

Friday evening, 18 November 2005

Try to develop a good motivation wishing to attain enlightenment for the benefit of all sentient beings and for this purpose to listen to these teachings. Try to develop a loving kind mind toward all sentient beings. We are talking about *Engaging in a Bodhisattva Deeds* written by Shantideva, the main subject of which is how to develop bodhichitta.

Engaging in a Bodhisattva Deeds says:

If any speech inserted in the sutra sets
Is asserted by you to be spoken by the Buddha,
Why do you not assert that regarding most of the Mahayana
Since they are similar to your sutras?¹ (49)

The Hinayana says that the Mahayana was not taught by Buddha Shakyamuni and that he only taught the Hinayana. Therefore, the Hinayanists say that the Mahayana scriptures are not the words of the Buddha. Because of this, here the text sets out to prove that the Mahayana teachings were taught by the Buddha. The Mahayanists ask this question to the Hinayanists. The Mahayanists say to the Hinayanists that you accept that the teachings on the higher training of concentration or higher of the mind are included in the Sutras taught by the Buddha, the higher training in morality included in the Vinaya, and the higher training in wisdom included in the Abhidharma that do not contradict the Ornament of Clear Realizations. Since the Mahayana scriptures also teach the three higher trainings in morality, concentration, and wisdom, why do you not accept them as also taught by the Buddha? This argument is made to prove that the Mahayana was actually taught by the Buddha. Because the higher training in morality, higher training in concentration or of the mind, and the higher training in wisdom are taught in the Hinayana scriptures they are Buddha's teachings, therefore for the same reason the Mahayana scriptures should be accepted to be taught by the Buddha.

In Sanskrit the higher training in morality is *adhishilashikya*. *Adhi* means supreme. *Shila*, morality, is literally translated into Tibetan as "coolness," which signifies that by practicing morality we are more relaxed and happy, and not burned by suffering. *Shikya* is higher training. Morality is the abandonment of the ten non-virtues and the practice of the ten virtues or ten moralities. The vows of individual liberation, either those of lay people or the ordained, are mentioned in Atisha's *Lamp for the Path*. There are either seven or eight types of vows of individual liberation. These vows are considered to be morality. The seven vows are taken until death, whereas the eighth is only taken for twenty-four hours and not for the entire life. Among the eight vows, three of the vows are for lay people, whereas the other five are those of ordained monks and nuns. There are the five precepts of *upasikas* and *upasikanis*, the four root vows with the addition of abandoning alcohol or intoxicants. The four root vows are to abandon killing, stealing, sexual misconduct, and lying. Lying refers to a big lie. Killing means to kill someone already established as a human being or someone who will be established as a human being. Killing therefore involves abortion of a fetus, a human being in the process of being formed. The consciousness enters the blood and semen which then slowly grows. If this growth is stopped by eliminating the fetus, it is killing. Stealing is that which is punishable by law. To take something small, such as one cent, is not stealing. This is discussed in detail in the texts. There are different types of sexual misconduct. Usually sexual misconduct is for someone who has a husband or wife

¹ Verses 49, 50, and 51 are set out here in accordance with how they occur in the root text but in Togme Sangpo's commentary they occur as verses 44, 45, and 46.

to have sexual intercourse with someone else. However, even if the couple involved are husband and wife, if they have sexual intercourse on a day in which one of them has taken the Mahayana Precepts it is sexual misconduct. To have sexual intercourse in public with other people looking on, like dogs, this is sexual misconduct. If the wife is pregnant, sexual intercourse becomes sexual misconduct. Also using the mouth and so forth is sexual misconduct. If a man rapes a nun, he commits sexual misconduct. Also if a woman pushes a monk to have sex with her, she commits sexual misconduct and the monk breaks his vows. There are many such rules set out in the Vinaya Sutra. We should try to keep morality or discipline as much as we can. If monks or nuns have sexual intercourse this is not sexual misconduct but a defeat. If a monk or nun is in danger of breaking his or her vows, he or she should first give them up and then enjoy sex! If one does this, one can take vows again later on, whereas if one breaks them by having sex without giving them up, they cannot be taken again. This is explained in sutra with respect to the vows of individual liberation. In addition, there are the bodhisattva vows and tantra vows. The bodhisattva vows, having been broken, can be taken over and over again. One purifies them and retakes them. The vows of individual liberation are likened to a clay cup, which if broken into pieces cannot be put back together. The bodhisattva and tantra vows, on the other hand, are likened to a gold cup, which when broken can be melted down and made into a new cup.

