

**PRESENTATION
OF
TENETS**



JETSUN CHÖGYI GYELTSEN (1469 – 1546)

PRESENTATION OF TENETS

I pay homage to the eminent holy beings who are in essence inseparable from Guru Protector Manjushri.

Here, in explaining the presentation of tenets, there are three outlines:

1. definition,
2. divisions and
3. the meaning of each division.

1. Definition

The definition of a person who propounds Buddhist tenets is: a person propounding tenets who asserts the Three Jewels to be the final objects of refuge and who does not accept any objects of refuge other than these.

2. Divisions

There are four divisions of proponents of Buddhist tenets:

1. Proponents of Vaibhasika (Great Exposition),
2. Proponents of Sautrantika (Sutra),
3. Proponents of Cittamatra (Mind Only) and
4. Proponents of Madhyamaka (Middle Way).

The first two are also called ‘the two schools that propound [truly existent external] objects’.

3. The meaning of each division

The explanation of

1. Vaibhasika School,
2. Sautrantika School,
3. Cittamatra School and
4. Madhyamaka School.

VAIBHASIKA

The explanation of the Vaibhasika School has seven outlines:

1. definition,
2. divisions,
3. etymology,
4. way of asserting objects,
5. way of asserting object-possessors,
6. way of asserting selflessness and
7. presentation of the grounds and paths.

1. Definition

The definition of a proponent of Vaibhasika is: a person propounding Hinayana tenets who does not accept self-cognition but does accept truly existent external objects.

2. Divisions

There are three divisions:¹

1. Proponents of Vaibhasika from Kashmir,
2. Proponents of Vaibhasika from the Western Region (*Aparantakas*) and
3. Proponents of Vaibhasika from the Central Region (*Magadhas*).

3. Etymology

Why are they called ‘proponents of particulars’?

They are called such because they propound tenets through following the *Mahavibhasa* (*The Great Exposition of Particulars*) or alternatively they are called proponents of particulars because they propound the three times to be particulars of substances.

4. Way of asserting objects

The definition of thing is: that which is able to perform a function.

Thing, existent and object of knowledge are equivalent.

There are two types of things:

1. permanent things and
2. impermanent things.

Examples of permanent things are un compounded space, analytical cessations and non-analytical cessations.

Examples of impermanent things are created phenomena, products and impermanent phenomena.

¹ There is also a division into 18 sub-schools: Majority Community, One Convention, Proponents of World-Transcendence, Much Hearing, Proponents of Imputation, Monument Ones, Eastern Mountain Ones, Western Mountain Ones, Abiding Firmly, Proponents of the Existence of All, Vatsiputra Followers, Dharmottara Followers, Bhadraryana Followers, Mahasammata Followers, Great Teaching, Dharmagupta Followers, Kashyapa Followers and Uttara Followers. [*Maps of the Profound* (Hopkins) pages 210-217]

Another way of dividing things is into:

1. conventional truths and
2. ultimate truths.

The definition of conventional truth is: a phenomenon such that an awareness apprehending it is cancelled if it is broken up or mentally separated into its individual parts.

Illustrations [of conventional truths] are a vase and a woollen cloth because if a vase is broken with a hammer, the mind apprehending it is cancelled, and if a woollen cloth is separated into its individual threads, the mind apprehending it is cancelled.

The definition of ultimate truth is: A phenomenon such that an awareness apprehending it is not cancelled if it is broken up or mentally separated into its individual parts.

Illustrations [of ultimate truths] are

- directionally partless particles,
- temporally partless [moments of] consciousness and
- uncomposed phenomena.

The *Abhidharmakosa* (*Treasury of Manifest Knowledge*) says: “Those things – such as a pot or water – which the mind cannot engage if they are broken or mentally separated into other [things] exist as conventional [truths]. Others exist as ultimate [truths].”

The three times are accepted to be substances. A pot is accepted to exist also at the time of the past of the pot and at the time of the future of the pot.

5. Way of asserting object-possessors

There are various assertions:

- [most of the eighteen sub-schools] accept the mere collection of the five aggregates to be the illustration of the person,
- [Aparantakas] accept the mental consciousness to be the illustration of the person and
- so forth [e.g. Kashmiris accept the continuum of the aggregates to be the illustration of the person].

There are two types of awareness:

1. valid cognition and
2. non-valid cognition.

There are two types of valid cognition:

1. valid perception and
2. valid inference.

There are three types of valid perception:

1. sense perception,
2. mental perception and
3. yogic perception.

A valid sense perception is not necessarily a consciousness because an eye sense power is a valid perception.

There are two types of yogic perception:

1. yogic perception that directly realizes selflessness of persons and
2. yogic perception that directly realizes subtle impermanence.

There are two types of yogic perception that directly realizes selflessness of persons:

1. yogic perception that realizes the person to be empty of being permanent, unitary and independent and
2. yogic perception that realizes the person to be empty of being self-sufficient substantially existent.

6. Way of asserting selflessness

Subtle selflessness and subtle selflessness of persons are accepted to be equivalent.

A selflessness of phenomena is not asserted because it is asserted that if it is an established base it is necessarily a self of phenomena.

Among them, the Vatsiputra Followers assert a selflessness of person that is [a person] being empty of being permanent, unitary and independent. However, they do not assert a selflessness of person that is [a person] being empty of being self-sufficient substantially existent because they assert a self-sufficient substantially existent self that is inexpressible even in terms of either being one entity with or a different entity from the aggregates and either being permanent or impermanent.

7. Presentation of the grounds and paths

This is explained in two parts:

1. objects of abandonment and
2. actual presentation of the grounds and paths.

