

**The Entrance for the Children of the Conquerors -
A Commentary on the Introduction to the Deeds of Bodhisattvas**

Chapter Nine: The Way of Training in the Wisdom That Is the Nature of Superior
Insight

Author: Gyaltsab Rinpoche
Subject: Bodhicitta and the Six Perfections
Translator: Fedor Stracke



Happy Monks Publication

All rights reserved.

No part of this work may be reproduced in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system or technologies now known or later developed, without permission in writing from Fedor Stracke.

© Fedor Stracke

**WITH PERMISSION TO BE REPRODUCED IN THE FPMT BASIC PROGRAM.
CENTRES MAY PRINT AS MANY COPIES AS NEEDED OR GIVE STUDENTS
ELECTRONIC COPIES.**

Table of Contents

The Way of Training in the Wisdom That Is the Nature of Superior Insight	
Explanation of the Chapter	
Showing That Those Wishing to Attain Liberation Need to Generate the Wisdom	
Realizing Suchness	
The General Meaning	1
The Auxiliary Meaning	3
The Method of How to Generate the Wisdom Realizing Suchness	
The Presentation of the Two Truths	
Actual	
The Division into the Two Truths	5
Definition of the Two Truths	
The Refutation of the School of Others	6
The Presentation of Our School	6
Identifying the Person Who Has Understood Both	
Divisions of a Person Who Wishes to Understand the Two Truths	8
Explaining the Difference of High and Low Awareness	8
Refuting Objections of No-Need and No-Ability Regarding Emptiness	
Actual	
Actual	9
Defending One's Position	
Refuting Realists Such as the Sautrantika in General	
Refuting Harm Through Direct Perception	10
Refuting Harm Through Quotations	
Showing the Sutras Which State That Compounded Phenomena Are Impermanent and So Forth to Be Interpretative	11
Refuting Them to Be Definite	11
Refuting That One Is In Contradiction	
Refuting That They Are Not Even Established as Illusory	11
Refuting That the Build-Up of the Accumulations Would Be Invalid	12
Refuting That Taking Rebirth Would Be Invalid	12
Refuting That the Division into Virtue and Negativity Would Be Invalid	13
Refuting That the Distinctive Individual Realization of Samsara and Nirvana Would Be Invalid	14
Refuting the Mind Only in Particular	
Expressing the View	15
Refuting It	
Similar Argument	15
Refuting the Answer	
Expressing the View	15
Refuting It	
The Non-dual Mind Is Not Seen by Anyone	15

Refuting the Self-Knower As the Answer to the Question	
Refuting This with Quotation	16
Refuting This with Logic	
Refuting the Example	16
Refuting the Meaning	17
Refuting the Arguments for the Existence of a Self-Knower	
Example of How Memory Is Generated Even Though There Is No Self-Knower	18
Refuting Other Reasons Used to Establish a Self-Knower	19
Actual	20
Refuting That the Illusory Workings of the Mind Are Inexpressible as Mind Itself or Other from It	20
Refuting That Imputed Objects Are Based on Truly Existent Functionalities	21
Refuting the Argument That the Path Realizing Emptiness Has No Use or Purpose for a Madhyamaka	
Argument	22
Answer	
The Reason Why the Illusionist Generates Attachment	22
Showing That Meditating on the Wisdom Realizing Emptiness Can Overcome the Afflictions and Their Imprints	
General Presentation	24
Specific Presentation	24
Showing That One Will Receive the Perfect Complete Result of Abandonment	
Showing with Example That Although There Are No Conceptual Thoughts, the Hopes of the Students Will Be Fulfilled	25
Refuting Arguments with Regards to This	26
Establishing That Even Just to Attain Liberation One Needs to Realize Emptiness	
Argument	27
Answer	27
Establishing This with Mahayana Sutras	28
Establishing This With Logic	
Establishing This by Way of Similarity	28
Establishing This with Shared Reason	
Showing That It Is Impossible to Become an Arhat and Go Beyond Sorrow If One Is Devoid of the Wisdom Realizing Emptiness	30
If One Can Become an Arhat Simply Through the Path of the 16 Aspects, then One Can Also Become an Arhat by Merely Abandoning the Manifest Afflictions	30
Refuting the Answer to This	31
Showing That Even Those Merely Wishing to Attain Liberation Need to Meditate on Emptiness	32
Establishing It As the Path to the Non-Abiding Nirvana	34
Advising That It Is Suitable for Those Wishing for Liberation to Meditate on Emptiness	34

Explaining Extensively the Reasoning Establishing Emptiness	
Explaining Extensively the Reasoning that Establishes the Selflessness of Person	
Refuting the Determined Object of Innate Self-Grasping	37
Refuting the Intellectually Acquired Self	
Refuting the Self Asserted to Be Consciousness by the Enumerators	
The Actual Refutation	39
Refuting the Reply	40
Refuting the Self Asserted to Be Matter by the Particularists	43
Refuting Objections Against the Refutation	
Refuting the Objection That Karmic Cause and Effect Become Non-Valid	
Objection	43
Answer	44
Refuting the Objection That Meditation on Compassion Becomes Invalid	45
Explaining Extensively the Reasoning Establishing the Selflessness of Phenomena	
Explaining the Selflessness of Phenomena by Way of the Four Close Placements by Mindfulness	
Meditating on the Close Placement by Mindfulness on the Body	
Comprehending That Possessing Parts, the Body, as Lacking Inherent Existence	47
Comprehending That the Parts Lack Inherent Existence	49
Then, Attachment to the Dream-like Body Lacking Inherent Existence Is Unsuitable	50
This Also Establishes the Person As Lacking Inherent Existence	50
The Close Placement by Mindfulness on Feelings	
Refuting That the Nature of Feeling Exists Inherently	
The Feeling of Suffering Does Not Exist Inherently	51
The Feeling of Happiness Does Not Exist Inherently	51
Advice to Abide in the Yoga of Meditating on the Lack of Inherent Existence of Feeling	52
Refuting That the Cause Exists Inherently	
Refuting the Inherent Meeting of Sense Power and Object	53
Refuting the Inherent Meeting with the Consciousness	54
Then, Contact Arising from the Meeting of These Three Does Not Exist Inherently	54
Refuting that the Focal Object Exists Inherently	55
Refuting That Their Object-Possessor Exists Inherently	55
The Close Placement by Mindfulness on the Mind	
Showing That Mental Consciousness Does Not Exist Inherently	56
Showing That the Five Sense Consciousnesses Do Not Exist Inherently	56
The Meditation on the Close Placement by Mindfulness on Phenomena	57
Refuting the Argument That the Two Truths Would Be Non-valid	

Refuting the Consequence of Absurdity	59
Refuting the Consequence of Becoming Endless	60
Showing There Is No Proof for the True Existence of Object and Consciousness	61
Stating the Reasons That Establish the Lack of True Existence	
The Vajra Sliver Reason	
Refuting Generation Without Cause	63
Refuting Generation from a Separate Permanent Cause	
Refuting Ishvara with Questions to Its Meaning	63
If It Is Permanent, It Is Unsuitable to Be the Cause of Anything Arising from Conditions	65
Reminder That Permanent Particles without Cause Were Already Refuted	66
Refuting Generation from a Permanent Principle	
Stating the Position	66
Actual	
Refuting That a Partless Permanent Can Be the Nature of the Expressions	67
Refuting It to Be Permanent	68
Refuting That It Would Be Impossible for Something to First Not Exist and Then to Generate Newly	69
The Fault Does Not Apply to the Madhyamaka	70
Summarizing the Meaning of Generation from No-cause	72
Refuting Generation from Both Self and Other	72
The Reason of Dependent Arising	72
The Reason of Refuting Generation and Cessation of Existence and Non-existence	
Refuting Inherent Generation Upon Establishing the Reason	73
Refuting this Refutes Inherent Existence	75
Then, Establishing the Equanimity of Samsara and Nirvana	75
Advice That It Is Suitable to Strive in Realizing Emptiness	
The Actual Advice	
Showing the Meaning of the Mode of Abiding	77
It Is Suitable to Strive in Realizing That	77
Showing the Object of Great Compassion by Showing the Disadvantages of Cyclic Existence	
The Disadvantages of This Life	78
The Disadvantages in the Next Life	78
Contemplating That Despite Taking Rebirth in the Happy Realm There Is No Time to Practice Dharma	79
Contemplating the Difficulty of Attaining a Birth with Leisure and Endowment	80
That Oneself and Others Are Afflicted By the Suffering of Cyclic Existence Is Suitable to Be Mourned	81
Showing the Mode of Apprehension of the Aspect of Great Compassion	82
Explanation of the Title	83

Translator's Introduction

I pay homage to the Gentle Peaceful One.

Illusory Truth

A central and repeated term in this chapter is 'illusory truth'. The more common version of this term is 'conventional truth', but the consensus these days among teachers and translators is that this is a misrepresentation of the Tibetan *Kun-dzob Denpa*. It neither conveys the meaning nor fits the word explanation given in the treatises.

There are other alternatives, such as 'concealer truth' or 'truth for a concealer', but these, while literally correct, never felt satisfactory to me. One reason is that they are not easily relatable.

After two decades of investigating the meaning of the Tibetan and Sanskrit terms, and consultation with the Ven. Geshe Doga with regards to the meaning that is supposed to appear to the mind upon hearing the term, I felt that 'illusory truth' would be a good translation. It is a handy term that both conveys the meaning as well as fits the word explanation of the Tibetan.

In a meeting with Kyabje Zopa Rinpoche in Vajrayogini Institute in 2009 I then started to present my argument to Rinpoche, somewhat apprehensively, to seek permission to use this translation in the FPMT. To my surprise I did not need any further argument, because Kyabje Zopa Rinpoche immediately and decisively said that this term can be used.

I shall try here to present briefly the main points of my thoughts on this:

Kun means 'all', *dzob* means obscuring, and *Denpa* means 'truth'. *Kun-dzob* is taken as one word, and can also mean 'mutual dependence' or 'nominal' according to Chandrakirti's *Clear Words*:

Kun-dzob refers to the three of obscuring suchness, the meaning of mutual dependence and worldly labels.

In the context of the two truths it refers to the first according to Lama Tsong Khapa in his *Middling Graduated Stages of the Path*:

Regarding this kun-dzob, when forms and the like are presented as true to the perception by a kun-dzob consciousness, it refers to the first of the three.

This alone already refutes 'conventional' as the accurate translation of the term in the context of the two truths, as Lama Tsong Khapa clearly states that the meaning of the word here is to obscure suchness.

Kun-dzob in the context of the two truths refers to ignorance, which is shown by Chandrakirti in his *Introduction to the Middle Way*, and by major commentaries on the root verse, such as by the First Dalai Lama Gyalwa Gedun Drub in his *Mirror Clearly Reflecting the Meaning of Emptiness*, or Lama Tsong Khapa in his *Illumination of the Thought*.

Kun-dzob Denpa then becomes the *truth of ignorance* in meaning. An illusion can be

an outer object such as a mirage, but it can be also a confused mental state with regards to our self or our environment. We hold illusions, and sometimes we become disillusioned. Ignorance is an illusion we hold in our mind about the true nature of ourselves and our environment.

Chandrakirti:

Illusional since being ignorance obscuring nature [6.28]
That appearing artificially as true through it
Was taught by the Able One as illusory truth.
Artificial phenomena are merely illusory.

The First Dalai Lama Gyalwa Gedun Drub in his *Mirror Clearly Reflecting the Meaning of Emptiness*:

Take the subject 'ignorance grasping at true existence' - it is illusional - because it obscures the direct perception of nature.

Take the subject 'form appearing as true because of true grasping, even though lacking true existence' - there is a reason why it was taught by the Able One as truth for an illusion - because it is true in the face of the illusional true grasping.

This is a word explanation of the term, and does not give the definition of the term. While generally regarded as false, or falsities, forms and the like are true for a particular type of mind. They are not true, or a truth, because they are true for ignorance. When hearing the term *kun-dzob denpa*, rather than a kind of truth being affirmed in our mind, we are supposed to be reminded that nominal objects are exactly the opposite of a truth. They are falsities, because they are a truth for ignorance. First one establishes the mere lack of true existence by meditating on emptiness, and then one takes this lack of true existence into the nominal world, reflecting how objects, while appearing as truly existent, are completely empty of this. They do not exist the way they appear, which is the essence of *kun-dzob denpa*.

When hearing the term *kun-dzob denpa*, a discrepancy between appearance and existence is supposed to appear to the mind, rather than some kind of reaffirmation of a truth.

Illusory truth, or truth for an illusion, fits all the requirements for a correct translation, and it is also a relateable term. The student immediately grasps the essential meaning and can see what appears to their mind as being like an illusion and some kind of truth. This loosens the grasp of ignorance on the mind, and immediately the person becomes more relaxed and happy.

Syllogisms

Take the subject 'superior hearer': it follows they have not attained the state of an arhat - because they did not take the wisdom realizing emptiness as the path.

Formulations like this are very common in Tibetan commentaries, and represent a fixed

debate style, where first the subject is presented, then the predicate, and then the reason. This format can be used to present an argument to explicitly prove something, or a consequence, which explicitly shows a fallacy in the opponend's position.

Translation

The *Bodhisattvacharyavatara* was composed ca. 700 AD, and the present commentary, *The Entrance for the Children of the Conqueror*, was written by Gyaltsab Je, a direct student of Lama Tsong Khapa, in the 14th century. It is therefore clear that both are ancient texts, with a unique style that may not immediately be comfortable to the modern reader.

My translation style is to first err on the side of being too literal, and then slowly working towards the middle, where it is easier readable, while still being an accurate translation, i.e., a work of Shantideva and Gyaltsab Je. This process has been started, but is not concluded.

There are by now many translations of the *Bodhisattvacharyavatara*, some very flowery, where I get the impression the translator felt the need to be also a commentator. My aim is more to provide a mirror image of the Tibetan text in English, and part of this process is that the English should also be cryptic if the Tibetan is cryptic. It is the function of the commentary to flesh out the words of the root text, and to elaborate on them. This particular commentary is what is called a 'word commentary,' which includes all the words of the root text in the explanation, in this way giving them context, structure and meaning.

The Way of Training in the Wisdom That Is the Nature of Superior Insight

(Explanation of the Chapter; Explanation of the Title)

Explanation of the Chapter

(Showing That Those Wishing to Attain Liberation Need to Generate the Wisdom Realizing Suchness; The Method of How to Generate the Wisdom Realizing Suchness; Therefore an Advice to Strive in Generating This Wisdom)

Showing That Those Wishing to Attain Liberation Need to Generate the Wisdom Realizing Suchness

(The General Meaning; The Auxiliary Meaning)

The General Meaning

The Able One explained all these branches [1]
For the purpose of wisdom.
Therefore, those wishing to pacify suffering
Need to generate wisdom.

Argument: Because we need to attain enlightenment to pacify all suffering in the continuum of others, we need to realize suchness. But why would one need to realize suchness to merely pacify the sufferings in one's own continuum?¹

Answer: The protector Nagarjuna said,

For as long as there is grasping at the aggregates,
For that long there is grasping at 'I'.

He is saying that for as long as there is true-grasping at the aggregates, for that long one will not stop the transitory view grasping at inherent 'I' and 'mine'.

Nobody here asserts that hearer and self-liberator arhats have not completely abandoned the transitory view, but because one needs to stop true-grasping at the aggregates to that end, it is asserted that they realize the non-true existence of the aggregates.

This master² asserts as well that one needs to realize suchness in order to pacify the sufferings of cyclic existence, which is explained further below. Those who wish to understand this presentation more extensively should do so in dependence on the great commentary by the great divine omniscient Lama Tsong Khapa, who is the guide of all the worlds, on the *Introduction to the Middle Way*.

The clear cognizance of the various commentaries on this text, which show it to teach that hearers and self-liberators do not realize the selflessness of phenomena, as mistaken meaning of the text, shall be explained.

These branches can refer merely to calm abiding, which is explained in the eighth chapter, or it can refer to all the remaining perfections starting with generosity. There are these two systems, and although the first system is feasible from the point of view of the relation of the earlier and later chapters, here one follows the second system.

¹ This questioner could be a Svatantrika-Madhyamaka or a Cittamatra, who accepts the possibility of complete enlightenment but does not assert the need to realize the selflessness of phenomena to attain individual liberation.

² Master Shantideva.

The doubts with regards to, “the branches of generosity and so forth were taught for the purpose of wisdom” are eliminated as follows:

In general do generosity and the other perfections not need to precede the realization of suchness by way of listening and contemplation, because although one needs to build up merit to realize emptiness, the practices of a bodhisattva, such as explained here, do not have to be preliminaries. This is similar to the two modes of realizing suchness through listening and contemplating as explained by the master Kamalashila.

One also does not need them as preliminaries to generate a mind-moving experience of emptiness, because then they would also have to precede other realizations such as an experience of impermanence. One also does not need them as preliminaries for the generation of superior insight realizing emptiness from meditation, because although they do not first engage in the practices of a bodhisattva, hearers and self-liberators realize suchness in the way just mentioned.

Argument: That they were taught for the purpose of wisdom is because the wisdom realizing emptiness is the substantial cause for the dharmakaya, and the methods of generosity and the other perfections are the simultaneously acting conditions. One needs the benefit of generosity and the other perfections to achieve the result of wisdom.

Answer: In that case one could also turn it around and say that wisdom was taught for the purpose of the other perfections.

Without the wisdom realizing emptiness one cannot exhaust the seeds of the two obscurations, and although one does not need to be adorned with infinite merit to eliminate merely the seeds of the afflictive obscurations, one does need infinite merit to eliminate the seeds of the obscurations to knowledge. As this text is mainly from the point of view of eliminating the obscurations to knowledge, it says, “these branches are taught for the purpose of wisdom”.

It is master Nagarjuna’s position that true-grasping is an afflictive obscuration, and this master³ asserts the same.

From *The Sutra Perfectly Condensing Dharma*:

If one places the mind in equipoise one knows the absolute the way it is.

Also from *The Compendium of Trainings*:

In equipoise one knows the absolute the way it is.

Knowing as it is refers to superior insight, and therefore the perfection of meditative stabilization explained in the eighth chapter is a causal branch of the wisdom explained here.

³ Master Shantideva.

The Auxiliary Meaning

As one wishes to pacify the sufferings of cyclic existence of self and others, one needs to generate the wisdom realizing selflessness. The earlier explained branches of generosity and the other perfections, this collection of causes, was taught by the Buddha for the purpose of generating the wisdom realizing emptiness.

The Method of How to Generate the Wisdom Realizing Suchness

(The Presentation of the Two Truths; Establishing that Even Just to Attain Liberation One Needs to Realize Emptiness; Explaining Extensively the Reasoning that Establishes Emptiness)

The Presentation of the Two Truths

(Actual; Refuting Objections of No-Need and No Ability Regarding Emptiness)

Actual

(The Division into the Two Truths; The Definition of the Two Truths; Identifying the Person Who Has Understood Both)

The Division into the Two Truths

The illusory and the ultimate, [2]
These are asserted as the two truths;
The ultimate is not an object engaged by awareness,
Awareness is stated to be illusory.

The Compendium of Trainings quotes *The Sutra of the Meeting of Father and Son*:

The Tathagata comprehend thus the illusory and the ultimate and exhausted the possibilities for that to be known into illusory truth and ultimate truth.

Because the Tathagata sees perfectly in emptiness, knows perfectly in emptiness, manifests well in emptiness, therefore he is called All Knowing Transcendental Wisdom.

Then, the explanations stating that the thought of the *Introduction to the Bodhisattva's Deeds* is that ultimate truth is not an object of knowledge, or that it cannot be known by any awareness, are wrong explanations.

