatory because their presence does not affect ordinary communication. An example is the subtle form of a monk's speech that is the opposite of lying and so forth but cannot be heard by others. It could, however, be perceived by those with special auditory clairvoyance.

This is not the only difference between the Proponents of the Great Exposition and the Proponents of Sutra because the Proponents of the Great Exposition assert [some] cause and effect as being simultaneous, whereas the Proponents of Sutra and above do not assert this.

~ According to the Proponents of the Great Exposition, a main mind and its accompanying

mental factors are simultaneously and mutually supportive, like the legs of a tripod, and thus simultaneously each other's causes and effects. The Proponents of Sutra and above do not assert this to be a case of simultaneous cause and effect because, for them, a cause must precede its effect. They maintain that the previous moment of one mental factor aids the later moment of another mental factor.

L5: [Assertions regarding object-possessors [subjects] :L5

This section has three parts: persons, consciousnesses, and terms.

L6: [Persons] :L6

The Followers of Scripture assert that the continuum of the aggregates is an illustration of a person [i.e., the continuum of the aggregates is the person].

The Followers of Reasoning assert that the mental consciousness is an illustration of a person.

~ The Followers of Reasoning assert that the actual person is a subtle neutral type of mental consciousness because this consciousness exists continuously—through deep sleep, during meditative equipoise, and from lifetime to lifetime.

L6: [Consciousnesses] :L6

Prime cognitions and non-prime awarenesses are the two types of consciousnesses.

~ A prime cognition is defined as a new and incontrovertible knower.¹ A prime cognition, therefore, must be both new and valid; later moments of cognition after the initial period of a prime cognition, which are called 'subsequent cognitions', are, therefore, not prime cognitions. Despite being valid, they are not new and thus are not prime cognitions.

// [Note: 1 gsar du mi slu ba'i rig pa. See Lati Rinbochay and Elizabeth Napper, *Mind in Tibetan Buddhism* (London: Rider and Company, 1980; Ithaca: Snow Lion, 1980), pp. 31 and 116. The requirement of both newness and incontrovertibility (non-delusiveness) is based on Dharmakirti's Commentary on (Dignaga's) 'Compendium of [Teachings on] Valid Cognition', II.2.]

There are two types of prime cognitions, direct prime cognitions and inferential prime cognitions.

Direct prime cognitions are of four types: direct prime cognitions that are sense direct perceptions, mental direct perceptions, self-cognizing direct perceptions, and yogic direct perceptions.

~ The Followers of Scripture do not accept that there are self-cognizing consciousnesses.

The physical senses [such as an eye sense] are not suitable to be prime cognitions because, lacking being luminous and knowing, they are incapable of comprehending their objects.

There are five types of non-prime awarenesses: subsequent cognition, wrong consciousness, doubt, correct assumption, and an awareness to which an object appears without being noticed.

~ Non-prime awarenesses are either not new or not valid or both. Subsequent cognitions

are moments of direct or conceptual cognition of an object that follow the moment in which that object was newly cognized by a direct or inferential cognition; they are valid but not new and thus are not prime cognitions (tshad ma, pramana).

~ A wrong consciousness is any consciousness that is mistaken as to its object of engagement; for example, due to a fault of the eye, a wrong consciousness that perceives the moon as double is produced. A wrong consciousness should not be confused with a mistaken consciousness, which is so called because it is a consciousness that is mistaken with respect to its appearing object. The appearing object of an inferential cognition that realizes a sound to be impermanent is a generic image of impermanent sound; its conceived object is impermanent sound. All inferences are mistaken with regard to their appearing object because the generic image of their object appears to be the actual object. However, an inferring consciousness does not conceive that the generic image and the actual object are one; it does not expressly determine, 'This generic image of impermanent sound is actual impermanent sound.' The generic image merely appears to an inferring consciousness to be actual impermanent sound. Therefore, although an inferential consciousness is mistaken in the sense that an image appears to it to be the actual object, it is not mistaken with respect to its object of engagement or conceived object, as in the case of understanding a sound to be impermanent. A wrong consciousness, on the other hand, is mistaken with respect to its object of engagement in the sense that, for instance, it sees a single moon as double or conceives sounds to be permanent.

~ Doubt, the third of the five non-prime awareness, is of three types. The first is doubt tending toward what is wrong—for example, a consciousness that has not decided whether sound is permanent or not but tends toward the wrong view that sound is permanent. The second is doubt that is equally divided between what is right and what is wrong—for example, a consciousness that tends toward both the wrong view that sound is permanent and the right view that it is impermanent. The third is doubt tending toward what is right, such as a consciousness that has no certainty as to whether sound is permanent or impermanent but tends toward the right view that sound is impermanent. These three stages of doubt are often experienced successively in the process of passing from wrong views, or ignorance, to correct views, or wisdom.

~ A correct assumption is a conceptual consciousness (not a sense consciousness, for instance) which 'decides' that, for instance, sound is impermanent but does not have unshakeable conviction. Usually, even when many proofs demonstrating the subtle impermanence of compounded phenomena are given, a valid and unshakeable inference of the momentary impermanence of sound is not immediately generated. Most persons first gain only a correct assumption, which is not entirely unshakeable, and later, after familiarization with correct reasoning, gain an inference.

~ The fifth non-prime awareness is an awareness to which an object appears without being noticed. This refers to a consciousness which, due to lack of interest and so forth, does not have sufficient power to draw the mental consciousness into noticing the perception. For example, when one has great interest in seeing a beautiful object, the conversation of someone close by might not be noticed. Technically, the conversation is heard, but it is not noticed and cannot be remembered.

Among these, two—direct perceptions and awarenesses to which an object appears but is not noticed—are necessarily devoid of conceptuality and are unmistaken, and three—inferential, correctly assuming, and doubting awarenesses—are only conceptual consciousnesses [because

they never perceive their objects directly].¹

~ Subsequent cognitions and wrong consciousnesses can be either conceptual or non-conceptual awarenesses.

// [Note: 1 The Dharamsala 1967 edition (37.11) mistakenly reads *snang la ma nges pa'i bio dang Inga yod pa las the tshom dang yid dpyod gnyis ni rtog pa kho na yin no*, whereas it should read *snang la ma nges pa'i bio dang Inga'o/1 de dag las mngon sum dang snang la ma nges pa'i bio gnyis la rtog bral ma 'khrul has khyab cingl rjes dpagl yid dpyod/ the tshom gsum ni rtog pa kho na yin no* in accordance with the Collected Works edition (510.3), the Gomang 1980 edition (37.5), the Peking edition (15b.3), the Tibet Gomang 1987 edition (12b.6), and Mimaki (87.16). The Teacher Training edition (37.2) has an even more confused reading that starts in the previous sentence: *tshad min gyi bio la/ bead shes/ log shesj the tshom/ yid dpyod/ the tshom gsum ni rtog pa kho na yin no*.]

When a consciousness comprehends an object, it realizes it within the context of having been generated in the image of its object. Also, minds and mental factors are asserted to be one substantial entity.²

// [Note: 2 For more reading on the topic of consciousness in the system of the Sutra School Following Reasoning, see Lati Rinbochay and Elizabeth Napper, *Mind in Tibetan Buddhism* (London: Rider and Company, 1980; Ithaca: Snow Lion, 1980). For a more historical presentation, see Leonard van der Kuip, *Contributions to the Development of Tibetan Buddhist Epistemology* (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1983).]

L6: [Terms] :L6

The definition of a term is: an object of hearing that causes the meaning that is its own object of expression to be understood. If terms are divided from the viewpoint of their objects of expression, there are two types, terms that express types and terms that express collections. An example of the first is the term 'form'; an example of the second is the term 'pot'.

~ Terms that express types and terms that express collections are not mutually exclusive. For, the term 'pot' expresses both a type and a collection since pot is a type and is a collection composed of parts. 'Table and vase' is a term that expresses a collection but not a type.

Again, if terms are divided from the viewpoint of their manner of expression, there are two types: terms that express qualities and terms that express qualificands. An example of the first type is the term 'impermanence of sound'; an example of the second type is the term 'impermanent sound'.

L4: [Assertions on the paths] :L4

This section has three parts: objects of observation of the paths, objects abandoned by the paths, and nature of the paths.

L5: [Objects of observation of the paths] :L5

The sixteen aspects of the four truths, impermanence and so forth, are the objects of observation of the paths. The Proponents of Sutra assert that the subtle selflessness and the subtle selflessness of persons are mutually inclusive.

~ These are mutually inclusive because the Proponents of Sutra do not assert a selflessness of phenomena as do the Great Vehicle schools.

A person's emptiness of being a self that is permanent [non-disintegrating], unitary [partless], and independent [not depending on the mental and physical aggregates] is asserted to be the coarse selflessness of persons. A person's emptiness of being substantially existent in the sense of being self-sufficient [i.e., able to exist by itself] is asserted to be the subtle selflessness of persons.

L5: [Objects abandoned by the paths] :L5

Like the Proponents of the Great Exposition, the Proponents of Sutra [when referring to the objects abandoned by the path] use the vocabulary of the conception of a self of persons, afflictive ignorance [which obstructs liberation from cyclic existence], and non-afflictive ignorance [which obstructs the all-knowingness of a Buddha]. Aside from merely those, the Proponents of Sutra and the Proponents of the Great Exposition do not assert a conception of a self of phenomena, nor do they assert obstructions to omniscience, etc.

L5: [Nature of the paths] :L5

They make a presentation of the five paths of the three vehicles. They assert that all sixteen moments of the eight paths of forbearance and the eight paths of knowledge are the path of seeing.

Because the appearing object of direct perception must be a specifically characterized object, the Proponents of Sutra do not assert that the subtle selflessness of persons is the object of the mode of apprehension by an uninterrupted path of a Hearer's [or anyone's] path of seeing. This is because they assert that the subtle selflessness of persons is realized implicitly by Hearers [and so forth] through explicit comprehension of compositional phenomena [the mental and physical aggregates] that are devoid of a self of persons.

~ The object comprehended by an uninterrupted path belonging to a path of seeing or a path of meditation must be perceived directly. Whatever is perceived directly must be a specifically characterized phenomenon, and such are always compounded phenomena. An emptiness, however, is an uncompounded phenomenon and, therefore, not a specifically characterized phenomenon. Since an emptiness cannot be cognized directly, it is asserted that a yogic direct perception does not explicitly cognize selflessness. Rather, it cognizes the mind and body as no longer qualified with such a self. Thus, it is compounded phenomena, the mental and physical aggregates, that are directly cognized, and thereby the emptiness of a self of persons is implicitly realized. This fact greatly distinguishes the Proponents of Sutra from the Great Vehicle schools, which assert direct cognition of emptiness itself.

L4: [Assertions on the fruits of the paths] :L4

The Proponents of Sutra assert that there is no Foe Destroyer who falls from abandonment [of all afflictions] or from realization [of the subtle personal selflessness]. They also assert that the form aggregate of a Buddha is Buddha. Other than this, the Sutra School's assertions on the ways of actualizing the fruits of the three vehicles and so forth are similar to those of the Great Exposition School.

~ In the chapter on the Great Exposition School, Gon-chok-jik-may-wang-bo said, 'A Buddha's physical body is included in the same lifetime as the physical base of a Bodhisattva on the path of preparation. Therefore, they assert that this body is not a

Buddha Jewel [an object of refuge] although it is Buddha.' Hence, he seems to contradict himself here by saying that the assertion by the Proponents of Sutra that the form aggregate of a Buddha is Buddha is not shared with the Proponents of the Great Exposition.

Both the Proponents of the Great Exposition and the Proponents of Sutra maintain that the scriptural collections [i.e., discipline, sets of discourses, and manifest knowledge] of the Great Vehicle are not the word of Buddha. However, it is said that there are later Proponents of the Great Exposition and later Proponents of Sutra who do assert them to be the word of Buddha.⁴

// [Note: 4 For more reading on the tenets of the Sutra School, see Anne C. Klein, *Knowing, Naming, and Negation*. Ithaca: Snow Lion, 1989; and Anne C. Klein, *Knowledge and Liberation: A Buddhist epistemological analysis in support of transformative religious experience: Tibetan interpretations of Dignaga and Dharmakirti* (Ithaca: Snow Lion, 1986).]

Stanza between sections:⁵

- ~ A festival of delight should be had by those propounding reasoning
- ~ In this expression of the secret words of reasoning
- ~ Of the Exemplifiers Following Reasoning,
- ~ Accurate from having trained well in the texts of reasoning.

// [Note: 5 The author uses the word 'reasoning' (rigs pa) in all four lines to indicate the emphasis on reasoning in the Sutra School Following Reasoning.]

L2: [MAHAYANA – the great vehicle] :L2

L2: [6. The Mind Only School – les idéalistes, tenants de l'esprit seul (CHITTAMATRA)] :L2

¢(Note: See also the descriptions in Jeffrey Hopkins's *Meditation on Emptiness*, Guy Newland's *Appearance and reality*, Paul Williams's *Mahayana Buddhism – The Doctrinal Foundation*, chapter 4 on Cittamatra and Chapter 5 on the tathagatagarbha, and in other articles at the end of this file.)