We should try to develop concentration in our every day life, by trying to concentrate a little bit. Try to set the mind on an object and keep the mind on it single pointedly without distraction. This is not easy, but we should try.

The training in wisdom is to do analytical meditation thinking that, for example, this table does not exist truly because it does not exist as one and does not exist as many. It does not exist inherently as one because it exists in dependence on its parts. This table is with parts because with parts and without parts are contradictory and without parts does not exist. The table also does not exist inherently as many because it does not exist inherently as one. This is because many depends on one and so forth. Alternatively, this table is not produced truly or inherently or ultimately because it is not produced from self, other, both, or without causes. There are reasons that prove each one of these. Things are produced but are not produced inherently or truly. One inherently existent cause giving rise to many inherently existent results is not possible. Also many causes giving rise to a single result is not possible. Also one cause giving rise to a single result is not possible. There are many such reasonings. In conclusion, phenomena are not inherently existent because they are dependent-relations. We should try to do analytical meditation in this way. There are many different ways to do analytical meditation, for example, that on death-impermanence. In this case we think about whether we will die or not. We will come to the conclusion that we will die. But when? That is not certain. We cannot say "I will not die until I am 100 years old." We should think about what will arrive first, tomorrow morning or our death. We think that we will not die tomorrow but due to certain conditions we *could* die. We say about someone "Last night he went to sleep, the next morning he did not wake up but was dead." In a Tibetan community in Zurich, Switzerland there was a man who would be heard by the people in the apartment below moving around very early in his apartment. One night he was heard arriving but the next morning no sound was heard so his neighbor went to check on him. When he knocked on the door no one answered so he called the police who, when they broke down the door, found that he had died while putting on his pajamas near his bed. Such things happen. Sometimes a thief breaks into a house thinking that the owner has money and kills the people living there. We do not know what conditions will take our life. Sometimes people go for a holiday but have a car accident and die. There are many conditions that can take our life. Therefore, the time of our death is not certain. No matter how much wealth we have collected we cannot bring even, for example, a single lira, with us. Although we have bought many clothes, we cannot bring even one with us. There are people who have so many clothes that they change several times a day, perhaps as much as thirty or forty pairs of pants, shirts, and so forth. But no matter how many one has, we cannot take even one with us. Also no matter how much we have been attached to our body, we cannot take it with us. When

someone dies, the body that is left behind is called a corpse or cadaver. Even close friends who come to visit us cover their nose and so forth. Therefore, we need to try just now to put energy into gaining inner realizations and developing our inner virtuous energy. The only thing we can bring with us at the time of death is our virtuous and non-virtuous energy, it follows us like a shadow follows a body. When we walk, sit, and so forth we are always with our shadow, we are never separated from it. White or virtuous actions show us a white, bright road whereas black or non-virtuous actions show us a black, dark road. Due to good or virtuous actions we can go to a good and nice rebirth, whereas non-virtuous actions bring a bad or dark rebirth in the lower realms. Try to do analytical meditation checking if we were to die where would we go. What kind of road would take us to what kind of rebirth? In this way we should try to do analytical meditation.

Saturday morning, 19 November 2005

Try to develop a good motivation wishing to attain enlightenment for the sake of all sentient beings and for this purpose to listen to the teachings.

Engaging in a Bodhisattva Deeds says:

If due to one exception²
All become faulty,
Why, due to one sutra being similar,
Were not all spoken by the Conqueror? (50)

The Mahayana asks this question to the Hinayana. Because one Mahayana scripture is different from the other scriptures of Buddha, you say that all become faulty, then since Buddha's teachings on morality, concentration, and wisdom are accepted in the Hinayana, why do you not accept those of the Mahayana that teach these subjects to be taught by the Conqueror?