7A. Objects of abandonment

Two types of obscurations are accepted:

1. afflictive obscurations and
2. non-afflictive obscurations.

There is no such thing as the convention ‘cognitive obscurations’.

Afflictive obscurations mainly prevent the attainment of liberation and non-afflictive obscurations mainly prevent the attainment of all-knowingness.

Illustrations of afflictive obscurations are the conception apprehending the person to be self-sufficient substantially existent and the three poisons that arise due to the force of that [conception] together with their seeds.

[Illustrations of] non-afflictive obscurations are the latencies of the conception apprehending the person to be self-sufficient substantially existent and the dysfunctional tendencies of the mind that arise due to the force of those [latencies].

7B. Actual presentation of the grounds and paths

It is accepted that there are differences in the way in which the persons of the three vehicles traverse the path.

Those of the hearers lineage conjoin the view realizing the person to be empty of being self-sufficient substantially existent with a small collection of merit, and having cultivated that for at least three lifetimes and so on they attain a small enlightenment.

Those of the solitary realizers lineage conjoin the view realizing the person to be empty of being self-sufficient substantially existent with a middling collection of merit and having cultivated that for at least one hundred eons and so on they attain a middling enlightenment.

Bodhisattvas conjoin the view realizing the person to be empty of being self-sufficient substantially existent with a great collection of merit and having cultivated that for at least three countless great eons and so on they attain a great enlightenment.

There are differences in the way in which they accumulate merit.

Bodhisattvas, having accumulated merit for at least three countless great eons on the great stage of the path of accumulation and below, actualize the heat stage of the path of preparation through to the path of no-more-learning on one seat.

Those of the solitary realizers lineage, having accumulated merit for at least one hundred great eons on the great stage of the path of accumulation and below, actualize the heat stage of the path of preparation through to the path of no-more-learning on one seat.

Those of the hearers lineage accumulate merit on all four learning paths and even after having attained an arya's path they must also train on the learners paths for up to fourteen lifetimes.

They accept that a Buddha's form aggregate is not Buddha because it is an object to be abandoned. This is so because it is included in the same lifetime as the bodily support of the earlier bodhisattva on the path of preparation. This is necessarily so because the bodily support of the bodhisattva on the path of preparation is an aggregate projected by previous karma and mental afflictions.

The Sambhogakaya (Complete Enjoyment Body) is not asserted. And it is accepted that at the time of nirvana without remainder of a Supreme Nirmanakaya (Supreme Emanation Body), the continuum of awareness is severed.

Although Arya Buddhas have abandoned all suffering and its origins without exception, it does not contradict that they still have true suffering in their continuum. This is because abandoning every single affliction that observes true suffering is posited as abandoning true suffering.

From the point of having attained the state of an Arhat till they give up their compositional factor of life, hearer and solitary realizer Arhats are posited as being with remainder whereas from the point of having given up their compositional factor of life they are posited as having passed beyond sorrow without remainder.

Although at the time of nirvana with remainder they have abandoned the afflictive obscurations without exception, they have not abandoned the non-afflictive obscurations. Although at the time of nirvana without remainder the non-afflictive obscurations are not destroyed by the power of an antidote, they do not exist because at that time, their support – the continuum of awareness – is severed.

When the proponents of things differentiate definitive and interpretive sutras, they differentiate them by means of whether or not they are suitable to be asserted literally.

[Some among] the two schools that propound objects do not accept the Mahayana scriptural collection to be Buddha's word because most proponents of Vaibhasika assert that sutras are necessarily sutras of definitive meaning.

SAUTRANTIKA

The explanation of the Sautrantika School has seven outlines:

1. definition,
2. divisions,
3. etymology,
4. way of asserting objects,
5. way of asserting object-possessors,
6. way of asserting selflessness and
7. presentation of the grounds and paths.

1. Definition

The definition of a proponent of Sautrantika is: a person propounding Hinayana tenets who asserts both self-cognition and external objects.

Proponent of Sautrantika and Exemplifier (*Darstantika*) are equivalent.

2. Divisions

There are two divisions:

1. Followers of Scripture and
2. Followers of Reasoning.

An example of a Follower of Scripture is a proponent of Sautrantika who follows [Vasubandhu's] *Abhidharmakosa*.

An example of a Follower of Reasoning is a proponent of Sautrantika who follows [Dharmakirti's] Seven Treatises on Valid Cognition.

3. Etymology

Why are they called 'Proponents of Sautrantika'?

They are called proponents of Sautrantika due to propounding tenets through following the sutras of the Bhagavan and they are called Exemplifiers due to desiring to teach all phenomena by way of examples.

4. Way of asserting objects

The definition of existent is: that observed by valid cognition.

There are two types of existents:

1. conventional truths and
2. ultimate truths.

The definition of ultimate truth² is: a phenomenon that is able to perform a function ultimately.

² This is according to the Followers of Reasoning. The Followers of Scripture assert the two truths in the same way as the proponents of Vaibhasika.

Ultimate truth, truly existent, thing, product, impermanent phenomenon, compounded phenomenon, substance and specifically characterized phenomenon are equivalent.

The definition of conventional truth is: a phenomenon that is not able to perform a function ultimately.

Conventional truth, falsely existent, permanent phenomenon and generally characterized phenomenon are equivalent.

Another way of dividing existents is into:

1. negative phenomena and
2. positive phenomena.

The definition of negative phenomenon is: an object realized by the awareness apprehending it by way of eliminating its object of negation.

The definition of positive phenomenon is: an object realized by the awareness apprehending it by way of not eliminating its object of negation.