The nature of the division is into the twofold division of illusory truth and ultimate truth. Although there can be different connotations to a division, here, it is to be of one nature but to be of different isolate. As both have a nature, it is impossible for them not to be of one or of different nature.⁴ If the subject is of different nature from the lack of true existence, then the faults outlined in the *Elucidations of the Thought* apply, such as that it would become truly existent. Moreover, if they are not different, then the faults explained there apply as well. Therefore, they are of one nature but of different isolate, just like produced and impermanent.

So, the basis for division, object of knowledge, is comprehensively divided into the two truths. The nature of the two divisions is that the meaning found by a nominal prime cognition is illusory truth, and the meaning found by an ultimate prime cognition is ultimate truth.

⁴ There is a difference between saying *one nature* and *of one nature*. For two phenomena to be of one nature, they need to be two different natures, or entities. The two truths are not only two different natures, but two clearly distinct mutually exclusive natures, which are yet of one nature.

Definition of the Two Truths

(Understanding It Through the Refutation of the School of Others and the Presentation of Our School)

The Refutation of the School of Others

Opponents such as the Red Ones from Toelung, using the first line “the ultimate is not an object engaged by awareness” as the statement, and the later line as the reason, have asserted that ultimate truth is unsuitable to be the object of conceptual or non-conceptual consciousness, because if it is awareness of the object of awareness, then there is a pervasion that this object is illusory truth, as shown in the lower lines. This is completely unsuitable, because if one accepts the non-existence of awareness in the meditative equipoise of a superior, then one supports the texts of *Those Putting Themselves Afar*.⁵ They posit that while there is consciousness up to the point of death, the continuity is severed upon death, and you would accept likewise that while there is awareness up to and including the last moment of the path of preparation, that it does not exist while in meditative equipoise on the mode of abiding.

Further, if one does not accept a directly cognized meaning, an object of knowledge that can purify stains, then the elimination of stains becomes impossible, and one will become somebody that singularly denies that a person can be posited as a buddha or bodhisattva.

If one accepts such a phenomenon, then to have ultimate truth as phenomenon but to have no awareness that realizes it, becomes a contradictory illusory phenomenon. If one asserts that the ultimate is never comprehended, then, since the ultimate cannot comprehend itself, it has nothing that understands it, and thus becomes baseless. If it is like that, then what is the purpose of positing the division of the two truths?

Further, if the illusory is empty of being true, then there is nothing to harm the acceptance that the truth of emptiness is ultimate truth, but lacking that, illusory truth becomes truly existent.

From the *Refutation of Arguments*⁶:

If the mere lack of nature is reversed,
Then it is established as existing in this very nature.

The Presentation of Our School

The first line shows the definition of ultimate truth and the second line shows the definition of illusory truth. Both the earlier and later awareness are dualistic awareness, and not mere awareness, which is from the point of view of the way of comprehension.

Then, it has to be related like this: The examples, the lack of inherent existence of the person and the aggregates, exemplify ultimate truth, and do not become an object of engagement of the awareness that is a prime direct perception comprehending them

⁵Those that put themselves afar from a happy rebirth: the Hedonists.

⁶Nagarjuna.

explicitly by way of them appearing in a dualistic manner. However, they are known by the prime direct perception comprehending them.

It is like stated in the *Introduction to the Middle Way*⁷:

Mistaken identities such as hairs, etc. [6.29]
Imagined due to defective faculties,
Similarly to pure eyes seeing their nature
One should know suchness here.

The examples of the person and the aggregates are called illusory truths because the awareness that is a prime direct perception realizing it explicitly has to do so in a dualistic manner. One should become acquainted with a more elaborate analysis of this from the commentary on the *Introduction to the Middle Way* composed by Je Rinpoche himself.

Therefore, the need to know thus in detail the detailed definitions of the two truths pervades also the two transcendental wisdoms of a buddha. This is so because although the transcendental wisdom of a buddha knowing suchness understands the world of multiplicity, and the transcendental understanding of the world of multiplicity understands suchness, the understanding of suchness is like water into water, and the understanding of the world of multiplicity is in a dualistic manner.

Argument by an opponent who does not understand the meaning of the commentary on the *Introduction to the Middle Way* at all: It is illogical to assert that a buddha's transcendental wisdom appears to itself as there are only two ways for it to appear. If it appears as different, then, since it is impossible for a buddha's transcendental wisdom to be mistaken with regards to the appearing object, one would need to accept that it is different from itself. If it appears as water into water, then it would irrefutably be ultimate truth. A buddha's transcendental wisdom realizes everything that is established as one entity with itself but is of different isolate on the basis of appearance, and regardless of whether it realizes the name implicitly or not, it realizes itself although not appearing to itself.

Answer: If it is the prime direct perception apprehending blue of an ordinary individual, then it does not appear to itself as it is impossible for it to be a self-knowing direct perception. It is also unsuitable to be posited as realizing, on the basis of appearance, the other parts that are established as being of one entity with it. It is singularly an implicit realization in dependence on the explicit realization of blue, and one should know that such an implicit realization is impossible for a buddha.

⁷ Chandrakirti

Identifying the Person Who Has Understood Both

(Divisions of a Person Who Wishes to Understand the Two Truths; Explaining the Difference of High and Low Awareness)

Divisions of a Person Who Wishes to Understand the Two Truths

Regarding this, two aspects of transitory beings are seen, [3ab]
Yogis and ordinary beings.

A person who wishes to comprehend the two truths is a transitory being, i.e., a person labelled in dependence on the aggregates. This is again seen in two aspects: a yogi with the concentration of the union of calm abiding and special insight, who realizes all phenomena as being empty of inherent existence, and ordinary beings asserting real existence. This is from the point of view of emphasis. Those that realize emptiness through listening and contemplating, and those whose minds have not been affected by a tenet are included in these classes.

Explaining the Difference of High and Low Awareness

The ordinary transitory being [3cd]
Is outdone by the yogic transitory being,

And yogis are outdone as well through distinctions [4ab]
Of awareness by the one above.

Ordinary transitory beings who assert partless particles, partless moments of consciousness and functionalities as existing truly can be transitory beings, as well as yogis. The yogic person who realizes the worlds as lacking inherent existence outshines lower tenets that propound realism, and among the yogis who have attained a union of calm abiding and special insight, the higher ones outdo the lower ones. With reasoning the Madhyamakās refute the Cittamātra's assertion of truly existing mind, which in turn refutes with reasoning the assertion of partless particles by the Sautrāntika.

If one wonders whether the yogis who realize emptiness outdo each other or not: Also among the yogis who have realized emptiness, those on the higher grounds such as on the second ground and so forth, harm, i.e., outshine, those on the lower grounds, such as on the first ground and so forth, due to a distinction of their awareness.

In addition, one should understand the implicit meaning, that also from the point of view of one continuum, an increased awareness through meditation of the higher grounds can harm the seeds that are to be abandoned, whereas the lower grounds cannot harm them.

The purpose of stating these lines is that having divided awareness into awareness that realizes the illusory and awareness that realizes the ultimate, if an awareness realizing the ultimate is not harmed by a prime cognition realizing the illusory, then what

need is there to talk about harm by the grasping at partless particles? The purpose is to understand that the awareness realizing the ultimate harms all extreme views.

Further, it is to understand that a mistaken assertion by the lower is refuted with logic by the higher. Through the distinction of their awareness, yogis of the Vaibashika and Sautrantika harm with logic the assertion of permanent functionalities accepted by Hindus, the acceptance of partless particles by the two Asserting Meaning⁸ is harmed with logic by the Mind Only, and the acceptance of truly existent mind by the Mind Only is harmed with reasoning by the Madhyamaka.

The earlier explanation is the view of the *Great Commentary*.

Refuting Objections of No-Need and No-Ability Regarding Emptiness

(Actual; Defending One's Position)

Actual

Through examples asserted by both, [4cd]
There is no investigation towards a result.

Transitory beings see objects [5]
And think they exist perfectly,
Not like an illusion; therefore here
The yogi and the transitory being disagree.

Argument: It is not valid that the yogi who realizes that all phenomena lack inherent existence harms ordinary tenets because there is no argument for the lack of inherent existence. If there is no inherent existence, then there would be no point in training in generosity and so forth to attain the result of enlightenment.

Answer: It follows an argument for the non-existence of inherent existence is not non-existent because for both Madhyamaka and Realists, the lack of inherent existence is established in dependence on examples that are well known and accepted as being false, such as dreams and illusions.

If there is no inherent existence, it does not follow that training in generosity and the other perfections is pointless. Although generosity and so forth, which are practiced in order to attain the result of enlightenment, are not truly established, one engages in them without investigation or analysis while holding them with the wisdom realizing them to be false, like an illusion. If the remaining perfections are not held by the wisdom realizing the absence of inherent existence, then they do not gain the name "having gone beyond" and they, as well as their objects, need to be guided up to the city of enlightenment.

Argument: If also you accept that fire, that which can perform the function of burning, and other functionalities and their functions, are established by direct perception, then

⁸ Euphemism for the Vaibhashika and Sautrantika, i.e., those who assert external meaning.

our debate is pointless, because as we both call that truly existent. If you do not accept this, then you receive the harms of being contradicted by direct perception and the like.

Answer: This argument is based on the view that the two truths contradict each other, i.e., if functionalities do not exist inherently, they become completely non-existent, and if they exist, then they have to exist inherently.

Both Madhyamaka and Realist worldly beings⁹ see fire and the like with prime cognition and accept them, but the Realists think of and accept them as being wholly perfectly established objects, and do not comprehend them as being illusory-like and lacking true existence. The Madhyamaka do comprehend them as such, and therefore also in this regard do the Madhyamaka yogis and the Realist worldly beings have a dispute.

Defending One's Position

(Refuting Realists Such as the Sautrantika in General; Refuting the Mind Only in Particular; Refuting the Argument that the Path Realizing Emptiness Has No Use or Purpose for a Madhyamaka)

Refuting Realists Such as the Sautrantika in General

(Refuting Harm Through Direct Perception; Refuting Harm Through Quotations)

Refuting Harm Through Direct Perception

The mere direct perception of forms and so forth [6]
Exists through renown and not by prime cognition.
They are false, just as impurity and so forth
Are renowned as purity and so forth.

Argument: If the five sense objects are not established inherently, then it would contradict them being seen with direct perception.

Answer: This is not valid. The prime direct perception of form and the other objects is merely a prime cognition of the renowned illusory aspect. It does not establish their suchness, and does not become a prime cognition in relation to their suchness. In that case, as even ordinary individuals would see suchness, there would be no need to generate a superior path. Also, the quote from the *King of Concentration Sutra*, “the eye, ear and nose are also not prime cognition” is to be understood as refuting them being prime cognitions of suchness.

Argument: If forms and the other objects do not exist inherently, then how can they be renowned, and although being renowned, how are they false?

Answer: Functionalities are false in the same way as the impure body of a woman, among other things, is renowned to be pure, among other things.

⁹ Gyaltsab Je: Or one relates the earlier worldly beings only to the Realists.

Refuting Harm Through Quotations

(Showing the Sutras Which State that Compounded Phenomena are Impermanent and so forth to Be Interpretative; Refuting Them to Be Definitive; Refuting That One Is in Contradiction)

Showing the Sutras Which State That Compounded Phenomena Are Impermanent and So Forth to Be Interpretative

For the purpose of introducing transitory beings [7ab]
The protector showed functionalities.

Argument: If forms and other objects are not established inherently, then it is contrary to the sutras stating that they are impermanent.

Answer: There is no contradiction as the Protector showed forms and the other functionalities to be impermanent in order to lead the transitory beings gradually to emptiness.

Refuting Them to Be Definite

They are not momentary in suchness. [7c]

These functionalities are not momentary in suchness because in suchness they are not established as one or many.

Refuting That One Is In Contradiction

(Refuting That They Are Not Even Established as Illusory; Refuting That the Build-Up of the Accumulations Would Be Invalid; Refuting That Taking Rebirth Would Be Invalid; Refuting That the Division into Virtue and Negativity Would Be Invalid; Refuting That the Distinctive Individual Realization of Samsara and Nirvana Would Be Invalid)

Refuting That They Are Not Even Established as Illusory

If said to be contradictory even with the illusory, [7d]

Yogis are not at fault in the illusory, [8]
They see suchness in comparison to the world.
Otherwise the thought of a woman's impurity
Would be harmed by the world.

Argument: Even on the illusory level it would be contradictory for compounded phenomena to be impermanent, because in the world the earlier functionality is renowned to also exist permanently in the later moment.

Answer: Although forms and the other sense objects are renowned in the world as permanent, the fault that their impermanence is not established by prime cognition does not exist. They are established as impermanent, misery, empty and selfless by the illusory nominal prime cognition of yogis.

Argument: This is in contradiction to the statement that seeing impermanence and the other characteristics is seeing suchness.

Answer: It is the mere assertion that in comparison to the grasping by worldly beings at purity, happiness, permanence and a self, this is seeing suchness. Otherwise, if being renowned by the world would be the measure for prime cognition, then it would follow that the yogi meditating on impurity, who has gained conviction regarding the impurity of the woman's body, would be harmed by the worldly grasping at the purity of the woman's body.

Refuting That the Build-Up of the Accumulations Would Be Invalid

Merits from the illusory-like conqueror [9ab]
Equal the ones from a truly existent.

Argument: If there is no inherent existence, it contradicts the explanation that one receives merits through making offerings and such to the conquerors.

Answer: There is no contradiction. That one accumulates merit through making offerings to the conquerors that are illusory-like and lack true existence is just like the assertion that one accumulates merit through making offerings to a truly existent conqueror. Regardless of whether they are suitable to exist truly or not, one accumulates merit in accordance with the object.

Refuting That Taking Rebirth Would Be Invalid

If sentient beings are like an illusion, [9cd]
Then how can they be reborn after death?

For as long as the conditions come together [10]
For that long even the illusion exists.
Just because of a long continuity
Sentient beings are truly existent?

Argument: If sentient beings are like an illusion and lack true existence then, just like the illusory sentient being does not regenerate after disintegration, how are they reborn upon death?

Answer: We do not accept that sentient beings and illusions are the same in each and every aspect, but we accept that they are the same in existing truly or not. If the fault only relates to that, since you also accept dreams and illusions to be false, then your question is like asking why the basis for deception does not appear as donkey, while it appears as horse.

Then, for falsities, as long as the conditions are complete, for that period of time the illusion exists. Similarly, for as long as the conditions of ignorance and so forth are complete, sentient beings will take rebirth.

Argument: It is not the same, as sentient beings exist for beginningless time.

Answer: It follows it is invalid to assert the distinction that sentient beings exist truly merely because they exist for a long time, and that illusions are false because they exist for a short while - if one analyses this, then one would need to also accept a difference in the true and untrue existence of dreams and illusions as they have a difference in length. The recent dream one can remember as one eon or as one day.

Refuting That the Division into Virtue and Negativity Would Be Invalid

The killing and the like of an illusory being [11]
Is not a negativity because there is no mind.
Relative to those endowed with an illusory mind,
Merits and negativities arise.

Since mantras and the like do not possess the power, [12]
An illusory mind does not arise.
The illusion that arises from manifold conditions
Is also manifold.

That one condition can do it all [13ab]
Is totally non-existent anywhere.

Argument: If they are like an illusion in that they lack inherent existence, then that would contradict that the killing and the like of sentient beings are negativities.

Answer: Regarding the killing and the like of an illusory person, if one hits them with a weapon with the intent to kill on the basis of perceiving it as a human and the like, then one creates the negativity of action, but there is no actual karma of killing as it does not possess mind.

If one benefits a person endowed with an illusory mind, then one creates merit, and if one harms such a person, then one creates negativity.

Argument: For those being the same in lacking inherent existence, how can there be a difference in generating a mind or not?

Answer: Because the illusory substances and mantras cannot generate an illusion with mind, the illusory horse and elephant do not have mind. The illusion that arises from various conditions also appears in various ways. The 'also' *does* not eliminate sentient beings.

That one needs various conditions for various results is because it is impossible for one result to generate all results. That one condition can generate all results is totally non-existent anywhere.

Refuting That the Distinctive Individual Realization of Samsara and Nirvana Would Be Invalid

If nirvana is the ultimate, [13cd]
And samsara the illusory,

Then also the Buddha would circle, [14]
What would be the point of the bodhisattva's practice?
If the continuity of the conditions is not cut off,
Then the illusion will also not be reversed.

If the continuity of the conditions is cut-off, [15ab]
Then it will not arise even conventionally.

The Madhyamaka accept that there is no ultimate birth or death, that the lack of inherent existence is the natural liberation and that the birth, death and so forth established by karma and afflictions are cyclic existence.

Regarding this a Sautrantika opponent argues: If the ultimate or natural liberation is actually liberation, then although the emptiness of inherent existence of cyclic existence is ultimate liberation, the continuity of circling, albeit in an illusory way, through birth and death, is cyclic existence. In that case, there would be a common basis for cyclic existence and liberation, which would mean that even buddhas circle in cyclic existence. In that case, it would be pointless for bodhisattvas to practise the bodhisattva trainings in order to attain enlightenment.

Answer: There is no such fault because there is a difference between natural liberation and the liberation purified of the adventitious. The natural liberation does not depend on meditating on the path because it is the suchness of all, irrespective of whether one meditates on the path or not.

The liberation free from the adventitious stains needs to be attained by cutting off the taking of rebirth in cyclic existence through the continuity of birth and death. Although it lacks inherent existence, if one does not cut the continuity of the conditions, one cannot even reverse an illusion, not to mention cyclic existence. If one does cut the continuity of the conditions of ignorance and so forth, then cyclic existence will not even arise in an illusory way.

To the earlier debate one needs to answer by making a distinction between ultimate liberation and liberation, rather than answering in any other way because the opponent accepts that the buddhas do not circle and that sentient beings do.

Refuting the Mind Only in Particular

(Expressing the View; Refuting It)

Expressing the View

If even the mistaken is non-existent [15cd]
What takes the illusion as its object?

Mind Only: If all phenomena lack inherent existence and even the mistaken consciousness apprehending the illusion does not exist, then what is the mind of which the illusion becomes the object of? As it does not exist, even the illusion becomes non-existent.

Answer: This again is the debate that if it exists, it has to exist inherently.

Refuting It

(Similar Argument; Refuting the Answer)

Similar Argument

When for you the illusion is non-existent, [16ab]
At that time, what becomes the object?

If the object held by you, the Mind Only, existed in the way it appears when it is held, i.e., as an outer object, then it would exist externally. In that case, that similar to an illusion and the mind taking it as its object, become non-existent. If it does not exist in the way it appears, it does not exist inherently, and in that case, according to you, it would have to be non-existent. If there is no apprehended illusory object appearing as an external object, at that time what is taken as object at that time? Even the apprehenders of the five objects of forms, sounds and so forth become non-existent.

Refuting the Answer

(Expressing the View; Refuting It)

Expressing the View

In case: "It exists in another way. [16cd]
The aspect is mind itself."

Mind Only: Although it does not exist in the very way it appears, as external object, it exist in a different way, because the aspects of form and the like are the substance of mind itself.

Refuting It

(The Non-dual Mind Is Not Seen by Anyone; Refuting the Self-knower as the Answer to the Question)

The Non-dual Mind Is Not Seen by Anyone

When the mere mind is an illusion, [17ab]
At that time what is seen by what?

If at the time, when an illusory-like meaning appears to the mere mind, it does not exist as an external object, what prime cognition sees the mind that lacks an external object? There is nothing that sees it.

Refuting the Self-Knower As the Answer to the Question

The Mind Only argue: Consciousness can be of two types: In the aspect of being directed outwards and in the aspect of only being directed inwards. The latter is the self-knowing direct perception. All consciousnesses are the object of that self-knower.