Engaging in a Bodhisattva Deeds says:

Mahakashyapa and the others
Did not manage to fathom that speech,
So who would consider it as not to be held as that
Due to your not realizing it? (51)

For example, Hinayana says that the *Hundred Thousand Stanza Perfection of Wisdom* is not Buddha's teaching because Mahakashyapa was not able to fathom it. Mahakashyapa was a hearer foe-destroyer, a Hinayanist, but he was not able to realize emptiness, the eight categories, and seventy topics taught in the *Ornament for Clear Realizations*. However, not understanding these subjects or not knowing Buddha's mind is not a reason to say that the Mahayana was not taught by the Buddha.

Vasubandhu said "The Mahayana is like a sky-flower, Nagarjuna is a manifestation of Mara, and my brother is a follower of that demon." Vasubandhu's brother was Asanga. Vasubandhu was initially a Hinayanist, however one time he went to visit Asanga at Asanga's invitation. He stayed together with him and during that time read some of the texts, the Five Treatises on the Grounds, composed by Asanga and thereby generated interest in the Mahayana. He came to realize his mistake in having criticized the Mahayana, Nagarjuna, and his brother and generated the wish to purify it. For the purpose of purifying this, he composed the *Treasury of Manifest Dharma* in eight chapters and its autocommentary. He also wrote many other commentaries on the Mahayana texts.

² The root text reads *ma gtoḡ* ("exception"), whereas Togme Sangpo's commentary reads *ma rtoḡs* ("not being realized").

This is a story that illustrates someone who initially criticized the Mahayana but later realized his mistake. We should not criticize any of Buddha's teachings nor those of other religions. This only creates negative karma and does not create any positive karma. The results will be experienced by oneself alone, it will not ripen upon anyone else. We should think in this way and try not to criticize anyone at all.

Engaging in a Bodhisattva Deeds says:

To remain in cyclic existence,
Free from the extremes of attachment and fear,
Accomplishing the welfare of those suffering out of confusion,
Is the result of [meditating on] emptiness. (52)

We should not abide in cyclic existence and not abide in self-peace, in nirvana. We should not think that it is enough for us to remain in nirvana, in a state of meditative absorption for our own sake alone. To not abide in the state passed beyond sorrow, that is, nirvana, one has to meditate on the path that realizes emptiness. This is important. If one has the confusion that thinks that the being, self, aggregates, and person are truly existent, then oneself and sentient beings will wander, suffering, in cyclic existence. Therefore, we should try not to be attached to our body, as are ordinary beings. Out of this attachment we create actions. By the power of these afflictions and actions, we will continue to wander in cyclic existence.

Hearers and solitary realizers think that it is enough to become free from cyclic existence, that is, to eliminate rebirth in cyclic existence and achieve nirvana. However, this is similar to the extreme of annihilation. Because we need to become free from these two attitudes, we need the Mahayana path. The arya bodhisattvas out of compassion take rebirth in cyclic existence, that is, they abide in cyclic existence for the benefit of other sentient beings. This is the result of having realized emptiness directly. By realizing emptiness one can easily achieve buddhahood. One can quickly become free from cyclic existence. On the other hand, if one does not realize emptiness, that is, if one is separated from the realization of emptiness, one will abide in cyclic existence because one has not yet cut its root. Without realizing emptiness it is not possible to cut the root of cyclic existence which is ignorance.

Ignorance means not knowing the final nature of phenomena, the being and the aggregates. It is not knowing the ultimate truth. Without knowing this, one cannot attain nirvana, let alone buddhahood. Therefore, we need emptiness. This emptiness is the emptiness of inherent existence. It is not the emptiness of being permanent, partless, and independent, which is the empty asserted by the Hinayana. There is a little difference between empty and emptiness. A cup that has nothing in it is empty. Everyone would say that it is empty. Also if someone does not have anything in his head, we say that his head is empty! Some people do not have any brains! Some people are unable to think, sometimes this happens because the brain shrinks and the person is as though dead. I am not joking, this can happen. For this reason scientists think that the mind is the brain.

If we wish or aspire to attain liberation, we need to meditate on emptiness correctly.

Engaging in a Bodhisattva Deeds says:

In that case, it is not correct to
Repudiate the side of emptiness.
Therefore, without entertaining any doubts,
Meditate on emptiness! (53)

Do not repudiate the side of emptiness, but strive to meditate steadfastly on emptiness. If you wish to attain liberation or nirvana, the small or middle enlightenment of hearers and solitary realizers, it

is necessary to meditate on emptiness. Without emptiness it is not possible to achieve even the state of foe-destroyer. Therefore, without doubt, we should meditate on emptiness. In order to achieve nirvana we need to eradicate the root of cyclic existence, the conception of true existence, ignorance, which is an affliction.