There are two types of negatives:

1. non-affirming negatives and
2. affirming negatives.

Illustrations of non-affirming negatives are uncompounded space, true cessations and emptiness.

Illustrations of affirming negatives are

- the opposite of non-thing and
- the appearance of the opposite of non-pot to a conception apprehending pot.

Another way of dividing existents is into:

1. singularities and
2. pluralities.

There are two types of singularities:

1. false singularities and
2. true singularities.

Examples of false singularities are object of knowledge and generally characterized phenomenon.

Examples of true singularities are thing and impermanent phenomenon.

There are two types of pluralities:

1. false pluralities and
2. true pluralities.

An example of a false plurality is the pair – isolate of pot and isolate of pillar.

An example of a true plurality is the pair – pot and pillar.

Past and future are both permanent. Present and thing are equivalent.

5. Way of asserting object-possessors

There are two assertions among the proponents of Sautrantika:

1. some accept the continuum of the aggregates to be the illustration of the person and
2. some accept the mental consciousness to be the illustration of the person.

An example of the first is proponents of Sautrantika who follow the *Abhidharmakosa*.

An example of the second is proponents of Sautrantika who follow the Seven Treatises on Valid Cognition.

The definition of awareness is: that which is clear and knowing.

There are two types of awareness:

1. valid cognition and
2. non-valid cognition.

The definition of valid cognition is: a new and non-deceptive cognition.

In outlining the definition of valid cognition it is necessary to mention the three – ‘new’, ‘non-deceptive’ and ‘cognition’ – because

- ‘new’ eliminates subsequent cognitions being valid cognitions,
- ‘non-deceptive’ eliminates correct assumptions being valid cognitions and
- ‘cognition’ eliminates physical sense powers being valid cognitions.

There are two types of valid cognition:

1. valid perception and
2. valid inference.

The definition of perception is: a non-mistaken cognition that is free from conceptuality.

The definition of valid perception is: a new and non-deceptive cognition that is free from conceptuality.

There are four types of valid perception:

1. valid self-cognizing perception,
2. valid sense perception,
3. valid mental perception and
4. valid yogic perception.

The definition of valid self-cognizing perception is: a new and non-deceptive cognition that is free from conceptuality, is only inwardly directed and bears the aspect of an apprehending-subject.

The definition of valid sense perception is: a new and non-deceptive cognition that is free from conceptuality and arises in dependence upon a physical sense power – its own uncommon empowering condition.

The definition of valid mental perception is: a new and non-deceptive cognition that is free from conceptuality and arises in dependence upon a mental sense power – its own uncommon empowering condition.

The definition of valid yogic perception is: an exalted wisdom that directly realizes subtle impermanence or either coarse or subtle selflessness of persons in dependence upon a meditative stabilization that is the union of shamatha and vipashyana – its own uncommon empowering condition.

There are three types of valid yogic perception:

1. valid cognition that directly realizes subtle impermanence,
2. valid cognition that directly realizes coarse selflessness of persons and
3. valid cognition that directly realizes subtle selflessness of persons.

The definition of valid inference is: a new and non-deceptive determinative cognition that is generated in dependence upon a correct reason – its basis.

There are three types of valid inference:

1. inference through the power of the fact,
2. inference through renown and
3. inference through belief.

An illustration of an inference through the power of the fact is an inference that realizes sound to be impermanent due to the reason that it is a product.

An illustration of an inference through renown is an inference that realizes that ‘rabbit-bearer’ is suitable to be called by the term ‘moon’ through the reason that it exists among objects of conception.

An illustration of an inference through belief is an inference that realizes the scripture – ‘due to generosity [comes] wealth; due to ethics [comes] happiness’ and so on – is non-deceptive with respect to the meaning indicated by it through the reason that it is a completely reliable scripture by the three-fold investigation.

An inference through renown is necessarily an inference through the power of the fact.

If it is a perception it is not necessarily a valid perception. If it is an inference it is not necessarily a valid inference because the second moment of a sense perception apprehending form and the second moment of an inference realizing sound to be impermanent are subsequent cognitions.

This is so because Dharmottara’s Commentary to [Dharmakirti’s] *Pramanavinishcaya* (*Ascertainment of Valid Cognition*) says: ‘The two – the first moment of a perception and the first moment of an inference – are valid cognitions. Latter moments [of those cognitions], since they are not different in terms of establishment and abiding – being a continuation of those, are not valid cognitions.’

The definition of non-valid cognition is: a cognition that is not new and non-deceptive.

There are five types of non-valid cognition:

1. subsequent cognition,
2. wrong consciousness,
3. doubt,
4. correct assumption and
5. inattentive awareness.

The definition of subsequent cognition is: a cognition that realizes that which has already been realized.

There are two types of subsequent cognition:

1. conceptual subsequent cognition and
2. non-conceptual subsequent cognition.

Examples of conceptual subsequent cognitions are

- a remembering consciousness remembering blue that is generated through being induced by a sense perception apprehending blue and
- the second moment of an inference realizing sound to be impermanent.

An example of a non-conceptual subsequent cognition is the second moment of a sense perception apprehending form.

The definition of wrong consciousness is: a cognition that engages [its object] mistakenly.

There are two types of wrong consciousness:

1. conceptual wrong consciousness and
2. non-conceptual wrong consciousness.

An example of a conceptual wrong consciousness is a conception apprehending sound to be permanent.

Examples of non-conceptual wrong consciousnesses are

- a sense consciousness to which one moon appears as two moons and
- a sense consciousness to which a snow mountain appears as blue.