The presentation of the tenets of the Proponents of Mind Only is in four parts: definition, subschools, etymology, and assertions of tenets.

L3: [Definition] :L3

THE DEFINITION OF A PROPONENT OF MIND ONLY IS:

- ~ a person propounding Buddhist tenets who asserts the true existence of other-powered natures but does not assert external objects.

¢(i.e. like a kind of idealists that are not nihilists; and not monism.)

- ~ Other-powered natures are phenomena that are under the influence of causes and conditions that are other than themselves; therefore, other-powered natures are impermanent. They are held to be truly established by this system but not by the Middle Way School.

- ~ External objects are objects that are different entities from the consciousness apprehending them. That the Mind Only School refutes external objects means that they refute

that a form, for instance, and the valid cognition apprehending it are different entities; still, this school holds that forms are the same entity as the consciousness that perceives them—both the form and the consciousness apprehending it being produced from a single predisposition contained within the mind. This school is, nevertheless, not solipsistic; it accepts that there are other beings who are different entities from oneself.

L3: [Subschools] :L3

Proponents of Mind Only are of two types,
-- True Aspectarians and
-- False Aspectarians.

Differences exist between these two groups because (1) an appearance of a blue [patch] as blue to an eye consciousness perceiving blue is the 'aspect' that is the basis of debate between the True and False Aspectarians and (2) True Aspectarians assert that an appearance of blue as blue to an eye consciousness apprehending blue exists as it appears whereas False Aspectarians maintain that an appearance of blue as blue does not exist as it appears to an eye consciousness apprehending blue.

~ It is important to determine just what 'aspect' (mam pa, akara) is being discussed in a passage, for there are many meanings to this word. In general, 'object-aspect' (yul rnam, visaya-akara) means the object itself; 'that which has (taken on) the aspect of the apprehended' (gzung rnam, grahya-akara) means the perceiving subject; 'apprehending aspect' ('dzin rnam, grahakaakara) means the perceiver of the apprehending subject, that is, a self-cognizing consciousness. However, sometimes 'that which has the aspect of the apprehended' (gzung rnam, grahyaakara) refers to the object rather than the subject. Here, 'aspect' refers to a mode of appearance of the object.

~ The True Aspectarians hold that a blue patch that appears as a gross or coalesced object does in fact exist as a gross or coalesced object in the manner in which it appears, whereas the False Aspectarians say it does not. Being Proponents of Mind Only, the True Aspectarians agree with the False Aspectarians that the appearance of a blue patch as an external object is false. However, unlike the False Aspectarians, the True Aspectarians maintain that, within the context of this false appearance, the portion of the appearance as a gross object is correct. The False Aspectarians, on the other hand, hold that there is a sense of grossness beyond what is actually there.

The above presentation is correct because:

-- 1. Both the True and False Aspectarians are similar in asserting that blue appears as blue to an eye consciousness apprehending blue.

~ This means that both accept that there are eye consciousnesses that perceive blue as blue and not as yellow, for there are objects that are the same entity as a perceiving consciousness even though there are no external objects. Similarly, both agree that there are eye consciousnesses that perceive blue as yellow, due to some fault in the eye.

2. They are also similar in asserting that blue appears as a gross object to an eye consciousness apprehending blue and that blue [falsely] appears to be an external object.

~ Both True and False Aspectarians agree on the undeniable point that a patch of blue appears to be a gross object—something composed of many particles and not just a single particle— and that even to valid sense consciousnesses objects appear falsely as if they

were entities external to the perceiving consciousness.

3. However, the True Aspectarians assert that an appearance of blue as an external object to an eye consciousness apprehending blue is polluted by ignorance, but that an appearance of blue as blue and an appearance of blue as a gross object are not polluted by ignorance, whereas the False Aspectarians assert not only that an appearance of blue as an external object is polluted by ignorance, but also that an appearance of blue as blue and an appearance of blue as a gross object is polluted by ignorance.

Therefore, the definition of a True Aspectarian Proponent of Mind Only is:

~ a Proponent of Mind Only who asserts that an appearance of a gross object to a sense consciousness exists as it appears.

The definition of a False Aspectarian Proponent of Mind Only is:

~ a Proponent of Mind Only who asserts that an appearance of a gross object to a sense consciousness does not exist as it appears.

There are three types of True Aspectarians:

- Proponents of an Equal Number of Subjects and Objects,
- Half-Eggists, and
- Non-Pluralists.

~ Only in the Mind Only and Yogic Autonomy systems do object and subject exist simultaneously. One latency or seed simultaneously produces both object and subject. For instance, one latency would produce the mottle of colors on the wing of a butterfly as well as the eye consciousness that apprehends these colors. Since the object appears to the perceiving consciousness, there is a question of whether just one aspect of the object, the mottle, appears to the subject, or whether many aspects of the object, such as the blue, yellow, red, and so forth, appear to the subject. Also, every school except the Great Exposition School asserts that the perceiving subject, such as an eye consciousness, comes to be like its object, much as a mirror comes to be like an object set before it. Thus, a similar question is asked: does an eye consciousness come to be produced in the many aspects of the object, an aspect of red, an aspect of blue, an aspect of yellow, and so forth? The question is this: at any one moment are there many eye consciousnesses that perceive the individual aspects of the object or is there one eye consciousness that perceives the object in general?

~ If there are many eye consciousnesses each moment, it would seem to contradict scripture which says that a plurality of consciousnesses of similar type does not occur at the same moment, even though an eye consciousness, an ear consciousness, a nose consciousness, a tongue consciousness, a body consciousness, and a mental consciousness may exist at the same moment. On the other hand, if there is only one eye consciousness every moment, how are all the individual aspects of the object perceived?

~ A few possible 'solutions' are:

~ (1) there are many eye consciousnesses each moment equal in number to the number of aspects belonging to the object;

~ (2) there is one general eye consciousness that apprehends the mottle, and there are many parts of this eye consciousness that individually apprehend the individual colors;

~ (3) there is only one eye consciousness each moment, and moment by moment the various aspects are serially apprehended.

~ All three of these are represented in the Sutra School where external objects are asserted. The Proponents of Mind Only offer another set of three which are given below in accordance with three different sets of interpretations by Tibetan scholars. The amount of attention that Gon-chok-jik-may-wang-bo devotes to this topic suggests that despite the supposedly decisive analysis of this topic in the Great Exposition of Tenets by his previous incarnation, Jam-yang-shay-ba, he was not convinced. Perhaps, Gon-chok-jik-may-wang-bo found the various interpretations a convenient means for stimulating interest in issues of perception.

The assertions of scholars with regard to the differences between these three do not agree.

Gung-ru Gyel-tsensang-bo explains in his Distillation of the Middle Way that:

-- Proponents of an Equal Number of Subjects and Objects are so called because they assert that when an eye consciousness apprehending the mottled colors on the wing of a butterfly apprehends that mottle, from the side of the object, aspects of each of the different colors—blue, yellow, and so forth—are cast [to the perceiving consciousness] and also from the subject's side, aspects of each of the different colors—blue, yellow, and so forth—are produced in the manner of being true aspects.

~ It is doubtful that any Proponent of Mind Only would assert that an object is known through its 'casting its aspect' toward the perceiving consciousness. This is the language of schools that assert external objects. In the Mind Only School, objects are known through the activation of internal predispositions for perception.

-- Half-Eggists are so called because they assert that, when the mottled colors on the wing of a butterfly are apprehended, from the side of the object, aspects of each of the different colors—blue, yellow, and so forth—are cast [to the perceiving consciousness] and from the subject's side, aspects of each of the different colors—blue, yellow, and so forth—are produced in an aspectless manner.

-- Non-Pluralists are so called because they assert that, when the mottled colors on the wing of a butterfly are apprehended, from the side of the object, aspects of each of the different colors—blue, yellow, and so forth—are not cast [to the perceiving consciousness] but the aspect of only the mottle is cast, and from the subject's side, aspects of each of the different colors—blue, yellow, and so forth—are not produced in an aspectless manner but the aspect of only the mottle is produced in an aspectless manner.

Drung-chen Lek-ba-sang-bo, Pan-chen So-nam-drakba, and so forth explain that:

-- Proponents of an Equal Number of Subjects and Objects are so called because they assert that just as the blue and the yellow, which appear to a sense consciousness apprehending a mottle, are different substantial entities, so within the eye consciousness apprehending the mottle there are many eye consciousnesses that are different substantial entities.

-- Half-Eggists are so called because they assert that, although in general a [patch of] blue and an eye consciousness apprehending the blue are of the entity of consciousness, they are different substantial entities.

~ It would seem that in this interpretation they are called Half-Eggists because they are one half like the Proponents of Sutra in that they maintain that subject and object are different entities and one half like the Proponents of Mind Only since in general they hold that subject and object are one entity. It is highly doubtful that any Proponent of Mind

Only would assert that subject and object are different entities.

-- Non-Pluralists are so called because they assert that just as the blue and yellow of a mottle are one substantial entity, so the sense consciousnesses that apprehend the blue and the yellow and are within the eye consciousness apprehending the mottle are one substantial entity.

Jam-yang-shay-ba's Great Exposition of Tenets¹ explains that:

-- Proponents of an Equal Number of Subjects and Objects are so called because they assert that when an eye consciousness apprehending the mottle [of colors on the wing of a butterfly] looks at the mottle, consciousnesses of similar type equal in number to the number of colors—blue, yellow, and so forth of the mottle—are produced simultaneously.

// [Note: 1 Jam-yang-shay-ba's Great Exposition of Tenets, nga 52a.5ff. Jam-yang-shay-ba is the author of the textbook literature the Gomang College of Drebung Monastic University and the previous incarnation of the author of this text, Gon-chok-jik-may-wang-bo. It is particularly interesting that, despite Jam-yang-shay-ba's supposedly having settled this issue in a decisive way, Gon-chok-jik-may-wang-bo does no more than list it as the third of three possibilities, after which he advises his readers to choose whatever seems most suitable to them.]

-- Half-Eggists are so called because they assert that although the blue and an eye consciousness apprehending the blue are serial in terms of the time of their coming into existence, they are one substantial entity in terms of the time of their observation.

~ They maintain that the object exists before and helps to produce the perceiving consciousness, but they hold that at the same time that the object is observed by the eye consciousness, the eye consciousness is observed by a self-cognizing consciousness.

-- Non-Pluralists are so called because they assert that it is not the case when an eye consciousness apprehending a mottle looks at its object, consciousnesses of similar type equal in number to the number of colors—blue, yellow, and so forth of the mottle—are produced simultaneously. Rather, they assert that the mere eye consciousness apprehending the mottle is the sense consciousness apprehending the blue, yellow, and so forth of the mottle.

Since [there are these different interpretations], one should hold whatever is most appealing.

Proponents of an Equal Number of Subjects and Objects are of two types:

-- those who assert eight consciousnesses [the five sense consciousnesses, a mental consciousness, an afflicted mind, and a mind-basis-of-all];

-- and those who assert six consciousnesses [the five sense consciousnesses and the mental consciousness].

Non-Pluralists are said to be of two types,

-- proponents of six consciousnesses and

-- proponents of a single consciousness.

It is said that the False Aspectarians are of two types,

-- Tainted False Aspectarians and

-- Non-Tainted False Aspectarians.

It is said that Tainted False Aspectarians are so called because they assert that the nature of the mind is polluted by the latencies of ignorance and that Non-Tainted False Aspectarians are so called because they assert that the entity of the mind is not in the least polluted by the latencies of ignorance. Or [according to another interpretation] it is said that the Tainted False Aspectarians are so called because they assert that although there is no ignorance at Buddhahood, there are mistaken appearances and that Non-Tainted False Aspectarians are so called because they assert that because there is no ignorance at Buddhahood, there are also no mistaken appearances.

~ The great Mongolian savant, Jang-gya Rolbay-dor-jay rejects both interpretations of Tainted False Aspectarians saying that there is no Buddhist system which asserts that the nature of the mind itself is polluted or that a Buddha perceives false appearances.

Further, Proponents of Mind Only can be divided into two types:

- Followers of Scripture and
- Followers of Reasoning.

The former are followers of Asanga's Five Treatises on the Grounds, and the latter are followers of Dharmakirti's Seven Treatises on Prime Cognition.

L3: [Etymology] :L3

Why are they called 'Proponents of Mind Only'? They are called 'Proponents of Mind Only' and 'Proponents of Cognition' because they propound that all phenomena are of the mere entity of the mind. Also, because they settle the practice of the deeds of the path from the yogic point of view, they are also called 'Yogic Practitioners'.

L3: [Assertions of tenets] :L3

This section has three parts: their assertions on the basis, paths, and fruits.

L4: [Assertions on the basis] :L4

This section has two parts: assertions regarding objects and assertions regarding object-possessors.

