

Definitions and Divisions of terms according to the Sutra School (*divisions are found within the columns below the row*):

Selflessness	
<p>Existent = Phenomenon that is established / realized / verified by a valid cognizer. Mutually inclusive with: Established base / Object of knowledge / Object of comprehension / Hidden phenomenon = object realized in a hidden manner by a thought consciousness apprehending it (it is hidden because it is realized by an inferential valid cognizer through a generic mental image and not directly). Another division: Singular phenomenon and Different phenomenon.</p>	
<p>Impermanent phenomenon = existent phenomenon that undergoes momentary change in each moment. Mutually inclusive with cause / effect & the following:</p>	<p>Permanent phenomenon = existent phenomenon that does not undergo momentary change. Mutually inclusive with:</p>
<p>Product = created or produced phenomenon</p>	<p>Non-produced phenomenon = non-created phenomenon</p>
<p>Ultimate truth = a phenomenon which is ultimately able to perform a function</p>	<p>Conventional truth = a phenomenon which is ultimately unable to perform a function</p>
<p>Specifically characterized phenomenon = a phenomenon which is established by way of its own character without being merely imputed by a term or thought consciousness</p>	<p>Generally characterized phenomenon = a phenomenon which is merely imputed by a term or a thought consciousness and is not established as a specifically characterized phenomenon</p>
<p>Composed phenomenon = phenomenon that is composed from causes and conditions</p>	<p>Uncomposed phenomenon = phenomenon that is not composed from causes and conditions</p>
<p>Functioning thing = that which is able to perform a function</p>	<p>Non-thing = that which is not able to perform a function</p>
<p>Manifest phenomenon = Object explicitly realized by a direct valid cognizer (who realizes this manifest phenomenon directly without having to depend on a mental image)</p>	

Non-existent = Phenomenon that is not established/ realized/ verified by a valid cognizer (therefore does not exist).

Mutually inclusive = different terms, same meaning and having the eight approaches of pervasion. **Mutually exclusive** = two or more existent in comparison with no common locus and are different.

Division within its own category is exhaustive and has no more other divisions. They are also mutually exclusive, having no common locus among them.

Example 1: Division within selflessness is only the two, existent and non-existent, a third division is not possible.

Example 2: Division within existent is only the two, impermanent and permanent, a third division is not possible.

Example 3: Division within impermanent phenomenon is only the three, matter, consciousness and non-associated compositional factor, a fourth division is not possible.

Example 4: Q – If it is not impermanent, is it necessarily permanent? R – Not necessarily, as there can be a non-existent that is not impermanent but also not permanent.

Example 5: Q – If it is an existent that is not impermanent, then it is necessarily permanent.

Example 6: Matter, consciousness and non-associated compositional factor are mutually exclusive, there is not an object that is any of the two or three in this category.

Example 7: A horse is both a hidden and manifest phenomenon. It is hidden due to it being realized by a thought through a mental image. It is manifest due to being realized directly by a valid cognizer.

Example 8: If it is an existent, it is necessarily realized by a thought consciousness.

Each division of impermanent phenomenon itself is a completely distinct entity from the moment of its production. This is due to it being established from its own continuum former moment of concordant cause / cause of a similar type.

E.g., each moment of matter or consciousness is established through its own continuum former moment of concordant cause / cause of a similar type of matter or consciousness respectively and not from a discordant cause / cause of a dissimilar type. Cause itself can be further divided into substantial cause and cooperative condition. Therefore, impermanent phenomena like matter and consciousness arise in dependence on its concordant substantial cause and cooperative conditions. Therefore, matter cannot act as a substantial cause of consciousness, likewise, consciousness cannot act as a substantial cause of matter.

This is because, on the level of the basis, in reality, matter and consciousness are completely distinct entities from each other, therefore, they necessarily arise from their respective substantial causes. Understanding this correctly establishes the existence of past and future lives. Likewise, based on the correct understanding of reality, basis or existent, liberation and enlightenment can also be ascertained.

Functioning thing									
Matter = Impermanent phenomenon which is atomically established. Mutually inclusive with: Form		Consciousness = Impermanent phenomenon that is void, non-obstructive, without color and shape, yet able to clearly apprehend objects appearing to it, i.e. possesses the factors of clarity and knowing. Mutually inclusive with: Awareness and knower Another division: Mind and Mental factor					Non-associated compositional factor = Impermanent phenomenon that is neither matter nor consciousness		
External matter = matter which is <u>not included</u> within the continuum of a person. e.g.: earth, water, fire, wind, objects of form, sound, smell, taste touch and phenomenon.	Internal matter = matter which <u>is included</u> within the continuum of a person. e.g.: contaminate d form aggregate, sense powers of eye, ear, nose, tongue and body.	Sense consciousness = a knower that is produced in dependence on its own *uncommon empowering condition, a physical sense power. <u>5 division</u> : Sense consciousnesses of <u>eye</u> , <u>ear</u> , <u>nose</u> , <u>tongue</u> and <u>body</u> . The three conditions for their production, which are not divisions of the entity of sense consciousness, are as follow in sequence:			Mental consciousness = a knower that is produced in dependence on its own *uncommon empowering condition, a mental sense power.			Persons : e.g. cow, horse, all types of sentient being.	Not persons: e.g. time and, as generalities, product, composed phenomenon . (Product, in general, is neither form nor consciousness.)
		1) Observed object condition (external matter): a) Visible form b) Sound c) Smell d) Taste e) Tangible object	2) Uncommon empowering condition (internal clear matter): a) Eye sense power b) Ear sense power c) Nose sense power d) Tongue sense power e) Body sense power	3) Immediately preceding condition: Any of the six consciousnesses immediately preceding its production	1) Observed object condition: Form for the mental consciousness (sense objects +phenomenon other than sense objects)	2) Uncommon empowering condition: Mental sense power = any of the six preceding moment of consciousnesses which is its empowering condition	3) Immediately preceding condition: Any of the six consciousnesses immediately preceding its production		

*** The Three Conditions for the Production of a consciousness:**

Generally, a consciousness is generated in dependence on three conditions: 1) Observed object condition 2) Uncommon empowering condition 3) Immediately preceding condition. Example: For an eye consciousness to be generated, the three conditions must be present: 1) its observed object condition is visible form, 2) its uncommon empowering condition is the eye sense power, 3) its immediately preceding condition is any of the six consciousnesses immediately preceding its production. All these three conditions must necessarily be present before any consciousness can be produced.

- 1) In dependence upon its uncommon empowering condition, an eye sense power, an eye sense consciousness is able to apprehend visible form and only visible form. This is due to it being dependent upon its own uncommon empowering condition, an eye sense power. In other words, the eye sense consciousness cannot apprehend other matter, like smell, also because of its own uncommon empowering condition.
- 2) The eye consciousness apprehending form is also generated in the aspect of the form itself. This is because of its observed object condition, form.
- 3) Eye consciousness apprehending form is also generated in the aspect of that which is clear and knowing. This is because of its immediately preceding condition, which is any consciousness that immediately precedes the generation of this consciousness. Since this immediately preceding consciousness is clear and knowing, therefore, when this eye consciousness is generated, it is also generated in the aspect of clear and knowing.

[That means: 1) Due to its **observed object condition**, the consciousness is able to be generated into the **aspect of the object**.

2) Due to its **uncommon empowering condition**, the consciousness is able to **apprehend its object**.

3) Due to its **immediately preceding condition**, the consciousness is able to be generated into the **aspect of clear and knowing**.]

The mental consciousness is generated in dependence upon its own uncommon empowering condition, the mental sense power. This is how the mental consciousness is distinguished from the other sense consciousnesses, due to having its own uncommon empowering condition, the mental sense power.

The significance of the study of Lorig:

All functioning things necessarily arise in dependence upon its own concordant cause, therefore, at the level of cause and effect, functioning things are dependently arisen. This is the coarsest level of understanding dependent arising, phenomenon arising in dependence on its cause.

Liberation from the sufferings of the lower realms: Matter and consciousness, as defined above, are established in their own nature/ entity, without further need to ascertain the reasons for their establishment. Since both matter and consciousness arise in dependence upon their own concordant causes, this allows for deeper reflection on past and future lives, happiness and suffering. [The experiences of] happiness and suffering both arise in dependence upon their own concordant causes, ascertaining this allows for deepening of faith in the law of causality.

Liberation from the sufferings of cyclic existence: All the unwanted sufferings arise from their concordant causes, the chief of which are karma and the afflictions. The root of these will be the ignorance apprehending a 'self'. This is the root cause of suffering. This ignorance apprehending a 'self' is not merely 'not knowing', but an active fundamental misapprehension of self and reality. Such an ignorance is a fundamentally wrong consciousness. To establish whether this is so and to remove it, its completely and directly opposite antidote, wisdom consciousness, has to be established to exist. If such a consciousness can harm its opposite, ignorance, then commensurate with the strength of such a wisdom consciousness, the more it will harm the opposite, ignorance, the root of suffering.

Liberating others from their sufferings in cyclic existence: Therefore, the point is to realize by valid cognition the status of reality, that which exist as it is. Doing so will enable the removal of all misapprehensions of reality, ignorance and so forth. This is how enlightenment can be ascertained to exist. Object of knowledge, the phenomenon that can be realized or known, which is the basis, can be divided into the two truths, which can be further divided into the four [noble] truths. The basis, objects to be known or realized, are based upon the two truths, which are realized as they are by their respective valid cognizers. Once realized, the practitioner continually familiarizes that realization through those valid cognizers. This is also how liberation and enlightenment are established. Such results are therefore the effects of valid cognition. This is because such states are the results of having continuously been accustomed with reality through valid cognition.

Characteristics of consciousness:

Consciousness has the factor of being 'clear' and 'knowing'. The factor of 'clarity' can be explained in several ways:

- 1) It has the entity of clarity, being clear, in the sense of not being atomically established.
- 2) Any objects, when being focused upon, can appear clearly to it.
- 3) It has the nature of clear light, in the sense that afflictions have not entered into its deepest recess. Therefore, it is by nature, not afflictive.

Its factor of 'knowing' can be explained as realizing its object or that objects can appear to it.

When the body of a horse appears to the eye sense consciousness, it is the aggregate of the form (of the horse) that appears, not horse itself. The form body of the horse is the basis in dependence upon which 'horse' is imputed/ designated/ labeled. Therefore, this shows that the horse's body is not 'horse' but the 'body/ form of a horse'.

This is same with the 'I'. 'I' is not the body nor mind. These two are in fact the basis in dependence upon which 'I' is imputed/ designated.

Singular phenomenon and Different phenomenon (or one and many):

If it is an existent, it is either one of these: Singular phenomenon or Different phenomenon (one or many).	
Singular phenomenon refers to that which is not diverse.	Different phenomenon refers to that which is diverse.
Examples of 'one': object of knowledge (by itself), product (by itself), impermanent phenomenon (by itself). This (object by itself) is not diverse as it is one with itself.	However, object of knowledge and established base (when comparing the two objects) are different. Even though these are 'different' in the sense of being 'many', they are not of 'different meaning'.
When a phenomenon has a same name and meaning, then it is a singular phenomenon/ one.	If two objects have different names and/ or meaning, then these are different/ many.
E.g., impermanent and product, even though these have different names, they are essentially the same in meaning, therefore, mutually inclusive, having the eight approaches of pervasion. Impermanent and permanent are different as well as mutually exclusive. Therefore, this shows that even if two objects are different, it does not necessarily mean they are mutually exclusive. Object of knowledge and impermanent are different but not mutually exclusive as there is a common locus between them, i.e., there is both an object of knowledge and an impermanent phenomenon (e.g., a cup).	