The definition of doubt is: a mental factor that, by its own force, hesitates with respect to two alternatives.

A mental consciousness that is concomitant with [doubt] and the accompanying feelings are not that which, by its own force, hesitates with respect to two alternatives because they hesitate with respect to two alternatives due to the force of that doubt.

There are three types of doubt:

1. doubt tending towards the fact,
2. doubt tending away from the fact and
3. equal doubt.

An example of doubt tending towards the fact is a doubt that thinks ‘Sound is probably impermanent’.

An example of doubt tending away from the fact is a doubt that thinks ‘Sound is probably permanent’.

An example of equal doubt is a doubt that thinks ‘Sound could be permanent or impermanent’.

The definition of correct assumption is: a determinative cognition that accords with the fact but deceptively determines its object.

There are five types of correct assumption:

1. correct assumption without a reason,
2. correct assumption with a contradictory reason,
3. correct assumption with an indefinite reason,
4. correct assumption with an inapplicable reason and
5. correct assumption with a correct but undetermined reason.

An awareness apprehending sound to be impermanent in dependence on the mere words ‘sound is impermanent’ is an illustration of a correct assumption without a reason because the words ‘sound is impermanent’ express the thesis that sound is impermanent but a correct reason why sound is impermanent has not been stated.

An awareness apprehending sound to be impermanent due to the reason of its being empty of the ability to perform a function is an illustration of a correct assumption with a contradictory reason because being empty of the ability to perform a function is contradictory with sound.

An awareness apprehending sound to be impermanent due to the reason of its being an object of comprehension is an illustration of a correct assumption with an indefinite reason because being an object of comprehension is an indefinite reason for establishing sound to be impermanent.

An awareness apprehending sound to be impermanent due to the reason of its being an object of apprehension of an eye consciousness is an illustration of a correct assumption with an inapplicable reason because being an object of apprehension of an eye consciousness is an inapplicable reason in proving that sound is impermanent.

An awareness apprehending sound to be impermanent due to the reason of its being a product, in the continuum of a person who has not ascertained with valid cognition that sound is a product is an illustration of a correct assumption with a correct but undetermined reason because, although being a product is a correct reason to establish that sound is impermanent, that correct reason has not been determined by that person.

The definition of inattentive perception is: a non-mistaken cognition that has a clear appearance of its object but does not ascertain it.

There are three types of inattentive perception:

1. inattentive sense perception,
2. inattentive mental perception and
3. inattentive self-cognizing perception.

An example of inattentive sense perception is an ear consciousness apprehending sound at the time the eyes are engrossed in a beautiful form.

Examples of an inattentive mental perception are mental perceptions in the continuum of an ordinary being that apprehend the five objects – forms and so forth.

Examples of an inattentive self-cognizing perception are self-cognitions in the continuum of an ordinary being that experience mental perceptions apprehending the five objects – forms and so forth.

In general, there are three types of object-possessors:

1. beings,
2. speech and
3. valid cognitions.

There are three types of valid object-possessors:

1. valid persons,
2. valid speech and
3. valid consciousnesses.

An example of a valid person is said to be The Teacher – [Shakyamuni] Buddha.

An example of valid speech is said to be the turning of the wheel of Dharma of the Four Noble Truths.

Examples of valid consciousness are valid perceptions and valid inferences.

6. Way of asserting selflessness

The person being empty of being permanent, unitary and independent is accepted to be a coarse selflessness of persons and the person being empty of being self-sufficient substantially existent is accepted to be the subtle selflessness of persons.

They are similar to the proponents of Vaibhasika in not asserting a selflessness of phenomena.

7. Presentation of the grounds and paths

Since, for those of all three lineages, the accumulation of merit is accumulated on all four learning paths, a Buddha's form aggregate is asserted to be Buddha.

The presentation of the obscurations and the way of traversing the grounds and paths and so forth are similar to [the assertions of] the proponents of Vaibhasika.

CITTAMATRA

The explanation of the Cittamatra School has seven outlines, as before.

1. Definition

The definition of a proponent of Cittamatra is: a person propounding Mahayana tenets who does not assert external objects but does accept truly existent self-cognition.

Proponent of Cittamatra, Proponent of Cognition (*Vijnaptivadin*) and Yogic Practitioner (*Yogacarin*) are equivalent.

2. Divisions

There are two divisions:³

1. Cittamatra True Aspectarians and
2. Cittamatra False Aspectarians.

The definition of a Cittamatra True Aspectarian is: a proponent of Cittamatra who accepts that a perception apprehending form in the continuum of an ordinary being does not engage, polluted by the latencies of ignorance, in the factor of its appearance as a gross form.

The definition of a Cittamatra False Aspectarian is: a proponent of Cittamatra who accepts that a perception apprehending form in the continuum of an ordinary being does engage, polluted by the latencies of ignorance, in the factor of its appearance as a gross form.

There are three types of True Aspectarians:

1. Proponents of an Equal Number of Apprehended-Objects and Apprehending-Subjects,
2. Half-Eggists and
3. Non-Pluralists.

Each has their own individual assertions.

It is said that the Proponents of an Equal Number of Apprehended-Objects and Apprehending-Subjects accept that when an eye consciousness apprehending the mottled colours on the wing of a butterfly apprehends the mottle, from the object's side the aspect of each different colour – blue, yellow and so on – is delivered, and also from the subject's side the aspect of each different colour – blue, yellow and so on – is produced in its true aspect.

It is said that the Half-Eggists accept that when such is apprehended, from the object's side the aspect of each different colour – blue, yellow and so on – is delivered however from the subject's side the aspect of each different colour – blue, yellow and so on – is produced in an aspectless manner.