L5: [Assertions regarding objects (like both truths exist simultaneously?)] :L5

The Proponents of Mind Only assert that all objects of knowledge are included in the three characters.

- ~ These are
- ~ -- other-powered characters, (i.e. dependent origination)
- ~ -- thoroughly established characters, (i.e. emptiness)
- ~ -- and imputational characters. (i.e. dependent on the mind)
- ~ The three characters are also called the three natures.

This is so because they assert that all compounded phenomena are other-powered characters, that the real natures of all phenomena [emptinesses] are thoroughly established characters, and that all other objects of knowledge are imputational characters.

- ~ -- Except for emptinesses, all permanent phenomena such as uncompounded space are imputational natures.
- ~ -- All emptinesses are thoroughly established natures.
- ~ -- All impermanent phenomena are other-powered natures.

- ~ In this way, all phenomena are included within the three natures.
- ~ Imputational natures are of two types, existent and non-existent.
- ~ -- Except for emptinesses, all permanent objects of knowledge, such as uncompounded space, are included in the category of existent imputational natures.
- ~ -- Non-existent imputational natures are not objects of knowledge, and thus they are not phenomena. For example, a permanent self or a table that is a separate entity from the consciousness perceiving it do not exist at all; these are non-existent imputational natures.

They assert that the three natures exist in their own right and exist inherently.

- ~ If a class has both existent and non-existent members, the class itself is considered to be existent. Thus, imputational natures in general are existent even though some imputational natures, such as a permanent self, do not exist. Since in the Mind Only School whatever exists necessarily inherently exists—i.e., can be found when sought among its bases of designation, even imputational natures, as a class, exist inherently.

However, there are differences with regard to whether the natures truly exist or not, because the Proponents of Mind Only assert that

- imputational natures do not truly exist and that
- both other-powered natures
- and thoroughly established natures are truly established.

¢(i.e. A bit like saying that both, dependent origination and emptiness, the Two Truths, are really existing. Everything is empty, but exist conventionally.)

The definition of an imputational nature is:

- ~ that which does not ultimately exist but exists for a conceptual consciousness.

When divided, imputational natures are of two types,

- enumerated [or existent] imputational natures and
- imputational natures whose character is nihil [i.e., non-existent imputational natures].

An example of an existent imputational nature is object of knowledge.

- ~ As generalities, object of knowledge, one, different, and so forth are permanent because their instances are both permanent and impermanent. In determining the classification of a category, existence predominates over non-existence and permanence predominates over impermanence.

Examples of non-existent imputational natures are the two selves.

- ~ The two selves are a self of persons and a self of phenomena. Persons are empty of being self-sufficient, substantial entities, and phenomena are empty of being subjects and objects that are different entities.

- ~ Thus, a non-existent imputational nature is something that exists for a conceptual consciousness, such as a substantially existent person, but does not actually exist at all.

- ~ Existent imputational natures, on the other hand, do actually exist but only in dependence on a conceptual consciousness, as in the case of uncompounded space which can only be realized through conceptually eliminating obstructive contact.

The definition of an other-powered nature is:

~ that which arises in dependence upon the power of others, that is, causes and conditions, and which is a base of a thoroughly established nature [an emptiness].

~ All compounded phenomena are other-powered natures because they arise in dependence on the major and minor causes that produce them. An other-powered nature is a base of a thoroughly established nature because it is empty of being a separate entity from a consciousness that perceives it and hence is a substratum of the quality of that emptiness. Thus every product is a base of emptiness.

When divided, there are two types of other-powered natures,
-- pure and
-- impure.

Pure other-powered natures are, for instance, the wisdom of Superiors subsequent to meditative equipoise and the major and minor marks of a Buddha.

~ Superiors (those who have attained a path of seeing) directly cognize emptiness during meditative equipoise. Their wisdom at that time is a pure other-powered nature. When they rise from meditation, they have a second type of wisdom; this is the knowledge that although subject and object appear to be different entities, they are not different entities. This knowledge is indirect or conceptual, whereas during meditative equipoise they had direct cognition of emptiness.

Impure other-powered natures are, for instance, the mental and physical aggregates that are appropriated through contaminated [actions and afflictive emotions].

The definition of a thoroughly established nature is:

~ a suchness that is an emptiness of either of the two selves [a self of persons or of phenomena].

~ There is controversy among Gelugpa colleges as to whether a selflessness of persons is a thoroughly established nature. Jam-yang-shay-ba, who is the author of the textbook literature of the Gomang College of Drebung Monastic University and the previous incarnation of the author of this book, holds that it is.

When divided, there are two types of thoroughly established natures,
-- non-perverse and
-- immutable.

An example of the first is a Superior's wisdom during meditative equipoise.

An example of the second is the real nature of phenomena. Although non-perverse thoroughly established natures are stated as a division of thoroughly established natures, they [actually] are not thoroughly established natures. This is because they are not final objects of observation of a path of purification through observation of which obstructions are extinguished.

~ A Superior's wisdom consciousness of meditative equipoise is not an emptiness simply because it is a consciousness; it is a cognition of emptiness in the mode of being fused with emptiness. The two are fused like fresh water in fresh water, but they are nevertheless different for a conceptual consciousness. Therefore, it cannot be said that this wisdom itself is an emptiness, and thus it cannot serve as an object of meditation that would remove obstructions.

Again, objects of knowledge can be divided into the two,
-- conventional truths and
-- ultimate truths.

THE DEFINITION OF A CONVENTIONAL TRUTH IS:

- ~ an object found by a prime cognition that is a correct consciousness distinguishing a conventionality. Falsity, conventional truth, and nominal truth are mutually inclusive.
- ~ All objects except emptinesses are falsities because they do not exist the way they appear, that is, as separate entities from a perceiving consciousness. However, in this system, impermanent phenomena and emptinesses truly exist, because the Proponents of Mind Only maintain that if these phenomena exist, they necessarily truly exist.

THE DEFINITION OF AN ULTIMATE TRUTH IS:

- ~ an object found by a prime cognition that is a correct knower distinguishing an ultimate. Emptiness, element of [a Superior's] qualities,² thoroughly established [nature], ultimate truth, limit of reality, and thusness are asserted to be mutually inclusive.

// [Note: 2 Because emptiness is that through meditation on which the qualities of a Superior are generated, it is called the 'element of [a Superior's] qualities'.]

Ultimate truths necessarily exist by way of their own character, but conventional truths do not necessarily exist by way of their own character. This is because other-powered natures exist by way of their own character, but imputational natures [which are also conventional truths] do not exist by way of their own character [although they inherently exist and exist in their own right].

- ~ Existent imputational natures, such as uncompounded space, are conventional truths, but non-existent imputational natures, such as a permanent self or a table that is a separate entity from a perceiving consciousness, are not even conventional truths because they do not exist.

Falsities do not necessarily falsely exist, for, although other-powered natures are falsities, they do not falsely exist.

- ~ In the Mind Only School, other-powered natures are falsities, but they do not falsely exist. This is because, if they did not truly exist, they would not exist at all. Nevertheless, they are false in the sense that, due to the predispositions that exist in the mind of the perceiver, they appear to exist as entities separate from a perceiving consciousness. Realization of the fact that they truly exist prevents extreme views of non-existence, and realization of their falseness in the sense of appearing one way but existing another prevents extreme views of exaggerated existence.

Proponents of Sutra, Proponents of Mind Only, and Autonomists all agree in their presentations of the three times and of non-affirming negatives.

- ~ These three schools assert that a pastness and a futureness are permanent phenomena, that is, mere absences, and that present functioning things are impermanent. They, along with the Consequentialists, agree that negatives do not necessarily imply something in place of the objects that they negate.

The five sense objects—forms and so forth—do not exist as external objects because they are

produced within the substantial entity of an internal consciousness through the power of predisposing latencies established by common and uncommon actions in the mind-basis-of-all.

-- The True Aspectarians assert that the five sense objects—forms, and so forth—are not external objects but do exist as gross objects.

-- The False Aspectarians maintain that, if such were the case, then forms and so forth would have to be external objects; therefore, they assert that the five types of sense objects do not exist as gross objects [although they do, of course, accept part and whole].

L5: [Assertions regarding object-possessors [subjects – like a very subtle mind that needs to be purified?]] :L5

The Followers of Scripture [mainly the followers of Asanga] assert eight consciousnesses; therefore, they assert that the mental consciousness and the mind-basis-of-all is the person.

The Followers of Reasoning [mainly the followers of Dharmakirti] assert that the mental consciousness is the illustration of a person [i.e., is the person].

~ This does not mean that all mental consciousnesses are the person, for there are many types of mental consciousnesses, desire, hatred, and so on. The mental consciousness that is the actual person is a subtle, neutral form of the mental consciousness which exists unceasingly throughout the whole life. It is called the mental consciousness that is the base of the name of the person. It is much like the mind-basis-of-all but is not separated off as a different entity from the other forms of the mental consciousness.

The Followers of Scripture assert that a mind-basis-of-all observes [the five senses, the five objects, and] the internal latencies.

~ The actual objects of observation of a mind-basis-of-all are the five senses and the five types of objects which are apprehended by the five sense consciousnesses. The mind-basis-of-all does not actually observe the latencies, but it is said to observe them because all perceptions are produced by the latencies.

A mind-basis-of-all has the aspect of not discriminating its objects [it does not notice its objects and cannot induce another consciousness to notice objects], and its entity is undefiled and neutral. It is a constant main mind, associated only with the five omnipresent mental factors.

~ The five omnipresent mental factors are contact, feeling, discrimination, intention, and mental activity.

Moreover, from among the two possibilities of being defiled or non-defiled, it is non-defiled and neutral.

~ It is non-defiled because it is not accompanied by afflictive mental factors.

A mind-basis-of-all is not virtuous because it exists in the continuum of one whose roots of virtue are severed. It is also not non-virtuous because those of the upper realms [the Form and Formless Realms] have a mind-basis-of-all; [therefore, it is neutral].

~ In the Form and Formless Realms, even the mental factors of pride and so forth are not non-virtuous but neutral.

The object of observation of an afflicted mind is a mind-basis-of-all.

~ However, it does not perceive the actual entity of the mind-basis-of-all as it is, for if it did, it would not perceive it as a self-sufficient person.

Its aspect is that of considering the mind-basis-of-all to be [a substantially existent or self-sufficient] I. Its entity is defiled and neutral.

~ An afflicted mind has nine accompanying mental factors, the five omnipresent mental factors and four mental factors that defile it: attachment to self, obscuration about self, pride in self, and view of self. When these four defiling mental factors are cleared away, the entity of an afflicted mind still exists, but it is then pure. At Buddhahood an afflicted mind is transformed into a wisdom of equality which views all objects equally as not different entities from the consciousness perceiving them.

Their way of presenting the six operative consciousnesses agrees with the general [Buddhist presentation of these six].

Both Followers of Scripture and Followers of Reasoning] assert that prime cognitions are of two types, direct and inferential, and they also assert a presentation of four types of direct prime cognition [sense, self-cognizing, mental, and yogic prime cognitions]. Self-cognizing direct perceptions and yogic direct perceptions are necessarily non-mistaken consciousnesses [because they are not infected by the false appearance of subject and object as different entities].

True Aspectarians assert that an eye consciousness in the continuum of the short-sighted [an ordinary being] that apprehends blue is a non-mistaken consciousness.

~ Etymologically, the term 'short-sighted' or 'one who looks near-by' refers to one who does not see beyond ordinary worldly appearances.

According to the False Aspectarians, all sense direct perceptions in the continuum of the short-sighted are necessarily mistaken consciousnesses. Also, they assert that mental direct perceptions in such a continuum are of two types, mistaken and non-mistaken.

~ Other scholars assert that all instances of both sense direct perceptions and mental direct perceptions in the continuum of an ordinary being are mistaken because objects appear to these consciousnesses to be separate entities from the perceiving consciousness.

L4: [Assertions on the paths] :L4

This section has three parts: objects of paths, objects abandoned by the paths, and the nature of the paths.

L5: [Objects of observation of the paths] :L5

The sixteen aspects of the four noble truths are impermanence and so forth (see pp. 203-204).

-- The coarse selflessness of persons is a person's emptiness of being permanent, unitary, and independent.

-- The subtle selflessness of persons is a person's emptiness of being substantially existent in the sense of being self-sufficient.

There are two subtle selflessnesses of phenomena:

-- a form and its prime cognition's emptiness of being separate substantial entities;

-- a form's emptiness of being established by way of its own character as the basis adhered

to by the conceptual consciousness apprehending it.

~ A form is not a separate entity from a consciousness apprehending it, and a consciousness of a form is not a separate entity from its object. Also, forms, consciousnesses, and so forth are not established by way of their own character as the referents of either conceptual consciousness or their respective terminology. The two types of emptiness are said to be intimately related.

Both subtle selflessnesses [of persons and of phenomena] are asserted to be emptinesses. However, an emptiness is not necessarily either of these, for both true cessations and nirvanas are asserted to be emptinesses.