Three and Four possibilities: When comparing any two mutually inclusive phenomena, e.g., a pot and a pot, the three and four possibilities do not exist between them. When comparing any two mutually exclusive phenomena, it is (only) possible for them to have **three** but not four **possibilities**. Therefore, when comparing two objects to ascertain whether they are mutually inclusive or exclusive, having three or four possibilities, is a way to analyze, gain deeper and clearer understanding of reality.

Comparison	Object of knowledge and Impermanent phenomenon	Matter and Consciousness
Singular or Different	Different, due to them having different names and meaning.	Different, due to them having different names and meaning.
Mutually inclusive or exclusive	Not mutually exclusive, due to there being something that is both. Also not mutually inclusive due to having different meanings.	Mutually exclusive, due to there being nothing that is both.
Three or Four possibilities	Only three: 1) Something which is object of knowledge but not impermanent: uncompounded space. 2) Something which is impermanent but not object of knowledge: <u>not possible</u> , as whatever is impermanent is necessarily an object of knowledge. 3) Something which is both an object of knowledge and impermanent: a cup. 4) Something which is neither: sky-flower.	Only three: 1) Something which is matter but not consciousness: cup. 2) Something which is consciousness but not matter: eye sense consciousness. 3) Something which is not both: time. 4) Something which is both: <u>not possible</u> , as they are mutually exclusive, having no common locus between them.

1) Q (summarized) – Can one say that “there is something that is both matter and consciousness: e.g. functioning thing. Therefore, these two are not mutually exclusive?”

KR – Comparison of phenomena is very important. Phenomena can be compared in three or four permutations. Such tools of comparison are extremely important in the investigation of phenomena.

KQ – For example, what are the possibilities that exist (comparing) between object of knowledge and consciousness? Is there something that is an object of knowledge but not consciousness? Horse. (*1st possibility*)

K – From here, one can see that the limit of pervasion of the object of knowledge is greater than the limit of pervasion of consciousness. That is, (the boundary of the) object of knowledge covers more things than (the boundary of) consciousness.

KQ – Is there something that is a consciousness but not an object of knowledge? R: No.

K – Correct, there is nothing that is an object of knowledge but not consciousness, because, whatever is a consciousness is necessarily an object of knowledge.

KQ – Is there something that is both? R: eye consciousness. (*2nd possibility*)

KQ – Is there something that is not both? Is there an existent that is neither an object of knowledge nor consciousness? (if it is an existent, then 'no', but if the pervasion can include something outside the boundary of existent, then 'sky-flower' is a possibility) (*3rd possibility*)

K – When comparing between matter and consciousness, there is nothing that is both matter and consciousness. Therefore, these two are mutually exclusive.

KQ – If someone were to give a challenge: “The subject, functioning thing, is both matter and consciousness.” How should one reply?

K – There are two different ways of asking this question:

- 1) Are both matter and consciousness functioning thing?
- 2) Is functioning thing both matter and consciousness?

KQ – What would the answer be for this question: Is functioning thing consciousness?

KQ – Giving an easier question: Is functioning thing a person? Functioning thing is quite extensive (in its boundary of pervasion). Is functioning thing elephant? Elephant is functioning thing, that is without doubt, but is functioning thing elephant? R – not necessarily.

K – I agree it is not necessarily, but that's not my question. Is functioning thing elephant? R – then it is no.

KQ – Then it is not horse? Not you? Not consciousness? For the same reasons?

K – Matter and consciousness are functioning things. That is no problem at all. However, if you were asked: Is functioning thing consciousness? Is it better to say yes or no? If you say functioning thing is consciousness and so on, then other consequential questions may arise: then is it a horse? A person? And so on. This then becomes very difficult to answer.

KQ – if you still say there's something that is both matter and consciousness, then please give an illustration? R – impermanent phenomenon. KQ – then is impermanent phenomenon both matter and consciousness? R – No. KQ – So then there's nothing that is both, is it not? R – Yes.

2) Q – What exactly is the form of the eye sense power? Can the eye be considered a non-associated compositional factor, then the (eye-) sight be the consciousness and the retina be the eye sense power?

K – According to the Great exposition and Sutra Schools, they assert that the eye sense power to be a clear form existing inside the eye ball the size of a raisin and not referring to the entire eye ball. Therefore, it is form, and in dependence on this eye sense power, the eye sense consciousness is generated, which belongs to the category of consciousness. Therefore, one cannot posit that the eye sense power and eye sense consciousness to be the same. (This is the same as the scientifically held position.)

As mentioned in the previous lesson, an eye consciousness apprehending (visible) form, apprehends a (visible) form source and not sound.

- 1) This is due to its uncommon empowering condition, the eye sense power. Therefore, for an eye sense consciousness apprehending (visible) form to be generated, it necessarily depends on its uncommon condition, the eye sense power.
- 2) It also must depend on its observed object condition, (visible) form.
- 3) Also, it necessarily needs its immediately preceding condition, any consciousness that exists prior to the production of this (eye) consciousness. This gives rise to a continuum of consciousnesses.

KQ – What is it that caused an eye consciousness apprehending (visible) form to be generated into the aspect of clear and knowing? The immediately preceding consciousness that existed just prior to the arising of this (eye) consciousness.

KQ – What is it that caused an eye consciousness apprehending (visible) form to be generated into the aspect of (visible) form? The observed object condition, (visible) form itself.

K – The eye sense power is form. However, whether this form can be apprehended by the naked eye needs to be analyzed. This is because there is a phenomenon form source. Therefore, one should investigate what exactly is this eye sense power, whether it is a form or a phenomenon form source.

3) Q – Since the 'person' that is labeled in dependence on the aggregates falls into the category of non-associated compositional factor, can the 'eye', that is labeled in dependence on its aggregates also be considered a non-associated compositional factor?

K – When the term 'eye' is used, it has to refer either to the eye sense power or the eye consciousness. There is not an 'eye' that is both. 'Eye' mainly refers to the physical eye, which is form. Therefore, this is definitely not a non-associated compositional factor. When reciting the Heart Sutra: No eye, no ear, no nose and so on, all these refer to the physical sense powers. Therefore, these are necessarily not non-associated compositional factor.

4) Q – What is phenomenon form source?

K – If I posit a dream elephant as an illustration, it is very clear that this dream elephant does not appear to an eye consciousness or any sense consciousnesses. It can only appear to a mental consciousness. It is a subtle form that can only appear to a mental consciousness and not any sense consciousnesses.

Q – Then it is not atomically established, not matter?

K – This should be analyzed. In the division of functioning thing, one of the division is matter. If one asserts that matter is mutually inclusive with form, then one would have to assert that phenomenon form source is atomically established. In the case of the dream elephant, one has to analyze carefully whether it is atomically established or not. It is easy to understand that the forms that appear to the sense consciousnesses are atomically established. However, it is not so with the forms that appear to the mental consciousness. However, not all buddhist tenets assert this. There are other schools that assert that matter and form are not mutually inclusive. Nevertheless, one still has to analyze whether a phenomenon form source, a dream elephant, is atomically established or not. All schools assert clearly that phenomenon form source is form, but whether it is atomically established or not has to be analyzed.

5) Q – If two phenomena in comparison have three possibilities, is it necessarily that there are no common locus between them as stated in the notes? Not necessarily.

Q – If two phenomena in comparison are mutually exclusive, is it necessarily that there are always three possibilities between them? Yes

Q – At any single moment, is it possible that all six consciousnesses are manifesting simultaneously? Yes

Q – Since these consciousnesses all depend on their respective immediately preceding conditions, any of the six consciousnesses, to arise, then there will be six streams of consciousnesses manifesting simultaneously. How does this not contradict the statement that 'there is only a single continuum of consciousness within a person?'

K – The immediately preceding condition for the production of a consciousness can be *any* of the six consciousnesses that precedes it. The uncommon empowering condition for the production of a mental consciousness is the mental sense power. The mental sense power can also be a **common** empowering condition for the production of any of the five sense consciousnesses.

6) Q – Why is the study of Mind and mental factors presented from the assertions of the Sutra School and not from the perspective of the Consequent Middle Way School?
K – It is good to know why there are the presentations of the four buddhist tenets. To understand well the presentation of the higher tenets, there are the presentations of the lower ones. The vast majority of the tenets have similar assertions with respect to valid cognizer. Essentially, from the Great Exposition to the Autonomy Middle Way schools, the assertions with regards to mind and their functions are mainly the same, with the exception of the Consequent Middle Way School. On the basis of understanding well the assertions of the lower tenets, when the assertions of the higher tenets are presented, one would be able to see and appreciate how the higher tenets are superior to the lower ones.

7) Q – How does a dream elephant exist?

KQ – Does the elephant conjured by an illusionist exist? The question is not whether it is 'elephant' or not, but an 'elephant conjured by an illusionist' exist or not? Yes.

K – If you were asked: “Is the 'elephant conjured by an illusionist' an elephant?” Then it would be no.

KQ – What is the category of this 'elephant conjured by an illusionist'? Is it a form, consciousness or non-associated compositional factor? Form.

KQ – Of the five division of (visible) form, sound, smell, taste and touch, which is it? Is it atomically established? Yes, (visible) form, as it is an object that appears to an eye consciousness.

K – Since the 'elephant conjured by an illusionist' exist, then one has to say that the 'dream elephant' exist, as it is an impermanent [phenomenon form source that appears to a mental consciousness.]

K – What one sees as water exists as water for one. However, this same water is perceived by a god and hungry ghost as nectar and pus respectively, exist [and functions] as such to them. Therefore, depending on the power of their individual karma, on the very same base, there can be these three things: water, nectar and pus.

8) Q – Is one's imagination or visualization that appears a 'phenomenon form source'?

K – There's a difference between conceptual and non-conceptual consciousnesses in terms of the way objects are being perceived by them. In the case of imagination or visualization, it is essentially [conceived] by thought. Whatever [is an appearing object] to a thought consciousness, it is not the actual object but a mental image of the object one is thinking of. Imagination or visualization is an appearance of an object to thought. Although 'sky-flower' does not exist, there can be a conception of sky-flower. When one thinks of a 'sky-flower', there can be a mental appearance/ image of a 'sky-flower' to a conceptual thought consciousness. Even though 'sky-flower' does not exist at all, the 'mental appearance/ image' of a sky-flower (or any object) to a thought consciousness apprehending it, do exist. This mental image is a meaning generality and is not form but a mere imputed factor. However, if it is an object that appears to a mental non-conceptual consciousness, then the object is necessarily form.

9) Q – What is the difference between internal and external matter, that which is included and not included within the continuum of a person respectively? Is a donated organ that is now used by the recipient an internal matter? Is the aggregate of a fetus in the womb an internal matter?

K – The fetus's body is an internal matter due to it being included within the continuum of the fetus. KQ – Is this fetus's body also included within the continuum of the mother? Even if it is so, is there any problem with it? K – When the fetus's body is still in the womb, it is considered an internal matter that is included within the continuum of the mother.

KQ – Is the poo-poo inside your body an internal matter? If it is included within your continuum, then you can cherish it!