It is said that the Non-Pluralists accept that when such is apprehended, from the object's side the aspect of each different colour – blue, yellow and so on – is not delivered but rather the aspect of the mere conglomeration is delivered, and from the subject's side the aspect of each different colour

³ Alternatively they can be divided into Followers of Scripture (followers of Asanga's Treatises on the Grounds) and Followers of Reasoning (followers of Dharmakirti's Seven Treatises on Valid Cognition).

– blue, yellow and so on – is not produced in an aspectless manner but rather the aspect of the mere conglomeration is produced in an aspectless manner.

There are two types of False Aspectarians:

1. Tainted False Aspectarians and
2. Untainted False Aspectarians.

3. Etymology

Why are they called ‘Proponents of Cittamatra’?

They are called proponents of Cittamatra because they accept that phenomena are merely the nature of mind and they are called proponents of cognition because they accept that all phenomena are merely the nature of cognition.

4. Way of asserting objects

There are two types of objects of knowledge:

1. ultimate truths and
2. conventional truths.

The definition of ultimate truth is: that which is realized by a valid perception directly realizing it by way of the vanishing of dualistic appearance.

Ultimate truth, final reality, sphere of reality and final mode of abiding are equivalent.

There are two divisions of ultimate truths:

1. subtle selflessness of phenomena and
2. subtle selflessness of persons.

When subtle selflessness of phenomena is divided by way of the bases of emptiness, there are twenty emptinesses. When those are condensed there are eighteen; when those are condensed there are sixteen; when those are condensed there are four emptinesses and so forth.

Illustrations of the subtle selflessness of phenomena are

- the emptiness that is a form and the valid cognition apprehending that form being empty of being different substances and
- the emptiness that is a form being empty of existing by way of its own characteristics as a basis for applying the term ‘form’.

An illustration of the subtle selflessness of persons is the emptiness that is a person being empty of being self-sufficient substantially existent.

The definition of conventional truth is: that which is realized by a valid perception directly realizing it by way of being together with dualistic appearance.

There are two types of conventional truths:

1. other-powered phenomena and
2. conventional truths that are included in imputational constructs.

Other-powered phenomena and compounded phenomena are equivalent.

Conventional truths that are included in imputational constructs and uncompounded phenomena other than ultimate truths are equivalent.

All things are asserted to be the common locus of being truly existent and being a falsity, all final realities are asserted to be the common locus of being truly existent and being true, and all uncompounded phenomena other than final realities are asserted to be the common locus of being falsely existent and being a falsity.

Final realities are necessarily non-affirming negatives. Illustrations of other non-affirming negatives are similar to those of the proponents of Sautrantika.

The five sense objects – forms and so forth – are produced on the basis of a substance that is an inner consciousness in dependence upon the latencies of common and uncommon actions deposited upon the mind-basis-of-all. They are not established as external objects.

According to the True Aspectarians, even though the five sense objects – forms and so forth – are not external objects they are asserted to exist as gross objects.

According to the False Aspectarians, the five sense objects – forms and so forth – are not gross objects because if they were gross objects they would necessarily be external objects.

5. Way of asserting object-possessors

True Aspectarians assert eight collections of consciousness because they accept that in addition to the six collections of consciousness asserted by the other proponents of tenets, adding the mind-basis-of-all and the afflicted mentality makes a total of eight collections of consciousness.

There are illustrations of both the mind-basis-of-all and the afflicted mentality. The consciousness that is an object different from the six collections of consciousness and does not depend upon a sense power that is its own empowering condition is accepted to be the mind-basis-of-all. The consciousness that observes the mind-basis-of-all – its observed object – and apprehends it in the aspect of it being a self-sufficient substantially existent ‘I’ is accepted to be the afflicted mentality.

The mind-basis-of-all is accepted to be the illustration of the person that is the support for actions and their results.

False Aspectarians accept six collections of consciousness and posit the mere mental consciousness to be the illustration of the person that is the support for actions and their results.

[The proponents of Cittamatra] accept two types of awareness:

1. valid cognition and
2. non-valid cognition.

They accept two types of valid cognition:

1. valid perception and
2. valid inference.

There are four types of perception. Self-cognizing perception and yogic perception are necessarily non-mistaken consciousnesses. Sense perception in the continuum of an ordinary being is necessarily a mistaken consciousness. Mental perception in the continuum of an ordinary being can be either a mistaken consciousness or a non-mistaken consciousness.

Perception is not necessarily valid perception because, although there exists a mental perception apprehending form in the continuum of an ordinary being, there does not exist a valid mental perception apprehending form in their continuum.

Self-cognition experiencing a mental perception apprehending form in the continuum of an ordinary being and the second moment of a sense perception apprehending form are non-valid cognitions.

There are four types of yogic perception:

1. yogic perception that directly realizes subtle impermanence,
2. yogic perception that directly realizes subtle selflessness of persons,
3. yogic perception that directly realizes coarse selflessness of persons and
4. yogic perception that directly realizes selflessness of phenomena.

Valid inference is necessarily conceptual. If it is an inference with respect to a phenomenon, it is not necessarily a conception with respect to that phenomenon because, although the inference realizing sound to be impermanent is an inference with respect to sound being empty of being permanent, it is not a conception with respect to that.

This is so because if it is a conception with respect to a phenomenon, the aspect of that phenomenon necessarily arises and with respect to the inference realizing sound to be impermanent, the aspect of the sound being empty of being permanent does not arise. Therefore, that [inference] does not explicitly realize [sound to be empty of being permanent]; it realizes that implicitly when it explicitly realizes sound to be impermanent.