We should think about the fact that we take rebirth in cyclic existence according to the twelve links. The first link is the root of cyclic existence, it is ignorance. Therefore, we need to eliminate the root of cyclic existence which is the ignorance that does not know that the final nature of the being and all phenomena is emptiness. All phenomena do not exist inherently because they are dependent-relations. We can take ourselves as an example and examine whether we are dependent or independent. We should check ourselves. We depend on food, clothing, a house, and other people such as friends. We need many things. That we have come to be depends on having had a father and mother. Therefore, we do not exist independently or inherently, we exist in dependence. Just as we have examined ourselves, so too should we examine other phenomena. For example, we can examine whatever wealth we have. It depends on someone having given us a job and a salary. Money does not fall like rain from the sky without depending on anything. Cars, watches, husbands, wives, sons, daughters do not fall from the sky! They do not arrive in this way but arrive in dependence on our own effort. Therefore, they do not exist inherently. Because of this the conception of them as inherently existent is mistaken, it is ignorance. We, therefore, need to try to eliminate this ignorance. To do this, we need to meditate on emptiness. It is not possible to miraculously realize emptiness and thereby eliminate ignorance. We need to strive to understand emptiness. First we gain a little bit of intellectual understanding of emptiness. Then slowly, slowly we gain more understanding until we come to a direct realization of emptiness. Initially emptiness is realized by way of a conceptual consciousness or a meaning generality, but gradually we can come to nakedly or directly realize emptiness. At this time we become an arya being. An arya being is a noble being. Not our Nobile, the man with a moustache. I am joking, perhaps he is a noble being.

We need to understand that ignorance, the clinging to true existence, is mistaken and therefore we strive to eliminate the conception of phenomena as truly existent.

Engaging in a Bodhisattva Deeds says:

The antidote to the darkness of the afflictive obscurations and
Obscurations to knowledge is emptiness.

So why do those who wish to quickly attain omniscience

Not meditate on it?³

(54)

There are two types of obscurations: the afflictive obscurations and obscurations to knowledge. If we want to attain the mere nirvana of a Hinayana foe-destroyer, either the small or middling enlightenment of a hearer or solitary realizer, it is sufficient to abandon the afflictive obscurations. To abandon them, we need to meditate on emptiness. If we wish to achieve omniscience we need to do much more than that, we need to meditate on emptiness, the side of wisdom, as well as bodhichitta, compassion, love, and so forth. If we are separated from meditation on emptiness, that is, if we do not meditate on emptiness, we cannot abandon the seeds of the afflictive obscurations. If we abandon the manifest afflictions but not their seeds, the afflictions will arise once again. In this way we will not be able to abandon the sufferings of cyclic existence.

The obscurations to knowledge are the imprints of the apprehension of true existence. If one has a container of sesame seeds, although one empties it of sesame seeds by burning them in a fire, the odor of sesame seeds still remains in the container. To eliminate this odor we need to clean the container well with soap and water. Likewise, even when the afflictions have been abandoned,

³ Verses 53 and 54 are set out here in accordance with how they occur in the root text but in Togme Sangpo's commentary their order is reversed.

something still remains, like the odor of the sesame seeds. These are the imprints, which are called obscurations to knowledge.

Engaging in a Bodhisattva Deeds says:

Fear should be developed with regard to
That which produces suffering – [apprehending] things;
But why develop fear with respect to
That which pacifies suffering – emptiness? (55)