Refuting this with quotation; with logic; refuting the arguments for the existence of a self knower; refuting that imputed objects are based on truly existent functionalities.

Refuting This with Quotation

Even the protector of the worlds said [17cd]
That mind does not see mind.

The edge of a knife does not cut itself [18ab]
It is the same for mind.

It is invalid for this very mind to experience and know itself in a non-dual manner. Even the protector of the worlds stated this in the *Sutra of the Precious Crown Ornament* with examples such as that the edge of the knife cannot cut that very knife itself, and that mind does not see mind.

For example, just like the edge of the blade cannot cut itself in any way, so can the mind not see the mind. Those who accept a self-knower accept that the very apprehending aspect knows itself. As there is not even one atom of difference in the arising aspect of the knower and that known, they need to accept them as one without any extra other part.

If one accepts such a self-knower, then one needs to accept examples such as that the blade of the knife cutting itself, or that prime cognition comprehends the object of comprehension independently of such an object.

Refuting This with Logic

(Refuting the Example; Refuting the Meaning)

Refuting the Example

If, 'It is like a candle [18cd]
Perfectly illuminating itself.'

The candle light is nothing to be illuminated [19]
Because darkness does not obscure.
Unlike a crystal, blue does not depend
On something else to be blue;

Likewise, some are seen to depend on others, [20]
And yet some are also not.
That which is not blue cannot produce itself
As blue out of its own nature.

Refuting the example of the candle light

Argument: Just as the candle light perfectly illuminates itself and other objects, in the same way does the consciousness know itself and others.

Answer: The example is not established because the candle light is not illuminated by itself. It does not need to and cannot illuminate itself. Otherwise, darkness should also obscure itself and others, which is not valid. If darkness obscured darkness, then one could not see darkness, just as one cannot see the vase covered by a cloth. One should try to extensively understand these arguments, in the way they are outlined in the *Root Wisdom*.

Refuting the example of the crystal

Argument: That the white crystal is generated as blue through the force of the basis is in dependence on other, rather than through its own nature. The blue of the lapis lazuli is blue out of its own nature, and not in dependence on others. Likewise, the knowing of forms and so forth exists in dependence on the other mind, but the knowing of mind by mind itself exists independently from some separate knower.

Answer: It follows that the example of the blue of the lapis lazuli being generated as blue independently from something else is not valid - because blue does not by its own self generate itself in the nature of blue, which it would need to in order to not be generated from a cause as blue.

Refuting the Meaning

If the statement, “the candle flame illuminates” [21]
Is made upon knowledge by consciousness,
Then the statement “awareness is luminous”
Is made upon knowledge by what?

To remark about it being illuminated or not illuminated, [22]
When it is not seen by anything,
Is pointless even though expressed,
Like the airs of a barren woman’s daughter.

If one says, ‘Although the candle does not illuminate itself, it is illuminated’, and says likewise, ‘it is known by consciousness’, then consciousness does not illuminate itself. Instead one has to say ‘consciousness illuminates’, and this statement would be made after it is known like this by which consciousness of different substance? This is invalid.

If it would be known by a consciousness of different substance, it would become infinite. Hence, it is not known by self or by another. As there is no knower seen by any consciousness, then although one may make statements regarding whether consciousness is illuminated or not, they are meaningless as the basis for the distinction is not established by prime cognition.

If it is impossible for the daughter of a barren woman to exist, then it is meaningless to talk about her airs.

Refuting the Arguments for the Existence of a Self-Knower

(Example for How Memory Is Generated Even Though There Is No Self-Knower; Refuting that Other-Knowers Would Be Impossible If There Were No Self-Knower)

Example of How Memory Is Generated Even Though There Is No Self-Knower

If there is no self-knower, [23]
How can one remember consciousness?
One remembers in relation to the experience of something else,
Like the poison of a rat.

Mind Only: If there were no self-knower, then how could there be a recollection of the object-possessor consciousness? There cannot be.

If one can infer the experience through the reason of recollection, and the recollection when one thinks, 'I previously saw blue' comes subsequent to the experience, then, when one says, 'I saw blue', one establishes the experience of the object through the recollection of the object, and that very experience of the object is the apprehension of blue.

When one says, 'I saw' one establishes the experience of the object-possessor through the sign of the recollection of the object-possessor, and that experience of the object-possessor is the self-knower.

The reasoning that refutes an other-knower as that experiencing the object-possessor also establishes the self-knower.

Madhyamaka: The memory of the object-possessor does not establish the self-knower. If the apprehension of blue experiences the other object of blue then, when one says, 'I previously saw this blue', the memory of the object-possessor is generated from the memory of the relation between the object and the object-possessor. It is not generated from the experience of the object-possessor, just like the marmot does not experience being poisoned at the time because of being foggy, but does remember it later.

For example: When the marmot in winter is foggy in relation to its body, then although the poison of the rat enters its body, it only experiences the fogginess and not the poison. Later, when it wakes up due to hearing thunder, it remembers being poisoned, but without having earlier experienced the poison at the time.

The fogginess of the marmot is similar to the experience of the object by the apprehension of blue. Being poisoned at the time of being foggy is like the experience of the object-possessor at the time of holding the object. That the object-possessor does not experience itself at this time is like the non-experience of poison at the time of being foggy.

Subsequently remembering the fogginess is like remembering the object. The memory of the object-possessor through the memory of the object, along with the object-possessor not having experienced itself earlier, is like the memory of the poison through the power of merely remembering being foggy, and without having experienced being poisoned at the time.

This reasoning to establish memory without a self-knower appears to me as having been composed by a fully qualified scholar, and as excellent. It seems it has not been adopted correctly by those practicing the words of the *Introduction to the Trainings*.

In general the answer given to, 'it is incorrect that the later consciousness remembers because the earlier consciousness did not experience itself, is 'the pervasion is not established', therefore it says that the assertion, 'the *Introduction to the Trainings* does not nominally refute a self-knower' is not the position of the great bodhisattva.

Refuting Other Reasons Used to Establish a Self-Knower

If, 'It can illuminate itself because [24]
That endowed with other conditions can see.'
By applying the formulated eye balm,
The vase is seen, but not the eye balm.

Mind Only: When that endowed with other conditions such as aspect, abiding, and purification can see the mind of others, then one can illuminate one's mind as one's object. For example, like being able to see the close mountain if one can see the far away needle.

Answer: Although one can see underground treasures such as vases by applying the substance made out of a medicinal eye balm, one does not see the eye balm itself. This reason harms the position of the self-knower, and does not support it.

Further: It is explained like this because, as they are the same in arising from the same illuminating cause, it follows that not only are that illuminating and that illuminated not established as one, they are certainly also not established as of one entity. This is so because at the time when the underground vase is seen due to applying the medicinal eye balm created through a secret mantra for seeing underground treasures, not only is the illuminated vase not one with the illuminating eye balm, they also do not become one entity. Hence, not only is it unsuitable as a reason establishing a self-knower, it harms the existence of a self-knower.

Refuting That Other-Knowers Would Be Impossible If There Were No Self-Knower

(Actual; Refuting that the Illusory Workings of the Mind are Inexpressible as Being the Very Mind or Other from It)

Actual

Just as the consciousnesses of seeing and listening, [25]
Are not to be refuted here,
That which becomes the cause of suffering,
The formulation of true existence, is to be refuted.

Argument: If there is no self-knower, then there is no memory, and therefore the experience of objects and the consciousnesses of seeing, listening and the like become non-existent.

Answer: The conventionalities of sight by eye consciousness, hearing by ear consciousness and knowing by mental consciousness are not something to be abandoned. They do not need to be abandoned because suffering is not generated merely through them, and also arhats possess these nominalities. They cannot be abandoned, because this would have to happen either through logic or through quotation, which would in turn also have to be refuted. If these are refuted, it is a mistake because one would adopt a nihilistic view.

Then, because the formulation of these phenomena as truly existent is the cause of suffering, that becoming the cause of suffering is that which is to be refuted, as it is the root of cyclic existence. If one does not reverse the root of cyclic existence, one does not stop cyclic existence, and because the true-grasping at forms, sounds and the like is shown to be the root of cyclic existence, it clearly shows that hearers and self-liberators realize the selflessness of phenomena.

The assertion that while the mere appearances to the sense consciousnesses such as a coarse mouth and the like are not objects of negation, but that if they are held as permanent or impermanent, existent or non-existent and the like, that then they are objects of negation, is a comeback response of the Chinese Abbot.

Refuting That the Illusory Workings of the Mind Are Inexpressible as Mind Itself or Other from It

If, 'There is no illusion apart from mind [26]
And I do not think they are not separate'.
If it is a functionality, then how is it non-other?
If asserted to be non-other, then there is no functionality.

Just as illusions, though untrue, are [27ab]
The perceived object, perceivers are too.

Mind Only: Because there is no outer existence there is no illusion, i.e., forms and the like, of different substance from the mind. Because of the earlier fault of 'at that time

what is seen by what?', I also do not think that they are not separate.

Madhyamaka: If forms and the like exist truly, they need to be true in the way they appear. In that case, as they appear as outer objects, they need to exist as outer objects. If they are outer functionalities, then how are they not of different substance from mind itself? It follows they are.

Mind Only: They are not of different substance.

Madhyamaka: It follows there is no true phenomenon because appearances are accepted to be false, and they do not exist in a different way. Although the illusions of forms and the like, which appear as outer objects but do not exist truly, are that perceived by the mind, and likewise, although the six consciousnesses are that which perceives, they are the same in not existing truly.

Therefore, the earlier fault of, 'If even the mistaken is non-existent' does not apply to the Madhyamaka, and this method would suit you, the Mind Only, well too.

Refuting That Imputed Objects Are Based on Truly Existent Functionalities

If, 'Cyclic existence is based on functionalities, [27cd]
Otherwise it would become like space',

If non-functionalities are based on functionalities [28]
How can they perform an action?
Your mind becomes completely isolated,
Without any support.

When the mind is devoid of that perceived [29]
Everyone will have gone thus.
In that case, what is the benefit
Of that imputed as mere mind?

Mind Only: The false and imputed phenomena of cyclic existence and beyond are each based on a truly existent functionality, because everything deceptive is based on a truly existent basis. For example, the partial tree that is mistaken for a human also exists truly. Likewise, cyclic existence is based on a truly existent basis. If it were not, then it would become a non-functionality, like space. The meaning of this debate is put forth in the *Compendium of Trainings* like this, and to explain it in any other way is not the meaning.

Madhyamaka: If the false non-functionalities of samsara and nirvana depended on a truly existent basis of deception, then how could they produce the results of bondage and liberation? It follows they could not - because the truly existent basis does not exist. This reason is put forth in the *Compendium of Deeds*.

Mind Only, according to your system the mind becomes an isolated self illuminating self-knower, without the supportive distortion into apprehender and apprehended and the like. This follows because, since you accept the appearance of object and object-possessor as being distant as not existing the way it appears, there is no outer existence, and because the appearances of forms and so forth as consciousness were refuted earlier. In this case the appearances of forms and such become objects distinct and unrelated to consciousness, and although the appearances of forms are tainted, they cannot taint the substance of consciousness.

If this is accepted: It follows that when the mind is free from the dualistic appearances of apprehender and apprehended, then all sentient beings become thus gone ones and effortlessly attain liberation - because all minds are free from the appearances of apprehender and apprehended.

If one looks at and accepts this position, then it follows that there is not the slightest need to comprehend the lack of apprehender and apprehended as being of different substance, which is labelled *mere mind*, in order to achieve the omniscient transcendental wisdom.

Refuting the Argument That the Path Realizing Emptiness Has No Use or Purpose for a Madhyamaka

(Argument; Answer)

Argument

Although knowing it to be like an illusion [30]
How can the afflictions be opposed?
Even the creator himself
Generates attachment for the illusory-like woman.

Mind Only: Although you may comprehend that all phenomena lack inherent existence, like an illusion, if it serves no purpose with regard to abandoning the afflictive and other obscurations, it merely causes exhaustion. Even if it is asserted to serve a purpose, how can it reverse the afflictions? It follows it cannot - because one who can see that even the creator of the illusory woman, who realizes it to be empty of an external woman, generates attachment by thinking of the illusory woman as something suitable to be enjoyed, and you have nothing beyond the initial realizations of emptiness through listening and contemplation.

Answer

(The Reason Why the Illusionist Generates Attachment; Showing that Meditating on the Wisdom Realizing Emptiness Can Overcome the Afflictions and Their Imprints; Showing that One Will Receive the Perfect Complete Result of Abandonment)

The Reason Why the Illusionist Generates Attachment

The creator has not abandoned the afflictive imprints [31]
Regarding objects of knowledge.

Hence, when seeing them
The imprints of emptiness are weak.

The illusionist who is the creator of the illusion has not abandoned in the slightest the afflictive imprints, i.e., true-grasping, with regards to the object of knowledge of the illusory woman. Because they grasp at true existence, when they see the object, the imprints of realizing emptiness are weak, and as a result they generate attachment.

If someone were to answer, 'The earlier has not abandoned the afflictions because his realization of the illusory woman being empty of being a woman is only a partial emptiness, but in my system they are abandoned because the pervasive emptiness is realized', then this answer would be invalid. Realizing that the illusory woman is empty of being a woman is not a partial realization of emptiness based on the subtle object of negation. If one has identified the object of negation, and then realized its non-existence on one phenomenon, then one can also understand this on other phenomena. This has been explained in other places.

Then, in general with regards to mistaken perceptions, to stop the non-conceptual mistaken perception of falling hairs due to vitreous humor, it is not enough for the mental consciousness to understand the absence of falling hairs, which by itself does not stop the appearance of falling hairs. Rather one needs to clear the disease from the eye.

With regards to conceptual mistaken perceptions such as the grasping at the colored rope as a snake due to adventitious conditions, the mere realization of the rope will stop the mistaken perception. One does not need to meditate longer on this understanding.

The true-grasping in the continuum of all migrators has been deeply mixed with their continuum since beginningless time. Even the buddhas do not see a beginning.

It is as if the continuum has been well cooked by it, and without even mentioning the seeds, just to stop coarse manifest self-grasping it is not enough to merely realize the lack of true existence. Even if one realizes the lack of true existence directly, it only abandons the intellectually acquired afflictions and their seeds, but not the innate ones. For this reason, the manifold presentation of the path of having to meditate for a long time on the path of meditation, among other things, was taught.

It is accepted that the conclusion of the realization of emptiness is the elimination of the afflictions, and the realization of emptiness can bring this about, but not immediately. It is not accepted that the afflictions need to be eliminated immediately upon the realization of emptiness. The statement, 'For that one needs repetition' contains the answer.

The illusionist who creates the illusion of a woman has not abandoned the afflictive

tendencies of true-grasping with regards to the object of knowledge of the illusory woman, and grasps at this object as truly existent. Hence, when he sees the illusory woman as empty of being a woman, his imprints of realizing emptiness are weak, and he does not have the ability to harm true-grasping as he does not possess anything that contradicts true-grasping.

The afflictive tendencies can refer to true-grasping, its seeds or the obscurations to knowledge, but here it is the earlier.

Showing That Meditating on the Wisdom Realizing Emptiness Can Overcome the Afflictions and Their Imprints

(General Presentation; Specific Presentation)

General Presentation

Meditating on the imprints of emptiness [32]
Abandons the imprints of phenomena.
Meditating on that called *completely non-existent*
Subsequently abandons even this.

By meditating on the imprints of emptiness, i.e., by realizing the lack of inherent existence of functionalities, the imprints of grasping at functionalities as truly existent are abandoned. By meditating on that called *completely non-existent*, i.e., by meditating on the lack of true existence as lacking true existence, subsequently even the true-grasping at the lack of true existence is abandoned.

If one only abandons the coarse object of negation, then one needs to subsequently abandon true existence, because true-grasping will only be abandoned once one has attained the cessation of the subtle object of negation from the point of view that true existence means an existent that does not exist as merely being posited by name. This will be explained later.

Specific Presentation

When it is said that nothing exists [33]
The investigated functionality is not observed.
At this time the non-functionality lacks a basis,
How can it linger before one's awareness?

When objects and non-objects [34]
Do not linger before one's awareness,
And since there is no other possibility,
They are totally pacified in non-existence.

When it is said that any functionality lacks true existence, if the investigated functionality existed truly, it should be observable, but it is not. Therefore, when it is realized as lacking true existence, then the truly existent non-functionality lacks a truly existent

basis. and as a result, how could the refuted true existence then linger before one's awareness? As there is no suchness without subject, if the lack of true existence existed truly, it would have to be established in the nature of the subject, which has already been refuted as being in the nature of true existence.

Then, when no truly existent functionality or non-functionality lingers before one's awareness, and as there is no other aspect of true existence at this time, one realizes that all objects of true-grasping are non-existent and all elaborations become pacified. In the perception of a person who realizes emptiness directly, all dualistic elaborations with regards to emptiness are pacified and although the realization of emptiness with a meaning generality has not stopped dualistic appearance, it has stopped the elaborations of true existence with regards to the meaning it ascertains. This verse and the lower five verses elaborately show the reality of the result.

A Red One from Toelung argues: On the basis of thinking that the meaning of this commentary, and of the abbot of the two truths, is that at the time of the manifesting of the mode of abiding, no object of knowledge or consciousness exists: 'I do not know consciousness without an object of knowledge and prime cognition without an object of comprehension. I accept the lack of true existence to exist truly.'

Gyaltsab Je: It is very clear that they do not understand the position of the great pioneer¹⁰, and it is as unsuitable to exaggerate their view as a realization of the meaning of the middle way as it is positing oneself as a permanent other-powered phenomenon.

Showing That One Will Receive the Perfect Complete Result of Abandonment

(Showing with Example That Although there Are No Conceptual Thoughts, the Hopes of the Students Will Be Fulfilled; Refuting Arguments with Regards to This)

Showing with Example That Although There Are No Conceptual Thoughts, the Hopes of the Students Will Be Fulfilled

Like the wish-fulfilling jewel and wish-granting tree [35]
Fulfill hopes
Similarly, through the power of prayer
The body of the conqueror appears to disciples.

For example, although having passed [36]
After having established an offering tree to the garuda,
And though a long time has passed since then,
Poisons and so forth will be pacified.

Having established an offering tree to the conquerors [37]
In accordance with the bodhisattva practices,
Although the bodhisattva has gone beyond misery,
They fulfil all purposes.

Argument: If buddhas have pacified all conceptual consciousnesses, then they also do not think, 'I shall show the dharma to those to be subdued' and therefore it is invalid

¹⁰ Nagarjuna.

to say they fulfill the purpose of sentient beings by showing the dharma and through other actions.

Answer: There is no fault. Although they have no conceptual thoughts, the wish-fulfilling jewel grants humans their wishes and wish-granting trees fulfill the hopes of gods when supplicated.

Similarly, the conquerors appear to those to be subdued through the power of their accumulated merit to meet them. Although the buddhas do not have conceptual thoughts, their form bodies appear and teach the dharma through the power of previous prayers such as, 'May I be able to fulfill the purpose of sentient beings effortlessly and simultaneously.'

Argument: Because a long time has passed since these prayers were made they cannot generate a result in the present, and as the ones praying were bodhisattvas, it is invalid to posit the enlightened activities of the conquerors as their result.

Answer: There is no fault. For example, the brahmin may have passed upon having established an offering tree to the poison pacifying garuda, and although a long time has since passed, the poison tree can even now still pacify poisons. Similarly, the bodhisattvas have established an offering tree to the conquerors by way of building up the two accumulations in accordance with the bodhisattva practices, and although the bodhisattvas have manifested the non-abiding nirvana, this does not contradict them fulfilling all the temporary and ultimate purposes of sentient beings. This debate arises from not knowing placement through continuity.