6. Way of asserting selflessness

The way of positing illustrations of coarse and subtle selflessness of persons is similar to the Svatantrikas and below.

An illustration of the selflessness of phenomena is the emptiness that is a form and the valid cognition apprehending that form being empty of being different substances.

7. Presentation of the grounds and paths

This is explained in two parts:

1. objects of abandonment and
2. actual presentation of the grounds and paths.

7A. Objects of abandonment

The conception of a self of persons together with its seeds and the three poisons arising due to the force of that [conception] together with their seeds are posited to be afflictive obscurations.

The conception of [things] as being true⁴ together with its seeds, the latencies of that [conception] and all mistaken dualistic appearances that arise due to the force of that are posited to be cognitive obscurations.

7B. Actual presentation of the grounds and paths

Those of the hearers lineage conjoin the view realizing the selflessness of persons with a small accumulation of merit for the sake of their own welfare and those of the solitary realizers lineage conjoin the view realizing the selflessness of persons with a middling accumulation of merit for the

⁴ Things being true means things existing in the way that they appear in terms of appearing to be external to the consciousness apprehending them and in terms of appearing to exist by way of their own characteristics as a basis for applying terms.

sake of their own welfare, and in dependence on having cultivated that for at least three lifetimes, one hundred eons and so on, they actualize their own respective enlightenment.

Bodhisattvas conjoin the view realizing apprehending-subjects and apprehended-objects being empty of being different substances with a great accumulation of merit for the sake of others welfare, and in dependence on having cultivated that for at least three countless great eons and so on, they actualize their own enlightenment.

True Aspectarians accept that when hearer and solitary realizer Arhats pass beyond sorrow without remainder their continuum of awareness is severed. They accept that it is impossible to sever the continuum of awareness of an Arya Buddha because they accept that for the bodhisattva who attained enlightenment initially as a Sambhogakaya in Akanishta, the continuum of similar type of aspect of that Sambhogakaya is not severed as long as samsara is not empty but rather it enacts the welfare of others through various emanations in accordance with the fortunes of each individual disciple.

The individual lineages of the three vehicles are definite because they accept that sentient beings, since beginningless time, are of three different lineages or dispositions, and thus have three different aspirations, and thus have three different ways of practicing and thus will attain three different results.

False Aspectarians do not accept that when hearer and solitary realizer Arhats pass beyond sorrow without remainder their continuum of awareness is severed because, although they accept that, at that time, the continuum of mere awareness that is included in true sufferings and true origins is severed, they accept that mere awareness goes on to the Buddha ground. Therefore they accept one final vehicle.

MADHYAMAKA

The explanation of the Madhyamaka School has three outlines:

1. definition,
2. divisions and
3. meaning of each division.

1. Definition

The definition of a proponent of Madhyamaka is: a person propounding Mahayana tenets who does not accept true existence even conventionally.

2. Divisions

There are two divisions:

1. Proponents of Svatantrika and
2. Proponents of Prasangika.

3. Meaning of each division

The explanation of

1. Svatantrika (Autonomy) School and
2. Prasangika (Consequence) School.

SVATANTRIKA

The explanation of the Svatantrika School has seven outlines:

1. definition,
2. divisions,
3. etymology,
4. way of asserting objects,
5. way of asserting object-possessors,
6. way of asserting selflessness and
7. presentation of the grounds and paths.

1. Definition

The definition of a proponent of Svatantrika is: a proponent of Madhyamaka who, by way of asserting autonomous reasons, does not accept true existence even conventionally.

Proponent of Svatantrika and proponent of Madhyamaka who propounds inherent existence are equivalent.

2. Divisions

There are two divisions:

1. Proponent of Sautrantika-Svatantrika and
2. Proponent of Yogacara-Svatantrika.

The definition of a proponent of Sautrantika-Svatantrika is: a proponent of Madhyamaka who propounds a presentation of conventionalities through mostly conforming with the proponents of Sautrantika.

The definition of a proponent of Yogacara-Svatantrika is: a proponent of Madhyamaka who propounds a presentation of conventionalities through mostly conforming with the proponents of Cittamatra.

Illustrations of proponents of Sautrantika-Svatantrika are Bhavaviveka and Jnanagarbha.

Illustrations of proponents of Yogacara-Svatantrika are Shantarakshita, Haribhadra and Kamalashila.

3. Etymology

There is a reason why Bhavaviveka is called a 'proponent of Sautrantika-Svatantrika'. He is called such due to the reason of him being a proponent of Madhyamaka who asserts autonomous reasons.

4. Way of asserting objects

Existence by way of its own characteristics, existence from its own side and inherent existence are equivalent.

Uncompounded space, true cessations, past, future and subtle selflessness of persons are both non-affirming negatives and conventional truths.

Ultimate truth, final reality and subtle selflessness of phenomena are equivalent.

Proponents of Sautrantika-Svatantrika accept that the five sense objects – forms and so forth – are different entities from consciousness and that they are gross external objects composed of partless⁵ particles.

Proponents of Yogacara-Svatantrika accept that the five sense objects – forms and so forth – are one entity with the consciousness apprehending them.

5. Way of asserting object-possessors

The mental consciousness is accepted to be the illustration of the person.

They accept six collections of consciousness.

There are two types of awareness:

1. valid cognition and
2. non-valid cognition.

There are two types of valid cognition:

1. valid perception and
2. valid inference.

Proponents of Sautrantika-Svatantrika do not accept self-cognizing perception.