Someone might say that he cannot meditate on emptiness because it frightens him. Some people think like this. Why? Because they think that emptiness means that they do not exist. They think that this kind of meditation eliminates the self. That it becomes inexistent. People who think like this are afraid to meditate on emptiness. However, it is suitable to be afraid of the conception that phenomena are truly existent because this conception produces suffering in that, having been born in cyclic existence, we experience suffering. Therefore, it is right to fear this conception, which brings rebirth and suffering, whereas there is no need to fear the realization of emptiness since the meditation on emptiness can pacify the sufferings of cyclic existence. Therefore, it is not right to be frightened of it. Meditation on emptiness pacifies sufferings and thereby creates happiness and pleasure. Therefore, meditation on emptiness produces happiness. Thus, it is not right to fear meditation on emptiness. We do not fear that which we fear, and we fear that which we do not fear, hence we are confused although we think that we are intelligent. There are people who say that they know everything whereas they do not. There are other people who say that they do not know anything, although they do. There are different types of mentality. We should try to develop more knowledge on the side of emptiness. This will eliminate the darkness in our mind. For this reason we should try in our daily life to meditate on emptiness. We should think that all phenomena are dependent-relations and do not exist inherently. We should try to alternate between single pointed meditation and analytical meditation on emptiness. By doing this, one day we will realize emptiness directly. Then we will think “Now I am able to fly.” In short, try to meditate on emptiness, bodhichitta, and compassion.

Engaging in a Bodhisattva Deeds says:

If some self existed
One should fear everything whatsoever.
But since no such self exists
Who is there to be afraid of? (56)

The self does not exist inherently or truly. If the self and others were established inherently, then, due to apprehending inherent existence or true existence, it would be suitable to generate fear. However, since oneself and others do not exist even slightly as inherently existent, there is no need for any fear whatsoever. Try to put effort mentally into thinking of selflessness. Thereby we will come to realize the emptiness of the self or selflessness, which liberates from every fear. For this reason we should try to understand emptiness more and more. Check oneself as to how one exists. If even a doubt arises regarding how we exist, it is good. It is said that even a mere doubt shakes the root of cyclic existence. Therefore, in this sense doubt regarding emptiness is very good. On the other hand, there are doubts that are negative, for example, the doubt that thinks that perhaps the law of cause and effect does not exist, that perhaps the Three Jewels do not exist, and so forth.

Saturday afternoon, 19 November 2005

Try to develop the motivation wishing to attain enlightenment in order to benefit all sentient beings.

Here the text sets out the proof of emptiness extensively, beginning with the selflessness of persons and then the selflessness of phenomena. There are two types of conception of a self: the innate conception of a self that exists truly and the intellectually acquired conception of a self that exists truly. These two conceptions of a self need to be eliminated. There is also a coarse self of persons and a subtle self of persons. These are set out by refuting various arguments.

For example, when the aggregates appear, we apprehend a self of these aggregates, that is, we apprehend truly existent aggregates. We do this without depending on reasoning and without depending on a particular tenet system. On the other hand, the intellectually acquired conception of a self that is truly existent arises in dependence on reasoning and tenets. The Vaibhashikas, for example, assert that all functioning things or compounded phenomena exist truly and ultimately and inherently. They say that if functioning things did not exist in this way, they would not exist at all. The Svatantrika Madhyamaka say that all phenomena exist from their own side and inherently and are established by way of their own characteristics. If they did not exist in this way, they would be non-existent, like the horns of a rabbit or a sky-flower.

First the innate conception of a self or the view of the transitory collection is refuted. The view of the transitory collection, observing I and mine, thinks I and mine (the body) exist by way of their own characteristics or inherently. However, the being is imputed on its basis of imputation, the five aggregates. These aggregates are not established by way of their own characteristics as a collection or as a continuity, nor are the respective parts established by their own characteristics. There does not exist an illustration of that which exists inherently.

This cup here on the table is a functioning thing. It is a functioning thing because it performs its respective function. Alternatively, this cup is a compounded phenomenon because it arises from causes and conditions. This is the way to prove the selflessness of persons and the selflessness of phenomena.

Engaging in a Bodhisattva Deeds says:

Teeth, hair, and nails are not the self.
The self is not the bones or blood.
The mucus is not it, nor is the phlegm,
Neither is the lymph or pus. (57)

The self is not the fat nor sweat.
The lungs and liver are also not the self,
Nor are the other inner organs the self.
The self is not the excrement or urine. (58)

The flesh and skin are not the self.
The warmth and winds are also not the self.
The cavities are not the self. In all ways
The six consciousnesses are also not the self. (59)