Refuting Arguments with Regards to This

How can one become endowed with a result [38]
From having presented offerings to one lacking mind?
Because it is taught that it is the same,
Whether they remain or have gone beyond sorrow.

Whether illusory or ultimate, [39]
The result is taught in the scriptures.
For example, like having a result
Relative to a true buddha.

Argument by a hearer: How can one achieve the result of merit by making offerings to a buddha, who lacks conceptual mind? They also do not possess the thought of having received the offering.

Answer: It follows it is valid that merits are received by making offerings to the buddhas although they lack conceptual consciousness - Why? Because it teaches in the *Maitri Lion's Roar Sutra* that it is equally meritorious to make offerings to the body of a buddha that is actually present, as it is to the relics of a buddha who has passed beyond sorrow.

From the Sutra:

Aside from the benefits of circumambulating,
Making offerings to those present and
To the relics of those gone beyond sorrow,
There is no difference in the merits
To a mind of equal clarity.

The Buddha taught in the scriptures that one will receive a result by making offerings to the buddhas and so forth regardless of whether they exist conventionally or ultimately. For example, like you assert. This can be seen in your assertion of results with regards to a true buddha. The important meaning is that, while treating the analysis into the meaning of suchness with equanimity for the moment, regardless of whether they are true or false, one will receive the result in accordance with the functionality. This is the important meaning.

Establishing That Even Just to Attain Liberation One Needs to Realize Emptiness

(Argument; Answer)

Argument

One becomes liberated by seeing truth, [40ab]
Why should one see emptiness?

Hearer opponent: By meditating on the direct perception of the four noble truths' 16 aspects of impermanence and so forth, one will attain the result of a liberated arhat. Why should one realize the emptiness of true existence of all phenomena for this? It is without purpose and even unsuitable.

Gyaltsab Je: For this hearer opponent not only does one not need to realize emptiness to attain enlightenment, they do not even accept the concept of selflessness of phenomena. These, who do not accept the Mahayana sutras to be the words of the Buddha, are the main opponent. To refute them and to refute by the way also those that, while positing the Mahayana sutras as valid, assert that one does not need to realize the selflessness of phenomena to attain the result of an arhat, I state these sources which, refuting these opponents, establish that only the wisdom realizing emptiness is the path to be liberated from existence.

Answer

(Establishing that Only the Wisdom Realizing Emptiness Is the Path to Liberation from Existence; Establishing It as the Path to the Non-Abiding Nirvana; Advising that It Is Suitable for Those Wishing for Liberation to Meditate on Emptiness)

Establishing That Only the Wisdom Realizing Emptiness Is the Path to Liberation from Existence

(Establishing This with Mahayana Sutras; Establishing This with Logic)

Establishing This with Mahayana Sutras

Because it is taught in scripture that [40cd]
Without this path there is no enlightenment.

It follows one definitely needs to realize emptiness to attain the result of a hearer or self-liberator arhat. For what reason? Because in the *Sutras of the Wisdom Gone Beyond* it teaches that without meditating on the path¹¹ realizing emptiness one cannot attain any of the three types of enlightenment.

In the *Great Commentary on the Introduction to the Bodhisattva Practices* it quotes the *Perfection of Wisdom Sutras* as saying that those with a recognition of functionalities cannot attain liberation, and that all those perfectly enlightened in the three times, as well as the results from a stream enterer up to a self-liberator are attained only in dependence on the *Perfection of Wisdom*. The scriptures refer not only to the highest enlightenment.

Further: I am not going to cite the innumerable quotes from the sutras showing that hearers and self-liberators realize the selflessness of phenomena. In these two lines Mahayana sutras were stated as an argument out of an understanding that some of those following the hearer's path accept the reason of Mahayana sutras.

If one thinks, 'Is it not devoid of reason to state arguments to those that do not accept Mahayana quotes as valid', then there is no fault. The opponent does not need to establish immediately the three modes of all arguments. Here the pervasion of the argument is also established, just as it is below, through the reason of similarity and normality.

It establishes the point of this reason that the wisdom realizing emptiness is the path to attain the three types of enlightenment. Although it is not established as the word of the Buddha by establishing the pervasion, there is no fault in relating the proof to quotation. Master Shantideva¹² cited these texts also because he knew it would refute the wrong conception of thinking of isolated Mahayana sutras as not the words of the Buddha.

Establishing This With Logic

(Establishing This by Way of Similarity; Establishing This with Shared Reason)

Establishing This by Way of Similarity

If the Mahayana is not established [41]
Then how are your texts established?
Since they are established for both of us.
Initially they are not established for you.

The conditions through which you generate faith [42]
Are the same for the Mahayana.
If true because two others assert it, then
The Vedas and so forth also become true.

¹¹ In some version it says 'chapter realizing emptiness', which would also work.

¹² Changed from 'the master'.

If you say, 'The Mahayana is in question', [43]
Non-Buddhists also question the texts,
And other texts are also questioned by
Self and other. Therefore they should be abandoned.

Argument: The Mahayana sutras are not established for me because I do not regard them as the words of the Buddha, and I do not accept them to be valid. Stating them as argument to establish that the realization of emptiness is also the path for the hearers and self-liberators makes the argument equal to the proposition.

Answer: How do you establish the quotes belonging to the Hinayana basket, which you accept to be valid, as the words of the Buddha?

Reply: The Hinayana sutras are the words of the Buddha because we both accept them to be the words of the Buddha.

Answer: Immediately upon birth, and before you established the meaning of the scriptures with logic, also the Hinayana basket was not established as valid for you. But later, the condition of accepting them to be valid scriptures, the *Great Treatise* and so forth, which show that the pure method lies within the Vinaya, induce into Sutra, as well as not contradicting the Abhidharma, with the methods for comprehending the words and meanings through reason, you generated faith in the sutras. The arguments with which you established this valid scripture as believable apply equally to the Mahayana sutras.

If this is not the case, and something becomes valid because two random people accept it, then it follows that also the Vedas and so forth are true - because there are two people that accept them to be true.

Argument: Because you also accept the Hinayana sutras that I accept as the words of the Buddha, we do not have any dispute there. But because I do not accept that Mahayana sutras to be the words of the Buddha, we have a dispute in that regard.

Answer: The Hinayana scriptures are questioned by non-Buddhists and Hinayanists alike. Also, while the Hinayana scriptures are accepted by all eighteen Hinayana schools as valid, there are individual quotes, such as the quotes that show the existence of an intermediate state, which are accepted by some Hinayana schools as the words of the Buddha, but are also not accepted by some other Hinayana schools. It would follow that the Hinayana baskets being valid is also something to give up, as they contain parts that are disputed by Buddhist and non-Buddhist schools.

Establishing This with Shared Reason

(Showing That It Is Impossible to Become an Arhat and Go Beyond Sorrow If One Is Devoid of the Wisdom Realizing Emptiness; If One Can Become an Arhat Simply Through the Path of the 16 Aspects, Then One Can Also Become an Arhat by Merely Abandoning the Manifest Afflictions; Refuting the Answer to That; Showing That Even Those Merely Wishing to Attain Liberation Need to Meditate on Emptiness)

Showing That It Is Impossible to Become an Arhat and Go Beyond Sorrow If One Is Devoid of the Wisdom Realizing Emptiness

If the root of the teachings is the essential bikkhu, [44]
Even the essential bikkhu has a problem.
The mind endowed with an object,
Has difficulty just to abide beyond sorrow.

The arhats had received direct teachings from the Buddha, and assembled them later into the collected works of the Buddha. Therefore, in a discussion amongst bikkhus, it would be difficult for even an ordained arhat to be the root of the Tathagata's teachings.

Take the subject 'superior hearer': it follows they have not attained the state of an arhat - because they did not take the wisdom realizing emptiness as the path. This shows also the consequence that those who do not accept the emptiness that is the lack of inherent existence of phenomena cannot destroy the foes. The word *just* indicates that 'not only can those devoid of a realization of emptiness not become enlightened, [...]'.'

The subject 'hearer arhat': it follows they have difficulties to go beyond sorrow as it is invalid for them to have liberation in their continuum - due to their mind possessing the object of true-grasping, as they have not repudiated with reasoning the grasped object of true-grasping, and so grasp at functionalities as truly existent.

Or: It is saying that for as long as one has true-grasping one will not go beyond sorrow. The first two lines state the proposition and the second two lines state the reason.

If One Can Become an Arhat Simply Through the Path of the 16 Aspects, then One Can Also Become an Arhat by Merely Abandoning the Manifest Afflictions

If liberated through abandonment of the afflictions, [45]
One transforms immediately afterwards.
Although not having afflictions,
One can see that their karma is still potent.

Argument: One does not need to realize emptiness to become an arhat. By meditating on the path that realizes the 16 aspects of impermanence and so forth, one exhaustively abandons the afflictions and attains the liberated result of an arhat.

Answer: It follows that the person who has merely abandoned the manifest afflictions temporarily transforms into an arhat immediately after. By merely meditating on the path of the 16 aspects of impermanence and so forth one eliminates the afflictions and becomes an arhat. It equalizes the two in all aspects.

This is unacceptable however. Although the manifest afflictions are temporarily non-existent, it is observed that the person who has abandoned the manifest afflictions temporarily has the karmic potential to connect with a future existence.

The school of the opponent is expressed by: 'If liberated through abandonment of the afflictions', and the meaning of this is as stated in: 'One becomes liberated by seeing truth.'¹³ What it is saying is that if one can abandon the afflictions and attain the state of an arhat through meditating on the path of the 16 aspects of impermanence etc.,

This is the meaning of what it is saying, because at this point it is debating whether or not one attains liberation from the afflictions merely through the path of impermanence and so forth. This also very clear from the arguments of, 'One becomes liberated by seeing truth.'

The meaning is certainly not that, while accepting that one can eliminate the afflictions by meditating on the path of the 16 aspects, that one will not be liberated from all sufferings through that.

I think the meaning is that when that posited specifically by the two Hinayana schools as afflictions¹⁴ is temporarily absent in its mere manifest form by having generated the earlier explained path in the continuum, they posit that one has attained liberation from the afflictions. As a result, by merely abandoning the manifest afflictions temporarily, one will then immediately attain liberation from all contamination.

That one cannot accept this is shown in the lines, 'Although not having afflictions one can see that their karma is still potent'. This is saying that although the manifest afflictions are temporarily absent one can observe the potential to be thrown into a future existence through the power of karma.

These lines need to be explained in this way, and not as some commentaries and Tibetans do, who say that because it is observed that Maugalyana and Phagpa Sodreng experienced the suffering result of karma created earlier while an ordinary individual, they are not liberated in the moments afterwards. Here it does not refer to the potential to create suffering in this life, but it is saying that one is not liberated because one has not stopped the karmic potential that throws one into a future existence.

Refuting the Answer to This

If: 'You say the craving that takes forcefully, [46]
Is temporarily non-existent. I say it is certain.'
Although this craving is not afflicted,
Why should it not be like ignorance?

Craving arises from the condition of feeling, [47]
And they have feeling;
It abides for some whose
Mind is endowed with an object.

Argument: The attainment of the state of arhat by meditating on the path of impermanence and so forth is not merely temporary. Craving is the simultaneously acting con-

¹³ Verse 40, line a.

¹⁴ The coarse afflictions corresponding to the explanations of the two *Knowledges*. These are the explanations of the afflictions having as their root the grasping at a self-sufficient substantial self. This text however follows the uncommon Prasangika presentation of the afflictions.

dition for the forceful taking of another existence, and as it is exhaustively abandoned through this path, there is no seed and one does not take another rebirth. It is like this with certainty.

Answer: Although the craving in the continuum of the person that you assert to be an arhat is not afflicted as explained in the *Knowledges*, similar to there being posited a total incomprehension¹⁵ that is afflicted according to the *Knowledges* and one being not, why should there not be a craving that is afflicted according to the *Knowledges* and one that is not? Two need to be posited.

These texts show the existence of a craving that is commonly renowned as non-afflicted in the two Hinayana schools and the Mahayana, but for the craving that is asserted by our own system certainly no afflicted and non-afflicted are asserted.

Then, it is saying that although one temporarily abandons the manifest craving induced by the grasping at a person that is a self-sufficient substantial-existent self, how can one say that the craving induced by the transitory view that is grasping at the person as existing out of its own nature, is non-existent? The elimination of the earlier mentioned in manifest form does not stop even the manifest form of the just mentioned transitory view and craving.

If it is the same for both schools that when their manifest afflictions are abandoned, that this does not mean that the seeds are abandoned, then it is meaningless to set craving apart.

A person who has not realized emptiness has not abandoned in the slightest the ignorance grasping at the true existence of feeling, and through the condition of feeling such a person will certainly generate craving for not being separated from happiness and the wish to be separated from suffering.

Because you posit that arhats have the grasping at inherent existence of feeling, that craving exists in their continuum. For as long as the mind that possesses the object that is perceived as truly existent, is manifest in the continuum of a person, for that long it is impossible to stop the manifest craving that is induced by it.

Showing That Even Those Merely Wishing to Attain Liberation Need to Meditate on Emptiness

The mind lacking emptiness [48]
Will arise again despite ceasing,
Like the absorption without recognition.
Then, meditate on emptiness.

Although the manifest afflictions are temporarily stopped in a mind that is devoid of the realization of the person and the aggregates as being the emptiness of being inherently established, they will again become manifest, just like in the case of the absorption

¹⁵ Ignorance.

without recognition.

Therefore, not only to attain omniscient consciousness, but also to attain the result of an arhat, or whichever result one wishes to attain, one should definitely desire to meditate on the emptiness that negates the subtle object of negation.

Tseg Wangjuk Sengye and others interpret the *Bodhisattvacharyavatara* as saying that hearers and self-liberators do not realize the selflessness of phenomena, and posit the fault of non-pervasion for inferring the result from the cause for the line, 'craving arises from the condition of feeling'. Regarding this, the sun of the earlier ones had not yet risen and it is advice that is unsuitable to arise collectively.

Master Shantideva¹⁶ posits the true-grasping at the person and phenomena as affliction. If one wishes to understand this topic extensively, then one should read the great commentary that was composed by Je Rinpoche himself on the *Introduction to the Middle Way*.

Now follow three verses starting with, 'If the words regarded as sutras', which attempt to show reasoning why the Mahayana sutras are the words of the Buddha. There is no occasion to see how they could come above the lines, 'If the root of the teachings is the essential bikkhu,' and in addition, the *Great Commentary* states that they are not the words of master Shantideva.

If the words attributed to sutra [49]
Are regarded as teachings of the Buddha,
Then why do you not regard most
Of the Mahayana in the same way as your sutras?

If because of only one [50]
All become faulty,
Then why, through one concordant sutra,
Are not all teachings of the conqueror?

The words are not comprehended [51]
By the great Mahakashyapa and so forth.
Who would disregard them
Just because you do not realize them?

However that may be, their meaning is: If the words that show the higher training of the mind belong to the sutras, those that show the training in morality belong to the Vinaya, and those that show the training in wisdom are not in contradiction to the Abhidharma and are posited as the words of the Buddha, then, as the Mahayana sutras show mostly the three trainings, why are they not accepted as the words of the Buddha?

If you assert all Mahayana sutras as faulty on the basis of the reason that there is one

¹⁶Changed from 'This master.'

sutra on which you do not realize the complete definition that you posit for the word of the Buddha, then why do you not assert all Mahayana sutras as the words of the conqueror when you see the definition that you posit for the word of the Buddha complete on one Mahayana sutra?

Argument: If the extensive *Perfection of Wisdom Sutra* and so forth were the word of the Buddha, then Mahakashyapa should realize their subject, but he does not. Therefore they are not the word of the Buddha.

Answer: Who would disregard the extremely profound, that is asserted to be difficult to comprehend by Mahakashyapa and so forth, as the word of the Buddha because of the reason that it is not comprehended by you? That is unsuitable.

Establishing It As the Path to the Non-Abiding Nirvana

For the sake of those suffering due to ignorance [52]
They attain freedom from the extremes of attachment and fear
And achieve an abiding in cyclic existence.
This is the fruit of emptiness.

The attainment of the non-abiding nirvana definitely depends on the realization of emptiness. Ordinary individuals are attached to the true existence of the aggregates and have fallen into the extreme of eternalism, where they circle in cyclic existence under the control of karma and afflictions. Hearers and self-liberators generated fear of the sufferings of cyclic existence, and have fallen into the extreme of nihilism where they take the going beyond sorrow, that has merely cut birth in existence, as their main goal of attainment.

For the sake of the miserable sentient beings circling in cyclic existence due to the delusion that the self and the aggregates exist truly, superior bodhisattvas who are free from these two extremes, have achieved an abiding in cyclic existence due to the power of their compassion. This is the fruit of realizing emptiness, because if they were devoid of the realization of emptiness, then although they have achieved a remaining in cyclic existence, by experiencing inherent sufferings of cyclic existence, they would repudiate them and fall into the extreme of nihilism.

Advising That It Is Suitable for Those Wishing for Liberation to Meditate on Emptiness

Thus it is not valid [53]
To repudiate the side of emptiness.
Then, free from doubt
Meditate on emptiness.

Then, it is invalid to repudiate the side of emptiness, as it was explained earlier, because it will also be contradicted by the reasons explained below. Then, even those wishing to attain the enlightenment of the hearers and self-liberators should meditate

on emptiness free from doubt. True-grasping is the affliction of ignorance that becomes the root of cyclic existence and without negating its grasped object it is impossible to attain liberation.

Emptiness is the antidote against the darkness [54]
Of afflictive and knowledge obscuration.
How can those wishing for quick omniscience
Not meditate on it?

If one generates fear [55]
Of the phenomena generating suffering
Then why generate fear of emptiness,
Which pacifies suffering?

Since the wisdom realizing emptiness is the antidote against the darkness of the afflictive obscurations and the obscurations to knowledge, how can those wishing to quickly attain omniscient transcendental consciousness, which is free from the two obscurations, not meditate on this emptiness? If one is separated from it, one will not even abandon the seed of the afflictive obscurations.

The seeds of the obscurations to knowledge are the final imprints of the afflictions, and the manifest obscurations to knowledge are the part that is the true appearance of functionalities and so forth. But to posit everything that appears as truly existent as the obscuration to knowledge is unsuitable.

Summary

Argument: One should not meditate on emptiness as one is afraid of emptiness.

Answer: If it is suitable to be afraid and to generate fear of the functionality of true-grasping, which acts as the main cause for the sufferings of cyclic existence, then how can one be afraid of the wisdom realizing emptiness, which pacifies the sufferings of cyclic existence? It is inappropriate to be afraid of it as it is that which eliminates all fears.

If some selves exist [56]
And one becomes afraid of any object,
Since there is no nature at all
Who is the one afraid?

If there exists some inherently existent selves, and if it is suitable to generate fear from any suitable object due to grasping at that self, then, as there exists no inherent nature in the slightest, who is the person that is afraid? Think, 'I have to reverse the awareness thinking of inherent existence towards the inside and by comprehending selflessness I shall become liberated from all fears.'

Explaining Extensively the Reasoning Establishing Emptiness

(Explaining Extensively the Reasoning that Establishes the Selflessness of Person; Explaining Extensively the Reasoning that Establishes the Selflessness of Phenomena)

Explaining Extensively the Reasoning that Establishes the Selflessness of Person

(Refuting the Determined Object of Innate Self-Grasping; Refuting the Intellectually Acquired Self; Refuting Objections Against the Refutation)

Refuting the Determined Object¹⁷ of Innate Self-Grasping

Regarding the difference between the innate true-grasping and the intellectually acquired true-grasping: Innate true-grasping is the true-grasping that everybody has, irrespective of whether the mind has been influenced by tenets or not. It is generated through its natural power with regards to the person or the aggregates, and it grasps at natural existence and at inherent existence independently of an analysis with reasoning. This true-grasping is called the innate true-grasping.