KQ – If it is an existent, is it necessarily singular and different? Is there not something that is not these two? Example: 'Horse' is singular. 'Horse and elephant' are different. Therefore, whatever existent is being analyzed, it is only these two, either it is singular or it is diverse. One should also analyze between the two, whether there is something that is both singular and different, having three or four possibilities, to make clear for oneself the relationship between them.

KQ – The subject, 'different', is it singular or different? [it is singular due to it being the same term and meaning with 'different'.]

<p>Object/ Existent – In general, if it is an existent, it is necessarily an object. However, [when objects are divided or re-grouped into] the two-fold divisions of object and object possessor, all consciousnesses necessarily fall under the category of object possessor, everything else necessarily falls under the category of object.</p>					
<p>Object – every phenomenon that is non-mind (which include the object possessors of persons and terms) falls under object. An object of the consciousness can be divided into the following (non-exhaustive division): ("=" means mutually inclusive here)</p>				<p>Object possessor (excluding persons and terms) – all types of consciousnesses fall under this category</p>	
<p>Appearing object/ Apprehended object</p>		<p>Determined object – only for thought</p>	<p>Object of engagement</p>		
<p>For a <u>direct</u> perceiver: Its appearing/ apprehended object = impermanent phenomenon</p>	<p>For a <u>conceptual</u> consciousness/ <u>thought</u> consciousness: Its appearing/ apprehended object = permanent phenomenon</p>	<p>For a <u>conceptual consciousness/ thought</u> consciousness: Its object of engagement = its object of mode of apprehension = its determined object</p>	<p>For a <u>direct</u> perceiver: Its object of engagement = its object of mode of apprehension</p>		<p>For a <u>conceptual consciousness/ thought</u> consciousness: Its object of engagement = its object of mode of apprehension = its determined object</p>

Put in another way:

<p>For a (non-conceptual) direct perceiver (e.g. eye consciousness), its: appearing object = apprehended object/ object of engagement/ object of mode of apprehension/ observed object/ impermanent object. Determined objects exist only for conceptual consciousnesses, not non-conceptual consciousnesses.</p>
<p>For a conceptual thought consciousness (e.g. thought thinking its object), its: determined object = object of engagement/ object of mode of apprehension/ observed object. Its appearing object = apprehended object/ permanent phenomenon/ mental image of object/ meaning generality</p>

<p>Consciousness – can be divided into conceptual and non-conceptual consciousnesses:</p>	
<p>Conceptual consciousness is necessarily: Conventional consciousness/ Mistaken consciousness/ Obscuring consciousness/ Facsimile of a direct perceiver/ False consciousness/ Eliminative engager. However, conceptual/ <u>conventional consciousness</u> is not an obscurational truth/ conventional truth as it is an <u>impermanent</u> phenomenon whereas <u>conventional truth</u> is <u>permanent</u>.</p>	<p>Non-conceptual consciousness, one of which can be a Non-conceptual direct perceiver, is necessarily: Ultimate consciousness/ Non-mistaken consciousness/ Direct valid cognizer [for the first moment] / Collective engager.</p>

One important way to understand the difference between a conceptual consciousness and a (non-conceptual) direct perceiver is how the two **engage/ apprehend** its respective objects:

<p>1) Conceptual consciousness is a conventional awareness/ obscuring consciousness. This is because it is <u>obscured</u> from apprehending/ perceiving the actual object directly due to its mental image/ meaning generality. It can only apprehend its object via this meaning generality of the object. What appears is the <u>actual object and the mental image of the object</u> being mixed. This mixed appearance appears to the conceptual consciousness as if they were the same. It is through such an appearance that the conceptual consciousness is apprehending its object. Therefore, whatever appears to the conceptual consciousness apprehending it is <u>not necessarily</u> the appearing object to this conceptual consciousness. E.g., conceptual consciousness apprehending 'blue', 'blue' appears <u>without</u> all its specific characteristics to it as it <u>explicitly realizes 'blue'</u>, therefore 'blue' is <u>not</u> its appearing object.</p>	<p>1) (Non-conceptual) Direct perceiver is an ultimate consciousness because it is non-mistaken with respect to its appearing object. Therefore, whatever appears to a direct perceiver is <u>necessarily</u> the appearing object of this direct perceiver. Therefore, whatever appears to an eye consciousness, for example, is not necessarily merely visible form. [This is because all the specific quality of that visible form, its impermanence and so on, also appear and is its appearing object.]</p>
<p>2) The conceptual consciousness is a false and mistaken awareness with respect to its appearing object, in that it is the opposite of not being a conventional awareness because it <u>implicitly realizes the opposite of its non-object</u>. This is because it does not directly perceive the actual object itself in the way the object exists. This is because the [<u>object that appears</u>] and the <u>mental image of the object</u> appears mixed as one. Therefore, it <u>explicitly realizes its object</u> via the <u>appearing of the aspect of the object to the consciousness</u>, while <u>implicitly realizes the opposite from what is its non-object</u>. Therefore, its object does appear but whatever appears to it does not necessarily have to be its appearing object. Facsimile of a direct perceiver/ mistaken consciousness is a knower that is mistaken with respect to its appearing object.</p>	<p>2) (Non-conceptual) Direct perceiver that is a direct valid cognizer is non-mistaken because it apprehends/ perceives its object directly exactly the way it exists.</p>
<p>3) Permanent object is generally characterized, because it cannot appear to the conceptual consciousness without depending on a mental image as a medium.</p>	<p>3) Functioning thing is specifically characterized, because every characteristics of the object appears, from its own side, directly to a direct perceiver completely as it is without depending on a mental image as a medium.</p>
<p>4) Conceptual consciousness is an eliminative engager because it engages its object by eliminating whatever is not the object in order to apprehend its object. All the specific characteristics of the object do not appear to this thought, only the general characteristics via a mental image and not directly.</p>	<p>4) (Non-conceptual) Direct perceiver is a collective engager because it engages all the characteristics of the functioning object collectively, fully and completely, without eliminating anything. It is therefore primarily concerned about the object it is engaged in (but not necessarily able to notice/ realize it).</p>
<p>5) Example: <u>Conceptual consciousness</u> apprehending blue is an eliminative engager. A <u>mental image of 'blue'</u> appears to this conceptual consciousness apprehending blue. Therefore, it is merely a likeness of 'blue' that appears to this conceptual consciousness. Therefore, <u>not</u> all its specific characteristics, like the blue's impermanence, appear to this conceptual thought apprehending it, only its general characteristics or its generic image, does.</p>	<p>5) Example: <u>Eye consciousness</u> apprehending blue is a collective engager. 'Blue', together with <u>all</u> its specific characteristics, its impermanence etc., appears to this eye consciousness apprehending blue. Even though every characteristics of 'blue' appears to this eye consciousness, it does <u>not</u> necessarily mean that it <u>realizes</u> all these characteristics.</p>

6) Likewise, the manner in which an 'expressive sound' or a 'term' operates is the same. The sound or term 'blue' <u>refers</u> to none other than 'blue'. [Therefore, 'blue' is the referent object of the expressive sound or term 'blue']. This expressive sound 'blue' merely refers to 'blue' and does not refer to, for example, the specific characteristics of the 'blue's impermanence', 'blue being a product', and so on. This is because, if the term 'blue' can refer to 'blue' together with all its characteristics, such as 'blue's impermanence' and so on, then there will be no need to use terms like 'blue's impermanence', 'blue being a product', 'blue being a functioning thing' and so on.		
7) Likewise, the conceptual thought apprehending blue that has been induced from the sound or term 'blue' can only <u>engage/ realize</u> 'blue' and not all the uncommon or specific characteristics that come together with blue.		
8) This shows that even though a conceptual consciousness <u>can realize blue</u> , for example, it <u>does not</u> necessarily mean it <u>realizes all its other characteristics</u> , like blue being an impermanent phenomenon, and so on. Therefore, to realize 'blue's impermanence', this conceptual thought can only realize it via a mental image of 'blue's impermanence'. Therefore, depending on whichever characteristics of blue it is trying to realize, it has to depend on its respective mental image.		
9) From here, one can understand why a conceptual consciousness does not engage its object collectively as a whole but in parts.		
Conceptual consciousness apprehending a meaning generality	Conceptual consciousness apprehending a sound generality	Conceptual consciousness apprehending both a meaning and sound generality
E.g., a conceptual consciousness that realizes 'a being imputed in dependence upon any of its five aggregates', but does not know that this is called 'person'. There is realization of (the meaning of) 'person', but not associating this meaning to the term 'person'.	E.g., a conceptual consciousness that does not realize the 'meaning of person', but merely realizing/ apprehending the 'term: person' itself.	E.g., a conceptual consciousness realizing that 'a being imputed in dependence upon any of its five aggregates' is a 'person'.

A generic image may arise from memory, imaginary construct, or from an after-image of an object apprehended by a sense consciousness. (CTA:226)

Consider this: if a sense consciousness realizes an object, does it necessarily mean that the mental consciousness also realizes it?

Conceptual consciousness apprehending a generally characterized phenomenon	Non-conceptual Direct Perceiver apprehending a specifically characterized phenomenon
1) A generally characterized phenomenon does not have the potential/ ability/ power, from its own side, to cast an aspect of its uncommon entity/ nature to the consciousness perceiving it. Rather, it has to be imputed by mind. Therefore, not every feature of an object appears to a conceptual consciousness apprehending it, even though the object itself does appear to this conceptual consciousness, it is not the appearing object to this conceptual consciousness. Therefore, its appearing object is a meaning generality and is permanent. Therefore, its nature can only be known/ completed through involving the mind imputing it.	1) A specifically characterized phenomenon has the potential/ ability/ power, from its own side, to cast an aspect of its uncommon entity/ nature totally together with all its characteristics only to a direct perceiver.
2) Conceptual consciousness can only apprehend its object via the medium of a mental image/ meaning generality. It cannot perceive its object nakedly/ barely.	2) A direct perceiver can apprehend its object directly without the medium of a mental image/ meaning generality. It perceives its object nakedly/ barely.
3) When the eyes are closed and one thinks of 'blue', the 'blue' that appears to the mind thinking 'blue' is not as clear as the 'blue' that appears to the eye consciousness directly perceiving it.	3) When an eye consciousness apprehends 'blue', 'blue' is clearly appearing to it.
4) The 'appearance of blue' necessarily arises first before the conceptual thought 'conceiving of blue'/ 'putting attention to blue'/ 'engaging in blue' can occur.	
5) Therefore, the 'appearance of blue' to the 'conceptual consciousness apprehending blue' consists of two parts: a) blue b) non-blue	

Object possessor – a thing which possesses its respective object		
Person/ Self/ I/ Being – a being imputed in dependence upon any of its five aggregates. Example, a being who possesses a basis of one of the three realms.	Awareness	Expressive sound/ term
Not necessarily imputed in dependence upon all five aggregates but any of its five aggregates. This is because a formless realm being does not possess a form aggregate, therefore, such a being is imputed in dependence upon its four aggregates.		

Awareness	
Valid cognizer (as asserted by all lower schools below the Consequent Middle Way School) – a new incontrovertible knower. <i>(The Consequentialist asserts that so long as an awareness realizes its object, it is a valid cognizer. Therefore, it is not restricted only to the first moment of realizing an object.)</i>	Non-valid awareness – a knower that is not new and incontrovertible.