The teeth are not an illustration of the self, that is, the teeth are not the self or being. The nails are also not the self. This is easy to understand. The self is not the bones nor the blood. The mucus and phlegm are not the self. Also the lymph and pus are not the self. This is not difficult, it is easy to understand. The self is not the fat or sweat, nor the lungs or liver, nor the other inner organs such as the kidneys, spleen, and so forth. Also the excrement and urine inside the body are not the self, they are not the being. The flesh and skin are not the self. Also the warmth of the body and the subtle and coarse inner winds are not the self. Also “the winds” can be understood to mean that the earth element (the solid aspect of the body), water element (the liquids inside the body), fire element, and

wind element are not the self. Cavities such as the eyes, nostrils, ears, and so forth are not the self. Cavities can also refer to the space element. Also the eye consciousness, ear consciousness, nose consciousness, tongue consciousness, body consciousness, and mental consciousness are not the self. The self is not any of these consciousnesses.

Here the text mentions almost everything that collected together composes our body. Only the external skin is attractive, the internal parts of the body such as the stomach are not. Therefore, why are we attached to our own and others' bodies? They are impure and not pure. We should meditate on this fact in order to diminish our attachment to the color and shape of the body. We are not attached to pus and so forth, urine and so forth. However, some Tibetans have the tradition to drink a little bit of urine of the Dalai Lama and other high lamas. Some Indians urinate a bit in the toilet and then they urinate into a cup and drink their own urine. They say that it acts as medicine preventing illness. One famous Indian prime minister, Mora Deshen, who was in his late eighties but walked very quickly and was almost never sick claimed that his good health was due to drinking his own urine as he had been taught by his parents.

The base that composes the being is the six elements: earth, water, fire, wind, space, and consciousness. Nagarjuna said that the being, the person or parusha, is not earth, not water, not wind, not fire, not space, and not consciousness. The being is also not a different entity from the six elements. We should examine whether our head, the two eyeballs, the two nostrils, the mouth, lips, teeth, the neck, the throat, the arms, the five fingers and so forth, going downward over the various parts of the body, are the self. We will find that they are not the self. In fact we will not find the self. Therefore, the self does not exist inherently. Not even the slightest atom of a self exists inherently.

According to the Samkyas the self is a knower and consciousness. The Vaisheshikas say that the self is matter. The Samkyas, the Enumerators, assert that all phenomena are included in twenty-five categories. Twenty-four of the twenty-five are material, whereas the other one is a knower or consciousness, it is the being. They assert a primordial principle which is the creator of all phenomena that is similar to the assertion that everything is created by God. When the being examines who created all phenomena, he comes to realize that they were created by the primordial principle. When the primordial principle understands that it has been recognized it is ashamed and withdraws the other twenty-three phenomena and then it too disappears like a rainbow, such that all that remains is the being. At this time the being has attained liberation. This is what is asserted by the Samkyas. Among the twenty-five categories some are only causes, some are both causes and results, some are only results, and some are neither causes or results. That which is only a cause is the primordial principle, seven, the great and so forth, are both causes and results, sixteen are only results, and the being or knower is neither a cause nor a result.

Someone asserts that a knower of sound is permanent. Some Samkyas also assert that sound is permanent. They say that sound remains in space for eons, for example, if one tells a lie today the sound remains for eons in space. Who can hear this sound? They say that someone who has the clairvoyance of the divine ear can hear it.

Engaging in a Bodhisattva Deeds says:

If a knower of sound were permanent,
At all times there would be the apprehension of sound.
If there is no object to be known,
Due to what type [of object] is it said to be a "knower"? (60)

The Samkyas say that the self, knower, or consciousness always utilizes mere five sense objects: mere forms, mere sounds, mere odors, mere tastes, and mere tangible objects. They say that the self, knower, and consciousness are synonyms. They are the being and the utilizer.

If a knower of sound were permanent, there would always be the apprehension of sound. If there is no object of knowledge, how can there be a knower? What exists?

Engaging in a Bodhisattva Deeds says:

If without a knower there is a knower,
It would follow that wood is also a knower.
Therefore, without a closely abiding object of knowledge
It is definitely to be stated “There is no knower.” (61)

The Samkyas say that although sound does not exist, the knower or apprehender of sound exists. If this is the case, it is argued that it would follow that also wood is a knower because there is no need to know an object. Wood would be a knower because a knower exists without an object of knowledge, this is accepted by you Samkyas. You say that even if there is no object of knowledge such as sound nearby, still there is a knower or being that apprehends sound. If an object of knowledge such as sound is not necessary for knowing, it follows that the being would always apprehend sound. You say that without an object of knowledge there is knowing. The Samkyas say that it is not contradictory for there to not be an object of knowledge but for there to be a knower. In other words, there is no fault in asserting this.