Intellectually acquired true-grasping: If it is true-grasping that, in dependence on an analysis with reasons, thinks it is valid that objects exist truly and that thinks ‘these objects exist truly’, then it is the intellectually acquired true-grasping. In the category of self-grasping at person, there is also an innate grasping at a self-sufficient substantial existent, and the grasping at the person as the lord and at the aggregates as the servant, which can only be intellectually acquired.

Likewise, also the grasping at partless particles and partless moments of time can only be intellectually acquired grasping at the self of phenomena.

In short, the two types of true-grasping that are generated through their natural power, independently of analysis, are innate and any other types of true-grasping are intellectually acquired.

The determined object of the earlier is the main object of negation, and the negation of the later should be understood as part of the negation of the earlier.

Argument: If one asserts that a refutation of the teeth, nails and so forth as being the self is for the purpose of liberation from cyclic existence, then this would be unsuitable, because sentient beings, while grasping at them as mine, do not grasp at them as ‘I’.

Answer: Since this is synonymous with the teachings that form and so forth are not the self, out of the focus and the aspect of the innate transitory view, it is the focus that is the mere self-isolates of the mere ‘I’ and ‘mine’, that are the basis of karmic cause and effect. The innate transitory view grasps at them as inherent ‘I’ and ‘mine’ and therefore, if the ‘I’ existed inherently, then one of the examples for the ‘I’, such as the collection of the aggregates or its continuum, its parts or division, or something of a different entity from the aggregates, should be established as the example of the ‘I’. But they are not, and that is what it is saying here. The point here is that this is not the case.

¹⁷ The apprehended object of conceptual thought.

The teeth, hair and nails are not the self; [57]
The self is not the bones or blood,
Not the nasal mucus or phlegm,
And also not lymph or pus.

The self is not the fat or sweat, [58]
And neither the lungs nor liver are the self.
The other inner organs are also not the self,
The self is not feces or urine.

The flesh and skin are not the self, [59]
The heat and air are not the self,
The holes are not the self, and certainly the
Six primary consciousnesses are not the self.

Refuting parts of the aggregates as examples for the 'I': The teeth and nails are not the self, the bones or blood are not the self, and neither is the nasal mucus or phlegm because the self is established as merely labelled on these. Also, because of the earlier reason, lymph or pus are not examples of the 'I', and neither are the sweat or fat examples of the self. And neither the lungs nor the liver are examples of the self, and also the other inner organs such as the intestines and so forth are not examples of the self. The self is neither feces nor urine and also the flesh or skin are not the self, as the self is established as merely labelled on them. The heat and air are not the self, and understand that also the holes of the body and so forth are not the self.

If the meaning of this is summarized: The Realists belonging to our side grasp at the aggregates as an example for the person, and non-Buddhists accept a self that is of different entity from the aggregates; the self being like the master and the aggregates like the servant.

What is shown here is synonymous with the refutation of the six spheres as the person in the *Garland of the Middle Way*. 'The holes are not the self' refutes the sphere of space as the person.

Then, it is also unsuitable to hold any of the collection of the aggregates, or its continuum, its parts or divisions, or something that is of a different entity from the aggregates, to be an example for the person even nominally, and also, anything of different entity from them cannot be posited as the person because the person is established as being merely labelled in dependence on these.

Argument: But then there is nothing that can be posited as the person.

Answer: Are you not satisfied with the analysis of Devadatta and Yajjadatta? As one will fall into the extremes of nihilism or eternalism if one posits an inherently existent person as the object labelled when saying 'person', understand that not even one atom of such a self exists.

Refuting the Intellectually Acquired Self

(Refuting the Self Asserted to Be Consciousness by the Enumerators; Refuting the Self Asserted to Be Matter by the Particularists)

Although there are infinite kinds of substantially established types of self asserted by non-Buddhists, as they are all either asserted to be matter or consciousness, with the thought that by refuting these two, one is able to refute all others, two are refuted here.

Refuting the Self Asserted to Be Consciousness by the Enumerators

(The Actual Refutation; Refuting the Reply)

The Actual Refutation

The Enumerators posit exactly 25 types of objects of knowledge, out of which 24, including the great principle, are matter, and the 25th is consciousness, a knower, experience, or the self endowed with mind. The great principle knows how to produce expressions but does not know how to use them, and the person, which is knowing consciousness, knows how to use objects but does not know how to produce them. This person is asserted to be a permanent functionality. At the time of using the object, to that called 'awareness' and 'the great' appear outwardly the five mere objects of sound and so forth, and inwardly appears the person, after which the object is used. Cyclic existence is asserted to come about through the awareness grasping at that used and the user as one.

I will not explain it here in detail, but you should understand their presentation from other sources because it appears that through mislabelling there are many assertions that the school of the Enumerators is the view of Highest Yoga Tantra.

If the consciousness of sound were permanent [60]
One would apprehend sound all the time.
If there is no object of knowledge, then what is known
To say it is such a consciousness?

If it is consciousness without that known, [61]
Then it follows that also wood is conscious.
Therefore one has to say that without proximity of
The object of knowledge, consciousness does not exist.

Although there are four possibilities with regards to sound and consciousness being permanent or not, the Enumerators posit both as permanent. If the knowledge consciousness person who engages the five mere objects of sound and so forth is a permanent functionality, then it follows that the knowledge consciousness person has sound as its apprehended object at all times, when sound exists and when sound does not exist - because it is a permanent entity that has made sound its object and apprehends it.

This thesis is unsuitable to be accepted - because if there is no object of knowledge, then what would be the known object in order for the consciousness to be the object-

possessor of such and such an object? It would be unsuitable to say such a thing.

Argument: The reason is not established because even if there is no sound, there is the permanent consciousness that apprehends it.

Answer: It follows that even wood becomes consciousness because it is permitted to accept consciousness without object of knowledge. Hence, it is confirmed that without the proximity of the object of knowledge of sound or the like, one has to say there is no consciousness. As there is no way to posit consciousness if there is no object of knowledge, one has to accept there is no time when the person does not apprehend sound.

Refuting the Reply

If, 'they know form', [62]
Why do they not hear anything at this time?
If, 'because there is no proximity to sound,'
Then there is also no consciousness of it.

How could that in the nature of the apprehension of sound [63]
Become the apprehension of form?
Although one is labelled as father and son
This is not absolute.

Enumerator: The consequence that there would be a consciousness without object does not exist - because at the time when sound does not exist, this permanent person is conscious of form by taking it as the object of apprehension.

Madhyamaka: Take the subject 'the being' - at the time of apprehending form by taking it as the object, why does it also not hear sound? It follows it does - because it is a permanent entity that engages the mere five objects without being closer to some or far from others.

Enumerator: Perhaps, because it does not abide close to sound at the time of being conscious of form, it is not conscious of sound at that time.

Madhyamaka: When the object of sound does not exist, then the consciousness that is its object-possessor also does not exist. If you accept this, then the thesis of a permanent pervasive person is lost.

Further, it follows that which is in the nature of a consciousness apprehending sound does not become a consciousness apprehending form - because their aspects are mutually exclusive.

Enumerator: One person can be presented as father and son from two different points of view. Similarly, from the points of view of expression and nature the expression of sound does not exist at the time of the apprehension of form, but the nature of sound

exists because form and sound are of one nature. Therefore one can also posit the object-possessor of sound at that time.

Madhyamaka: It follows the example does not fit the meaning - because although one person is labelled father and son from two different points of view, that person does not exist in an absolute manner as either. Yet you accept these natures to be ultimately established.

Thus, courage and particles [64]
As well as darkness are neither father nor son.
It is not seen as possessing
The nature of apprehending sound.

You accept that the equilibrium of courage, particles and darkness is the great principle, nature and ultimate truth. Regarding this, the very nature at the occasion of the son is not the nature at the occasion of not being the son, i.e., the father, because the Enumerators state,

The supreme nature of qualities
Does not become something visible.
That which becomes visible
Is without any essence like an illusion.

The nature is accepted as something that does not become visible, and the directly visible father and son and the like are accepted as illusory. From this point of view, the very father becomes the son, and that very son becomes the father because both their natures are one.

Then, because the natures of the father and the son are accepted as one, it is also impossible to posit individual occasions in dependence on the basis. Further, take the subject 'these two, the apprehender and apprehended' - they do not exist in the nature that possesses the apprehension of sound - because if they would exist in this way, it should be observable with prime cognition, and it is not observable.

If it is seen in a different guise [65]
Like an actor, then it is not permanent.
In case, 'the different guise is one
With it,' that is without precedent.

If the apprehension of sound is seen in the different manifestation of the apprehension of form, just like an actor who puts on a new costume upon having abandoned the earlier costume, then it follows that the consciousness knowledge is not a permanent functionality - because it takes on a different mode upon abandoning another one.

Enumerator: Because the apprehension of form, which is a different mode from the

apprehension of sound, is of one nature with the apprehension of sound, there is no mistake.

Madhyamaka: This one nature is without any earlier precedent because it only abides individually.

Further: It follows it is unsuitable to accept the later mode as said earlier mode itself - because the later one is one without any past. It states in the *Great Commentary*:

If this very one is this very one at the time of later generation, then this one is without a past because they are accepted as mutually exclusive ones.

If, 'The different mode is not true,' [66]
It is its own nature I say.
If you say, 'only consciousness', according
To this it follows that all beings are one.

Also the animate and inanimate [67]
Become one because of their shared existence.
When the particulars are distorted
Then what could be their shared basis?

Enumerator: There is no fault because what appears in another mode is not true in the way it appears.

Madhyamaka: It follows that you should, yet cannot, say that it is the singular true nature of that consciousness - because you accept that whatever mode appears, is not true in the way it appears.

Enumerator: Only the continuum of the knowledge consciousness person exists truly.

Madhyamaka: In this case, it follows that all people of different continua become one - because all people are accepted as partless permanent pervading entities.

It follows that also the animate knowledge consciousness and the inanimate matter and principle become one - because they are the same in existing as partless permanent pervading entities. Or, one relates it to the answer that their mere existing nature is true.

Consider: When the different particulars of expression are distorted falsities, then it follows that their concordant basis, the primary principle, which exists truly, also does not exist - because the expressions are false.

Refuting the Self Asserted to Be Matter by the Particularists

The inanimate is also not the self [68]
Because it is inanimate, like a vase.
Then if, 'because it is endowed with consciousness
It is conscious,' it follows not knowing is eliminated.

If there is nothing that becomes the self, [69]
How does the mind affect it?
Thus, devoid of consciousness and action,
Space has been made the self.

The self posited as matter without mind by the Naiyayika and Particularists is also not a self since it is inanimate, e.g., like a vase.

Particularists: Although the self itself is matter, it possesses mind by way of compounded relation, and therefore one posits it as knowing objects.

Madhyamaka: It follows the phenomenon of the self truly not previously knowing objects is then eliminated - because it knows objects through the power of subsequent other phenomena.

If one accepts that there is nothing that becomes the self, then how does the mind affect the self so that the self knows objects? It follows the self does not know objects - because it is accepted that there is nothing that transforms into the self.

Summary: Because the self is accepted as lacking consciousness and action, one has made space into the self, which makes it pointless to accept such a self as it cannot act in any beneficial or harmful manner.

Refuting Objections Against the Refutation

(Refuting the Objection That Karmic Cause and Effect Become Non-Valid; Refuting the Objection that Meditation on Compassion Becomes Invalid)

Refuting the Objection That Karmic Cause and Effect Become Non-Valid

(Objection; Answer)

Objection

If it is said, 'In case the self does not exist, [70]
Then karmic cause and effect relationships are invalid.
If one disintegrates upon creating karma,
Whose karma does it become?'

Argument: If the non-existence of the self, which becomes the basis for all bondage and liberation, is taken as momentary generation and disintegration of all functionalities, then virtuous and non-virtuous karmas and the relation to their results are invalid. If the person disintegrates in the next moment upon having created virtuous or non-virtuous karma, then whose karmic creation does it subsequently become? At the time of

experiencing the result, the creator of the karma does not exist. According to our view however, if the person were permanent [...].

Answer

The bases of action and result are different, [71]
And although the creator self does not exist,
Since this is the same for both of us,
Isn't this debate here pointless?

It is impossible to see what you say, [72]
That the cause is endowed with the result.
In dependence on one continuum
We refer to agent and engager.

The past and future minds [73]
Are not the self because they do not exist.
Then, if the generated mind is the self
Because it disintegrates, again there is no self.

For example, like the banana tree, [74]
When taken apart nothing is there.
Similarly, when looking with analysis
Also the self is not absolute.

Since it is established for both of us that the persons who are the basis at the causal time of creating the action, and at the resultant time of experiencing the result are of different substance, and that at the time of experiencing the result the self who created the karma does not exist, isn't your debate here at this time of explaining the relationship between karmic cause and effect pointless? You also accept that at the causal time of creating the karma the experience of the result is not there, and that at the time of experiencing the result, the creator of the karma is not there. If this becomes a fault, then it also applies to you. Additionally, your observation that the one endowed with the cause at the time of creating the cause is endowed with the experience of the result, this observation is impossible.

Particularists: How is it then in your school?

Madhyamaka: In dependence on one continuum of aggregates we refer to the agent who creates the karma and the engager of the result. That called a continuum is the taker, which possesses parts, possessing that taken, the parts of the earlier, intermediate and later moments. In brief, it is valid to say this person creates karma, as well as experiences karma, and nobody is able to isolate¹⁸ cause and effect at any one time.

The past and future minds are not the self or exist as self because they disintegrate and do not generate and therefore do not exist as self. Then, if the generated present mind were the self, as it disintegrates in the next moment, again the self asserted by you does not exist. For example, when the banana tree is separated into its parts, there

¹⁸ Changed from *posit*.

is nothing there that exists inherently. Likewise, if one searches with the logical analysis whether something is established inherently or not, then also the self does not exist in an absolute manner, because such a self is harmed by the reasoning that establishes the selflessness of person that is explained below.

Refuting the Objection That Meditation on Compassion Becomes Invalid

If it is said, 'If there is no sentient being, [75]
Then with whom does one practice compassion?'
That accepted to achieve the result,
Labelled by mental darkness.

Realist: If there is absolutely no inherently existing person, then, as there is no focal object for compassion, for whom should one practice meditation on compassion?

Madhyamaka: If there is no inherently existing person, then it follows there is no such fault that the focal object of compassion is non-existent - because that nominally existing sentient being, labelled by mental darkness, which is accepted for the purpose of achieving the result of liberation, is valid to be the focal object of compassion.

If one relates the 'labelled by mental darkness' to the true-grasping at person and phenomena then, since they label the person as truly existent and one refutes that it exists the way it is labelled, the sentient being is not refuted. By having refuted this, the sentient being is established as existing only in mere name, as an imputed existent.

Further, if one relates the mental darkness merely to ignorance, then the sentient being that becomes labelled by it exists as the focal object of compassion.

Without sentient beings whose result is it? [76]
True, but even though, it is posited from mental darkness.
For the purpose of pacifying suffering
Do not stop the resultant mental darkness.

Realists: If there is no sentient being then, because the meditation on compassion loses its result, the buddha resulting from the meditation on compassion is the attainment of which person?

Madhyamaka: Although it is true that these causes and effects do not exist truly, it is not contradictory to meditate on compassion that arises from nominally fantasizing about them as phenomena.

For the purpose of pacifying the sufferings of sentient beings one should not stop the non-afflictive mental darkness at the time of the subsequent attainment of having attained the resultant buddha. One cannot stop it adventitiously, and although one does not stop it, if one relates this branch of the method for attaining complete enlightenment to the delusion regarding suchness, then it is a deluding of true existence.

One can relate it to the compassion merely focusing on sentient beings that have not been characterized as lacking true existence, and to the compassion focusing on phenomena, being explained as becoming the cause for enlightenment.

Otherwise the meaning²⁰ is that nominalities such as the focusing on *only mind* by those not realizing suchness is not something to be abandoned.

Pride is the cause of suffering, [77]
Which increases due to delusion regarding the self.
If, 'This cannot be reversed,'
The meditation on selflessness is superior.

Realist: Which mental darkness including the object was refuted earlier?

Madhyamaka: As was shown earlier in the statement, 'It becomes the cause for cyclic existence', the pride that becomes the cause for cyclic existence, i.e., afflictive ignorance, fantasizes about the self, and the sufferings of cyclic existence increase. There is no contradiction as this pride needs to be stopped, and can be stopped.

Argument: There is no stopping of true-grasping aside from stopping this kind of mental darkness, and it cannot be stopped. Although one stops it once, because it arises again, similar to the circling aggregates, it cannot be eliminated completely.

Madhyamaka: It is not impossible to abandon true-grasping. It is distorted with regards to the mode of abiding of functionalities, and hence it is very weak and inferior, and the meditation on selflessness is superior compared to it. Because it realizes the mode of abiding of functionalities faultlessly, the other can be eliminated from the root.

²⁰ ...of the third and fourth line of verse 76 is ...

Explaining Extensively the Reasoning Establishing the Selflessness of Phenomena

(Explaining the Selflessness of Phenomena by Way of the Four Close Placements by Mindfulness; Refuting the Argument that the Two Truths Would Be Non-valid; Stating the Reasons That Establish the Lack of True Existence)

Explaining the Selflessness of Phenomena by Way of the Four Close Placements by Mindfulness

(Meditating on the Close Placement by Mindfulness on the Body; The Close Placement by Mindfulness on Feelings; The Close Placement by Mindfulness on the Mind; The Close Placement by Mindfulness on Phenomena)

Meditating on the Close Placement by Mindfulness on the Body²¹

(Comprehending That Possessing parts, the Body, as Lacking Inherent Existence; Comprehending that the Parts Lack Inherent Existence; Then, Attachment to the Dream-like Body Lacking Inherent Existence Is Unsuitable; This Also Establishes the Person as Lacking Inherent Existence)

Comprehending That Possessing Parts, the Body, as Lacking Inherent Existence

The body is not the feet or calves, [78]
The thighs and buttocks are also not the body,
The stomach and back are also not the body,
The chest and upper arms are also not the body,
The rib cage and hands are also not the body,

The armpits and shoulders are also not the body, [79]
The internal organs are also not it.
If also the head and neck are not the body,
Then what of this is the body?

It follows the body does not exist inherently - because if it existed inherently, then an example of the body should be findable in the individual limbs of the body, in the collection of the accumulated parts or as a different entity from these, but it is not found.

Argument: The collection of all the accumulated parts is the body. What doubt is there about this?

Madhyamaka: Because one labels the body in dependence on the collection, the collection of the parts of the body is unsuitable to be the body. If it is not like this, then one needs to accept a final partless particle.

Then, when one analyzes whether and how the basis of engagement for the label that expresses 'body' exists from the side of the body itself: The feet and calves of the person are not the body of the person, the thighs and buttocks are also not the body, and also the stomach and back are not the body, because the body of the person is labelled in dependence on these. The chest and upper arms are also not the body, the rib cage and hands are also not the body, the armpits and shoulders are also not the body and the internal organs are also not it. If also the head and neck are not the body, then which of these parts is the body? Not any of them.

Because also their collection is not the body and also nothing of one or of different

²¹ Jetsun Chokyi Gyaltsen: The definition of close placement (of wisdom) by mindfulness: An exalted knower on the path, that is contained in either mindfulness or wisdom, and which meditates by investigating the general and specific characteristics of the body.

entity from these is the body of the person, therefore, the body does not exist inherently.

In case this body abides [80]
In all parts individually
Then of course the parts abide in parts.
How can it abide in itself?

In case the entire entity of the body [81]
Abides in the hands and so forth,
However many limbs such as hands,
Are found, they become bodies.

If there is no body inside or out, [82]
Then how is there a body in the hands and other parts?
If it does not exist apart from them,
Then how can it exist?