Valid and non-valid cognizers can be further divided into the Sevenfold division of consciousnesses:

Valid cognizer	
<p>If an awareness possesses these three features, then it is a valid cognizer: a) New: first moment of realizing an object. Eliminates subsequent cognizers as valid cognizers. b) Incontrovertible/ infallible: knowing/ ascertaining/ realizing the object as it is [as how it exists in reality]. Eliminates correctly assuming cognizers as valid cognizers. c) Knower: eliminates physical sense powers as valid cognizers.</p>	
<p>This definition is generally shared by all tenets, but it can also be asserted as the actual way a 'person' exists. However, depending on each school's assertions of what 'person' is, it is then categorized as form, consciousness or non associated compositional factor respectively. The Consequent Middle Way School, however, asserts that the 'person' is that which is merely imputed in dependence upon the aggregates.</p>	
<p>1) Direct valid cognizer (nc): a new incontrovertible non-conceptual knower. If it is a valid cognizer that is <i>nc</i>, then it is necessarily a direct valid cognizer.</p>	<p>2) Inferential valid cognizer (c): a new incontrovertible determinative knower directly produced in dependence on a correct sign which is its basis. If it is a valid cognizer that is <i>c</i>, then it is necessarily an inferential valid cognizer. E.g., a thought thinking that there's "fire in the mountain pass" (<i>a new incontrovertible determinative knower directly produced</i>) in dependence on "seeing smoke there" (<i>a correct sign which is its basis</i>). Therefore, this inferential cognizer does not perceive fire nakedly but via a mental image of fire.</p>

Non-valid cognizer				
3) Subsequent cognizer (ecnc) –	4) Awareness to which an object appears but is not ascertained (nc)	5) Correctly assuming consciousness (c) –	6) Doubting consciousness (c) –	7) Wrong consciousness (ecnc) –
<p>A knower which realizes what has already been realized (earlier by a valid cognizer).</p>	<p>A knower that is a common locus of: 1) Having a clear appearance of its object of engagement, a specifically characterized phenomenon which is its object of engagement, and 2) Being unable to induce ascertainment wrt this specifically characterized phenomenon.</p>	<p>A factually concordant <u>determinative</u> knower which is controvertible wrt to determining its object.</p>	<p>A knower which has qualms two-pointedly by its own power.</p>	<p>A knower which engages its object erroneously.</p>
<p>Does not refer to the first moment/ initial comprehension of its object. It is merely realizing what has already been realized earlier by a valid cognizer, therefore, a subsequent realization of the same object. It is not a valid cognizer because it is not the initial apprehension of the object, therefore, it is not a new knower.</p>	<p>E.g., when, due to attachment or anger, the mind is completely engrossed in its object, a visible form or a sound can appear to the eye or ear consciousness respectively. While these objects appear, this eye or ear consciousness did not ascertain what appeared to it.</p>	<p>E.g., someone who has not realized the impermanence of sound, but firmly believes that sound is impermanent without any valid/ correct reason.</p>	<p>E.g., a mind that wonders whether sound is impermanent or permanent.</p>	<p>E.g., a mind which firmly believes that sound is permanent.</p>

c = necessarily a conceptual consciousness *nc* = necessarily a non-conceptual consciousness *ecnc* = either a conceptual or non-conceptual consciousness

Lam Rim Chen Mo:

“When you seek your object of meditation, the basis upon which you first keep your attention, look for an excellent painting or sculpture of the Teacher's body and view it again and again. Remembering its features, firmly familiarize yourself with the mental appearance of the object.”

“Or, seek your object of meditation by reflecting upon the meaning of the eloquent descriptions of the Buddha's form which you have heard from your guru and make this image appear in your mind.”

“Furthermore, do not let the object of meditation have the aspect of a painting or sculpture; Rather, learn to have it appear in your mind with the aspect of an actual buddha.”

You try to create an appearance of the object of your focus or meditate on the image of a buddha. This mental appearance is an appearance to conceptual consciousness. You first focus/ hold onto the object, which is an image that is appearing as buddha. Once you are able to hold onto to this image, you meditate on it with your mental consciousness and not sense consciousness. In the beginning, you have to meditate on an image/ appearance of the object. Therefore, this has to be done conceptually, with a conceptual consciousness. Therefore, you start your meditation with a conceptual thought focusing on the appearance of your chosen object of meditation. Gradually, such a conceptual consciousness can be transformed into the entity of a direct perceiver.

This shows that understanding the workings of mental conceptual consciousness is very important as you start your meditation with it. To do this, you need to understand well the appearing object of a thought consciousness. Without understanding what is an appearing object, how a conceptual consciousness functions and so forth, there is no way to understand the Lam Rim well. To have full, complete and correct understanding of the Lam Rim, you necessarily need to study the treatises. The Lam Rim text may seem easy, but when scrutinizing its terms and meanings in detail, you will find that you do not really know anything.

For the Appearance as blue to conceptual consciousness apprehending blue, this <u>appearance</u> has two division:	
Specifically characterized phenomenon	Generally characterized phenomenon

Identifying isolates:

Specifically characterized phenomenon = functioning thing = cause = effect = product = impermanent phenomenon = composed phenomenon = ultimate truth. These terms are one/ same entity but different isolates. Object possessors are divided into person, awareness and expressive sound/ term.

The way/ mode of engagement of conceptual thought is the same as the way/ mode of engagement of expressive sound:

How expressive sound/ term engages its object: The term 'product' engages in the meaning of 'product' or engages in its object 'product' through eliminating everything else that is 'non-product' .
The 'opposite from non-product' is 'product' itself.
How conceptual thought engages its object: Conceptual thought apprehending 'product' induced by the term 'product' engages in 'product' by eliminating everything else that is 'non-product' . Therefore, what this thought realizes is 'product'.
[The term] 'product' appears as 'product'. Therefore, the 'opposite from non-product' also appears.
This shows that the ways/ modes in which a term and a conceptual consciousness engage its object are the same.

What isolate means: *(an isolate brings the focus onto just that phenomenon itself that is one with itself, the singular aspect: DTB417)*

Even though the term/ sound expressing 'product' expresses 'product' and 'that which is opposite from non-product', it does not express 'that which is opposite from non-impermanent phenomenon'.
Even though these two, 'product' and 'impermanent phenomenon', are mutually inclusive, however, the term 'product' can <u>only</u> express 'product' and not 'impermanent phenomenon'.
Since the term 'product' does not express 'impermanent phenomenon', therefore, it also cannot express the phrase-term 'opposite from non-impermanent phenomenon'.
On one basis/ entity, there can be many isolates. E.g., on one basis/ entity 'product', there are many isolates: 'opposite from non-impermanent phenomenon', 'opposite from non-ultimate truth', 'opposite from non-composed phenomenon' and so forth.
All these isolates exist on one basis, 'product'.
Since the phrase-term 'opposite from non-product' cannot express/ refer to the phrase-term 'opposite from non-impermanent phenomenon', therefore, the isolates ('opposite from non-product' and 'opposite from non-impermanent phenomenon'), that exist on one basis, are different.
Therefore, on one basis of 'product', which is mutually inclusive with impermanent phenomenon/ specifically characterized phenomenon etc, there exist the isolates of 'opposite from non-impermanent phenomenon', 'opposite from non-composed phenomenon' and so on.
Since the isolate is 'opposite from non-impermanent phenomenon', therefore, it is impermanent phenomenon. Since the isolate is 'opposite from non-composed phenomenon', therefore, it is composed phenomenon. This shows that the isolates are different.

The purpose of identifying isolates is to indicate their distinctive ways of realizing their respective objects: DTB421

The process of imputation of the isolates: generalities and instances (general idea and specific idea)

The term 'vase' expresses 'vase' and also expresses the phrase-term 'opposite from non-vase'. Essentially, the term 'vase' expresses 'vase' through 'eliminating non-vase'.
The basis of imputation of 'vase' is: a flat-based bulbous thing performing the function of holding water. Through this basis, the term 'vase' is imputed.
The two appearances: 1) Appearance as 'vase' and 2) the appearance as 'opposite from non-vase', are the reasons why the convention 'vase' is used.
The appearance as 'opposite from non-vase' to a conceptual consciousness apprehending 'vase' has two parts: a) a specifically characterized vase, and b) a meaning generality of vase, a permanent phenomenon.
The process of imputation of: “the term 'vase' through 'that which is a flat-based bulbous thing performing the function of holding water' ” is through - the appearance as opposite from non-vase .
The appearance as <u>opposite from non-vase</u> to a <u>conceptual consciousness apprehending</u> 'vase' is the generality of 'vase'. Therefore, 'vase' is a generality.
'Golden vase' is an instance/ specific of 'vase'.
Since 'vase' is a generality, therefore, 'opposite from non-vase' is also a generality. Even though it is a generality, it is necessarily a functioning thing.
The term 'vase' expresses the 'opposite from non-vase', which pervades 'golden vase', 'copper vase', 'diamond vase', 'glass vase' and so on.
Likewise, on every single specific instance of 'vase', the 'generality of vase', the 'appearance as opposite from non-vase' and the 'opposite from non-vase' exist/ pervade.

How generalities enable imputation of instances:

When a golden flat-based bulbous thing able to hold water' is initially perceived by someone, who does not know what it is, and is told that it is a 'vase', this induces in that person a thought apprehending that 'golden flat-based bulbous thing able to hold water' as 'vase'.

The imputation of 'vase' to that 'golden flat-based bulbous thing able to hold water' is through the 'appearance as opposite from non-vase'.

That is, with the 'vase generality' as the object, 'vase' is imputed onto that 'golden flat-based bulbous thing able to hold water'.

Later, when a copper flat-based bulbous thing able to hold water' is perceived, immediately, the thought thinking: "This is a vase" arises automatically without the need to be told by someone again that this is a vase.

The innate ability to label the term 'vase' to the second vase, even though it is made of copper instead of gold, is due to recognizing the 'generality of vase'.

The term 'vase' expresses 'vase', but it also expresses 'opposite from non-vase', which is a generality/ general concept/ general idea of 'vase'. This 'generality of vase' exists on the 'copper vase'. Therefore, when the 'copper flat-based bulbous thing able to hold water' is perceived in the above example, one will be able to immediately conceive of it as a 'vase'.

Therefore, when the term 'vase' is given/ imputed onto a 'golden flat-based bulbous thing able to hold water', this term essentially eliminates everything that is 'non-vase' and expresses [the only thing that is] 'opposite from non-vase', a 'vase generality', which pervades all instances of vase.

Therefore, this shows that: 'opposite from non-vase', a 'vase generality', exists on the 'copper vase', which is an instance of [the generality of] 'vase'.
Due to this proof/ sign/ reason, when the second vase is seen, conception of 'vase' automatically arises.

How buddhist and non-buddhist tenets differ in this area:

For buddhist tenets, expressive sounds/ terms and conceptual consciousnesses are eliminative engagers whereas for non-buddhist tenets, these are asserted as collective engagers.

According to the buddhist presentation on epistemology, the study of knowledge and justified belief based on the texts on valid cognition, that which enables an immediately automatic recognition of things similar to what was perceived before, is due to the **generality existing on all instances of the object**.

How the **appearance** to the conceptual consciousness is necessarily a meaning generality, even though both permanent and impermanent objects appear:

When the two factors: 1) the factor of 'opposite from non-vase' existing on a 'golden vase' and 2) the factor of 'opposite from non-vase' existing on a 'copper vase', appear to a conceptual consciousness, they appear as if they were the same.

To a conceptual consciousness apprehending 'vase', there is the 'appearance as opposite from non-vase'. This 'appearance as opposite from non-vase' is **not** 'vase', even though it appears as if it was the actual vase.