~ This is a technical point. A true cessation is an emptiness of the mind of one who has utterly extinguished an obstruction, and it must be either of the two selflessnesses. But once it can be either, in general it is neither.

Compounded phenomena are asserted to be the same substantial entity as the prime cognitions that apprehend them. Uncompounded phenomena are asserted to be the same entity as the prime cognitions that apprehend them.

L5: [Objects abandoned by the paths] :L5

The objects abandoned by the paths are the afflictive obstructions and the obstructions to [simultaneous cognition of all] objects of knowledge.

~ Less literally, these are
~ -- the obstructions to liberation from cyclic existence
~ -- and obstructions to omniscience.

The obstructions to liberation are, for instance, consciousnesses conceiving a coarse or subtle self of persons, together with their seeds, as well as the six root afflictive emotions and twenty secondary afflictive emotions.

~ The six root afflictions are desire, anger, pride, ignorance, doubt, and afflictive view.

~ The twenty secondary afflictions are belligerence, resentment, concealment, spite, jealousy, miserliness, deceit, dissimulation, haughtiness, harmfulness, non-shame, non-embarrassment, lethargy, excitement, non-faith, laziness, nonconscientiousness, forgetfulness, non-introspection, and distraction.

The obstructions to omniscience are, for instance, consciousnesses conceiving a self of phenomena, together with their predisposing latencies.

Bodhisattvas take the obstructions to omniscience as their main object of abandonment; they do not take the obstructions to liberation as their main object of abandonment. Lesser Vehicle Learners [Hearers and Solitary

Realizers on the paths of accumulation, preparation, seeing, and meditation] take the obstructions to liberation as their main object of abandonment and do not take the obstructions to omniscience as their main object of abandonment.

L5: [Nature of the paths] :L5

A presentation of the five paths—the paths of accumulation, preparation, seeing, meditation,

and no more learning—is made for each of the three vehicles.

The Proponents of Mind Only also assert a presentation of the ten Bodhisattva grounds for the Great Vehicle.

~ The first of the ten grounds begins with the Great Vehicle path of seeing which is also the beginning of the Superior's path. Roughly speaking, the remaining nine grounds are the path of meditation.

L4: [Assertions on the fruits of the paths] :L4

Those whose lineage is definite as that of the Lesser Vehicle take as their main object of meditation the thoroughly established nature in terms of the selflessness of persons.

~ The three natures can be presented either in terms of the selflessness of persons or in terms of the selflessness of phenomena. The former presentation is for practitioners of the Lesser Vehicle, whereas the latter is for practitioners of the Great Vehicle.

~ From among the three natures, in both presentations

~ -- other-powered natures are impermanent phenomena produced in dependence upon causes and conditions, (i.e. dependent origination)

~ -- but the imputational nature,

~ ---- in terms of the selflessness of persons, is a person's substantial establishment in the sense of being self-sufficient (i.e. conventionally established person)

~ ---- whereas, in terms of the selflessness of phenomena, it is the establishment of objects by way of their own character as the bases adhered to by the conceptual consciousness apprehending them (or a difference of entity between subject and object). (i.e. conventionally established phenomena)

~ Similarly, the thoroughly established nature,

~ ---- in terms of the selflessness of persons, is a person's not being substantially established in the sense of being self-sufficient, whereas, (i.e. emptiness of person)

~ ---- in terms of the selflessness of phenomena, the thoroughly established nature is objects' not being established by way of their own character as the bases adhered to by the conceptual consciousness apprehending them (or the absence of a difference of entity between subject and object). (i.e. emptiness of phenomena)

When familiarity with the thoroughly established nature is complete, then in dependence on the vajra-like meditative stabilization of the Lesser Vehicle path of meditation, they abandon all the obstructions to liberation and simultaneously actualize the fruit of a Lesser Vehicle Foe Destroyer.

There is not even the slightest difference between Hearers and Solitary Realizers regarding the selflessness that is their object of meditation, or regarding the afflictive emotions that are their objects of abandonment. Therefore, the presentation of the eight Approachers and Abiders applies to both. However, Solitary Realizers only live in the Desire Realm [and do not exist in the Form or Formless Realms]; therefore, the arrangement of the twenty members of the spiritual community does not apply to them.

Still, it is not the case that there are no differences at all between Hearers and Solitary Realizers. It is asserted that Hearers are inferior and Solitary Realizers are superior from the point of view that a Solitary Realizer extends the amassing of the collections of merit for one hundred aeons, whereas a Hearer does not. The fruits that arise for Solitary Realizers and Hearers through the force of these practices are also respectively superior

and inferior.

The Mind Only Followers of Scripture do not assert that a Lesser Vehicle Foe Destroyer who is solely directed to peace ever enters the path of the Great Vehicle. However, they assert that a Foe Destroyer whose enlightenment becomes transformed [into that of a Bodhisattva] enters the path of the Great Vehicle. This entry is from a nirvana with remainder. There is no entry from a nirvana without remainder because they assert that there are three final vehicles.

~ A remainderless nirvana is asserted to be a severance of the continuum of form and consciousness, like the extinguishing of a lamp. Thus, it would be impossible to enter the Great Vehicle at that point.

The Mind Only Followers of Reasoning assert that all Lesser Vehicle Foe Destroyers enter into the Great Vehicle because they assert that there is [only] one final vehicle.

Those who have the Great Vehicle lineage take as their main object of meditation the thoroughly established nature in terms of the selflessness of phenomena. They practice meditation on the selflessness of phenomena in conjunction with [amassing] the collections of merit over three periods of countless aeons and gradually traverse the five paths and the ten grounds. By means of the uninterrupted path at the end of their continuum [as a sentient being who still has obstructions to be abandoned], they completely abandon the two obstructions, thereby attaining Buddhahood in a Highest Pure Land. They attain a Truth Body, the abandonment of obstructions and realization of selflessness that is the perfection of their own welfare, and attain the two Form Bodies [Complete Enjoyment Body and Emanation Body], the perfection of activities for others' welfare.

According to some followers of Asariga's Compendium of Manifest Knowledge, it is evident that complete enlightenment also can occur in a human life.

~ They maintain that Buddhahood can be attained in a human body, not just with the special body of one in a Highest Pure Land.

Regarding the word of Buddha, Proponents of Mind Only accept the distinction of definitive scriptures and scriptures requiring interpretation. For they assert that the first two wheels of doctrine as described in the Sutra Unravelling of the Thought are sutras requiring interpretation and that the final wheel is comprised of definitive sutras.

~ The term 'sutra' can refer either to a whole text or to scriptural passages. For a brief discussion of the three wheels of doctrine, see chapter three, pp. 171-173.

They posit a scripture whose explicit teaching is not suitable to be accepted literally as a sutra requiring interpretation. They posit a scripture whose explicit teaching is suitable to be accepted literally as a definitive sutra.

There are three types of nirvanas: with remainder, without remainder, and non-abiding (see the next chapter). There are Three Bodies of a Buddha, Truth Body, Complete Enjoyment Body, and Emanation Body. A Truth Body is of two types, a Nature Body and a Wisdom Truth Body. Also, there are two Nature Bodies, a Nature Body of natural purity and a Nature Body of freedom from peripheral defilements.

~ A Wisdom Truth Body is a Buddha's omniscient consciousness, and a Nature Body is the emptiness of a Buddha's omniscient consciousness. In the sense that a Buddha's mind has always been essentially free of the defilements, the emptiness of that mind is called a

naturally pure Nature Body. In the sense that a Buddha's mind has become free of peripheral defilements, the emptiness of that mind is called a Nature Body as freedom from peripheral defilements.

Because they assert these points, the Proponents of Mind Only are called proponents of Great Vehicle tenets.

Stanza between sections:1

- ~ It is right for the discriminating to enter here with joy
- ~ To the tenets of those propounding cognition-only
- ~ Who follow the word of the Subduer, the Leader,
- ~ Since this was stated in accordance with the word of many sages.

// [Note: 1 The poetic play of this stanza revolves around use of the term rnam in all four lines—either as an intensifier or as meaning 'aspect'—but it is untranslatable.]

L2: [7. THE MIDDLE WAY SCHOOL – les tenants du milieu (MADHYAMIKA)] :L2

¢(Note: See also the descriptions in Jeffrey Hopkins's Meditation on Emptiness, Guy Newland's Appearance and reality, Paul Williams's Mahayana Buddhism – The Doctrinal Foundation, chapter 3 on Madhyamaka, and in other articles at the end of this file.)

The presentation of the tenets of the Proponents of Middle Way School,¹ the Proponents of Non-Entityness, is in four parts: definition, etymologies, subschools, and descriptions of the individual subschools.

// [Note: 1 dbu ma pa, madhyamika. This chapter and the next have also been translated (with romanized Tibetan of the Collected Works edition) by Shotaro Iida in Reason and Emptiness: A Study in Logic and Mysticism (Tokyo: The Hokuseido Press, 1980), pp. 27-51.]

L3: [Definition] :L3

THE DEFINITION OF A PROPONENT OF THE MIDDLE WAY SCHOOL IS:

- ~ a person propounding Buddhist tenets who asserts that there are NO TRULY EXISTENT PHENOMENA, not even particles. (i.e. not external, not internal)
- ~ The Middle Way School refutes true existence with respect to all phenomena even down to particles. This means that through reasoning this school shows that things are not established as their own mode of subsistence, or are not their own reality.
- ~ The final mode of being of a table, for instance, is not the table but its emptiness of being established as its own reality.
- ~ According to Gelugpa expositions, in the Middle Way Autonomy School phenomena are not established by way of their own uncommon mode of existence without being posited through the force of appearing to a non-defective awareness. Although objects seem to have their own unique self-established mode of being, they do not; they exist from their own side but also depend, for their existence, on appearing to a non-defective awareness.
- ~ In the Middle Way Consequence School, however, the refutation of true existence

includes refutation of a phenomenon's existing from its own side or existing inherently, due to which objects exist only imputedly.

~ Since, in both sub-schools, phenomena are held to exist, the refutation of true existence does not mean that things actually do not exist; rather, they seem to be their own mode of subsistence whereas they are not and thus are falsely established. (i.e. Emptiness doesn't mean complete non-existence. The Middle Way is beyond the extremes of existence and non-existence.)

L3: [Etymologies] :L3

Why are they called Proponents of the Middle Way School? They are called Proponents of the Middle Way School because they assert the middle that is FREE FROM THE EXTREMES OF PERMANENCE AND ANNIHILATION. They are called Proponents of Non-Entityness because they propound that PHENOMENA HAVE NO ENTITYNESS, THAT IS, NO TRUE EXISTENCE.

~ 'Entityness' or 'inherent nature' (ngo bo nyid rang bzhin, svabhava) has three usages:

~ -- the conventionally existent nature of a phenomenon, such as the heat of fire;

~ -- the real or final nature of a phenomenon, that is, its emptiness or absence of true existence; and

~ -- true existence—an object's being established as its own final mode of being.

~ All Proponents of the Middle Way School assert the existence of the first and second and refute the third.

L3: [Subschools] :L3

There are two types of Proponents of the Middle Way School:

-- proponents of the Middle Way Autonomy School

-- and Proponents of the Middle Way Consequence School.

~ This chapter (#7) deals with the Autonomists;

~ the Consequentialists are the subject of chapter eight.

L3: [Descriptions of the individual subschools] :L3

This section has two parts:

-- descriptions of the systems of the Autonomists

-- and of the Consequentialists.

L2: [7.1 The autonomy school – les autonomes (MADHYAMIKA-SVATANTRIKA) [uses Syllogisms]

:L2

¢(Note: See also the descriptions in Jeffrey Hopkins's Meditation on Emptiness, Guy Newland's Appearance and reality, Paul Williams's Mahayana Buddhism – The Doctrinal Foundation, chapter 3 on Madhyamaka, and in other articles at the end of this file.)

This section has four parts: definition, etymology, subschools, and assertions of tenets.

L3: [Definition] :L3

THE DEFINITION OF AN AUTONOMIST IS:

~ a Proponent of Non-Entityness who asserts that phenomena exist by their own character conventionally [although not ultimately].

L3: [Etymology] :L3

Why are they called Proponents of the Middle Way Autonomy School? They are called such because they refute truly existent things through relying on a correct logical sign whose three aspects exist from their own side.

¢(i.e. They refute emptiness using SYLLOGISMS having the three aspects, while consequentialists refute using prasanga.)

~ A correct logical sign or reason must have three qualities:

~ -- the sign must be a property of the subject;

~ -- the sign must be pervaded by the predicate, i.e., the predicate must be something that is always true of the reason;

~ -- and the opposite of the predicate must be pervaded by the opposite of the sign.

~ For example, in the syllogism, 'A person does not truly exist because of being a dependent-arising,' 'person' is the subject, 'does not truly exist' is the predicate, and 'dependent-arising' is the sign or reason. The reason is a property of the subject because a person is a dependent-arising. The predicate pervades the reason because all dependentarisings do not truly exist, i.e., do not exist as their own mode of subsistence. The counterpervasion also is true because, hypothetically speaking, a truly existent object could not be a dependent-arising. The Autonomists assert that a correct reason inherently possesses these three aspects within the context of not ultimately existing. That they do not ultimately exist means that they are not established by way of their own uncommon mode of existence without being posited through the force of appearing to a non-defective awareness.