Proponents of Yogacara-Svatantrika accept all four types of perception. Self-cognizing perception and yogic perception are necessarily non-mistaken consciousnesses and the other two [sense perception and mental perception] can be either mistaken or non-mistaken.

Proponents of Sautrantika, proponents of Cittamatra and proponents of Svatantrika all assert that

- perception is necessarily a consciousness free from conceptuality,
- subsequent cognition is necessarily a non-valid cognition,
- a consciousness that is mistaken with respect to its determined object is necessarily a wrong consciousness,
- if it is a mistaken consciousness with respect to a phenomenon, it is necessary not a valid cognition with respect to that phenomenon,
- if it is an inference, it is necessarily not a valid cognition with respect to its appearing object, and so on.

6. Way of asserting selflessness

The person being empty of being permanent, unitary and independent is accepted to be a coarse selflessness of persons and the person being empty of being self-sufficient substantially existent is the subtle selflessness of persons.

Proponents of Yogacara-Svatantrika accept that form and the cognition apprehending that form being empty of being different substances is a coarse selflessness of phenomena.

All phenomena being empty of true existence is accepted to be the subtle selflessness of phenomena.

The two [subtle] selflessnesses are differentiated by way of the object of negation and not by way of the basis of the emptiness because the refutation of the object of negation – true existence – upon

⁵ This needs to be investigated since Jamyang Shabya in his *Great Exposition of Tenets* says 'Because many have refuted [partless particles], that Madhyamikas and Cittamatrins assert those is mistaken'.

the basis of a person is the subtle selflessness of phenomena and the refutation of self-sufficient substantial existence upon the basis of a person is the subtle selflessness of persons.

The two conceptions of self are differentiated by way of the mode of apprehension and not by way of the observed object because through observing the basis – the person – and apprehending it to be truly existent it is a conception of a self of phenomena and through observing the basis – the person and apprehending it to be self-sufficient substantially existent it is a conception of a self of person.

7. Presentation of the grounds and paths

According to proponents of Yogacara-Svatantrika the differences between the persons of the three vehicles are posited in terms of three different obscurations that are the main objects of abandonment and three different views that are the main objects of meditation.

Those of the hearers lineage, having taken the conception apprehending [the person] to be self-sufficient substantially existent together with its retinue as their main object of abandonment, through taking, as the antidote to that, the view realizing the person to be empty of being self-sufficient substantially existent as their main object of meditation, they attain a small enlightenment.

Those of the solitary realizers lineage, having taken the conception apprehending form and the valid cognition apprehending that form to be different substances as their main object of abandonment, through taking, as the antidote to that, the view realizing apprehending-subjects and apprehended-objects to be empty of being different substances as their main object of meditation, they attain a middling enlightenment.

Bodhisattvas, having taken the conception of true existence together with its latencies as their main object of abandonment, through taking, as the antidote to that, the view realizing all phenomena to be lacking true existence as their main object of meditation, they attain a great enlightenment.

According to proponents of Sautrantika-Svatantrika there is no difference between hearers and solitary realizers regarding their main objects of abandonment and main objects of meditation because they are both similar in taking the afflictive obscurations as their main objects of abandonment and they are also both similar in taking the selflessness of persons as their main object of meditation.

However, there is a reason why there is a difference in the results of those two in terms of inferiority and superiority. It is because there is a difference in terms of the amount of merit accumulated and the length of time [spent accumulating that merit].

The proponents of Svatantrika are similar to the proponents of Cittamatra in accepting two types of sutras – Mahayana sutras and Hinayana sutras – and in accepting two parts to sutras – definitive and interpretive.

However, they are not similar in the illustrations of these because the proponents of Cittamatra accept the first two turnings of the wheel [of Dharma] to be sutras of interpretive meaning and the third to be sutras of definitive meaning. In this context, the first and third turnings of the wheel [of Dharma] are sutras of interpretive meaning while the middle [turning of the wheel of Dharma] has both parts – interpretive and definitive – because those where the qualification of ‘ultimately’ is applied to the object of negation are accepted to be sutras of definitive meaning while those of the middle turning of the wheel where such is not applied are accepted to be sutras of interpretive meaning.

PRASANGIKA

The explanation of the Prasangika School has seven outlines, as before.

1. Definition

The definition of a proponent of Prasangika is: a proponent of Madhyamaka who, by way of asserting just other-approved consequences, does not accept true existence even conventionally.

2. Divisions

Examples [of proponents of Prasangika] are Buddhapalita, Chandrakirti and Shantideva.

3. Etymology

There is a reason why Acharya Buddhapalita is called a ‘proponent of Prasangika’. He is called such due to accepting that an inference realizing a thesis is generated in the continuum of an opponent by [stating] just consequences.

4. Way of asserting objects

There are two types of objects:

1. hidden objects and
2. manifest objects.

Objects that are necessarily realized in dependence on a logical reason are posited as hidden objects and objects that can be ascertained by an ordinary person through the force of experience without depending on a logical reason are posited as manifest objects.

Illustrations of hidden objects are

- the impermanence of sound and
- the emptiness of sound being truly existent.

Illustrations of manifest objects are a pot and a woollen cloth.

Perceptible object⁶ and manifest object are equivalent.

Another way of dividing objects is into:

1. conventional truths and
2. ultimate truths.

The definition of being a conventional truth is: an object that is found by a valid cognition analysing a conventionality and with respect to which the valid cognition analysing the conventionality becomes a valid cognition analysing a conventionality.