Then, there is no body. Body awareness is generated [83]
Through delusion regarding the hands and other parts,
Similarly to awareness of a person generated for
A scarecrow through the specific shape it is placed in.

As long as the conditions are there [84]
The body will appear as the person.
Likewise, as long as they are there regarding
The hands and so forth, they will appear as the body.

Argument: The coarse body is of a different entity from the limbs and parts.

Madhyamaka: If there is such a coarse body that possesses parts, and it is of a different entity from the parts, does then each part of that coarse body individually abide in one of the parts, such as one part in the hand, one part in the calves and so forth, or does the whole part-possessor abide in each of the parts, without being divided up?

If one looks at the first, as the part-possessor pervades hands and so forth, with each part abiding on the respective part, then it would become infinite for each part, e.g., the hand has again parts such as the fingers, which then also would also abide in their respective parts.

If the part-possessor is partless, then there are no individual parts that can abide in the individual parts. Rather, as in the later examination, the whole entity would abide in each of the parts of the complete body, and there would be therefore as many bodies as there are parts. As the parts would not touch the body, it is solely false and not in the slightest truly existent.

Summary: If one analyzes well with reasoning in this way, then regardless of whether it is the body of the outer person asserted by the Buddhists or the internally fabricated

person by the non-Buddhists, it does not exist inherently. Therefore, how could the hands and so forth be pervaded by an inherently existing body? They are not.

Although the body does not exist inherently, regarding the cause for being mistaken: Although the body does not exist inherently, there is a reason for being mistaken with regards to it because although it does not exist inherently, by fantasizing that the hands and so forth exist truly, the awareness thinking that the body exists inherently is generated. For example, like the generation of the awareness of a person as a scarecrow because of the characteristic of the human-like shape it is placed in.

For as long as the conditions for the mistake such as the unclear appearance of the heap of stones are complete, for that long the body shape will appear as the person. Likewise, for as long as the causes and conditions of the hands and other parts are complete, for that long the body will appear as that which has limbs, and the awareness grasping at the body as existing inherently will be generated.

Comprehending That the Parts Lack Inherent Existence

Likewise, because of being the collection of fingers, [85]
What could the hand also become?
Because they in turn are a collection of digits,
Also the digits are divided by their parts,

And the parts are divided into particles, [86]
The particles should be divided into directions.
Since the partitioned directions lack parts,
They are like space. Hence, there are also no particles.

The body of the person is labelled in dependence on the collection of limbs and parts, and does not exist truly. Likewise, as the hand is also labelled in dependence on the collections of parts and fingers, how could it become something inherently existent? It is impossible. Also because the finger is labelled in dependence on the collection of digits it cannot exist inherently. If the digits are also divided into their parts, they do not possess inherent existence. If the parts of the digits are divided into particles, then they also do not exist inherently. When the particles are also divided into different directional parts through the division into the directional part of the east and so forth, then they are labelled in dependence on directional parts and do not exist inherently. Also the directional parts do not exist inherently because they lack inherently existing parts, for example, like space.

Then, also the particles do not possess inherent existence because if they did, then one would need to accept partless particles, but this is refuted by the reasoning of 'if six are connected simultaneously'.

Then, Attachment to the Dream-like Body Lacking Inherent Existence Is Unsuitable

Thus, who with discernment, [87ab]
Is attached to a dream-like form?

The dream-like form appears as something identifiable at the time of immediate investigation, but at the time of investigation it does not exist inherently. Who that possesses discernment would be attached? It is unsuitable, as there is nobody that comprehends the object of true-grasping.

This Also Establishes the Person As Lacking Inherent Existence

When the body does not exist in this way [87cd]
At that time who is the man, who is the woman?

As a result, when the body of the person does not exist inherently, then at that time who is the inherently existing man, and who is the inherently existing woman? There is no inherently existing person.

In this school one does not realize the selflessness of person completely by merely realizing the absence of a person that is a self-sufficient substantial existent. To this end, one needs to realize the absence of a person that is not posited in mere name.

There is no difference in the difficulty of realizing the two selflessnesses, because on the basis of the person and the aggregates, one does not divide into the coarseness and subtleness of being an imputed existent, or being a substantial existent. In addition, one does not attribute a difference in coarseness or subtleness to the object to be negated.

In any case, the argument over whether or not hearer and self-liberator arhats realize the selflessness of phenomena while positing that they are unsuitable to realize the selflessness of person, should be understood as lacking comprehension.

The Close Placement by Mindfulness on Feelings²²

(Refuting That the Nature of Feeling Exists Inherently; Refuting That the Cause Exists Inherently; Refuting That the Focal Object Exists Inherently; Refuting That Their object-possessor Exists Inherently)

Refuting That the Nature of Feeling Exists Inherently

(The Feeling of Suffering Does Not Exist Inherently; The Feeling of Happiness Does Not Exist Inherently; Advice to Abide in the Yoga of Meditating on the Lack of Inherent Existence of Feeling)

The Feeling of Suffering Does Not Exist Inherently

If suffering exists in suchness [88ab]
Then why does it not impede extreme joy?

Showing that like the body, feeling also does not exist inherently: If that which is experienced, the suffering, and that experiencing, the feeling, exists in suchness, then for what reason does the feeling of suffering that exists on one mental consciousness, since it exists inherently and is unsuitable to change into something else, not harm the feeling of extreme joy and happiness? If it were to harm, and if that harm necessarily cancelled any occasion for the generation of happiness, then, because we can see happiness is generated, the former does not exist inherently.

The Feeling of Happiness Does Not Exist Inherently

If happy, then why do deliciousness etc., [88cd]
Not give joy when overcome with misery?

Perhaps due to being powerful it suppresses [89]
And there is no experience.
How can that not in the nature of
Simultaneous experience, be a feeling?

Merely subtle suffering exists, [90]
Isn't the coarse one cleared away?
If, 'It is a mere joy apart from it',
The subtle itself belongs to it as well

If, 'since the adverse condition is generated [91]
Sufferings are not generated.'
'Feelings are conceptual fabrications'
Is this saying not established?

If happiness also existed inherently, then why does fine food and drink not provide joy in the mind at the time of being overwhelmed by misery because of a dead child? It follows it does make one happy - because fine food, drink and the like generate inherently existing happiness.

Argument: Although happiness is generated at the time of being overwhelmed by misery, because the suffering is strong it suppresses the happiness. Perhaps that is why one does not experience happiness.

²² Jetsun Chokyi Gyaltsen: The definition of close placement (of wisdom) by mindfulness on feelings: An exalted knower on the path, that is contained in either mindfulness or wisdom, and which meditates by investigating the general and specific characteristics of feelings. There are three types of feelings: Happiness, Suffering and Equanimity.

Madhyamaka: How can that not in the nature of simultaneous experience be the feeling of happiness? It follows it cannot - because of simultaneous experience. One can relate the answer likewise to the suppressing of inherently existing suffering by strong happiness.

Argument: Because at the time of strong happiness there is a subtle feeling of suffering it is not as if one did not experience any suffering.

Madhyamaka: If there are subtle feelings of suffering, then what harm did the powerful happiness give to the suffering, so that one posits the experience of powerful happiness? Did the powerful happiness not clear away the coarse suffering?

Argument: This I accept, but this subtle suffering is only a form of subtle joy apart, separate from that great happiness.

Madhyamaka: Since this subtle happiness is not outside the definition of happiness, if it is subtle happiness, it needs to be happiness.

Argument: Wishing to repudiate the fault of, 'If it is happiness, then why does fine food and so forth': Because the contrary condition for suffering, i.e., happiness, is generated from things like fine food and drink, therefore no suffering is generated at this time.

Madhyamaka: Isn't the saying, 'the feelings of happiness and suffering are mere conceptual fabrications and imputations' established? It follows it is - because one instance of food or drink is labelled as the cause for both happiness and suffering through the power of conceptual thought.

Advice to Abide in the Yoga of Meditating on the Lack of Inherent Existence of Feeling

Because of this very fact this analysis [92]
Should be meditated upon as its antidote.
The mental stabilization derived from the field of
Analysis is the food of a yogi.

Because of the very fact that feelings do not exist inherently, one should meditate on this analysis, which realizes feeling to be lacking inherent existent existence, as the antidote against the true-grasping at feeling. If one meditates on the mental stabilization of superior insight in dependence on the superior insight focusing on suchness that arises from the field of pure analysis and investigation, and in dependence on calm abiding, then the body of the yoga will be further and further increased and boosted. Therefore it is called 'food', like the food that increases the body.

Through this concentration the ordinary body is also increased. Hence, one should strive in single-pointed meditative placement upon realizing emptiness.

Refuting That the Cause Exists Inherently

(Refuting the Inherent Meeting of Sense Power and Object; Refuting the Inherent Meeting With the Consciousness; Then, the Contact That Arises from the Meeting of These Three Does Not Exist Inherently)

Refuting the Inherent Meeting of Sense Power and Object

If there is room between sense power and object, [93]
Then how can the two meet?
If there is no room and they are merely one,
What is meeting with what?

Subtle particles cannot enter subtle particles, [94]
They do not have the circumstance and are equal.
Without entering there is no mixing,
Those that did not mix cannot meet.

How could it possibly be valid to say [95]
That the partless can meet.
In case the partless and their meeting
Is observed, show it!

Argument: One needs to refute that particles meet. If the subtle and coarse particles of the sense power and the object meet, is there space between them or not? I say there is.

Madhyamaka: How can these particles meet as they possess the fallacy of not meeting? In the intermediate space there are also the particles of either light or darkness, between which there is again intermediate space, and thus it would become endless.

Argument: There is no intermediate space.

Madhyamaka: Again, when two partless particles meet there cannot be the surface where they touch and the surface where they do not touch, and therefore they would need to touch each other in their complete nature. In this case they merge into one point of reference, become one mere particle, and then what is meeting with which object to be met? It follows there is no such meeting - because there are no two objects.

The reason for this is that one subtle particle cannot enter, i.e., absorb, into another subtle particle, because there is not the circumstance of empty space between these particles, and they are of the same size.

This states the reason why they cannot meet in their complete nature. There is a pervasion because particles that do not enter and absorb into each other cannot mix, and partless phenomena that did not mix cannot meet. How can the statement 'partless phenomena meet' be accurate? Because it is impossible, if you observe the meeting with something partless, then you should show it, but you cannot.

Refuting the Inherent Meeting with the Consciousness

That primary consciousness without body [96]
Can be met is simply invalid;
There is also no phenomenon on the collection,
Similar to the earlier analysis.

The assertion that primary consciousness without a form or body can be met inherently is simply invalid because it does not have form.

The refutation of meeting with the coarse: Also the meeting with a coarse object that is a collection of many atoms does not exist inherently because no truly existent object exists on that. Similarly, inherent existence had already been refuted earlier through the analysis of the collection of digits.

Then, Contact Arising from the Meeting of These Three Does Not Exist Inherently

If thus there is no contact [97]
From what does feeling arise?
What is the purpose of this exertion?
What is giving harm to whom?

When there is no one experiencing feeling, [98]
And when the feeling does not exist as well,
Having seen this circumstance at that time,
Why should craving not be opposed?

Argument: As explained earlier, the meeting of object, sense power and primary consciousness do not exist inherently. If, when looking at it from that point of view, contact does not exist inherently, then from what cause does truly existent feeling arise? A false cause does not have the power to generate a truly existent result. If there is no inherently existing feeling, then what good is the exertion and effort for its sake? It is meaningless.

Argument: The exertion is for the sake of abandoning inherently existing feeling of suffering.

Madhyamaka: This is a fallacy because, as there is no inherently existing feeling, who is the person that receives harm from which cause?

In this world exists merely the happiness that can cure suffering, but there is no self-characterized happiness in the way there is self-characterized suffering. For example, the experience of happiness that one experiences when, on a cold day, one stands in the sun and the suffering of cold recedes a little, is the feeling of happiness. But at that time the suffering of the cold day still exists because immediately upon its generation it exists uninterruptedly as the vanguard of the suffering of heat. Then, one needs suffering as the basis for imputing happiness, but one does not need happiness as the basis for generating suffering awareness; e.g. like blue and distance.

With regard to the teaching that cyclic existence is reversed, if one realizes the non-existence of inherent feeling: When there is comprehension that there is no inherent person experiencing feeling, and that the experienced feeling also does not exist inherently, then at this time, having seen this circumstance of no inherent experience and experiencer at the time, why should craving not be stopped? The craving wishing to attain happiness and the craving wishing to be separated from suffering are induced through the force of true-grasping.

Refuting that the Focal Object Exists Inherently

Whether seen or felt, [99ab]
It is due to its dream-like illusory nature

Regardless of whether it is seen by eye consciousness or felt by the body consciousness, because of the dream-like and or illusory-like nature of the object empty of inherent existence generating the feeling, the feeling also does not exist inherently.

Refuting That Their Object-Possessor Exists Inherently

Because it is generated simultaneously with mind [99cd]
Feeling is not seen by it.

Although generated earlier and later [100]
It is remembered but not experienced.
It does not experience its own nature,
And is also not experienced by others.

Since there is absolutely no one with feeling, [101]
Then feeling is not suchness.
In this way, how can this collection lacking self
Be harmed by this?

Because feeling is generated simultaneously with mind, it is not seen inherently by the mind because those that are of different substance and simultaneous are unrelated. Although feelings are generated earlier and later, they are remembered but not experienced because, at that time, they have ceased and are not generated.

Summary: That feelings do not experience themselves is refuted with the refutation of self-knowers. They are also not experienced by an inherently existent another because then that which is experienced and the experiencer are unrelated. Not only does that producing the feeling not exist inherently, there is also absolutely no inherently existent experiencer of feeling. This was already refuted at the time of refuting the self of person.

Then, just as feeling does not exist as suchness, how should the collection of aggregates, that lack an inherently existing self, be benefited by happiness and harmed by suffering? There is no inherently existing suffering. It is suitable to meditate on the close placement of mindfulness on feeling that lacks inherent existence.

The Close Placement by Mindfulness on the Mind²³

(Showing That Mental Consciousness Does Not Exist Inherently; Showing That the Five Sense Consciousnesses Do Not Exist Inherently)

Showing That Mental Consciousness Does Not Exist Inherently

Mind does not abide in the sense powers, [102]
Not on form, and also not in-between,
There is also no mind inside or outside,
And it is also not found elsewhere.

It is not the body; it does not exist apart, [103]
It does not mix and it also does not stand alone.
Because of not existing in the slightest, therefore
Sentient beings are naturally gone beyond misery.

Mind does not exist inherently because it does not abide inherently on the six sense powers; it does not abide inherently on the six objects of form, sound, scents, tastes, tactile sensations and objects of mental consciousness, and it also does not abide in-between these two or on the collection of these two. Remember the seven-fold analysis of the chariot as explained in the *Introduction to the Middle Way*.

The mind also does not abide inherently in the internally elaborated person labelled by the non-Buddhists, not on the outer hands and other limbs, and it cannot be found to abide inherently in another way apart from inside and outside. It is not the body or truly something else other than the body, the mind is not mixed with the body, and it also does not abide as some inherent object apart from the body. Because it does not exist inherently in the slightest way, the emptiness of inherent existence of the mind is naturally gone beyond sorrow.

Showing That the Five Sense Consciousnesses Do Not Exist Inherently

If consciousness exists before the object of knowledge, [104]
In reference to which object is it generated?
If consciousness and the object of knowledge are simultaneous,
In reference to which object is it generated?

Well then, if it exists subsequently to the object, [105ab]
At that time what is consciousness generated from?

If the sense consciousness exists before the object of knowledge, then, as it is not preceded by a focal condition, in reference to which object is it generated? If the consciousness and the object of knowledge are simultaneous, then in reference to which object is it generated? When the sense consciousness is not generated, the focal condition is not generated, so it cannot be generated, and once the focal condition is generated the consciousness is also generated and does not need a generator anymore.

Well then, if the sense consciousness exists subsequently to the object of knowledge, at that time from what condition is the sense consciousness inherently generated?

²³ Jetsun Chokyi Gyaltzen: The definition of close placement (of wisdom) by mindfulness on mind is: An exalted knower on the path, that is contained in either mindfulness or wisdom, and which meditates by investigating the general and specific characteristics of mind.

This is not valid.

If it is generated from the disintegration of the previous moment, then a sprout is generated from a burnt seed. If it is generated without the disintegration of the preceding, is it generated with another moment in-between or not? In the first case it becomes impossible to be generated directly. In the latter case, as there is no interval in relation to its full nature, they become mixed within the one moment. If the interval relates only to one part and not to the whole, then its true existence dissolves, and it becomes non-truly existent.

The Meditation on the Close Placement by Mindfulness on Phenomena

In such a way the generation of all phenomena [105cd]
Is not realized.

In the way explained earlier the generation of all phenomena is not realized as inherently existent, because, as it is taught in the *Sutra Requested by the Superior Inexhaustible Discriminating Wisdom*, one should realize all compounded and un-compounded phenomena as non-inherently existent.

Refuting the Argument That the Two Truths Would Be Non-valid

(Refuting the Consequence of Absurdity; Refuting the Consequence of Becoming Endless; Showing There Is No Proof for the True Existence of Object and Consciousness)

Refuting the Consequence of Absurdity

In case the illusory thus does not exist; [106]
How could both truths exist on it?
If it is illusory due to another,
How can sentient beings go beyond misery?

This mental superstition apart [107]
Is not our illusion.
If it is subsequently ascertained, it exists.
If it is not, it is not even an illusion.

Conceptual thought and that imputed [108]
Are both mutually dependent.
Just as in dependence on renown
All investigations are expressed.

Argument: Previously object and object-possessor were refuted as inherently existent, having been labelled as earlier and later. In that case, the same fault would apply to their illusory existence and, as there is no basis for the designation of any phenomenon if inherent existence is impossible, the illusory becomes non-existent. As a result, how can the two truths exist on it? They become non-existent.

In the case of: You accept that the objects of form, sound and so forth exist truly to the perception of the illusion, which grasps at them as inherently existent, but that they lack true existence from their side, and exist in an illusory manner. If we look at this, then just as the rope lacks a snake from its side, but exists as snake for the perception of the grasping at the rope as snake, your illusory existence is posited through the mere elaboration as existent by another awareness. If this is looked at, then how can sentient beings go beyond sorrow even conventionally? It follows that liberation becomes impossible - because everything that exists has been established as the mere delusion of a distortion. If this is accepted, then it follows that to comprehend the view for the purpose of liberation becomes meaningless.

Madhyamaka: When we refer to existing in an illusory manner, it is not the meaning of our own Middle Way system to assert it as that merely elaborated as existent by the mental superstition of true-grasping, which is the separate awareness that is mistaken with regards to the grasped object. Regarding what is referred to as the illusory existent accepted by the Madhyamaka: that merely elaborated as existent by the mental superstition of true-grasping, the awareness apart that is mistaken with regards to the grasped object, this is not the meaning of existing in an illusory manner in our own Middle Way system. In our own system the meaning of existing in an illusory conventional manner is: because all phenomena posited as the objects of the view realizing the mode of abiding are realized as being empty of inherent existence, the illusory actions and activities of being generated, generating and so forth can be posited as existing, through being ascertained by prime cognition in an unconfused manner.

If it is not like this, and in our own system actions and activities cannot be posited as being established by prime cognition, then their illusory conventional existence wanes. Regarding the way of positing something as an illusory conventionality in our own system: Both the object-possessor of the conceptual thought and the imputed object are mutually dependent, i.e., they are posited relative to each other, and do not exist in the slightest out of their own nature. This is explained in the *Root Wisdom*:

The actor is produced in dependence on the action.

Just as being renown to worldly nominal prime cognition, they are all an analysis in dependence on mere name, i.e., all presentations are expressions.