This is because, to a conceptual consciousness apprehending 'vase', the appearance as 'opposite from non-vase' is necessarily a permanent phenomenon.

It is permanent because it is an imputed factor.

However, to a conceptual consciousness apprehending 'vase', whatever is an 'appearance as opposite from non-vase' is not necessarily permanent/ an imputed factor.

This is because, there is: 1) an 'appearance as opposite from non-vase' that is a specifically characterized phenomenon, which is 'vase' itself, and
2) an 'appearance as opposite from non-vase', a generally characterized phenomenon that is an imputed factor, which is the 'meaning generality of vase'.

The reasons showing why a conceptual consciousness is a mistaken consciousness:

The way 'vase' appears to a conceptual consciousness apprehending 'vase' is that the 'meaning generality of vase' / 'the appearance as opposite from non-vase' (here, necessarily permanent), appears as one/ mixed with 'vase', [which is an 'appearance as opposite from non-vase' that is a specifically characterized phenomenon].
This shows why the conceptual consciousness apprehending 'vase' is a mistaken consciousness, which is mistaken with respect to the 'appearance as opposite from non-vase that is a meaning generality of vase', from the 'appearance as opposite from non-vase that is a specifically characterized vase'.
To this conception, although the 'appearance as opposite from non-vase' [that is a meaning generality] appears as the actual vase, it does not believe in this appearance as the actual vase.

Conceptual consciousness apprehending a vase, **what** it apprehends and **how** it apprehends it:

What it is apprehending/ realizing:	How it is apprehending/ realizing it (the way/ mode of apprehension) :
What does the conceptual consciousness apprehending 'vase' apprehends/ realizes? It apprehends/ realizes 'vase', it does not apprehend/ does not realize 'vase generality'.	How does the conceptual consciousness apprehending 'vase' apprehends/ realizes 'vase'? It apprehends 'vase' <u>by way of</u> the appearing of the appearance as opposite from non-vase to this conceptual consciousness.
This is because, what this 'conceptual consciousness apprehending vase' is getting at/ involved with, is 'vase' itself.	This is because: 1) the 'actual vase' appears as one/ mixed with the 'appearance as opposite from non-vase'. 2) Nevertheless, the 'appearance as opposite from non-vase' appears as if it was the 'actual vase' itself.
Therefore, the object of engagement, object of the mode of apprehension and determined object for a conceptual consciousness apprehending vase is vase itself.	Therefore, the appearing object/ apprehended object of this conceptual consciousness apprehending 'vase' is the meaning generality of vase, the appearance as opposite from non-vase .

How appearance to the direct perceiver can be realized by the conceptual consciousness to not exist in the way it appears:

A conceptual consciousness apprehending 'vase' is a mistaken consciousness, because to it, the 'appearance as opposite from non-vase' appears as 'vase'
Likewise, for an eye consciousness apprehending a ' <u>reflection of your face in the mirror as your actual face</u> ', this ' <u>reflection of your face in the mirror as your actual face</u> ' appears to this eye consciousness as if it was 'your actual face'.
Even though this ' <u>reflection of your face in the mirror as your actual face</u> ' is not 'your actual face', it nevertheless 'appears as your actual face'.
When you place a mirror in front of your face, there is a reflection of your face in the mirror. By depending on the 'appearance of what is reflected on the mirror', you realize/ apprehend your face.
When your eye consciousness sees a reflection of your face in the mirror, what appears to your eye consciousness is the 'reflection of your face in the mirror' [mixed] as if it was your actual face.
Even though this ' <u>reflection of your face in the mirror as your actual face</u> ' appears as your actual face, your [conceptual consciousness] do not normally conceive/ believe/ apprehend that the 'reflection of your face in the mirror' is your actual face.

How the Sevenfold Division of Consciousnesses are generated in dependence on an example: Shadow of a bird

Direct valid cognizer: a new incontrovertible knower that is free from conceptuality.	For an eye consciousness apprehending a shadow, it is valid with respect to its appearing object, shadow. This is because shadow exists in the way it is apprehended, exists in the way it appears. This eye consciousness apprehending shadow realizes/ knows/ notices shadow as it is, and therefore is a direct valid cognizer [with respect to shadow only and not bird's shadow].
Doubting consciousness: a knower which has qualms two-pointedly by its own power.	However, at the same time, while the eye consciousness apprehending shadow is operating/ engaging shadow, it is possible to have a conceptual thought that wonders about the nature of the shadow, whether it is a shadow of a bee or of a bird. In reality, it is a shadow of a bird. Therefore, it is possible to have a doubting consciousness , which is two-pointed, not exactly sure what kind of shadow it is. This shows that at the same moment, there can be these two minds/ consciousnesses, one valid and the other non-valid, operating simultaneously.
Correct assumption/ Correctly assuming consciousness/ Correct belief: a factually concordant determinative knower which is controvertible with regard to determining its object.	After some time from having this doubt, one may think further and reasoned that because it <u>looks like</u> the shadow of a bird, therefore, one concludes that it is definitely the shadow of a bird. Since it has the shape of a bird, therefore, one may conclude in one's heart, albeit with a controvertible reason, that it is a shadow of a bird. This doubting consciousness is therefore transformed into correct assumption . Even though in reality, it is true that it is a shadow of a bird and one's conclusion is also a correct conclusion, nevertheless, this conclusion is a mere assumption as it has not realized incontrovertibly that it is a shadow of a bird. Therefore, it is not a valid cognizer of a shadow of a bird. Therefore, correct assumptions can be made with various incorrect reasons, even though the conclusion is a correct one. It is a decisive conclusion that accords with reality, however, it is a conclusion that is not necessarily reached with a correct reason. For a correct assumption, whatever it apprehends necessarily exists as it is in reality. Therefore, it is a factually concordant determinative knower.
Inferential valid cognizer: a new incontrovertible determinative knower that is directly produced in dependence on a correct sign which is its basis.	It is also possible for this correct assumption to be transformed into a valid cognizer. One may have decisively concluded correctly that it is a shadow of a bird, albeit arriving at this with an invalid reason. Subsequently, one may look up into the sky and see a bird flying above, right below it, one may see the shadow of a bird. Now, based on such a valid reason, one is incontrovertible that it is indeed the shadow of a bird. One's eye consciousness is a direct valid cognizer apprehending bird's shadow, one's conceptual consciousness is an inferential valid cognizer apprehending a bird's shadow.
Wrong consciousness: a knower which engages its object erroneously.	If, for whatever reasons, one were to apprehend this bird's shadow as a leaf's shadow, then the mind apprehending it as a shadow of a leaf would be a wrong consciousness . This is because this mind has as its principal object a leaf's shadow, which makes this consciousness engages in its object erroneously.
Subsequent cognizer: a knower which realizes what has already been realized.	After one has generated a valid cognizer realizing a bird's shadow, the second moment of that valid cognizer and so forth, whenever one remembers that bird's shadow, all these moments are subsequent cognizers , due to these being knowers that realize what has already been realized.
An awareness to which an object appears but is not ascertained:	[If one is concentrating on this shadow and trying to ascertain what kind of shadow it is exactly, the sound of a bird may appear to this person's ear consciousness, but due to the strong concentration while trying to ascertain the shadow, this sound of a bird is not noticed/ realized by this person. This ear consciousness is then an awareness to which an object appears (the sound of a bird) but is not ascertained.]

K: There's a bird's shadow on the ground and this shadow appears to the eye consciousness apprehending it. It is a direct valid cognizer as it is valid with respect to what is appearing, the shadow. However, this eye consciousness is not a valid cognizer with respect to a bird's shadow. This is because, in reality, even though it is a bird's shadow, however, when the eye consciousness apprehends/ realizes/ gets at the shadow, it apprehends only the shadow and not the bird's shadow. If the eye consciousness did apprehend the bird's shadow, then the person would not have doubt and so on. Since there was doubt and so on, this shows that the eye consciousness did not realize the bird's shadow.

KQ: to the eye consciousness apprehending shadow, does bird's shadow appear? Whatever appears to a collective engager, a direct perceiver, is not necessarily ascertained. Everything [about the object] does appear, but not everything that appears is necessarily ascertained.

K: memory is a remembering consciousness, which remembers whatever that has already been realized, therefore, it is a conceptual subsequent cognizer.

Rudimentary explanation of a complex issue of: The sequence of apprehending blue -

Sense direct perceiver apprehending blue:	Eye consciousness apprehending blue is a: 1) direct perceiver 2) sense consciousness 3) valid cognizer. Therefore, this eye consciousness apprehending blue is a sense direct perceiver apprehending blue .
Mental direct perceiver apprehending blue:	After this sense direct perceiver apprehending blue is generated and then ceases, in dependence upon its uncommon empowering condition, a mental sense power, immediately in the next moment, a mental direct perceiver apprehending blue is generated. In this case, its mental sense power is asserted to be the <u>last moment</u> of this sense direct perceiver apprehending blue that immediately precedes the generation of the mental direct perceiver. In the <u>continuum of an ordinary being</u> , this mental direct perceiver lasts only for the shortest of <u>one moment</u> and is asserted to be <u>an awareness to which an object appears but is not ascertained</u> . Even though it apprehends blue, it does not realize blue. This is because this mental direct perceiver apprehending blue in the continuum of an ordinary sentient being lasts for merely a single moment. Since it is so brief, an ordinary sentient being cannot realize it.
Conceptual consciousness apprehending blue:	After the mental direct perceiver apprehending blue is generated, it lasts only for one moment, immediately after it ceases, a conceptual consciousness apprehending blue is generated. Since the mental direct perceiver does not realize blue, it is this conceptual consciousness apprehending blue that induces an ascertainment of blue, that realizes blue. Conceptual consciousness apprehending blue does realize blue, thinking: "This is blue, or this is not blue, and so on". It is based on such thoughts that expressions/ conventions/ terms like 'blue' and so on, can come about. Nevertheless, it realizes blue <u>only</u> by way of a generic image of blue.

An example to ascertain whether any consciousness falls into these sevenfold division or not:

	What appears to this consciousness:	Between a sense and a mental consciousness:	Between a conceptual and non-conceptual:	Between a valid and non-valid consciousness:	What this consciousness is:
Dream consciousness	A consciousness to which a <u>dream elephant</u> [a phenomenon form source] can appear.	It is a mental consciousness.	It is a non-conceptual consciousness	It is a non-valid wrong consciousness. It is a wrong consciousness because it engages its object erroneously. This is because it merely engages in a dream elephant and takes the dream elephant to be the real elephant.	Therefore, it is a non-conceptual wrong mental consciousness.