Engaging in a Bodhisattva Deeds says:

“That very one knows form.”
At that time, why is there also not hearing?
“Because there is no sound nearby.”
Therefore, a knower of that [sound] also does not exist. (62)

The Samkyas say that when ear consciousness is not apprehending sound there is an eye consciousness sees form. The being, who is permanent, when it not apprehending sound can apprehend form, therefore it is a knower. When the being apprehends form, why does it not apprehend sound? When the being apprehends forms it can also apprehend sound. The five objects – forms, sounds, odors, tastes, and tangible objects – are not different in terms of some abiding close and some abiding distant, they are all the same in that the being always utilizes them. For example, a being can look with the eyes, hear with the ears, smell with the nose, taste with the tongue, and touch with the body, therefore one being can simultaneously utilize all five sense objects. It is not right that when there is the apprehension of form there is no apprehension of sound. You, Samkyas, assertion that there is a permanent being has been refuted.

Engaging in a Bodhisattva Deeds says:

How can that which is the nature of
Apprehending sound apprehend form?
That one is considered to be
Both father and son is not correct. (63)

When form is apprehended, the result sound does not exist, but the nature of sound exists because sound and form are of the same nature. Sound exists primordially. The nature of all phenomena is the same in being partless and all pervasive and primordial. They are like God who exists everywhere and is partless and is able to create all.

Sunday morning, 20 November 2005

Try to generate the motivation wishing to attain enlightenment for the benefit of all sentient beings.
Try to develop a good heart and a loving kind mind toward all sentient beings.

Engaging in a Bodhisattva Deeds says:

In that case, the lightness, motility, and darkness
Are not a son, nor are they a father.
That [apprehension of form] is not seen to be the nature
Of possessing the apprehension of sound. (64)

The consciousness apprehending sound is the nature of the consciousness apprehending form because they are one nature, that is, the primordial principle. If it were like that, then that which is the nature of the apprehension of sound would apprehend form. Father and son are two separate beings. Father is the cause and son is the result. When form is apprehended sound is also apprehended, when sound is not manifest there is the observation of form, although sound does not exist the nature of sound exists. One person can be both father and son. Therefore, a single man can be called father and son although they are not two distinct beings but are one single being. The Samkyas make this assertion. The Prasangika Madhyamaka says this is not correct, while one person can be both father and son but with respect to a single basis it is not correct to say both form and sound. For example, if one emits a sound this is only sound, it is not visible form. Sound and visible form are two different things. If sound were visible form it could be seen with the eyes but it cannot. Or with the eyes closed one could see forms with the ears.

The primordial principle has the nature of lightness, motility, and darkness.

Engaging in a Bodhisattva Deeds says:

If that itself, like an actor, is seen in other modes,
It would not be permanent.
“That itself has other modes.”
Such a oneness is a oneness that never existed before. (65)

An actor changes his clothing, changes wigs, and so forth but he is just one person. Sometimes on TV we see a man who dresses up as a woman, pads his breasts, and tries to talk like a woman. This is a sign of impermanence, of changing. If the apprehension of sound becomes the apprehension of form this should be perceived by a valid cognizer. When an actor changes clothes, he can be seen with the eyes to change clothes but to remain the same being. Like an actor who puts on one costume and then later on changes into another costume, similarly the self, knower, and consciousness is not permanent because it changes. Therefore, the self cannot be permanent although that is asserted by you Samkyas who say that it is neither a cause or result. The apprehension of form is not an apprehension of sound but when form is apprehended the nature of sound also exists. The nature of sound remains. These two natures abide without separation as a oneness. The Madhyamikas say that such a oneness never existed before, before they were completely different, but now such a oneness has suddenly come to exist.

Engaging in a Bodhisattva Deeds says:

“Although it has other modes, it is not true.”
Tell us what is its nature.
“It is just consciousness.” If it were like that,

It would follow that all beings are one.

(66)

Although it appears in different modes, it is not true, therefore they are one and true. There is no need to mention this. Is the mode of appearance true or not? It seems that it is not true.