¢(i.e. Indeed, to think that syllogisms can prove anything one has to be fool enough to think that there are real things existing (inside or outside), at least conventionally, real direct perception of things and signs, real universal relations, real logical rules, etc. See Mipham's texts on this.)

L3: [Subschools [idealist logicians, dualist logicians] :L3

There are two divisions, the Yogic Autonomy Middle Way School and the Sutra Autonomy Middle Way School.

THE DEFINITION OF A PROPONENT OF THE YOGIC AUTONOMY MIDDLE WAY SCHOOL IS:
[IDEALISTS]

~ a Proponent of the Middle Way School who asserts self-cognizing consciousness and does not assert external objects. An illustration is the master Shantarakshita³ [who is considered to be founder of this subschool].

// [Note: 3 Shantarakshita lived during the eighth century; he visited Tibet and is renowned, along with Padmasambhava, as one of the great early disseminators of Buddhism in Tibet.]

THE DEFINITION OF A PROPONENT OF THE SUTRA AUTONOMY MIDDLE WAY SCHOOL IS:
[DUALISTS]

~ a Proponent of the Middle Way School who does not assert self-cognizing consciousness and who asserts that external objects exist by way of their own character. An illustration is the master Bhavaviveka¹ [who is considered to be the founder of the Autonomy School and of this subschool].

// [Note: 1 Bhavaviveka lived during the sixth century. He criticized Buddhapalita's commentary on Nagarjuna's Treatise on the Middle (dbu ma'i bstan bcos, madhyamakasastra) which was later defended by Chandrakirti, whereby the split between the Autonomy and the Consequence Schools developed.]

There are also etymologies.

-- Proponents of the Yogic Autonomy Middle Way School are so called because they assert a presentation of the basis in accordance with the Proponents of Mind Only [i.e., Yogic Practitioners].

-- Proponents of the Sutra Autonomy Middle Way School are so called because, like the Proponents of Sutra, they assert external objects that are composites of minute particles.

Moreover, Proponents of the Yogic Autonomy Middle Way School are of two types,

-- those who accord with True Aspectarians

-- and those who accord with False Aspectarians.

-- Instances of the first are Shantarakshita, Kamalashila,² and Aryavimuktisena.³

-- Instances of the second are the masters Haribhadra,⁴ Jetari,⁵ and Kambalapada.¹

---- It is explained that Jetari accords with the Tainted False Aspectarians,

---- and Kambalapada accords with the Non-Tainted False Aspectarians.

// [Note: 2 Kamalashila lived during the eighth century; he was a student of Shantarakshita and is famed for coming to Tibet and defeating a Chinese monk in debate at Sam-yay (bsam yas) in the latter part of the eighth century. The outcome of the debate set the predominantly Indian-oriented tone of Tibetan Buddhism.]

// [Note: 3 Aryavimuktisena flourished during the first half of the sixth century; he is said to have been a student of Dignaga, Bhavaviveka, and also Vasubandhu; see David Seyfort Ruegg, The Literature of the Madhyamaka School of Philosophy in India (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1981), p. 87.]

// [Note: 4 Haribhadra flourished during the later part of the eighth century (see Ruegg, p. 101); he is famed for his commentaries on Maitreya's Ornament for Clear Realization (mngon rtogs rgyan, abhisamayalamkara). Taranatha (p. 277) explains that Haribhadra was a student of Shantarakshita.]

// [Note: 5 Ruegg (p. 100, n. 312) relates that there are two scholars by the name of Jetari (or also Jitari), one who lived during the ninth century and another who lived during the eleventh century. Kambalapada probably flourished during the first part of the eighth century, if Taranatha's placing him as an approximate contemporary of Jnanagarbha is correct (see Ruegg, p. 106).]

L3: [Assertions of tenets] :L3

This section has two parts: the system of Yogic Autonomy Middle Way School and the system of the Sutra Autonomy Middle Way School.

L2: [7.1.1 Tenets of the yogic autonomy middle way school (MADHYAMIKA-SVATANTRIKA-YOGACARA) (Santaraksita, Haribhadra, Kamasila) [idealist logicians, no external objects, but consciousnesses are real conventionality] :L2

¢(Note: See also the descriptions in Jeffrey Hopkins's Meditation on Emptiness, Guy Newland's Appearance and reality, Paul Williams's Mahayana Buddhism – The Doctrinal Foundation, chapter 3 on Madhyamaka, and in other articles at the end of this file.)

This section has three parts: their assertions on the basis, paths, and fruits.

L4: [Assertions on the basis] :L4

This section has two parts: assertions regarding objects and assertions regarding object-possessors.

L5: [Assertions regarding objects] :L5

They maintain that any established base [i.e., object] necessarily exists by way of its own character, because they assert that, regarding any phenomenon, if the imputed object is sought, it is findable.

~ The Consequence School asserts just the opposite; they maintain that when an imputed object—any phenomenon—is sought, it cannot be found and thus does not exist by way of its own character.

Therefore, they assert that inherently existent, existing by way of its own character, existing by way of its own mode of subsistence, and existing in its own right are mutually inclusive.

~ The Autonomy School affirms these of all phenomena whereas the Consequence School refutes these of all phenomena.

When objects of knowledge are divided, they are twofold—ultimate truths and conventional truths.

THE DEFINITION OF AN ULTIMATE TRUTH IS:

~ an object that is realized in a non-dualistic manner by a direct prime cognition that directly realizes it.

~ When an ultimate truth, an emptiness, is directly realized in meditative equipoise, it is realized in an utterly non-dualistic manner without any appearance of subject and object, conventionalities, conceptual image, difference, or true existence. It is only an ultimate truth that can be non-dualistically cognized in this way.

THE DEFINITION OF A CONVENTIONAL TRUTH IS:

~ an object that is realized in a dualistic manner by a direct prime cognition that directly realizes it.

~ Duality here refers to an appearance of subject and object, which in this system are conventionally one entity.

A pot's emptiness of true existence is an illustration of an ultimate truth. A pot is an

illustration of a conventional truth.

If an extensive division of ultimate truths is made, there are sixteen emptinesses. Or, in brief, there are four emptinesses.

~ The four emptinesses are of compounded phenomena, uncompounded phenomena, self, and other.

There are two types of conventional truths, real conventional truths and unreal conventional truths. An example of the first is water; an example of the second is a mirage.

~ A mirage exists but is commonly known to be unreal because it appears to be water but is not.

This system asserts that any consciousness is necessarily a real conventionality.

L5: [Assertions regarding object-possessors [subjects] :L5

Both Yogic Autonomists and Sutra Autonomists assert that [a subtle, neutral] mental consciousness is an illustration of [i.e., is] the person.

Also, both subschools do not assert a mind-basis-of-all or an afflicted mind but assert six consciousnesses. There are two kinds of awarenesses, prime cognitions and non-prime awarenesses. There are two types of prime cognitions, direct prime cognitions and inferential prime cognitions.

[For the Yogic Autonomists]¹ there are four types of direct perception: sense, mental, self-cognizing, and yogic. They assert that all self-cognizing and yogic direct perceptions are unmistakable consciousnesses.

~ These are not mistaken either with respect to the non-difference of entity of subject and object or with respect to the absence of true existence.

// [Note: ¹ This qualification is necessary because, as the author himself later says of the Sutra Autonomists, '... this system asserts external objects and does not assert self-cognizing consciousness'.]

Since they do not accept external objects, they maintain that a direct perception apprehending a blue [patch] and the blue [patch] itself are one substantial entity.

L4: [Assertions on the paths] :L4

This section has three parts: objects of observation of the paths, objects abandoned by the paths, and nature of the paths.

L5: [Objects of observation of the paths] :L5

The Yogic Autonomists assert that a person's emptiness of being permanent, unitary, and independent is a coarse selflessness of persons.

They assert that a person's emptiness of being substantially existent in the sense of being self-sufficient is a subtle selflessness of persons.²

~ The coarse selflessness of persons is also applicable to phenomena in the sense that all phenomena are empty of being objects of use of a permanent, unitary, and independent user. The subtle selflessness of persons similarly applies to phenomena in that all phenomena are empty of being objects that are used by a substantially existent or

self-sufficient user. Thereby it is seen that, according to the Autonomists, the base of the emptiness of persons is not just the person but all phenomena. Also, the bases of the emptiness of phenomena are not just phenomena (excluding the person) but also the person. Thus the bases of the two emptinesses are the same; however, the object negated in, for instance, the subtle selflessness of persons is substantial existence, whereas the object negated in the subtle selflessness of phenomena is true existence. Thus, for the Autonomists the bases of the emptiness of a self of persons and the bases of the emptiness of a self of phenomena are the same, but the object negated, or that of which the bases are empty, is different. 'Base of emptiness' here means an object that is empty of a negated element and should not be misunderstood as a physical base out of which phenomena are produced. Still, it can be said that emptiness is the base of all phenomena because if phenomena were not empty of true existence, they could not be produced or destroyed.

// [Note: 2 These two assertions apply not only to this school but to all schools except the Consequence School and the five subschools of the Great Exposition School that assert an inexpressible person.]

The Yogic Autonomists assert that a form's emptiness of being an entity other than the prime cognition apprehending the form is a coarse selflessness of phenomena.

They assert that the emptiness of true existence of all phenomena is the subtle selflessness of phenomena.

L5: [Objects abandoned by the paths] :L5

The Yogic Autonomists assert that

-- consciousnesses conceiving [the coarse and subtle versions of] a self of persons are the obstructions to liberation.

-- They assert that consciousnesses conceiving [the coarse and subtle versions of] a self of phenomena are the obstructions to omniscience. There are two types of obstructions to omniscience.

---- They assert that a consciousness conceiving an otherness of substantial entity of apprehended object and apprehending subject is a coarse obstruction to omniscience

---- and that a consciousness conceiving the true existence of phenomena, such as the mental and physical aggregates, is a subtle obstruction to omniscience.

L5: [Nature of the paths] :L5

The Yogic Autonomists assert the five paths of the three vehicles, making fifteen paths, just as the other systems do. The difference is in their assertion that an uninterrupted path and a path of release of a Solitary Realizer must have the aspect of realizing an emptiness of duality [of subject and object].

~ An uninterrupted path is the meditative equipoise vanquishing the obstructions of that level. It leads directly, without interruption, to the attainment of a path of release—the experience of having vanquished those obstructions. 'Emptiness of duality' here refers to subject and object's emptiness of being different entities. The aspect of a path is its mode of apprehension. A path is a consciousness which, when actualized, will lead one to high attainments.

L4: [Assertions on the fruits of the paths] :L4

Solitary Realizers take as their main object of abandonment the coarse obstructions to

omniscience [the conception that subject and object are different entities]. Therefore, the presentation of the eight Approachers and Abiders is not applicable to Solitary Realizers.

~ Because Solitary Realizers strive mainly to abandon the coarse obstructions to omniscience, the eight Approachers and Abiders, which deal with abandoning the obstructions to liberation, do not apply to them.

However, the eight Approachers and Abiders are asserted with respect to Hearers.

Those firm in the Hearer lineage take as their main object of meditative cultivation the view realizing the selflessness of persons.

~ To be 'firm in the Hearer lineage' means to enter the Hearer path and complete it without switching to the path of a Solitary Realizer or a Bodhisattva.

Finally, in dependence on the vajra-like meditative stabilization of their path of meditation, they abandon all obstructions to liberation and simultaneously actualize the fruit of Hearer Foe Destroyer.

Those firm in the Solitary Realizer lineage take as their main object of meditative cultivation the view that apprehending subject and apprehended object are empty of duality. Finally, in dependence on the vajralike meditative stabilization of their path of meditation, they entirely abandon the obstructions to liberation as well as all the coarse obstructions to omniscience and simultaneously attain the fruit of Solitary Realizer Foe Destroyer.

Lesser Vehicle nirvanas are of two types, those with remainder and those without remainder. The first is a nirvana having the remainder of miserable [mental and physical] aggregates that were wrought by former [contaminated] actions and afflictive emotions. The second type is asserted to be a state devoid of miserable mental and physical aggregates. A Hearer or Solitary Realizer Foe Destroyer will necessarily enter the Great Vehicle because they assert only one final vehicle.

Therefore, in this system, due to a difference in the objects of abandonment and in the type of realization of Hearers and Solitary Realizers, there is also a distinction of inferiority and superiority with respect to the fruits that they attain.

Those firm in the Great Vehicle lineage generate a mind of altruistic aspiration to highest enlightenment. Then, during the great level of the path of accumulation [from among the division of this path into small, middling, and great levels], in dependence on the meditative stabilization of the stream of doctrine they actually listen to preceptual instructions from supreme Emanation Bodies. When, in dependence on their practicing the meaning of these instructions, they first produce the wisdom arisen from meditation which observes emptiness, they pass on to the path of preparation.