The difference between a wrong consciousness and a mistaken consciousness: necessarily ascertained on the basis of their individual definitions -

	Wrong consciousness: a knower which engages its object erroneously.	Mistaken consciousness: a knower that is mistaken with regards to its appearing object.
Inferential valid cognizer apprehending vase: a new incontrovertible determinative knower that is directly produced in dependence on a correct sign which is its basis.	It is <u>not</u> a <u>wrong consciousness</u> as it is a new <u>incontrovertible</u> knower. It is incontrovertible/ valid with respect to its main object, vase, because it <u>realizes</u> vase. Therefore, it is not a wrong consciousness because there is no common locus between a valid cognizer and a wrong consciousness [they are mutually exclusive].	Even though it is a valid cognizer, nevertheless, it is a mistaken consciousness. This is because it is mistaken with regards to its appearing object. This is because the appearing object of a thought consciousness is necessarily permanent. The appearing object of a conceptual consciousness apprehending vase is not the actual vase but the meaning generality of vase, which is an imputed factor designated by thought. Since it is imputed by thought, it is necessarily permanent.
		<u>Whatever appears</u> to the conceptual consciousness apprehending vase is <u>not</u> posited to be its appearing object. Rather, the factor which is <u>imputation by thought</u> , that ' <u>appearance as vase/ mental image of vase/ meaning generality of vase</u> ', is posited as the appearing object of the conceptual consciousness apprehending vase.
		The appearing object of the inferential valid cognizer <u>apprehending vase</u> is: the appearance 'appearing as vase' or the appearance as 'vase', which is <u>not</u> the 'actual vase'. E.g., if the appearance 'appearing as gold' or the appearance as 'gold' is the actual gold, then it absurdly follows that there will be no poverty in the world.
		The appearing object to the conceptual consciousness apprehending vase is: the appearance 'appearing as vase', while this appearing object is not the 'actual vase', it 'appears as the actual vase'. The conceptual consciousness apprehending vase is therefore <u>not able to realize its appearing object</u> , <u>not able to realize that this appearance 'appearing as vase' is not a vase</u> . Therefore, this shows that it is mistaken with regards to its appearing object .

How to understand the Sevenfold division of consciousness through their respective definitions:

Firstly, understand, at least at the rudimentary level, how direct perception and thought function, the manner/ way/ mode of engaging their objects are different:	
Conceptual consciousness can only apprehend its object by way of the meaning generality/ generic image of the object	Direct perception does not require the aid of any mental image, rather, it perceives the object as it is, everything about the object appears to the direct perceiver.
On the basis of such a basic understanding, know clearly what kind of consciousness each one is by depending on their respective definitions. Then, compare one with another through that: for example,	
Q1) Is a valid cognizer an awareness to which an object appears but is not ascertained? A: No, because a valid cognizer necessarily realizes/ induces ascertainment of its object as it is incontrovertible, whereas the AAA is unable to do so.	
Q2) Is a wrong consciousness a valid cognizer? A: No, because a valid cognizer never engages its object erroneously/ is never wrong about its object.	
Q3) Is a correctly assuming consciousness a valid cognizer? A: No, a valid cognizer is necessarily incontrovertible whereas a correctly assuming consciousness is necessarily controvertible and there is no common locus among them.	
Q4) Is a doubting consciousness a valid cognizer? A: No, a valid cognizer never vacillates about its object as it realizes its object completely without a doubt or qualm.	
Therefore, this shows that to be able to compare any two types of consciousness, one necessarily needs to know their respective definitions	

In the twelve links of dependent arising, there are the four projected results, these are the links of: 1) Name and form 2) Six sources 3) Contact and 4) Feeling. To understand them well, without the prior study/ understanding of the presentation of Mind, for example, it will be difficult to really comprehend what these four projected results are all about:

The first projected result is the link of Name and form . This refers to the specific five contaminated and appropriated aggregates of form, feeling, discrimination, compositional factors and consciousness, which are projected by karma and the afflictions.	
The link of Six sources refers to the time when the six sense powers are established up to but before the generation of the respective consciousnesses that depend on them. Therefore, to know what the six sense powers are, one necessarily has to study about them.	
The link of Contact refers to the time/ moment when these three conditions gather: 1) Object 2) Sense power 3) Consciousness. *However, if these three conditions are present simultaneously at that moment, how does one posit a cause and effect relationship between them?	
The link of Feeling : it is only after the gathering of these three would there be the link of feeling, which is the result arising from contact, without which, the link of feeling cannot arise.	
Khen Rinpoche's personal thesis about the *qualm is this:	Just like what the link of contact is posited to how it occurs, likewise, for example, for an eye consciousness apprehending vase, the three conditions for the production of a consciousness must gather: 1) Observed object condition – vase 2) Uncommon empowering condition – eye sense power 3) Immediately preceding condition – consciousness.
	When these three conditions gather, in dependence upon these three conditions, an eye consciousness apprehending vase is generated. The eye consciousness apprehending vase occurs only after these three conditions gather.
	In this instance, the three conditions are therefore posited to be the cause that lead to the effect, an eye consciousness apprehending vase. There is therefore a cause-and-effect relationship.
	Therefore, here, vase would have to be posited as a cause of the eye consciousness apprehending vase. This is because this eye consciousness apprehending vase is produced in dependence upon vase.
	With the exception of the Great Exposition School, all the schools above it assert that “cause and effect are sequential”. This means that cause and effect cannot occur simultaneously, cause necessarily precedes effect.
	The Great Exposition School asserts that the eye consciousness apprehending vase functions almost like a hand grabbing the vase. This is because they assert that both the physical sense power and the consciousness do know/ realize their object. This is, however, refuted by the Sutra School and all the schools above them.
	Even though when the eye consciousness apprehends the vase, this consciousness and the vase seem to exist simultaneously, however, in reality, this is not the case as cause necessarily precedes effect. Since that is the case, then the two cannot occur simultaneously.
	Vase is posited to be the cause of the eye consciousness apprehending vase. Eye consciousness apprehending vase is the effect of its observed object condition, vase. Therefore, in dependence on vase as the observed object condition, the eye consciousness apprehending vase is generated into having the aspect of vase.
Causes, when divided, have substantial cause and cooperative conditions. [Vase, here, is the cooperative condition for the eye consciousness apprehending vase]	

How to reconcile the production of eye consciousness apprehending vase, even though there is a cause-and-effect relationship between its production and the object (Khenrinpoche's personal postulation):

Stating the qualm:	Using the above example and relating it to the manner for the link of contact to be generated, the three conditions necessarily precede it: object, sense power and consciousness.
	Likewise, is it possible to posit that this is how an eye consciousness apprehending vase is produced?
	The issue is essentially this: An eye consciousness apprehending vase is produced in dependence on the gathering of its respective three conditions: vase, eye sense power and consciousness. It is only after the gathering of these three would there be a production of an eye consciousness apprehending vase. However, when this eye consciousness apprehending vase is produced, the vase that existed earlier through meeting with the eye sense power and consciousness, would have <u>ceased to exist</u> at this moment, since it is momentary.
	Since that is the case, the qualm is: How to explain then, that the eye consciousness apprehending vase is able to be produced?
Reply to the qualm:	The Sutra School and all the schools above it assert that “ consciousnesses are aspected ”, whereas the Great Exposition School assert that “consciousnesses are non-aspected”. The former assert that between the object and the consciousness apprehending it, there is something that 'interrupts' them. This is asserted to be the “aspect”.
	At the moment when the three conditions gather, the vase, eye sense power and consciousness (this consciousness being the entity of that which is clear and knowing), the latter is generated into the aspect of vase. This consciousness has the aspect of the “apprehended”.
	It is this consciousness, [the immediately preceding condition] being generated into the entity of vase and having the aspect of the “apprehended”, that is transformed/ generated into the entity of the eye consciousness apprehending vase.
	Therefore, it is only then that the eye consciousness is able to apprehend/ realize vase.
	A rudimentary example is given here: mirror is likened to the consciousness, whereas an object placed in front of it is likened to vase. This object is thus reflected in the mirror. Likewise, when an object is brought to the mind's attention, one could say that the object is reflected on the mind. Specifically, the consciousness is generated into the aspect of the object.
	In this manner of asserting eye consciousness apprehending vase, at the moment the three conditions gather, there is the immediately preceding consciousness, which is generated into the aspect of vase. Therefore, even though (one of) the cause for the eye consciousness apprehending vase, the observed object condition, vase, has ceased in the previous moment, the immediately preceding consciousness, being generated into the aspect of vase, is then transformed into the entity of eye consciousness apprehending vase in the next moment.
	This postulation is arrived at using the similar scenario of the generation of the link of contact, which refers to the moment when the object, sense power and consciousness gather. It is only after the generation of this contact that the link of feeling arises. Likewise, it would also be plausible to assert the production of an eye consciousness apprehending vase in a similar manner.

K: The above example of the relationship between the twelve links and the detailed study of buddhist philosophy highlights the importance of further studies. Even though one may already know, for example, something about the twelve links, however, without further detailed understanding of the presentation of mind, one would be unable to have a good grasp of the Lam Rim. One necessarily needs to remember that the Lam Rim is the subject matter that gathers the subject matter of the Five Great Treatises/ Topics, the main philosophical subjects. The Lam Rim is thus the essence of these treatises. Therefore, to know the Lam Rim well, it is important to study the great buddhist philosophies like the topics presented here. Since the Lam Rim is the principal means by which one subdues one's mind and achieve enlightenment, one needs to know it well, to know it well, one necessarily needs to study the great treatises well.

Understanding of each consciousness and the comparison between them is done by way of understanding well their respective definitions: using the example below -

Comparison	Definition	Similar characteristics			Dissimilar characteristics		Conclusion
Direct perceiver	a knower which is free from conceptuality and non-mistaken.	Consciousness	Non-conceptual	Non-mistaken	Not necessarily new	Not necessarily incontrovertible	Not necessarily a direct valid cognizer
Direct valid cognizer	a new incontrovertible knower that is free from conceptuality.	Consciousness	Non-conceptual	Non-mistaken	New	Incontrovertible	Necessarily a direct perceiver

This shows that to understand each consciousness well and be able to compare with other consciousnesses, one necessarily needs to know their respective definitions.

Highlights to distinguish the sub-divisions of direct perceivers and the manner to establish their generation:

	Divisions:	Essential features that bring about its production:	Factors that determines the respective direct perceivers:				Not necessarily direct valid cognizers, because:
			Uncommon empowering condition:	Further sub-divisions:	The uncommon empowering conditions of its sub-division:	The way to eventually determine the sub-division of direct perceivers:	
Direct perceiver	Sense direct perceiver (SDP):	1) Produced in dependence upon its own uncommon empowering condition, a physical sense power 2) Non-conceptual 3) Non-mistaken	Physical sense power	When divided in one way, there are the five sense direct perceivers apprehending <u>visible forms, sounds, odors, tastes and tangible objects</u> . This is because these five SDP have their respective observed object conditions and uncommon empowering conditions of eye, ear, nose, taste and touch sense powers.	They are common in being generated by a physical sense power, but uncommon in being generated by their respective <u>eye, ear, nose, taste and touch sense powers</u> , as well as their respective <u>observed object conditions of visible form, sound, odor, taste and tangible object</u> .	E.g., When this consciousness has: 1) An eye sense power as its uncommon empowering condition 2) Visible form as its observed object condition 3) Is a knower 4) Is non-conceptual 5) Is non-mistaken Then this consciousness is a: <u>SDP apprehending form.</u>	There are SDP that are: 1) Subsequent cognizers 2) Awareness to which an object appears but is not ascertained
	Mental direct perceiver (MDP):	1) Produced in dependence upon its own uncommon empowering condition, a mental sense power 2) Non-conceptual 3) Non-mistaken 4) An <u>other knower</u>	Mental sense power	When divided, there are MDP which are 1) valid cognizers 2) Subsequent cognizers 3) Awareness to which an object appears but is not ascertained. Therefore, there are <u>no</u> MDP that are inferential cognizers, correctly assuming consciousnesses, doubting consciousnesses and wrong consciousnesses.			There are MDP that are: 1) Subsequent cognizers 2) Awareness to which an object appears but is not ascertained
	Self-knowing direct perceiver						
Yogic direct perceiver							