It would follow that if all beings, all knowers, all consciousnesses are established truly they would not exist separately as different beings and different consciousnesses. Then one could not say that different people were father, son, and so forth, that there are human beings, cats, dogs, and so forth. They would all be one, then “You are a dog. You are a cat.” The Samkyas say that the being or knower is one. It is the utilizer of forms, sounds, and so forth by way of the powers. Samkyas set out eleven types of powers or faculties. For example, they say that the skin is a power or faculty. If you Samkyas accept like that, then all the different continua of all beings would be one being. You must accept that because you assert that the being is permanent, partless, and unitary.

Engaging in a Bodhisattva Deeds says:

Also that with mind and that without mind
Would become one because they are similar in existing.
When instants are mistaken,
How can they have a similar support?

(67)

Also that with mind, the being or knower, and that without mind, material phenomena, would become one. This is because you accept them to be the nature of the primordial principle and therefore permanent, partless, and all pervasive. Because the nature of the primordial principle is permanent, partless, and all pervasive so to is the nature of all phenomena. You Samkyas accept this, therefore it follows that all phenomena are one. You Samkyas assert that all exist in the nature of the primordial principle, therefore they are true.

When instants are mistaken, how can they have a similar support? The manifestations or results, the particularities, are different and deceptive truths and therefore mistaken and not true. So how can they have the same support, the primordial principle, since all particularities are mistaken? If the particularities are mistaken then the primordial support that is true cannot exist. This concludes the refutation of the Samkyas’ assertions.

It is said that those who give up the Samkyas views immediately adopt the view of the Prasangika Madhyamikas, and not those of the lower Buddhist schools. For example, Ashvagoshā, a Samkyas, went to debate the monks of Nalanda Monastery in India. The monks recognized that they could not defeat him and called upon Aryadeva, who was living near Nagarjuna’s place, to come to debate him. In order to call him, they offered a tormā to Mahakalā inside of which they wrote a letter inviting Aryadeva to come to debate Ashvagoshā. The tormā was placed outside and eaten by a crow who brought the letter to Aryadeva, who recognized the crow to be a manifestation of Mahakalā. Aryadeva practiced the debate with his teacher Nagarjuna, who took the position of the Samkyas. During the debate, Aryadeva circled his shoes around Nagarjuna’s head saying “Kor sum.” Nagarjuna told him that he was now ready to debate Ashvagoshā and that he would win the debate but that due to having circled his teacher’s head with his shoes he would encounter an interference on the road. Aryadeva set off quickly on his journey and encountered an old woman who was blind and asked Aryadeva to give him an eye so that she would be able to find food. Out of strong compassion, Aryadeva gave one of his eyes to the old woman, due to which later on he came to be called “One Eyed.” When Aryadeva arrived at Nalanda the monks were assembling and Ashvagoshā was standing in the door. As the monks arrived at the temple, he tapped them one by one on the head as they entered. When Aryadeva arrived, Ashvagoshā hit him on the head and said “From where does the previously not arrived bald head come?” Aryadeva responded “It comes from the neck,” to which Ashvagoshā could not reply as Aryadeva had not said that he came from South India as would have been expected. Then Ashvagoshā asked him, “Are you inside or outside?”

Aryadeva said that it in depends on one's motivation. The king and his ministers came to the debate. When Ashvagosha could not remember the reply, there was an old lady who would write the response for him. On the other side Aryadeva manifested a naked man with an erect organ, which made the woman embarrassed and so she escaped. Then Ashvagosha manifested a bird who gave him the responses so Aryadeva manifested a cat due to which the bird escaped. Then a man came and poured oil in the paper so it could not be written on. So Ashvagosha lost the debate and flew up into the sky. Aryadeva followed and warned him that if he went any higher he would be in danger and to prove this told him to throw his long hair up into the air whereupon it was cut off. Ashvagosha returned with Aryadeva to Nalanda and was locked in the library. He began to read the books there and at one point saw the prophecy that in the future he would win many debates with Buddhists and convert them to the Samkya view but then when he debated Aryadeva he would lose and thereby be himself converted to Buddhism. Ashvagosha then wrote the *Life Stories (Jataka Tales)* of the Buddha and many other texts to purify his having criticized the Buddha.

Next the Vaisheshikas' assertions are refuted.

END