Then at the time of heat⁸ [the first of four levels in the path of preparation], the manifest conception of thoroughly afflicted objects [as truly existent objects of use] diminishes.

~ An example of this is the apprehension of a cup as an object of use (e.g., drinking) that truly exists. That only the manifest conception of this diminishes indicates that the seeds of these obstructions are not abandoned at this point; thus, these obstructions still exist latently.

// [Note: 8 'Heat' (drod, usmagata) indicates that the fire of the non-conceptual wisdom of the path of seeing will soon be generated.]

At the time of attaining peak¹ [the second level of the path of preparation], the manifest conception of pure objects [such as true cessations and true paths as truly existent objects of use] diminishes. When forbearance² [the third level of the path of preparation] is attained, the manifest conception [of a truly existent user] with regard to a subject [i.e., consciousness] that apprehends objects as substantially existent diminishes. When highest mundane qualities³ [the fourth and last level of the path of preparation] is attained, the manifest conception [of a truly existent user] with regard to a subject [i.e., consciousness] that apprehends objects as imputed diminishes. These four conceptions are abandoned by the path of seeing.

// [Note: 1 'Teak' (rise mo, murdhagata) indicates that one has reached the peak, or end, of the instability (susceptibility to destruction) of roots of virtue.]

// [Note: 2 'Forbearance' (bzod pa, ksanti) indicates a meditative serviceability with emptiness, a lack of fear of emptiness, etc.]

// [Note: 3 'Highest mundane qualities' (chos mchog/ 'jig rten pa'i chos mchog, laukikagradharma) indicates that this level is the supreme of levels while one is still an ordinary being, for the next level is the path of seeing, at which point one becomes a Superior Cphags pa, aryan).]

The four—heat, peak, forbearance, and highest mundane qualities—are respectively called the meditative stabilization of achieving perception [of emptiness], the meditative stabilization of the increase of the perception [of emptiness], the meditative stabilization which understands suchness one-sidedly, and the uninterrupted meditative stabilization.

~ The meditative stabilization which understands suchness one-sidedly is so called because for the first time yogis have attained clear conceptual perception of the emptiness of objects but have not yet gained such perception of the emptiness of subjects; thus, their concentration is one-sided with respect to emptiness. The uninterrupted concentration is so called because in the same session the yogi will proceed, without interruption, to a path of release of a path of seeing.

Right after that, the acquired obstructions to liberation and the acquired obstructions to omniscience, together with their seeds are removed by an uninterrupted path of the path of seeing. A path of release [of the path of seeing] and a true cessation [of the acquired obstructions] are then actualized.

~ Acquired obstructions to liberation refer to superimpositions of a self of persons that are not inborn but intellectually acquired. Such conviction is gained through teachings and proofs of, for instance, a substantially existent, self-sufficient person. Acquired obstructions to omniscience refer to superimpositions of a self of phenomena that derive from conviction gained through the teachings and proofs of a difference of entity of subject and object or of true existence.

~ The path of release here is the state of having vanquished the acquired obstructions. True cessation here is the state of cessation, completely and forever, of the acquired obstructions.

It is said that, through the nine steps of the path of meditation, the seeds of the sixteen

afflictive emotions and the seeds of the one hundred and eight obstructions to omniscience—which are to be abandoned by the path of meditation—are gradually abandoned. Finally, in dependence on the uninterrupted path at the end of the continuum [of existence as a sentient being] the innate afflictive emotions and the innate obstructions to omniscience are simultaneously abandoned. In the next moment highest enlightenment is attained.

~ Upon the attainment of Buddhahood one is no longer a 'sentient being' (sems can, sattva), but this does not mean that a Buddha has no mind. The term 'sentient being' specifically refers to a being who has obstructions yet to be overcome, and thus because a Buddha does not have obstructions yet to be abandoned, a Buddha is not a 'sentient being'. The innate obstructions are the consciousnesses conceiving a self of persons and a self of phenomena that derive from the beginningless habit of viewing persons and phenomena as, for instance, truly existent. The term 'innate' or 'inborn' means that these obstructions are produced along with the mental and physical aggregates without the need of conviction gained through teachings and proofs.

This is the way the fruit is manifested by those who are firm in the Bodhisattva lineage.

They assert that a Great Vehicle nirvana and a non-abiding nirvana are mutually inclusive.

~ In a non-abiding nirvana, due to wisdom there is no abiding in cyclic existence, and due to compassion there is no abiding in solitary peace.

They assert that the number of Bodies of a Buddha is definitely four. Even though Aryavimuktisena and Haribhadra debated about the teachings regarding the Bodies of a Buddha [in Maitreya's Ornament for Clear Realization], they did not debate about the number being limited [to four].

~ The Four Bodies of a Buddha are Nature Body, Wisdom Body, Complete Enjoyment Body, and Emanation Body.

With respect to the word of Buddha, a presentation of definitive sutras and sutras requiring interpretation is made. For, sutras requiring interpretation are those that teach within taking conventional truths as the main object of their explicit teaching, and definitive sutras are those that teach within taking ultimate truths as the main object of their explicit teaching.

~ For a scripture to be definitive, it also must be literally acceptable, without qualification. For instance, even a passage teaching that all phenomena are empty of inherent existence requires interpretation; though the main object taught is an ultimate truth, the passage cannot be accepted without the qualification 'ultimately' (don dam par, paramarthatas), that is, all phenomena are ultimately empty of inherent existence.

With respect to the wheels of doctrine as explained in the Sutra Unravelling the Thought, the first wheel requires interpretation; the last two wheels are both asserted to have two types, definitive and requiring interpretation.

L2: [7.1.2 Tenets of the sutra autonomy middle way school
(MADHYAMIKA-SVATANTRIKA-SAUTRANTIKA) (Bhavaviveka) [dualist logicians, accept external

objects are real conventionality, but reject self-cognition] :L2

¢(Note: See also the descriptions in Jeffrey Hopkins's Meditation on Emptiness, Guy Newland's Appearance and reality, Paul Williams's Mahayana Buddhism – The Doctrinal Foundation, chapter 3 on Madhyamaka, and in other articles at the end of this file.)

L4: [Assertions on the basis] :L4

Except that this system asserts external objects and does not assert self-cognizing consciousness, their presentation of the basis mostly resembles that of the Yogic Autonomy Middle Way School.

L4: [Assertions on the paths] :L4

With respect to differences regarding the paths, the Sutra Autonomy Middle Way School asserts that those firm in the lineages of Hearers and of Solitary Realizers do not realize the selflessness of phenomena. Also, they do not assert a wisdom that realizes that subject and object are empty of being different substantial entities, and they do not assert that a conceptual consciousness apprehending external objects is an obstruction to omniscience.

L4: [Assertions on the fruits of the paths] :L4

The obstructions that Hearers and Solitary Realizers abandon and the selflessness that they realize do not differ in coarseness or subtlety; hence, there is no difference in their type of realization. The Sutra Autonomists make a presentation of the eight Approachers and Abiders for both Hearers and Solitary Realizers.

They assert that those firm in the Great Vehicle lineage abandon the two obstructions serially. For, Bhavaviveka explains in his Blaze of Reasoning that, at the time of achieving the eighth ground, the obstructions to liberation are exhaustively abandoned. However, unlike the Consequentialists, they do not assert that one begins to abandon the obstructions to omniscience only when the obstructions to liberation have all been removed.

~ The Sutra Autonomists say that Bodhisattvas on the first ground simultaneously begin to rid themselves of the obstructions to liberation and the obstructions to omniscience but that the final removal of the two obstructions does not take place simultaneously. The completion of the abandoning of the obstructions to liberation takes place at the beginning of the eighth Bodhisattva ground, and the completion of the abandoning of the obstructions to omniscience takes place at Buddhahood.

Except for only these differences, the Sutra Autonomy Middle Way School's presentation of the basis, paths, and fruits mostly accords with that of the Yogic Autonomy Middle Way School.¹

// [Note: 1 For more reading on the tenets of the Autonomy School, see Donald S. Lopez, A Study of Svatantrika (Ithaca: Snow Lion, 1986).]

Stanza between sections:2

~ O, those whose own wish is to be wise, take up this exposition
~ Expressing well, without my own fabrication, all the distinctions
~ In tenets of the Proponents of Own-Power who assert that things,
~ Though existent by way of their own character, do not truly exist.

// [Note: 2 The author uses the term 'own' (rang) in all four lines—'own character' (rang

mtshan), 'own power' (rang rgyud) which has usually been translated as 'autonomy', 'own fabrication' (rang bzo), and 'whose own wish is to be wise' (rang nyid mkhas 'dod). Most likely, he is emphasizing the Autonomists' assertion that objects exist from their own side.]

L2: [7.2 THE CONSEQUENCE SCHOOL – les conséquentialistes (MADHYAMIKA-PRASANGIKA) (Buddhapalita, Chandrakirti, Shantideva) [uses Prasanga] :L2

¢(Note: See also the descriptions in Jeffrey Hopkins's Meditation on Emptiness, Guy Newland's Appearance and reality, Paul Williams's Mahayana Buddhism – The Doctrinal Foundation, chapter 3 on Madhyamaka, and in other articles at the end of this file.)

The presentation of the tenets of the Consequentialists is in three parts: definition, etymology, and assertions of tenets.

L3: [Definition] :L3

THE DEFINITION OF A CONSEQUENTIALIST IS:

~ a Proponent of Non-Entityness who does not assert that phenomena exist by way of their own character even conventionally.

~ Illustrations are Buddhapalita, Chandrakirti, and Shantideva.¹

// [Note: 1 Buddhapalita lived around 470-540, as tentatively indicated in Ruegg, p. 58. Chandrakirti was a seventh century scholar who came to the defense of Buddhapalita's commentary on Nagarjuna's Treatise on the Middle which had been criticized by Bhavaviveka. Shantideva was an eighth century scholar and poet whose view is held to be that of a Consequentialist.]

L3: [Etymology] :L3

Why are they called 'Consequentialists'? They are called Consequentialists [i.e., THOSE WHO USE CONSEQUENCES] because they assert that an inferring consciousness that realizes the thesis [that phenomena do not inherently exist can be] generated in the continuum of other parties just by [presenting that person with an absurd] consequence [of their own position].

~ The Consequentialists maintain that the mere consequence, 'It follows that a person is not a dependent-arising because of inherently existing/ can generate in another—who is properly prepared—the understanding that a person does not inherently exist (because of being a dependent-arising). The other systems hold that, after presenting a consequence, it is necessary to state explicitly its import in syllogistic form in order to cause an opponent to realize the intended thesis. Thus, it is not that the Consequentialists do not accept syllogistic reasoning; rather, they hold that it is not necessary to state a syllogism for another to generate an inferential understanding of emptiness.

L3: [Assertions of tenets] :L3

This section has three parts: their assertions on the basis, paths, and fruits.

L4: [Assertions on the basis] :L4

[This section has two parts: assertions regarding objects and assertions regarding object-possessors (subjects).]

L5: [Assertions regarding objects] :L5

They assert that whatever is an established base [i.e., whatever exists] necessarily does not exist by way of its own character. This is because they assert that ALL OBJECTS¹ ARE ONLY IMPUTED BY CONCEPTUALITY and that the word 'only' in the term 'only imputed by conceptuality' eliminates the existence of objects by way of their own character. Established base, object, and object of knowledge are mutually inclusive.

// [Note: 1 Literally, 'whatsoever established bases' (gzhi grub tshad). tshad here does not refer to valid cognition (tshad ma) but to 'measure' as in 'whatsoever measure' or 'whatsoever extent'.]

Objects are divided into the manifest and the hidden, and they are divided into the two truths.

L6: [The manifest and the hidden] :L6

THE DEFINITION OF A MANIFEST OBJECT IS:

~ a phenomenon that can be known through the power of experience, without depending on a logical sign. Obvious object,² manifest object, sense object, and non-hidden phenomenon are mutually inclusive and synonymous. Illustrations are forms, sounds, odors, tastes, and tangible objects.

// [Note: 2 Only the Consequentialists assert that this term primarily applies to objects; the other schools use the term primarily to refer to directly perceiving consciousnesses.]

THE DEFINITION OF A HIDDEN OBJECT IS:

~ a phenomenon that must be known through depending on a reason or sign. Hidden object, non-obvious phenomenon, and object of inferential comprehension are mutually inclusive and synonymous. Illustrations are the impermanence of a sound and a sound's selflessness of phenomena.

~ These definitions are taken from the point of view of ordinary beings because there are no hidden objects for a Buddha, who realizes everything directly. Also, although an ordinary being who has a yogic direct perception that directly realizes the subtle impermanence of, for instance, a sound must depend on inference before directly cognizing it, a Superior can directly perceive the impermanence of a sound without first depending on an inference. Thus the impermanence of sound is not always a hidden object; it can be perceived directly as under the above conditions. Consequently, the synonyms given are only roughly mutually inclusive because what is an object of inference for one person could be an object of direct perception even for another ordinary being. The point here is that a hidden object is something that an ordinary being can newly cognize only through inference. It can be understood from the illustrations that the author gives—the impermanence of a sound and a sound's selflessness of phenomena—that hidden objects are not propositions about phenomena inaccessible to an ordinary being's experience but are such phenomena themselves.