Self-knowing direct perceiver

Essential features that bring about its production:	1) Aspect of an apprehender 2) Non-conceptual 3) Non-mistaken		
The tenets that assert and do not assert self-knower:	The Sutra, Mind Only and Autonomy Middle Way Schools assert self-knowers. Great exposition and Consequent Middle Way Schools do not assert Self-knowers.		
The nature/ entity of a self-knower:	Self-knower is asserted to be that which has the aspect of the apprehender. Essentially, it is an experiencer of consciousness, being one collection with the consciousness it is experiencing. It is neither a main mind nor a mental factor.		
The manner of experiencing its consciousness:	What a self-knower does, is to experience the consciousness, which is the factor of clarity and knowing, that is of one collection with it. Therefore, it is directed inwards and not directed towards something external like form and so on. The manner of experiencing the consciousness that comes along with it is through the subsistence of duality, as if being one with the consciousness.		
Stating the difference between a self-knower and other-knower - an analogy of the illumination of a flame on a butter lamp:	This illumination of a flame is by nature that which is clear, bright and illuminating. This flame is also able to illuminate other objects as well. Likewise, the consciousness is by nature that which is clear and knowing, this is likened to the <u>self-knower</u> , an <u>aspect of the apprehender</u> . An <u>other-knower</u> is also able to highlight/ clarify other objects other than itself, this is related to the <u>aspect of the apprehended</u> . These two factors are established in any single consciousness.		
Stating the assertion of how a memory conception is able to remember both subjective and objective aspects:	Example: For an eye consciousness that apprehended blue, in the future, one is able to remember having seen blue. The reason for being able to remember having seen blue is because, at the earlier moment, there was a valid cognizer that realized blue. At the later time of remembering the object, blue, one also remembers the <u>mind</u> that saw blue. Such a memory conception consists of two factors, remembering 1) the object, blue, and 2) the subject, the consciousness which experienced blue. Such a memory conception is asserted by all schools.		
Stating this as the essential reason/ correct sign for asserting self-knowers, to account for a memory conception:	Since the reason for being able to remember blue is due to a valid cognizer realizing blue at the earlier time, then likewise, the reason for being able to remember the eye consciousness that apprehended blue is due to another valid cognizer/ <u>an experiencer of this eye consciousness that apprehended blue at that same earlier time</u> . Proponents of self-knowers assert that at that same time of an eye consciousness apprehending blue, there must be a self-knower, an experiencer of this consciousness itself. Without such an experiencer/ self-knower of an eye consciousness apprehending blue, at a later time, one would <u>not be able to remember this eye consciousness</u> (that apprehended blue).		
Stating the difference between the aspect of the apprehender and the aspect of the apprehended:	The factor of consciousness which is a <u>mere experience</u> is asserted to be the <u>aspect of the apprehender (self-knower)</u> . The factor of consciousness which illuminates/ <u>experiences other objects</u> other than itself is asserted to be the <u>aspect of the apprehended (other-knower)</u> . The presentation of main minds and mental factors is explained from the perspective of the <u>aspect of the apprehended</u> . This is because a main mind realizes the entity of the object it is apprehending. The mental factors, however, realizes the characteristics of the object. This is essentially the main difference between a main mind and its mental factors. Therefore, through the sense, mental and yogic direct perceivers, mind and mental factors are explained. Self-knowing direct perceivers are merely an experiencer of the entity of consciousness, that which has an aspect of the apprehender. Since the self-knower is asserted to be the aspect of the apprehender, it is therefore neither a main mind nor a mental factor. It is an integral part of consciousness, from the moment consciousness is generated, it has this factor of experiencing itself.		
Self-knowing direct perceiver which are valid cognizers	Self-knowing direct perceiver which are subsequent cognizers	Self-knowing direct perceiver which are awarenesses to which an object appears but is not ascertained	

Illustrations of self-knowing direct perceiver which are awarenesses to which an object appears but is not ascertained:		
1) A self-knowing direct perceiver in the continuum of a Samkhya that experiences bliss as being a consciousness	According to some Indian non-buddhist philosophical traditions like the Samkhyas and Vaisheshikas, they assert that bliss is matter and not consciousness. For the buddhists, bliss is necessarily consciousness.	In the continuum of a Samkhya/ Vaisheshika who experiences bliss, even though bliss is a consciousness in reality and appears, but it is not realized to be a consciousness. There is also an experiencer/ self-knower of such a bliss as well. This self-knower experiences the consciousness of bliss but does not realize this bliss to be a consciousness. It is therefore a self-knower which is an awareness to which an object appears but is not ascertained.
2) A self-knowing direct perceiver in the continuum of a Vaisheshika that experiences bliss as being a consciousness		
3) A self-knower in the continuum of a Nihilist which experiences an inferential valid cognizer as being a direct valid cognizer	The Nihilists assert that there are only direct valid cognizers and no inferential valid cognizers. Nevertheless, in their minds, there are inferential valid cognizers. Since that is the case, there must be a self-knower that experiences each inferential valid cognizer. Therefore, this self-knower that experiences the inferential valid cognizer in the continuum of a Nihilist has to be a self-knower which is an awareness to which an object appears but is not ascertained. This is because the self-knower in the continuum of a Nihilist does not realize the inferential valid cognizer even though it experiences it.	
Q: Can a self-knower which <u>experiences an awareness</u> to which an object appears but is not ascertained be asserted to be a self-knower which is <u>itself an awareness</u> to which an object appears but is not ascertained?		
KR: There can be an ear consciousness to which sound appears but the eye consciousness is fully engrossed in seeing an object. This ear consciousness to which sound clearly appears is an awareness to which an object appears but is not ascertained. There is also a self-knower that experiences this ear consciousness which is an awareness to which an object appears but is not ascertained. However, it is not necessarily that this self-knower itself becomes an awareness to which an object appears but is not ascertained. This is because it is possible for a self-knower experiencing an awareness to which an object appears but is not ascertained to <u>realize it</u> . This is because, it is possible, at a later moment, to remember having experienced this awareness to which an object appears but is not ascertained.		

SQ: The eye consciousness apprehending blue is realizing blue, it is therefore a direct perceiver of blue. However, the same eye consciousness also apprehends the impermanence of blue but does not realize it. Since that's the case, is it also an awareness to which an object appears but is not ascertained with respect to the impermanence of blue?

KR: The eye consciousness apprehending blue is a valid cognizer. Since that's the case, then it cannot be an awareness to which an object appears but is not ascertained. However, it is an awareness to which an object appears but is not ascertained with respect to blue's impermanence. It itself is not an awareness to which an object appears but is not ascertained. This is because whether a consciousness is an awareness to which an object appears but is not ascertained or not, depends entirely on its object of operation/ engagement. Since the object of engagement of an eye consciousness apprehending blue is blue and not blue's impermanence, therefore, it is a valid cognizer and not an awareness to which an object appears but is not ascertained.

SQ: What is the comparison of 'vase generality, the opposite of non-vase' and 'meaning generality of vase, the appearance as opposite from non-vase'?

KR: 'Vase generality/ generality of vase' is different from 'meaning generality of vase'.

'Meaning generality of vase' has to [possess two factors]: 1) 'appearance as opposite from non-vase' and 2) a factor imputed by thought.

'Vase generality' itself is permanent, because it is an imputation by thought. This is because, generalities and instances, by themselves, are mere imputations/ concepts by thought. Even though 'vase generality' itself is permanent, however, whatever is a 'vase generality' is not necessarily permanent. For example, something which is a 'vase generality' but is not permanent is 'opposite from non-vase', 'vase' itself. 'Opposite from non-vase' is a 'vase generality', but it is impermanent. Nevertheless, there is also a 'vase generality' that is permanent, an 'appearance as opposite from non-vase'.

Comparison of direct perceivers between a few tenet systems:

Assertions of a few tenet systems		Direct perceivers (DP)				Conceptual consciousnesses
		Sense DP	Mental DP	Self-knowing DP	Yogic DP	
Sutra School		Necessarily non-mistaken				Necessarily mistaken
Mind Only School	True Aspectarians Mind Only School	Sense DP in the continuum of ordinary beings are necessarily mistaken	[Necessarily non-mistaken]			
	False Aspectarians Mind Only School	Necessarily mistaken		Necessarily non-mistaken		
Consequence Middle Way School		With the exception of the wisdom directly perceiving selflessness, all minds in the continua of sentient beings are necessarily mistaken				

Since there are various assertions of what constitute a mistaken or non-mistaken consciousness by the various schools, therefore, it is important to understand what are mistaken and non-mistaken consciousnesses.

Distinguishing between a self-knower and other-knower:

After a sense direct perceiver apprehending form is generated, a mental direct perceiver apprehending form is produced. This mental direct perceiver apprehending form in the continuum of a sentient being lasts only for the smallest unit of time. After which, there comes a conceptual consciousness that apprehends form.
The conceptual consciousness apprehending form is able to realize/ induce ascertainment with respect to form. This is due to the realization of form earlier by the sense direct perceiver apprehending form.
The mental direct perceiver apprehending form in the continuum of an ordinary being lasts only for the shortest moment of time. Due to this, the mental direct perceiver apprehending form <u>does not</u> realize/ induce ascertainment with regards to form.
There are four characteristics of a mental direct perceiver: 1) Generated in dependence upon a mental sense power which is its own uncommon empowering condition 2) Non-mistaken 3) Non-conceptual 4) An other-knower.
An other-knower realizes object other than itself. It is divided into other-knowers that are: 1) Sense DP 2) Mental DP 3) Yogic DP and 4) All conceptual consciousnesses. Therefore, if it is either any one of these consciousnesses, it is necessarily an other-knower.

Q: Since a sense DP is an other-knower, why is this term not included in its definition?

KR: For conceptual consciousnesses, there is no need to specifically mention it as an other-knower in the definition. The term 'other-knower' is included in the definitions of mental and yogic DP, however, this is not mentioned in the definition of a sense DP.

Related to this issue, consider this example: for a self-knower which experiences an eye consciousness apprehending blue, is it a sense DP? That is, is a self-knower experiencing a sense DP itself a sense DP?

R: No.

K: It follows that it is.

K: It follows that the self-knower experiencing a sense DP is [itself] a sense DP because it is produced in dependence upon its own uncommon empowering condition, a physical sense power.

KQ: Is the uncommon empowering condition of a self-knower experiencing a sense DP, a physical sense power?

K: Since, for example, a self-knower and the eye consciousness it is experiencing are established simultaneously, therefore, the uncommon empowering condition for this self-knower would have to be posited as the physical sense power.

KQ: The self-knower, which experiences an eye consciousness, is a DP, non-mistaken and non-conceptual. Therefore, is it generated in dependence upon the uncommon empowering condition of the eye consciousness, a physical sense power?

K: This is the same for a mental direct perceiver. An 'other-knower' is specifically included in its definition. This is because there is a self-knower experiencing a mental consciousness. This MDP is non-mistaken, non-conceptual, generated in dependence upon its own uncommon condition, a mental sense power, as well being an other-knower. If an 'other-knower' is not included in the definition, then this MDP would have the same definition as the self-knower experiencing mental consciousness. Therefore, this is perhaps the reason an 'other-knower' is included in the definition of a MDP, [to distinguish it from the mental consciousness it is experiencing].

K: However, when the same reasoning is applied to a SDP, then [how does one account for the missing term, 'other-knower', in its definition?]