It is inadmissible to divide conventional truths into two – real conventional truths and unreal conventional truths – because there are no real conventional truths. This is so because if it is a

⁶ *mngon sum* (Skt. *pratyaksa*) This can also be translated as ‘direct’. For schools other than the Prasangika school, this is normally translated as ‘perception’ or ‘direct perceiver’ since it refers to the cognitive subject. In the Prasangika school however it primarily refers to the object of cognition and hence it is translated here as ‘perceptible object’.

conventional truth, it is necessarily not real. This is so because if it is a conventional truth, it is necessarily unreal. [i.e. a falsity]

It is admissible to divide conventional truths into two – real and unreal – relative to the perspective of worldly consciousness because a form, relative to the perspective of worldly consciousness, is real and the reflection of a face in a mirror [being a face], relative to the perspective of worldly consciousness, is unreal. If it is real relative to the perspective of worldly consciousness it does not necessarily exist because truly existent forms are [real with respect to worldly consciousness but do not exist].

The definition of being an ultimate truth is: an object found by a valid cognition analysing the ultimate and with respect to which the valid cognition analysing the ultimate becomes a valid cognition analysing the ultimate.

The divisions [of ultimate truths] are similar to those in the context of the proponents of Cittamatra however in this context it is accepted that true cessations are necessarily ultimate truths.

5. Way of asserting object-possessors

The mere ‘I’ which is imputed in dependence on the five aggregates is accepted to be the illustration of the person.

Person is necessarily a non-associated compositional factor.

There are two types of awareness:

1. valid cognition and
2. non-valid cognition.

There are two types of valid cognition:

1. valid perception and
2. valid inference.

Self-cognizing perception is not accepted and a sense consciousness in the continuum of a sentient being is necessarily a mistaken consciousness. Mental consciousness and yogic perception can be either mistaken or non-mistaken.

There are two types of valid perception:

1. conceptual valid perception and
2. non-conceptual valid perception.

Illustrations of conceptual valid perceptions are

- the second moment of an inference realizing sound to be impermanent and
- a remembering consciousness that is a factually concordant memory of blue generated through being induced by a sense perception apprehending blue.

An illustration of a non-conceptual valid perception is a sense perception apprehending form.

If it is a valid perception it does not necessarily have a perceptible object because if it is a yogic perception it necessarily does not have a perceptible object. This is so because perceptible object and manifest object are equivalent.

If it is a subsequent cognition it is necessarily a valid perception.

There are four types of inference:

1. inference through the power of the fact,

2. inference through renown,
3. inference through an example and
4. inference through belief.

Inference through renown and inference through an example are included in inference through the power of the fact.

If it is a valid cognition it is not necessarily non-mistaken with respect to its determined object because an inference realizing sound to be impermanent is a consciousness that is mistaken with respect to the impermanence of sound.

If it is a consciousness it necessarily realizes its object of comprehension because the generic image of the horns of a rabbit is the object of comprehension of a conception apprehending the horns of a rabbit and the generic image of permanent sound is the object of comprehension of a conception apprehending sound to be permanent.

6. Way of asserting selflessness

The person being empty of being self-sufficient substantially existent is accepted to be a coarse selflessness of persons and the person being empty of true existence is accepted to be the subtle selflessness of persons.

A gross object composed of partless particles and the valid cognition apprehending it being empty of being different substances is posited as a coarse selflessness of phenomena and the aggregates – the basis of designation – being empty of true existence is posited as the subtle selflessness of phenomena.

The two [subtle] selflessnesses are differentiated by way of the basis of emptiness and not by way of the object of negation because the refutation of the object of negation – true existence – upon the basis of a person is the subtle selflessness of persons and the refutation of the object of negation – true existence – upon the basis of the aggregates and so forth is the subtle selflessness of phenomena.

The two conceptions of self are differentiated by way of the observed object and not by way of the mode of apprehension because through observing the basis – the person, apprehending it to be truly existent is posited as the subtle conception of a self of persons and through observing the basis of imputation – the aggregates and so forth, apprehending them to be truly existent is posited as the subtle conception of a self of phenomena.

7. Presentation of the grounds and paths

This is explained in two parts:

1. objects of abandonment and
2. actual presentation of the grounds and paths.

7A. Objects of abandonment

The coarse and subtle conception of a self together with their seeds and the attachment and so forth that arise due to the force of those [conceptions] together with their seeds are afflictive obscurations. They are posited as obscurations that mainly prevent the attainment of liberation.

The latencies of the conception of true existence and all factors of mistaken dualistic appearance that arise due to the force of those [latencies] are cognitive obscurations. They are posited as obscurations that mainly prevent the attainment of omniscience.

7B. Actual presentation of the grounds and paths

There is no difference in terms of superiority among the views that are the objects of meditation of the persons of all three vehicles because all three are similar in taking the subtle selflessness of persons and the subtle selflessness of phenomena as their main objects of meditation.

There are differences with respect to their main objects of abandonment because hearers and solitary realizers take the two conceptions of self together with their seeds as their main objects of abandonment whereas bodhisattvas take the latencies of those [conceptions] as their main objects of abandonment.

The suchness qualified by the abandonment of the two conceptions of self together with their seeds in the continuum of a hearer or solitary realizer Arhats in meditative equipoise is a nirvana without remainder and such a suchness in the continuum of a hearer or solitary realizer Arhat in post equipoise is a nirvana with remainder.

For those of the Mahayana lineage who are definite in that lineage from the very beginning, the [complete] abandonment of the afflictive obscurations occurs simultaneously with the attainment of the eighth ground and the [complete] abandonment of the cognitive obscurations occurs simultaneously with the actualizing of the four bodies.



Translated into English by Glen Svensson (based on an earlier translation by Kathleen McDonald)

Chenrezig Institute, April 2005

Updated June 2016