Refuting the Consequence of Becoming Endless

When the investigating Analysis analyses,
When also the analysis is,
By analysis, then it has no end. [109]

Having investigated the analyzed object
There is no basis for investigation.
Since there is no basis, it is not born.
This is also called going beyond misery. [110]

Argument: When the investigating analysis, which analyzes whether phenomena exists truly or not, discerns them to be empty of inherent existence, at that time, as it does not fall under that analyzed, does one need to analyze the non-true existence of the analyzing awareness or not?

If not, then it is the same for all other phenomena, and their lack of true existence wanes. If yes, then, because the non-true existence of this analysis needs to be in turn analyzed by another analysis, there would be no end to the analyzing analysis.

Madhyamaka: It follows that no other prime cognition analyzing the lack of true existence is needed for the prime cognition realizing the lack of true existence of all phenomena. Why? Because when the prime cognition analyzing the lack of true existence has analyzed the non-true existence of that to be analyzed, i.e., all phenomena, no truly existent subject that would be a basis for a repeated analysis of non-true existence, exists in the perception of that awareness for as long as it does not lose that mode of apprehension.

Also, for the person who has realized all phenomena as empty of true existence, and for whom the realization holds and has not waned, a subject basis that is characterized by an analysis into true or non-true existence, is impossible because immediately upon generating that thought, the mindfulness thinking, 'it does not exist truly' is generated.

The fault of endless analysis into non-true existence despite having realized all phenomena as lacking true existence, exists for you, because of the necessity of another prime cognition having to analyze that very awareness. If another analysis were needed, then there would remain a leftover of intellectually acquired true-grasping, despite all manifest intellectually acquired true-grasping being stopped by the earlier prime cognition itself.

Because the subject basis does not exist truly, both the object of negation and that negating are not generated inherently, and are therefore called 'naturally gone beyond sorrow'. Realizing this and meditating on it is called 'attaining the liberation beyond sorrow free from adventitious stains'.

Showing There Is No Proof for the True Existence of Object and Consciousness

Whichever way one looks at it, [111]
That these two are true is extremely problematic.
If, 'The meaning is established through the power
Of consciousnesses', what basis exists for mere existent consciousness?

Then, 'consciousness is established from that known'. [112]
What basis is there for the existence of the object of knowledge?
Both exist through their mutual power,
Both again are non-existent.

If there is no father without a child, [113]
Then from where does the child arise?
Without a child there is no father,
Likewise these two do not exist.

The sprout is generated from the seed [114]
And just as the seed is realized through it,
Why should one not realize the existence of
The object of knowledge from the consciousness generated from it?

If the existence of the seed is ascertained and realized [115]
Through a consciousness apart from the sprout,
From what does one realize the existence
Of the consciousness realizing that object of knowledge?

Regardless of the way that a Realist looks at it, it is extremely problematic to assert that the two, object and consciousness, exist truly, because there exists no proof.

Realist: One can establish the meaning of true existence from the example of truly existent primary cognition consciousness.

Madhyamaka: What supporting prime cognition is there for the existence of a truly existent consciousness? There is not any because there is no self-knower, and if it is known by another consciousness, then it would become endless.

Realist: But, consciousness is established through the direct perception of true objects of knowledge and comprehension.

Madhyamaka: What support is there for the existence of object of knowledge? If it is posited by prime cognition, then it is certain: Because both object and consciousness exist through the power of mutual dependence, it is clearly established that again both do not exist inherently, e.g., like long and short or here and there.

If there is no child, then the father is not an existent because that which is defining the father does not exist. As there is no cause if there is no father, from where does the child arise? And if there is no child because there is no father, then the two are mutually dependent on each other and lack true existence; the two, object and consciousness, lack true existence in the same way.

Realist: The sprout is generated from an inherently existing seed and the seed can be inferred through the valid reason of that very sprout. Likewise, why should one not realize the existence of truly existent ultimate object of knowledge through the truly existent consciousness that is generated from the object of knowledge?

Madhyamaka: This is not valid. If the existence of the seed is ascertained and realized through a prime cognizing consciousness that is of different substance from the sprout and sees the sprout, then from what prime cognition is the existence of a consciousness through the realization of the object of knowledge realized? Self-knowers have already been refuted, and you do not accept any other way of knowing.

Stating the Reasons That Establish the Lack of True Existence

(The Vajra Sliver Reason; The Reason of Dependent Arising; The Reason of Refuting Generation and Cessation of Existence and Non-existence)

The Vajra Sliver Reason

(Refuting Generation without Cause; Refuting Generation from a Separate Permanent Cause; Refuting Generation from a Permanent Principle; Summarizing the Meaning of Generation from No-cause; Refuting Generation from Both Self and Other)

Refuting Generation Without Cause

Right now, the direct perception of worldly beings [116]
Sees all causes.
The different petals of the lotus
Are generated by different causes.

If it is asked, 'By which different causes?' [117]
Of course by the preceding different causes.
Why can a cause generate an effect?
From the mere force of the preceding cause.

Hedonists and others: Because one cannot see the products of the colors of the face on the wings of a butterfly and others, and one does not see any creator of the movement of the lotus petals or their smooth shape, or the sharpness of thorns and so forth, therefore they exist out of their own nature.

Madhyamaka: This is invalid. The direct perception of worldly beings sees most of the generating cause for the various inner and outer functionalities such as crops and the like. The different results such as the colors of the different lotus petals, their number and the like are generated by different causes. If it is asked, 'By which different causes?', then of course by preceding different causes.

Argument: Why are different causes able to produce different results?

Madhyamaka: The fault that they cannot do this does not exist. Through the very force possessed by a preceding cause, different causes have the ability to generate different results.

Then, these functionalities are not without cause because they are observed as adventitiously generated in relation to place and time.

Refuting Generation from a Separate Permanent Cause

(Refuting Ishvara with Questions to Its Meaning; If It Is Permanent, It Is Unsuitable to Be the Cause of Anything Arising from Conditions; Reminder That Permanent Particles without Cause Were Already Refuted)

Refuting Ishvara with Questions to Its Meaning

If Ishvara is the cause of migrators, [118]
Well then, declare what Ishvara is?
If you say, 'the elements,' that may be, but
Why get strung out over a name?

However, since earth and so forth are many, [119]
Impermanent, immutable and not divine,
Since they are the very ground walked upon and impure
They are not Ishvara.

Space is not Ishvara because it is immutable. [120]
That the self is not Ishvara has been proven earlier.
Also, a creator beyond thought,
What good is it to describe that beyond thought?

The Naiyayika, Enumerators and Particularists that accept Ishvara: The all-knowing self-arisen Ishvara produced all places, bodies and enjoyments with a preceding movement of his mind, and is therefore the cause of migrators.

Madhyamaka: Well then, declare what is posited as the meaning of Ishvara.

Upon being asked that question: Due to the increase and decrease of the four elements of earth, water, fire and wind the results also increase or decrease.

Madhyamaka: That may be. Although we also accept that from the increasing and decreasing of the elements, the results also increase or decrease, why get strung out over a difference in name of the same meaning out of a great attachment to establish Ishvara? This is unsuitable because that Ishvara is unsuitable to be any great permanent or impermanent meaning is shown in the lines 'However [...]'.
Because the four elements are in the nature of different substances, are impermanent and producing generation and disintegration, are immovable in the sense of preceding the production of results with awareness, are not divine and the very ground that is walked upon, and because they are impure, they are not Ishvara. Ishvara is permanent, unitary and precedes the production of a result with awareness, is accepted to be divine, not to be the very ground walked upon and not as impure.

Argument: Space is Ishvara.

Madhyamaka: Take the subject 'space' - it is not Ishvara - because it is immutable for the purpose of a result. A permanent self is also not Ishvara because this has been refuted earlier both from the point of view of matter or consciousness.

Argument: Because Ishvara is a creator beyond thought these faults do not apply.

Madhyamaka: What is the point of taking something that is beyond thought as the creator? In addition, you cannot know who Ishvara is as he is beyond thought.

If It Is Permanent, It Is Unsuitable to Be the Cause of Anything Arising from Conditions

Also what does it desire to create? [121]
Aren't the nature of the self,
Earth and so forth and Ishvara permanent?
Consciousness is generated from the object of knowledge,

And beginningless happiness and sufferings from karma. [122]
Tell, what is generated by him?
If there is no first cause,
How could there be a first result?

Why should he not always produce? [123]
He does not rely on others.
If there is nothing other that is not produced by him,
How could he rely on these?

If the feelings of happiness, suffering, equanimity and other functionalities are generated from previous karma and other causes, then what is the result that the Ishvara asserted by you desires to create?

Argument: It is the self.

Madhyamaka: It follows that it is not valid - because it follows that this self, the four elements of earth, water, fire and air, and also subsequent similar types of Ishvara are not produced by Ishvara - because aren't the self, the particles of the four elements and Ishvara permanent? Because you accept them to be permanent they are invalid as that which is generated and the generator.

Then, because the different sense consciousnesses to which blue and so forth appear are generated from the objects of knowledge blue and so forth, and because the feelings of suffering and happiness are generated from virtuous and non-virtuous karma, therefore state the result that is generated by Ishvara. The result generated by Ishvara does not exist.

Because the causal Ishvara is a permanent functionality, if he were to exist since beginningless time, then how can there be a first of his resultant feelings and other results? The direct cause of the feeling generated today possesses its ability since beginningless time.

As he produces all results without depending on other conditions, why would he not produce all results on a continual basis? It follows it is like that - because if there is no other separate result that is not created by Ishvara, then in dependence on what condition does this Ishvara generate these results? That asserted as simultaneously acting condition needs to be created by Ishvara and it is acceptable that it is produced by him.

If he relies, then the aggregation [124]
Is the cause and not him.
If there is aggregation, he is powerless to prevent generation.
If there is no aggregation, he has no power to generate.

If he creates despite not wishing to do so, [125]
Then he is under the power of others.
Although wishing, it depends on the wish.
Although creating, how can it be Ishvara?

With regard to Ishvara generating a result, if it is in dependence on the simultaneously acting condition, the combination of substantial cause and simultaneously acting condition becomes the cause, then it follows there is no cause that Ishvara controls - because once the causes and conditions are complete Ishvara has no power to prevent the result, and if they are not complete, then he does not have the power to generate the result.

If the results of suffering of the lower realms and the like are generated from karma against Ishvara's wish, then it follows that Ishvara is controlled by other conditions, and the position that he is independently the creator of all is lost.

Even if Ishvara creates results upon wishing to create the result, the result would depend merely on the wish, and also if the wish is creating the result, how can that be Ishvara? The wish is impermanent.

Reminder That Permanent Particles without Cause Were Already Refuted

Those asserting permanent particles [126ab]
Also they have been refuted earlier.

The position of the Particularists that permanent particles create migrators was refuted earlier with the reasoning refuting partless particles, and there is no need to add anything to that which has already been said.

Refuting Generation from a Permanent Principle

(Stating the Position; Repudiating It)

Stating the Position

That a permanent principle is the cause [126cd]
Of migrators is asserted by the Samkya.

The equilibrium of the qualities of [127]
Courage, particle and darkness
Is strongly asserted as principle
And their imbalances are its expressions.

Enumerators: From nature comes the great, from which in turn pride arises. Pride leads

to the collection of 16, which are expressions while the person is neither nature or expression.

The Enumerators posit that out of the 25 classes of objects of knowledge the principle has the five qualities of being permanent, unitary and so forth and is the cause for the various expressions and the migrators. Courage, particle and darkness are other words for happiness, suffering and equanimity. When these three characteristics are in equilibrium they are strongly asserted as the principle, and when they are in disharmony then they are the worlds, i.e., the expressions.

Repudiating It

(Actual; The Fault Does Not Apply to the Madhyamaka)

Actual

(Refuting That a Partless Permanent Can Be the Nature of the Expressions; Refuting It to Be Permanent; Refuting That It Would Be Impossible for Something to First Not Exist and then to Generate Newly)

Refuting That a Partless Permanent Can Be the Nature of the Expressions

For one to have three natures [128]
Is invalid. Hence it does not exist.
Likewise, qualities do not exist
Because they each have three aspects.

If there are no qualities, then also the existence [129]
Of sound becomes very far-fetched.
It also becomes impossible for non-sentient,
Clothes and so forth to have happiness, etc.

If functionalities exist in the nature of the cause, [130]
Haven't functionalities already been analyzed?
Your cause is happiness and the like,
From that, clothes and the like do not arise.

Happiness and the like arise from clothes and the like, [131ab]
Because it does not exist, happiness and the like do not exist.

Take the subject 'object of knowledge' - it follows it is unsuitable for forms and so forth, and for a singular partless principle to have three natures of happiness and so forth - because it becomes impossible for them to be one. If that is impossible, it is also impossible for them to be many, and thus they are perfectly non-existent.

For that reason a partless principle in the nature of three qualities does not exist. Likewise, the mere qualities are not truly existent because each of these has again three qualities. If upon this analysis the principle with three equal qualities does not exist, then also the existence of the five objects of forms and so forth becomes farfetched as the five mere objects are accepted as expressions of the primary principle.

Because they are inanimate matter, it follows it is impossible for the subject of the

clothes and so forth to be of one simultaneously established substance with happiness, suffering and equanimity.

If the functionalities that are expressions, such as clothes, exist truly in the nature of happiness, suffering and equanimity, which is their cause, then the true existence of functionalities has not yet been examined because they have already been refuted as true.

If, as according to you, the cause of clothes and the like is the principle in which the three parts of happiness, suffering and equanimity are in equilibrium, then clothes and the like cannot arise from the principle because this principle is impossible.

If happiness and the other qualities are generated from clothes and the like then, because clothes and other objects do not exist subsequently, also the principle that contains the three equal parts of happiness and so forth becomes non-existent, because a result without a cause is impossible. It is unsuitable for you to accept this because you accept the principle to be a permanent functionality.

Refuting It to Be Permanent

Happiness and so forth [131cd]
Are never observed as permanent.

If the particulars of happiness exist, [132]
Why is the experience not apprehended?
If it becomes subtle,
How can it be coarse or subtle?

Since it stops being coarse and becomes subtle [133]
The coarse and subtle are impermanent.
Similarly, why do you not assert
All functionalities to be impermanent?

If the coarse is not distinct from happiness, [134ab]
Then happiness is clearly impermanent.

It follows that the nature of happiness and so forth never exists as permanent - because it is not observed as such by prime cognition. In case the particulars of happiness exist as permanent functionalities, then why is the experience of happiness not apprehended at the time of experiencing suffering? It follows that one does apprehend it.

If this very happiness becomes subtle at that time, how can it be coarse and then abandon that status and be subtle? It follows it cannot do that - because it is permanent. Because happiness and the like stop being subtle and become coarse, and stop being coarse and become subtle, therefore this subtle and coarse phenomena become impermanent. Therefore, why do you not posit the subject of all functionalities to be impermanent? It follows that is suitable - because they change in their nature from one to the other.

Is the coarse cause of different substantial establishment from happiness or not? In case of the first, because one still experiences happiness although the coarse cause stops, one has a clear experience of happiness, and it is not a coarse cause. If it is not of different substance, then happiness clearly becomes impermanent because when the coarse cause stops, happiness also stops. If this is accepted, then the permanent nature of happiness and the other qualities wane.

Refuting That It Would Be Impossible for Something to First Not Exist and Then to Generate Newly

In case you say whatever is non-existent [134cd]
Cannot generate because of not existing,

Then although not asserting it, [135]
You abide on the generation of the unclear.
If the effect abides in the cause, then
One would eat feces while eating food.

One would have to include the price [136]
Of the cotton seeds when buying cotton.
If worldly beings do not see it due to delusion,
This reality is determined through knowledge.

Because also worldly beings have this knowledge [137]
Why should they not see?
If the worldly are not valid,
Then also the perception of the particulars is untrue.

If your assertion is that for something to generate it has to exist at the time of the cause, then something that does not exist at the time of the cause cannot generate, because it does not exist in the nature of the cause. So what is your meaning of 'generate'?

Argument: The nature that, although existing earlier, did not appear as object to the awareness at that time, is now clearly revealed.

Madhyamaka: Because you accept the clearly revealed that does not exist as generated at the time of the cause as generated, then although you do not posit the new generation of something that did not exist earlier, you abide on this view. You accept the meaning, and merely do not accept the name.

Or: Although you do not posit the new generation of a previously non-existent particular, i.e., expression, you need to accept that you abide in this view.

In the case where the result abides in the cause without being of different nature, then it follows one would eat feces when eating food - because the nature of the food and the nature of the feces are partlessly one. This is because you accept the principle as the nature of phenomena, mode of abiding, ultimate and as a partless permanent, as

well as accepting that the nature of food and the nature of feces as one.

Further, one would have to put the price of cotton onto the cotton seeds when buying cotton. It follows they would be suitable to be worn - because the nature of the cotton cloth and the nature of the cotton seed are partlessly one.

Argument: What if, even though the two are of one nature, worldly beings cannot see the result at the time of the cause because of being deluded, and therefore do not wear the seeds.

Madhyamaka: Well then, as you the Enumerators accept your teacher Rishi Lingkye and others to be omniscient, and that you know that the result exists at the time of the cause because they have determined this reality with their knowledge, then you eat feces when eating food. Because in your system also worldly beings can understand reality, why should they not see that the result exists at the time of the cause? It follows they see it - because they know that the Enumerator has determined that the result exists at the time of the cause.

Or: That the teacher referred to in the earlier line who is accepted to know reality, is seen insisting on wearing cotton clothes and not cotton seeds, makes it clear that the result does not exist at the time of the cause.

Argument: Because the perception of worldly beings is not a prime cognition they do not realize it.

Madhyamaka: Well then, it also follows that their perception of the particular expression that became a manifest entity is also untrue - because the perception of worldly beings is not a prime cognition.

The Fault Does Not Apply to the Madhyamaka

In case prime cognition is not valid [138]
Doesn't what it comprehends become false?
For that very reason your
Meditation on emptiness is invalid.

Without contact with the analyzed object [139]
One will not apprehend its non-existence.
Therefore the non-existence of any
False object is clearly false.

Then, the thought thinking, [140]
'The dream child has passed away'
Cancels the thought thinking that it
Exists, and is false.

Realist: If prime cognition is not ultimately prime cognition, then it is a false prime cognition, and in this case does not its comprehended object also become a false distorted object not existing in the way it is comprehended? It follows that it becomes that — this is the case because the comprehending prime cognition is false. For that very reason, because the comprehending prime cognition is false, that which you posit as meditation on emptiness becomes distorted and invalid.

Madhyamaka: Take the subject 'object of knowledge' - for us it is very valid that the prime cognition that comprehends emptiness, and the emptiness posited by it are false. To ascertain the negation of the functionality true for conception depends on the appearance of the object of negation arising in the mind. It follows it is like this - because without the conceptual thought making contact with the analyzed object of true existence and the appearance of true existence that does not appear to the mind, then the investigating thought will not apprehend the object of being empty of true existence, the lack of true existence. Therefore, because the falsity that is the object of negation is impossible, therefore the negation that is the non-object is clearly also false.

The example of the earlier ones: Without the aspect of the child of a barren woman appearing to the conceptual mind, the aspect of a dying child of a barren woman does not appear.

If the emptiness of true existence that lacks the object of negation exists truly, then the appearance of the lack of true existence to the knowing inferential cognition also needs to exist truly. If one looks at this, a collection with only one part negated is impossible, and because the object of negation appears truly to it, the true appearance needs to also exist truly. In this case, true existence should be an existent, which it is not. The emptiness of true existence that has abandoned it, is also false and not truly established.

This point is shown in the *Root Wisdom*, 'In case something slightly non-empty exists'. Without the meaning generality of the lack of true existence appearing to the mind, one does not properly ascertain the lack of true existence, and therefore one needs to be proficient in identifying the object of negation.