Therefore, in this system a manifest object and a hidden object are mutually exclusive [for ordinary beings].

Also, the three spheres of objects of comprehension [the manifest, the slightly hidden, and the very hidden] are asserted to be mutually exclusive.

~ Slightly hidden objects, such as an emptiness of inherent existence, are amenable to realization by the usual type of inference. The very hidden, such as the layout of the universe, are known through such means as inference based on valid scriptures.

L6: [The two truths] :L6

THE DEFINITION OF SOMETHING'S BEING A CONVENTIONAL TRUTH [or, more literally, a truth for a concealing consciousness] is:

~ an object that is found by a valid cognition distinguishing a conventionality and with respect to which a valid cognition distinguishing a conventionality becomes a valid cognition distinguishing a conventionality. An illustration is a pot.

¢(i.e. Rinpoche: “The explanations of valid cognition are mainly from the perspective of the sutra and the mind only schools, the Sautrantika and the Cittamatra. The middle way or the Madhyamaka schools say that since there is not a single phenomenon that truly exists, then THERE IS NO SUCH THING AS VALID COGNITION. They do not assert anything; they do not have any

of their own assertions from their own perspective, because there is nothing to make any assertions about. There is no one to make any assertions, so how could there be any assertions? But they do explain things from the perspective of others. So they explain valid cognition from the perspective of how it is thought of in the world.”

¢-- From: Commentary on In Praise of the Dharmadhatu (Nagarjuna) by Khenpo Tsultrim Gyamtso Rinpoche, Shenpen Osel Web Site

¢ – See also: Hopkins Meditation on Emptiness, Part 5, section 7 Validation of Phenomena (why talking about valid cognition?))

~ A definition of a conventional truth sufficient to apply to anyone but a Buddha is: an object found by a valid cognition that distinguishes a conventionality (that is, any existent except an emptiness). However, a single consciousness of a Buddha distinguishes both conventionalities (everything except emptinesses) as well as the final nature of those phenomena (emptinesses). Thus, a Buddha is said to have a valid cognition that distinguishes conventional phenomena only from the point of view of the object, such as a pot. Similarly, a Buddha is said to have a valid cognition that distinguishes the final nature only from the point of view of the object, such as the emptiness of a pot. Thus, relative to different objects, a Buddha is said to have valid cognitions that distinguish conventional phenomena and that distinguish the final nature. However, a Buddha's valid cognition that distinguishes conventional phenomena also distinguishes the final nature of phenomena, and a Buddha's valid cognition that distinguishes the final nature also distinguishes conventional phenomena. Therefore, with respect to a Buddha, an object found by a valid cognition that distinguishes conventional phenomena is not necessarily a conventional phenomenon. Similarly, with respect to a Buddha, an object found by a valid cognition that distinguishes the final nature is not necessarily a final nature. The second part of the definition, therefore, is given for the sake of including the objects of a Buddha's cognitions within the framework of the definition.

Conventional truths are not divided into real conventionalities and unreal conventionalities. This is because THERE ARE NO REAL CONVENTIONALITIES, for

conventionalities are necessarily not real since conventionalities are necessarily unreal [in the sense that they appear to be inherently existent but are not inherently existent]. However, relative to an ordinary worldly consciousness, conventional truths are divided into the real and the unreal. For relative to a common worldly consciousness, a form is real, and relative to a common worldly consciousness, the reflection of a face in a mirror is unreal. [Still] whatever is real relative to a common worldly consciousness is not necessarily existent because truly existent forms are real relative to a common worldly consciousness [but are totally non-existent].

~ Although forms exist, truly existent forms do not exist at all.

THE DEFINITION OF SOMETHING'S BEING AN ULTIMATE TRUTH IS:

~ an object found by a valid cognition distinguishing a final nature [an emptiness] and with respect to which a valid cognition distinguishing a final nature becomes a valid cognition distinguishing a final nature. An illustration is a pot's absence of inherent existence. The divisions of ultimate truths are as given above [p. 287].

¢(i.e. Rinpoche: "The explanations of valid cognition are mainly from the perspective of the sutra and the mind only schools, the Sautrantika and the Cittamatra. The middle way or the Madhyamaka schools say that since there is not a single phenomenon that truly exists, then THERE IS NO SUCH THING AS VALID COGNITION. They do not assert anything; they do not have any

of their own assertions from their own perspective, because there is nothing to make any assertions about. There is no one to make any assertions, so how could there be any assertions? But they do explain things from the perspective of others. So they explain valid cognition from the perspective of how it is thought of in the world."

¢-- From: Commentary on In Praise of the Dharmadhatu (Nagarjuna) by Khenpo Tsultrim Gyamtso Rinpoche, Shenpen Osel Web Site

¢ – See also: Hopkins Meditation on Emptiness, Part 5, section 7 Validation of Phenomena (why talking about valid cognition?))

Furthermore, a pastness, a futureness, and a disintegratedness are asserted to be [functioning] things [capable of producing an effect, rather than permanent phenomena as the Proponents of Sutra, Proponents of Mind Only, and Autonomists assert]. Also, the Consequentialists assert external objects because they assert that apprehended object and apprehending subject are different entities. (???? This doesn't make sense. They are not different, not the same. They are non-dual: not two, not one.)

L5: [Assertions regarding object-possessors [subjects] :L5

L6: [Persons] :L6

The Consequentialists assert that a person is the mere I that is imputed in dependence upon its bases of imputation, which are either the five mental and physical aggregates [in the Desire and Form Realms] and or the four aggregates [in the Formless Realm].

~ In the Consequentialist system, a person is the dependently imputed I, not the mental consciousness, nor the composite of aggregates, nor a mind-basis-of-all as the other systems say.

Persons are necessarily compositional factors that are neither form nor consciousness. (This means that their position is not realism, nor idealism; but that is not complete, we have to

add that it is not dualism, not minism. The complete Tetralemma.)

~ A person is not any of his/her bases of designation and shares the qualities of all the mental and physical aggregates. Therefore, persons are included in the fourth aggregate, among non-associated compositional factors. Though a person is thus technically an instance of the fourth aggregate, a person is still not any of the aggregates that serve as that person's bases of imputation. (i.e. It is not the same as the aggregates, not different. It is not matter, not non-matter, not both, not neither.)

L6: [Awarenesses] :L6

Awarenesses are of two types, valid and non-valid.

Valid cognitions are of two types, direct and inferential.

Direct valid cognitions are of three types, sense, mental, and yogic direct perceptions.

The Consequentialists do not accept self-cognizing direct perceptions.

ALL SENSE CONSCIOUSNESSES in the mental continuum of a sentient being are necessarily mistaken consciousnesses.

~ Sense consciousnesses of sentient beings are necessarily mistaken in that objects appear to them to exist inherently even if they do not conceive those objects to exist inherently. This type of mistake is limited to 'sentient beings', those who have minds with obstructions yet to be removed; thus, the term 'sentient being' includes all conscious beings except Buddhas. Only sense consciousnesses of sentient beings are said to be mistaken because Bodhisattvas in meditative equipoise on emptiness perceive emptiness directly with their mental consciousness in a unmistakable manner. They are sentient beings because they have obstructions yet to be removed, but their mental consciousness at the time of directly cognizing emptiness is totally unmistakable. Therefore, not all consciousnesses but all sense consciousnesses of sentient beings are mistaken; still, except for those directly realizing emptiness, all other consciousnesses—sense and mental—of sentient beings are mistaken in that there is a conflict between how things appear and how they exist. Even when Bodhisattvas (or Hearers or Solitary Realizers) rise from meditative equipoise on emptiness, their sense and mental consciousnesses again come under the influence of previously acquired predispositions that make objects appear as if inherently existent.

YOGIC DIRECT PERCEPTIONS are of two types, mistaken and unmistakable.

-- A yogic direct perception that is in uncontaminated meditative equipoise [on emptiness] is unmistakable,

-- and a yogic direct perception of a short-sighted person¹ that directly realizes subtle impermanence is a mistaken consciousness.

~ The latter is mistaken because impermanence falsely appears to it to be inherently existent even though it does not conceive impermanence to be inherently existent. Subtle impermanence is the moment by moment disintegration of compounded phenomena and is difficult to realize. Illustrations of coarse impermanence are death, the breaking of an object, and so on, which can be realized very easily.

// [Note: 1 Literally, 'one who looks nearby' (tshur mthong), i.e., someone who has not realized emptiness.]

It follows that a yogic direct perception of a short-sighted person is a mistaken

consciousness because it is a consciousness in the mental continuum of a common being.

~ All sense and mental consciousnesses of common persons are mistaken, whereas with regard to sentient beings (a term that includes Superiors) only sense consciousnesses are necessarily mistaken, because a mental consciousness—in the continuum of a Superior—directly cognizing emptiness is unmistaken. Conversely, all consciousnesses of a Buddha are unmistaken. This means that a Buddha's consciousness—sense or mental—neither perceives nor conceives objects as being inherently existent whether in or out of meditative equipoise.

All subsequent cognitions are necessarily direct valid cognitions. For, the second moment of an inferring consciousness that realizes that a sound is impermanent is a conceptual direct valid cognition and the second moment of a sense direct perception apprehending a form is a non-conceptual direct valid cognition.

~ In the Consequentialist system the term *pramana* (*tshad ma*)—which is translated here as 'valid cognition' but in other contexts as 'prime cognition'—does not refer to a cognition that newly realizes its object in such a manner that its cognition is incontrovertible. Rather, in accordance with worldly usage of the term, *pramana* refers just to a valid, right, or incontrovertible cognition that is not mistaken with respect to its prime or main object; it is not necessarily perceiving its object for the first time. Thus, for the Consequentialists, a valid cognition is an incontrovertible knower of its main object, but it is not necessarily new as the other systems maintain.

~ To understand what the other systems mean by 'new', consider the following. Often because of intense concentration on an object one does not notice other objects that nevertheless appear. For instance, when watching a particularly interesting object of sight, one might not notice what was said within hearing range. The ear consciousness heard the sound, but what was heard was not noticed by the mental consciousness at that time, nor could it be remembered in the future. Such a consciousness is not a *pramana* because, although the object appeared to it clearly, no notice was taken of what was perceived. Thus, even though one might be in contact with an object for some time, one might not notice the object due to lack of attention. Also, a consciousness of an ordinary being cannot apprehend a single instant of an object. Whether attention is intense or not, it takes many instants before an ordinary being can notice an object.

~ If the object of a consciousness is not noticed, that consciousness is not a *pramana*. For a consciousness to be a *pramana*, there must be a noticing of the object. Thus, according to the non-Consequentialist use of the term, a 'sense direct prime / valid cognition' refers to a correct sense consciousness at that period of time when its object is initially noticed. The subsequent moments of consciousness in the same continuum of attention to that object, during which no other noticed perceptions intervene, are called subsequent cognitions. This is because in those moments an object that was formerly noticed is being cognized again through the power of the former cognition. In all systems except that of the Consequentialists, a subsequent cognition is not a *pramana* because it does not newly realize its object. However, the Consequentialists do not gloss the *pra* (prime/valid) of *pramana* as 'first' or 'new'; they gloss it as 'valid', 'right', or 'main'; and thus, for them a subsequent cognition is a *pramana*, a valid cognition, or even 'prime cognition' in the sense that it is a cognition that is valid with respect to its prime or main object.

~ The same holds true for an inferential consciousness. Once an inference has been produced, its subsequent moments are subsequent cognitions that the Consequentialist system

alone accepts as a pratyaksapramana, a direct valid cognition. Since the subsequent moments of an inferential consciousness do not rely again on a reason in order to cognize the object, the second period is no longer inferential but direct. This is because it remembers the object already inferred without renewed reliance on a logical reason. Therefore, in the Consequentialist system, unlike the other systems, a direct perception can be conceptual. A subsequent cognition of an already inferred object that does not rely again on a logical sign in its cognition is a conceptual direct perception. Even though direct, it nevertheless is conceptual because it cognizes its conceived object through the medium of a generic image. 'Direct' here means not relying on a logical sign; it does not imply that the consciousness is non-conceptual. A subsequent cognition that is the subsequent moment of a direct sense perception is a non-conceptual direct valid cognition.

INFERENCE IS OF FOUR TYPES:

- inference by the power of a fact [that serves as a logical sign such as the presence of dependent-arising which is a sign of an absence of inherent existence];
- inference by renown [such as coming to know that the term 'moon' is suitable to express that object];
- inference through example [such as inferring what a cow without a dewlap is through knowledge of a cow with a dewlap];
- and inference through correct belief [in which a scripture is realized to be incontrovertible with respect to what it teaches due to its not being implicitly or explicitly contradicted by other scriptures, inference, or direct perception].

Being mistaken with respect to an object and realizing that object are not mutually exclusive, because the Consequentialists assert that an inferential cognition realizing that a sound is impermanent is mistaken with respect to impermanent sound.

~ Such an inferential cognition is mistaken in the sense that impermanent sounds appears to exist inherently. However, it does not conceive that impermanent sound inherently exists; furthermore, it correctly realizes the impermanence of a sound. Therefore, 'mistaken' here refers to the appearance of what does not inherently exist as inherently existent. Thus, a consciousness may correctly ascertain an object but may be mistaken in that the object appears to it to be inherently existent.

Dualistic consciousnesses are necessarily direct valid cognitions with respect to their own appearing object.

This is because even a conceptual consciousness that [misconceives sound to be permanent is a direct valid cognition with respect to its appearing object.

~ Its appearing object is merely a generic image of permanent sound; actual permanent sound does not even appear to it because permanent sound does not exist. The consciousness is valid with respect to its appearing object because it notices and can induce memory of this generic image, no matter how erroneous that image is.

~ A conceptual consciousness that conceives sound to be permanent is not itself a valid cognition because it is not a correct knower. However, if one considers merely the conceptual appearance of its object, which is an idea or image of permanent sound, then it is valid with respect to this appearance because validity involves a noticing of the object and an ability to remember it. Thus, even a wrong consciousness is a valid cognition with respect to its own appearing object.

All consciousnesses [correct, wrong, conceptual, or non-conceptual] realize their own objects of comprehension. For, a generic image of the horns of a rabbit is the object of comprehension of a conceptual consciousness apprehending the horns of a rabbit, and a generic image of permanent sound is the object of comprehension of a conceptual consciousness apprehending permanent sound.

L5: [Assertions on the paths Objects of observation of the paths] :L5

-- A person's emptiness of substantial existence in the sense of self-sufficiency is asserted to be a COARSE SELFLESSNESS OF PERSONS.

-- Also, a person's emptiness of true existence is asserted to be the SUBTLE EMPTINESS OF PERSONS.

The two subtle selflessnesses [of persons and of phenomena] are differentiated from the point of view of the bases that are predicated by emptiness [persons and phenomena]; they are not differentiated from the point of view of the object of negation. This is because true existence is the object of negation, and a negative of true existence—the object of negation—in relation to a person as a base of negation is a subtle selflessness of persons and a negative of true existence—the object of negation—in relation to a mental or physical aggregate or the like as a base of negation is a subtle selflessness of phenomena. A subtle selflessness of persons and a subtle selflessness of phenomena do not differ in subtlety, and both are asserted to be the final mode of existence [of persons and other phenomena].

L5: [Objects abandoned by the paths] :L5

The coarse and subtle conceptions of self, together with their seeds, and the three poisons that arise through their influence, together with their seeds, are asserted to be the obstructions to liberation from cyclic existence. This is so because the Consequentialists assert that a consciousness conceiving true existence is an obstruction to liberation. The latencies of the conception of true existence, the mistaken appearances of [inherently existent] duality which arise through their influence, and the taints of apprehending the two truths as different entities are asserted to be the obstructions to omniscience.

~ The seeds of the conception of true existence produce a consciousness conceiving that phenomena and persons truly exist, but the latencies of the conception of true existence produce an appearance of persons and phenomena as inherently existent. The taints of apprehending the two truths as different entities are what make it impossible for anyone but a Buddha to perceive directly both phenomena and their final nature, emptiness, at the same time.

L5: [Nature of the paths] :L5

The Consequentialists present THE FIVE PATHS for each of THE THREE VEHICLES. Also, relying on the Sutra on the Ten Grounds, they present the ten grounds for the Great Vehicle. The three vehicles do not have different types of wisdom because the Consequentialists assert that all Superiors directly cognize the selflessness of phenomena.

L4: [Assertions on the fruits of the paths] :L4

Those firm in the Lesser Vehicle lineage cultivate the view of selflessness merely through brief reasoning. In dependence on this, they finally remove the conception of true existence, together with its seeds, through the vajra-like meditative stabilization of the Lesser Vehicle path of meditation and simultaneously actualize the Lesser Vehicle

enlightenment.

The Proponents of the Middle Way Autonomy School and below assert that in order to attain a nirvana without remainder it is first necessary to attain a nirvana with remainder.

~ This statement does not appear to cover the case of a person who is reborn in a pure land and who newly actualizes nirvana there. Since birth in a pure land is not due to contaminated actions and afflictions but is due to pure wishes, it would seem to be impossible for such a person first to actualize a nirvana with remainder, given that these 'lower' schools define a nirvana with remainder as having a remainder of aggregates that are impelled by contaminated actions and afflictions. It seems that such a person would actualize only a nirvana without remainder, and thus this would be a case of actualizing a nirvana without remainder without having first actualized a nirvana with remainder.

However, in the Consequentialist system it is asserted that prior to a nirvana with remainder it is necessary to attain a nirvana without remainder.

~ The Consequentialists have a different meaning for the two terms. For them, a nirvana without remainder refers to the meditative equipoise on emptiness during which practitioners of the Lesser Vehicle finally become Foe Destroyers. At that time they have overcome the conception of inherent existence and thus possess a nirvana, a passing beyond sorrow, with 'sorrow' identified as the obstructions to liberation. Since at that time they are directly cognizing emptiness, they also are temporarily free of the appearance of inherent existence and thus are said not to have any 'remainder' of this false appearance. However, when they rise from equipoise, things falsely appear to exist inherently even though they never again will assent to this false appearance and thereby conceive things to exist inherently. Thus, Foe Destroyers first have a nirvana without remainder and then a nirvana with remainder. Gradually, Foe Destroyers enter the Great Vehicle and, after a great accumulation of merit, also purify their perception of the false appearance of inherent existence. They thereby eliminate the obstructions to omniscience and become Buddhas.

The Consequentialists assert a presentation of the eight Approachers and Abiders for Hearers and Solitary Realizers, and they assert that all Approachers and Abiders are Superiors.

The way that the Great Vehicle enlightenment is actualized is this: Bodhisattvas extensively cultivate the view of selflessness through innumerable forms of reasoning and thereby remove the obstructions. Moreover, until the obstructions to liberation are exhaustively abandoned, they do not begin to abandon the obstructions to omniscience. They begin to abandon the obstructions to omniscience on the eighth Bodhisattva ground which is when Bodhisattvas who did not initially go on a Lesser Vehicle path exhaustively abandon the obstructions to liberation. Finally, through depending on the uninterrupted path at the end of the continuum [of being a sentient being with obstructions to be abandoned] they abandon, without residue, all obstructions to omniscience and simultaneously actualize the state of the Four Buddha Bodies.

The Consequentialists assert that all nirvanas and true cessations are ultimate truths.

~ A nirvana is an emptiness of the mind in the continuum of one who has completely and forever abandoned all afflictions. A true cessation is an emptiness of the mind in the continuum of one who has completely and forever abandoned a portion of the afflictions.

The first and last of the three wheels of doctrine as described in the Sutra Unravelling the Thought are scriptures that require interpretation because they do not contain any passages

that explicitly teach [the actual] emptiness.

~ This refers only to the three wheels as set forth in the Sutra Unravelling the Thought. According to the Consequentialists' own way of setting forth the three wheels of doctrine, certain passages in the first and third wheels are also definitive because they teach emptiness, the final nature of phenomena, explicitly.

They assert that the middle wheel of doctrine, as described in the Sutra Unravelling the Thought, is composed of definitive scriptures because the Heart Sutra is a definitive scripture.

The main distinguishing feature of the Consequence School is that, based on the reason that internal and external phenomena are dependently imputed, they refute that phenomena exist by way of their own character, but within their own system and without needing to rely on [the ignorance of] others they know how to establish—without fault—bondage and liberation, cause and effect, known and knower, and so forth, conventionally, only nominally, that is, as only imputedly existent.

~ Some other interpretations of the Consequence School hold that Consequentialists posit bondage and liberation, etc., only in the face of others' ignorance. The author rejects this notion and maintains that Consequentialists posit these phenomena from their own point of view and that their doing so within the context of completely refuting inherent existence is, in fact, the chief distinguishing feature of the school.¹

// [Note: 1 For extensive discussion of this point in the special insight section of Tsong Khapa's Great Exposition of the Stages of the Path, see Elizabeth Napper's *Dependent-Arising and Emptiness* (London: Wisdom Publications, 1989).]

Nowadays, some who are vain about having high views say that phenomena are only mistaken appearances and take them to be utterly non-existent, like the child of a barren woman; then they hold that non-attention to anything is the supreme practice. They do not have even the scent of a Consequentialist in them.

Therefore, those who seek liberation, having seen all the marvels of cyclic existence as being like a whirlwind of fire, should abandon all bad views which are fabricated to look like doctrine and should value supremely the Middle Way Consequence School's own system, the highest of all systems of tenets.²

// [Note: 2 For more reading on the tenets of the Consequence School, see Jeffrey Hopkins, *Meditation on Emptiness* (London: Wisdom Publications, 1983) and *Emptiness Yoga* (Ithaca: Snow Lion, 1987).]

[Concluding stanzas:]

~ The depth [of the ocean] of terms and meanings, gathered on the golden earth of the systems of doctrine, is difficult to fathom.

~ Successive waves of various reasonings move about, causing fear in the hearts of children of low intellect.

~ Splitting into a thousand rivers of manifold views, it is a place of sport for birds of clear intellect.

~ Who can measure all the particulars of the great treasure of water of outer and inner systems of doctrine?

~

~ However, the boat obtained through birth,
 ~ Impelled by a favorable wind arisen from endeavor,
 ~ Goes to the center of the ocean of tenets
 ~ And presently finds here this precious garland of eloquence.
 ~
 ~ The youthful groups of those with clear intellect
 ~ Wishing to spread the feast of eloquent song
 ~ Before millions of the best of the wise should make use
 ~ Of this condensation of the essence of our own and others' tenets.
 ~
 ~ O, the wonder of those nowadays vainly considering themselves to be wise,
 ~ Running off from the top of their heads, without training
 ~ A long time in the great books, assuming for the sake of wealth and respect
 ~ The tiring task of the dance of composition!
 ~
 ~ Thousands of rays of eloquence from the sky of analysis
 ~ Shine forth, closing all the jasmines of faulty explanations
 ~ But cause to smile the white countenance of the marvellous meanings
 ~ Of the great grove with hundreds of petals of the pure systems.
 ~
 ~ This book illuminating countless tenets upon condensing the essence
 ~ From the books of Indian and Tibetan scholars
 ~ Was not done through competitiveness or jealousy but for the sake
 ~ Of furthering the intellect of those whose lot is similar to mine.
 ~
 ~ Through this good deed rising from hard work,
 ~ Suppressing with its brilliance even the light of the moon,
 ~ May all transmigrating beings be freed from the chasm of bad views
 ~ And be restfully sustained by the pure path forever.

This brief presentation of outer and inner tenets called A Precious Garland was composed by the reverent Gon-chok-jik-may-wang-bo during the waxing of the sixth month in the water-snake year (1773). He composed it in the face of requests by the faithful, energetic, and discriminating Gu-shri Ngak-wang-gel-sang and the monk Ngak-wang-sang-bo. The scribe was Da-dringsay-ring.

Sarvamangalam.

L1: [Appendix] :L1

COLLATION WITH THE STAGES OF THE PATH

Tsong Khapa's Great Exposition of the Stages of the Path (lam rim chen mo) offers a thorough discussion of the topics presented in Part One. The page references for the topics of Part One as found in that text (Dharmasala: Shes rig par khang, 1964) are:

- How to act in the session 37a.5
- How to act between sessions 41a.4

- How to prepare for a session 37a.6
- How to perform the actual session 40a.4
- Generating ascertainment of the presentation of the path in general 58a.3
- Thought on the meaningfulness of leisure and fortune 53b.4
- Thought on the difficulty of finding leisure and fortune 55b.4
- Refuge 86b.6
- Inevitable effects of actions 103b.3
- Sufferings of cyclic existence in general 136b.6
- Sufferings of bad transmigrations 75b.6
- Sufferings of happy transmigrations 149a.4
- How to meditatively cultivate the aspiration to enlightenment 184a.5
- How to achieve even-mindedness 194a.3
- Recognition of all beings as mothers 195a.6
- Thought of the kindness of all mothers 195b.4
- Thought to repay their kindness 196a.6
- Love 197b.6
- Great compassion and a compassionate attitude exceeding the usual 198b.6
- Aspiration to enlightenment for the sake of all beings 202a.2
- How to meditate on the correct view 365a.3
- Identifying what is refuted in the view of selflessness 374b.4
- Ascertaining the selflessness of persons 462b.3
- Ascertaining the lack of true oneness 469a.4
- Ascertaining the lack of true plurality 473a.5
- Ascertaining the selflessness of other phenomena 483a.4

[End]