For this reason: When e.g., in a dream one observes the child dying and thinks, 'Now it does not exist anymore', this thought cancels out the thought thinking that it exists.

Just as these two, the dream object of abandonment and the dream antidote, are false, so it is not contradictory for the false antidote to destroy the false object of abandonment, and for the false prime cognition to comprehend the false object of comprehension?

It is not the same for you because the Enumerators accept all phenomena as truly existent, and do not know how to posit a false prime cognition.

Summarizing the Meaning of Generation from No-cause

Therefore, by analyzing in such a way [141ab]
There is nothing without a cause

Therefore, for these reasons, if one investigates with the reasons mentioned above, not only does generation from discordant causes such as Ishvara and the primary principle become impossible, saying 'there is no result that generates without a cause', it is also the concluding summary of the refutation of causeless generation.

Refuting Generation from Both Self and Other

It also does not abide on the individual [141cd]
Conditions or their collection;

It does not come from other, [142ab]
It does not abide or go.

These four lines can be a summary for the refutation of generation from three principles, and can also be related to the refutation of generation from both self and other.

The sprout abides neither inherently on the individual causes such as the water, fertilizer, warmth and moisture nor on their collection, as a juniper tree would abide on the bronze base. If it abides in such a way it should be observable, which it is not. It is the same for other results. They also do not exist at that time because without the conditions taking shape the sprout cannot be generated. It also does not come from something other than these conditions, it also does not abide inherently upon having been generated inherently, and it does not go somewhere else upon cessation. Hence, it does not exist inherently in the slightest, and therefore there is also no generation from self, generation from other or generation from both self and other.

In short, this establishes the directional property of the argument, 'take the subject the aggregates and the person': it follows they are not generated inherently - because they are not generated from self, generated from other, generated from both or generated from no cause.

The Reason of Dependent Arising

How is that made true by delusion [142cd]
Different from an illusion?

That magically generated by a magician [143]
And that magically generated by a cause
Where do they come from, where do they go?
You should analyze this.

That which is seen due to proximity [144]
To something, which likens the artificial reflection
In being not if that does not exist,
How could it possess a true reality?

What difference is there between the object labelled and made true by afflicted delusion, i.e., ignorance, and an illusion, dream, reflection and so forth? They appear as inherently existent while being empty of inherent existence.

If the illusory horse and elephant conjured by the magician and the functionalities conjured by causes and conditions were to exist truly then, when they are generated, they should come from somewhere else, and when they cease they should go somewhere else. In this case it should be analyzed where they come from and where they go to. Because they do not possess inherent coming or going, take the subject 'the person and the aggregates' - they lack inherent existence - because they are dependent arising, e.g., like a reflection of form.

Any result, such as the compounded itself or the sprout are seen to generate in proximity to their cause, such as ignorance or the seed and the like. Because they are artificial phenomena that are not generated if these causes do not exist, they are like a reflection of form. How could they exist in the very nature of true existence? They do not.

The four lines of, 'That magically [...]' establish the pervasion of the reason of dependent arising. The next two and a half lines show the reason, the next half is the example and the last line shows the thesis.

If one wishes to study this more extensively, then one should study the great commentary on the *Introduction*.

The Reason of Refuting Generation and Cessation of Existence and Non-existence

(Refuting Inherent Generation Upon Establishing the Reason; Refuting This Refutes Inherent Existence; Then, Establishing the Equanimity of Samsara and Nirvana)

Refuting Inherent Generation Upon Establishing the Reason

For a functionality to come into existence [145]
What need is there for a cause?
Even in the case that it does not exist,
What need is there for a cause?

Even through one billion causes [146]
A non-functionality cannot be changed.
How can this status be functional?
What else is that which becomes functional?

If an existent functionality is impossible when non-existent, [147]
When does functionality become existent?
Without having been generated as functionality
It does not become separated from this non-functionality.

If it is not separated from non-functionality, [148]
An occasion for the existence of functionality is impossible?

Also, the functionality does not become non-existent
Because it would follow that it has two natures.

For a functionality to come into existence inherently, what need is there for a cause? That which exists inherently does not need to be generated. Further, in the case that such a result does not exist, what need is there for a cause? There is an inability to generate it. As all results are never generated at the time of the cause, this is not refuted, but what is refuted is that they are not generated at all.

Argument: The refutation of generation of an existing result is the refutation of the result that exists at the time of the cause as asserted by the Enumerators, and is most of the time a refutation of a result existing inherently, but since it is already generated it does not need to be generated.

Answer: This statement is completely illogical. Then, the non-inherently existing causes and effects are accepted to be like the illusion of a reflection.

Regarding establishing that a non-functionality is unsuitable to be created by a cause:
Argument: Although one does not need to generate something that is already generated, why should something non-existent not be generated?

Madhyamaka: Even through one billion causes, a non-functionality cannot be changed into a functionality because a non-functionality cannot fulfill the function of any functionality. If it changes, does it change without giving up its non-functional status or upon giving it up? If we look at the first, how can the status of non-functionality be a functionality? The status of being able to perform a function and the status of not being able to perform a function are mutually exclusive. If we look at the second, what is the cause that changes into a functionality apart from being a functionality or non-functionality? There is no such thing.

Further, if it does not give up the status of non-functionality, and if it is not possible for a functionality to exist at a time when no functionality exists, when does functionality become existent? Functionality has not been generated at the time of non-functionality.

Further, if it becomes upon having abandoned the status of non-functionality: Without functionality having been generated it is impossible to become separated from non-functionality, and if it is not separated from non-functionality, then there is no chance for the existence of functionality, because these two types of status are mutually exclusive. Just as a non-functionality does not become a functionality, a functionality does not become a non-functionality because if it would be half functionality and half non-functionality, then the consequence would arise that merely one would have two natures.

Take the subject 'sprout' - it is not generated inherently - because it is not inherently

generated as existent, and it is not inherently generated as non-existent, e.g., like the child of a barren woman. Although its generation is refuted if non-existent at the time of the cause, it is a refutation of its inherent generation at the time of generation, even though it is non-existent at the time of the cause. Therefore, one needs to relate it to the object of negation.

Refuting this Refutes Inherent Existence

The negation does not exist in such a way [149]
And because functionalities also do not exist
All these migrators
Are never generated and never cease.

If we look at the non-inherent existence of generation due to the reasoning explained above, because the negation does not exist inherently and because functionalities do not exist inherently, all these migrators are never inherently generated or inherently cease, they are primordially pacified and naturally liberated.

Then, Establishing the Equanimity of Samsara and Nirvana

Migrators are like a dream [150]
When investigated they are like banana trees
Having gone beyond misery and having not gone -
They do not have any distinction.

The dream-like migrators of existence have not the slightest nature and they abide individually, without action and activity mixing. When analyzed with the reasoning investigating suchness they are like a banana tree, they appear as if there is something identifiable but there is not the slightest inherent essence.

The station that decides whether it becomes an analysis into suchness or not: If one is not satisfied with mere imputation by name and analyzes on the basis of wanting to investigate how the basis exists, then it becomes an analysis into suchness, but if one is satisfied with mere imputation by name and investigates whether Devadatta comes and goes, then it is a nominal analysis. There is no difference in suchness between those gone beyond sorrow free from the bonds that bind them to existence, such as attachment, and those not gone beyond sorrow that are caught in the prison of cyclic existence, because both existence and peace are the same in being empty of inherent existence.

From the *King of Concentration*,

The dream-like migrators of cyclic existence,
They are not born and neither do they die.

From the *Sutra Requested by the Superior Upali*,

If one has comprehended the nature of phenomena, then all results are non-existent and there is also no result to be attained.

Advice That It Is Suitable to Strive in Realizing Emptiness

(The Actual Advice; Showing the Object of Great Compassion by Showing the Disadvantages of Cyclic Existence; Showing the Mode of Apprehension of the Aspect of Great Compassion)

The Actual Advice

(Showing the Meaning of the Mode of Abiding; It Is Suitable to Strive in Realizing That)

Showing the Meaning of the Mode of Abiding

How can functionalities thus empty [151]
Be attained or lost?
How could one be praised?
How could one be criticized?

Where do happiness and suffering come from? [152]
What is there to like or dislike?
Having investigated suchness
Who craves, and for what?

When analyzed, this life's worldly being, [153]
How can it pass away here?
What will arise, what arose?
Who is a relative or friend?

If one comprehends the actual nature of functionalities that are thus empty of inherent existence in the way explained earlier, then which gain does one attain and become attached? Through the loss of what gain does one generate anger? What is the benefit received by praise, and what is the harm received by criticism, and by whom? From what true cause does the suffering of happiness, for which one engages into effort to attain and abandon it, arise? What is the inherent object of aversion and desire that one dislikes and likes? If one investigates suchness with the reasoning investigating the nature of the mode of abiding, then which craving person generates craving for which object, in dependence on which basis is craving generated? The three circles of craving lack inherent existence. If one analyzes thus a result, if one analyzes karma and the person accumulating karma, then, because death is empty of inherent existence, how can this worldly sentient being die here in existence, how? How can it arise in a later life, how could it have arisen in a previous life? As there is not even the slightest inherent existence in the slightest, who is the benefiting relative, or the attractive friend? Therefore, having worked at comprehending the meaning of the mode of abiding, one should train in equanimity for the eight worldly dharmas.

It Is Suitable to Strive in Realizing That

Everything is like space - [154ab]
That is how the likes of me should hold everything.

Therefore, those like me, the author, should hold all phenomena to be like space, because it is the main path to cut the root of existence and progress to all-knowing transcendental wisdom. 'Those like me' is to bend the pride of the author, and the main reason is as advice to those ordinary individuals that have not yet realized suchness.

Showing the Object of Great Compassion by Showing the Disadvantages of Cyclic Existence

(The Disadvantages of This Life; The Disadvantages in the Next Life; Contemplating that Despite Taking Rebirth in the Happy Realm There Is No Time to Practice Dharma; Contemplating the Difficulty of Attaining a Birth with Leisure and Endowment; That Oneself and Others Are Afflicted by the Suffering of Cyclic Existence Is Suitable to Be Mourned)

The Disadvantages of This Life

Those who desire happiness for themselves, [154cd]
Through the causes of fighting and liking,

Are agitated or joyful; [155]
Are miserable, striving and arguing,
Cutting, stabbing, and creating negativity
With each other; it is a very difficult life!

Even in this life, those desiring happiness for themselves, are not beyond the power of suffering. Out of the wish for happiness they fight with enemies and like their friends, and through these causes they are either very disturbed or joyful. They are miserable when not achieving their aim. It appears as if they have to lead a very difficult life with much exertion, and yet attain little fruit due to the effort exerted to achieve the aim of their desires, due to arguing with others, cutting and stabbing each other's bodies, and accumulating infinite negativities of speech, mind and so forth. Therefore, the wise ones should not crave for the perfections of this life.

The Disadvantages in the Next Life

Taking a higher rebirth from time to time, [156]
And having experienced plenty of happiness there
One falls after death into the lower realms,
Experiencing long and terrifying sufferings.

There are a multitude of precipices in the world. [157]
Suchness does not exist there
And they contradict each other.
Hence, nothing like it exists in the world.

Additionally, there is a terrifying infinite [158ab]
Ocean of suffering without example.

Through the force of occasionally meeting with a virtuous teacher one takes a happy rebirth from time to time for the shortest of periods, like a flash of lightning in the sky. Having enjoyed much happiness there, one then has to experience the rough hot unpleasant sufferings of the lower realms and fall into the unceasing great hells where one remains for infinite eons experiencing terrifying suffering. Therefore, contemplate the sufferings of the lower realms.

Contemplating the general sufferings of existence, in the existence of desire, form and the formless is a great multitude of precipices of harmful suffering. The cause why one

is not beyond this is that this world does not comprehend suchness, which is the method to be liberated from suffering. Situations such as being bound by the noose of existence is mutually exclusive with such an understanding.

Therefore, if one does not comprehend suchness, then one elaborates functionalities as truly existent, and as a result, one will be in contradiction to the cause of liberation. Then there is nothing left but to circle in cyclic existence because in the world of circling there is no such comprehension of suchness, and it is a unique existence in which one experiences an ocean of terrifying infinite suffering without example. Therefore it is suitable to strive in understanding emptiness.

Contemplating That Despite Taking Rebirth in the Happy Realm There Is No Time to Practice Dharma

There thus it is weak [158cd]
And one's life is short.

There are actions to live [159]
And stay healthy; thirst and fatigue,
Sleep and harm. Likewise, due to
Meaningless association with the childish,

Life passes by quickly, and [160]
The opportunity to investigate is extremely rare.
How can the method to overcome
Habituation with distraction possibly exist there?

There, in that existence, although one takes rebirth in a happy realm, as a consequence the power to create virtue is thus weak, and the basis for achieving virtue, the freedoms and endowments, is short-lived.

Even if one stays there for the briefest of times, there is no time to practice the dharma, and one's time passes quickly with meaningless activities. There are actions with which one hopes to stay with for a long time, such as washing and massaging the body and relying on medicine to stay free from sickness. There is thirst, fatigue on the road, sleep and [being harmed by] various inner and outer harms. Likewise, through meaningless association with the childish, life passes quickly without meaning and disintegrates without the opportunity to practice dharma due to meaningless association with the childish.

Because it is extremely difficult to find opportunity to investigate the meaning of suchness, which is the cause to go beyond existence, one should strive in the method to reverse cyclic existence.

Contemplating the Difficulty of Attaining a Birth with Leisure and Endowment

Demons work there to throw one
Into the vast hells; [161]
There are many wrong paths,
And it is difficult to contradict doubt.

Finding freedom again is difficult [162]
And the coming of a buddha is extremely rare to find.
It is difficult to abandon the river of afflictions
And, alas, weighed down by these one continually suffers.

Argument: It is acceptable because one can stop cyclic existence through meditating on emptiness when one takes rebirth in a happy realm and meditates on emptiness.

Answer: Cyclic existence is extremely difficult to stop due to having habituated oneself since beginningless samsaric lives to grasping at functionalities as truly existent, and to the distractions such as outer excitements and the like. How can there be the method to stop it, as conducive conditions are extremely rare and harmful obstructing conditions are abound? Even during this limited time to practice, the dharma demons such as the 'Son of Gods' work for one to fall into the great hells. The conditions obstructing liberation from existence are many and difficult to stop.

Argument: It is not difficult to find opportunity to liberate oneself from existence because when one takes rebirth in the happy realms, then one can achieve liberation through such practices such as meditating on faith for the truth, the Three Jewels and the like.

Answer: While taking rebirth in the happy realms there are many wrong paths that have fallen into the extremes of eternalism or nihilism, which are opposing conditions to generating the right view. There are false teachers that lead one on these paths, and it is difficult to contradict doubt with regards to the correct paths because it is difficult to find the inner and outer conditions to cut that doubt.

Argument: Although one may not find a virtuous teacher in this life, it is acceptable because one will find one in the next life and then practice.

Answer: If one does not strive well in this life, when one has found a virtuous teacher, then it will be difficult to find freedom again in the future, and since it is extremely rare for a buddha to come to the world, it is very hard to meet with a virtuous teacher.

Although one has met a virtuous teacher and already attained a wholesome basis with freedoms and endowments, if one does not strive well in conscientiousness, then it is hard to counter the river of afflictions. They will continue to pour down until one has attained liberation. 'Alas' contains the meaning of sadness and despondency because one continually experiences one suffering after the next, as well as experiencing extreme suffering. Although one may be free from one suffering, one falls into another

suffering. Therefore, one should strive in contemplating the sufferings of cyclic existence while having attained freedom and endowments.

That Oneself and Others Are Afflicted By the Suffering of Cyclic Existence Is Suitable to Be Mourned

Those who do not see their suffering [163]
Despite suffering to the extreme,
They, submerged in the river of suffering,
'Oh dear', they are appropriate to be mourned.

For example, some, after having washed repeatedly, [164]
Go into fire again and again.
Thus, even though abiding in extreme suffering,
They project that they are happy.

Thus those continually acting [165]
As if without old age and death
Are first killed,
And then comes the terrifying downfall into the lower realms.

Sentient beings suffer to the extreme, they do not see that they are sinking in suffering by mistaking suffering for happiness, and they are submerged in a river of suffering. Having generated love for these sentient beings that sink in the mud of suffering, they are suitable to be mourned with the thoughts of, 'Oh dear, how wonderful would it be if sentient beings were free from suffering' and the like. Therefore, one needs to strive in meditating on great compassion.

For examples, some followers of outside tenets, that were deceived by misleading teachers, repeatedly wash themselves and then enter the fire again and again. Although they abide with strong suffering due to the physical austerity, they project happiness onto it by holding it to be a method for attaining liberation.

Thus, those that abide acting like arhats without death or sickness, are first killed by the lord of death without any means to stop or abandon him, and then come the terrifying sufferings of having fallen into the three lower realms.

Showing the Mode of Apprehension of the Aspect of Great Compassion

Thus may I become someone from whose [166]
Clouds of merits rain of a well borne
Accumulation of happiness that pacifies those
Tortured by the sufferings of fire.

May I, by respectfully building up the accumulation of merits [167]
In the way that lacks focus,
Be able to show emptiness to those
Who are destitute because of having focus.

Having contemplated the way they who experience terrifying suffering in their continuum in the way explained earlier, are afflicted by suffering, one should meditate on great compassion in the following manner, keeping in mind the sentient beings that are tortured by the fires of suffering in mind:

‘When will I become someone that pacifies the sufferings of the lower realms with medicine, food and the like? That which are parts of my collection of happiness, built up from clouds of merits built up by generosity and so forth. How wonderful would it be if sentient beings were free from suffering? May they be free from suffering. May I bring about that freedom.’

Meditate in the following way on great compassion:

‘Dedicating as the cause for liberation from the sufferings of cyclic existence: When will I realize that all phenomena lack inherent existence, and respectfully build up the infinite accumulations of merit of generosity and so forth with the method of the objectless wisdom? When will I show emptiness to the sentient beings that are destitute in cyclic existence due to the object of true-grasping, to pacify their samsaric suffering? How wonderful it would be if all sentient beings were free from the suffering of cyclic existence. May I free them from that suffering.’

To fulfill the definition of great love and compassion that are contained in the Mahayana path one needs to wish to place sentient beings in the state of complete enlightenment that is endowed with all happiness, and which is free from all suffering.

In short, one should meditate on the mode of abiding in dependence on calm abiding. Further, because the ‘I’ of the thought ‘I’ is established as merely labelled in dependence on the aggregates and does not exist inherently, it does not exist intrinsically, it is not established in the slightest in an independent mode. Therefore, the existent person is merely posited in name, it exists only as labelled and in a dependent mode. Hence, take to heart, ‘It does not exist inherently’.

Meditate in the same way on all phenomena such as the aggregates and so forth.

I say this as summary:

For as long as one does not find a holy master

One will not even realize partially

The Middle Way of dependent arising that is free from extremes

That can cut the root of existence.

Whatever well-spoken advice I receive

Is due to the kindness of the lama.

May this virtue become the cause

That my mothers meet a Mahayana guru.

Without realizing the suchness of the Middle Way, free from extremes

One cannot touch the state of a superior.

Hence, by deciding that dependent arising is the meaning of emptiness

Strive accordingly in achievement.

That difficult to find even in a billion eons;

Because the pure school of Nagarjuna pronouncing the two truths

Because they will disappear before long in this realm

Those with intelligence will quickly generate joyous effort.

Explanation of the Title

This is the commentary on the ninth chapter called the *Perfection of Wisdom* from the commentary on *The Introduction to the Actions of Bodhisattvas*, called *The Entrance for the Children of the Conquerors*.