SQ: Should not the uncommon empowering condition of a self-knower experiencing an eye consciousness apprehending form, be a mental sense power? This is because this self-knower is experiencing a consciousness, not form, therefore, its uncommon empowering condition has to be a mental sense power and not a physical sense power.

KR: Good point.

On the eye consciousness apprehending blue, there are two parts: 1) the part that experiences itself, and 2) the part which experiences something other than itself, blue. These two parts are present/ exist on any one collection of consciousness.

It is like the illumination of a flame, there are two parts existing on the flame: 1) one part is illuminating itself, 2) the other part illuminates something other than itself. The first part is likened to the self-knower, the second part is likened to an other-knower. When this 'other-knower' is expanded, there SDP, MDP and YDP. These two parts are included in one collection. One can say that it is one entity but two isolates.

This is a (concluding) rudimentary explanation of what a self-knower is (from lessons 9 and 10). In the final analysis, according to the Consequent Middle Way School, **self-knowers do not exist**. However, in order to compare the merits of the assertions of these schools, one necessarily needs to know what a self-knower is all about. It is only then that refutations by the higher schools would make sense.

SQ: Does the self-knower experiencing the eye consciousness apprehending blue have the same three conditions that produced the eye consciousness apprehending blue?

KR: Perhaps one can say that the self-knower experiencing the eye consciousness apprehending blue is generated in dependence upon: 1) blue 2) the eye sense power 3) the consciousness that existed immediately prior to the generation of the eye consciousness apprehending blue. However, whether blue is the observed object condition of the self-knower experiencing eye consciousness apprehending blue, needs to be analyzed. The eye consciousness apprehending blue and the self-knower experiencing it come into being, abide and disintegrate simultaneously. Therefore, the causes responsible for the generation of the eye consciousness apprehending blue can be asserted as the same causes for the production of the self-knower experiencing the eye consciousness apprehending blue.

SQ: What would be the problem if the self-knower experiencing the eye consciousness apprehending blue have the same three conditions as the eye consciousness apprehending blue?

KR: Blue is the appearing object of the eye consciousness apprehending blue. However, if one were to assert that blue is also the appearing object of the self-knower experiencing the eye consciousness apprehending blue, what would be the problem? What appears to the self-knower experiencing the eye consciousness apprehending blue, is only the eye consciousness apprehending blue itself, not blue. [If blue does appear to this self-knower, then it would seem that this self-knower is an other-knower]

SQ: What are the differences between apprehended, apprehender, aspect of the apprehended and aspect of the apprehender in an eye consciousness apprehending blue?

KR: The apprehended/ appearing object of the eye consciousness apprehending blue is blue. Therefore, blue is the apprehended object of the eye consciousness apprehending blue. The eye consciousness apprehending blue is the aspect of the apprehended [aspect of blue, the apprehended object], it is a consciousness that is generated in the aspect of blue.

Relationship of the apprehended, apprehender, aspect of the apprehended and aspect of the apprehender in an eye consciousness apprehending blue:

Blue	Eye consciousness apprehending blue (other-knower)	Self-knower experiencing the eye consciousness apprehending blue
Apprehended (by the eye consciousness)	Apprehender of blue , therefore, this eye consciousness takes on the aspect of the apprehended (blue). Therefore, it is: Generated into/ having the aspect of the apprehended.	Apprehender of the eye consciousness apprehending blue , therefore, this self-knower takes on the aspect of the apprehender (of blue, that is, the eye consciousness apprehending blue). Therefore, it is: Generated into/ having the aspect of the apprehender.
In general, apprehended refers to the object and apprehender refers to the subject/ object possessor. However, if it is an established base, it is necessarily an object, therefore, the subject, an apprehender, is an apprehended (object by another consciousness) as well.		
Nevertheless, the subject/ consciousness itself, can be divided into self-knower and other-knower.		

Using an analogy of the harmful effects of smoking to show how one can progress on the path:

Doubt	A smoker may know that smoking is bad for his/ her own health. However, such a thought can be a mere doubt. Therefore, such a doubt thinking whether smoking is really bad for his/ her health obviously does not realize that smoking is bad for his/ her own health. Therefore, he/ she will continue to smoke.
Correct assumption	After hearing about the harmful effects of smoking, the smoker may reach a strong belief that smoking is really bad for his/ her own health. Even though it is still an assumption, it nevertheless accords with the fact. Even though this is a mere thought, it is still better than doubt. When there is correct assumption, the chances of smoking less becomes higher, therefore, there is greater hope [than doubt]. Such a correct assumption has a strong belief on the side of truth, that smoking is bad for his/ her own health. However, he/ she has yet to induce any ascertainment/ realization (that smoking is bad for his/ her own health). Therefore, he/ she continues to smoke and there is still some way to go before any inducement of realization is reached.
Inferential valid cognizer	When he/ she is able to induce ascertainment of a valid cognition that smoking is bad for his/ her own health, this then becomes an (inferential) valid cognizer. Here, the chances of him/ her smoking less will definitely be higher than when he/ she has had a mere correct assumption/ belief.

Summary answers to a series of questions:

- Whatever is sense consciousness is not necessarily non-mistaken. This is because there are many instances that are both sense consciousnesses and being mistaken.
- Mental DP are produced in dependence upon the three conditions, depending on what MDP it is, if it is a MDP apprehending form, then the observed object condition will be form, uncommon empowering condition will be mental sense power, the immediately preceding condition will also be the mental sense power.
- Conceptual consciousness apprehending vase realizes the actual vase, therefore it is a mental consciousness realizing form, even though it is not realizing form directly, nevertheless, it does realize form. Therefore, form can appear to a mental consciousness. Therefore, consciousnesses to which forms appear are not necessarily sense consciousnesses.
- Even though a phenomenon source form is a form that can only appear to a mental consciousness and not to sense consciousnesses, it does not mean other forms cannot appear to a mental consciousness.
- If it is an established base, it is necessarily all three: appearing object, determined object and object of engagement. That is, if there is an existent that is not any one of these three, then the answer is no, an established base is not necessarily all three. However, if there is no existent that is not any one of these three, then the answer must be yes. For example, if it is consciousness, it is necessarily a determined object of a thought apprehending it. [It is an appearing object of a DP apprehending it, it is also an object of engagement of this DP apprehending it]. Therefore, comparing them individually, established base and appearing object, established base and determined object, as well as established base and object of engagement are all mutually inclusive.

SQ: Since there are only three types of self-knowing DP, then how would there be self-knowers experiencing, say, a doubting consciousness?

KR: all consciousnesses necessarily have a self-knower experiencing it. A valid cognizer has a self-knower experiencing it, however, this self-knower is not necessarily a valid cognizer. A wrong consciousness also have a self-knower experiencing it, however, this self-knower experiencing it itself is not a wrong consciousness.

SQ: Does wrong consciousnesses have objects of engagement?

KR: The position of Sera Jhe is that there are no objects of engagement for wrong consciousnesses. Other colleges assert that wrong consciousnesses do have objects of engagement. The definition of wrong consciousnesses in some other texts states that: wrong consciousness is a knower that is mistaken with regards to its object of engagement. Whereas our position defines wrong consciousness as: a knower that engages its object erroneously.

Yogic DP:

Characteristics	<p>1) Uncommon empowering condition: a mediative stabilization that is a union of calm abiding and special insight 2) Non-mistaken 3) Non-conceptual 4) An exalted knower in the continuum of a Superior 5) An other-knower.</p> <p>A self-knower experiencing a YDP is not itself a YDP. This is because it is <u>not an other-knower</u> although it is 1) generated in dependence upon a mediative stabilization that is a union of calm abiding and special insight 2) Non-mistaken 3) Non-conceptual 4) Included in the continuum of a Superior.</p>
	<p>The internal divisions of the other DP, SDP, MDP and self-knowing DP (SKDP), all have DP that are awarenesses to which an object appears but is not ascertained. However, for a YDP, there is no such division, merely YDP that are valid cognizers and YDP that are subsequent cognizers. This is because if it is a YDP, it is necessarily a mind that realizes/ ascertains its object. Therefore, there are no YDP that are awarenesses to which objects appear but are not ascertained. For SDP, MDP and SKDP, there are instances of them being awarenesses to which objects appear but are not ascertained. This is because, whatever is a SDP, MDP or SKDP, is not necessarily a mind that ascertains/ realizes its object.</p>

KQ: In the sub-divisions of SDP, MDP and SKDP, there are three divisions: their respective valid cognizers, subsequent cognizers and awarenesses to which an object appears but is not ascertained. These three consciousnesses themselves form three out of seven in the seven-fold division of consciousnesses.

Why is it that there are no SDP which are doubting consciousnesses, correctly assuming consciousnesses and wrong consciousnesses?

This is because doubting consciousnesses and correctly assuming consciousnesses are necessarily conceptual consciousnesses, whereas wrong consciousnesses are necessarily mistaken consciousnesses. SDP are necessarily non-conceptual and non-mistaken.

KQ: The eye consciousness to which a white snow mountain appears as blue is a mistaken consciousness. However, a SDP is a knower that is non-mistaken and non-conceptual. Since that the case, would a eye consciousness apprehending blue snow mountain be a SDP?

KQ: What is the reason to say that if it is a SDP, it is not necessarily a valid cognizer?

K: When SDP are divided, there are three: SDP which are valid cognizers, SDP which are subsequent cognizers and SDP which are awarenesses to which an object appears but is not ascertained. Therefore, from here, it is very clear that if it is a SDP, it is not necessarily a valid cognizer. An illustration of a SDP that is not a valid cognizer: the second moment of an eye consciousness apprehending blue.

Difference between a SDP and a Sense direct valid cognizer: the definition of a sense direct valid cognizer is built upon the definition of a SDP, the only distinction is that the sense direct valid cognizer has an additional characteristics of being new and incontrovertible.

Facsimile of a direct perceiver/ Mistaken consciousness: a knower that is mistaken with regards to its appearing object

There are various ways to divide a facsimile of a direct perceiver/ mistaken consciousness:			
Facsimile of a direct perceiver/ Mistaken consciousness that is a -		Facsimile of a direct perceiver/ Mistaken consciousness that is a -	
Conceptual consciousness (all conceptual conscientiousnesses are necessarily mistaken consciousnesses/ facsimiles of a direct perceiver)	Non-conceptual consciousness	Sense consciousness	Mental consciousness
To the Sutra School, all mistaken consciousnesses/ facsimile of a direct perceiver is mistaken due to being produced by <u>temporary causes of errors</u> , not permanent errors.			

A process to conclusively determine how a mistaken consciousness is mistaken with regards to its appearing object:

Conceptual mistaken consciousness/ Conceptual facsimile of a direct perceiver	
E.g.: Thought apprehending sound as permanent (wrong consciousness)	E.g.: Inferential cognizer realizing sound as impermanent (valid cognizer)
Even though one is a wrong consciousness and the other is a valid cognizer, they are the same in being mistaken consciousnesses because: they are <u>mistaken</u> with regard to their <u>appearing objects</u> .	
For an inferential cognizer realizing sound to be impermanent, its appearing object would be: 1) appearance as impermanent sound or, 2) appearance as opposite from non-impermanent sound This inferential cognizer is mistaken with regards to its appearing object because: these [either] two appearances, while <u>it</u> (the appearance) is not impermanent sound, <u>appears</u> as the actual impermanent sound. [Since the appearance does not exist in the way it appears], therefore, this cognizer is mistaken.	

How the four causes of errors are used to explain the manner in which a non-conceptual facsimile of a direct perceiver which is a sense consciousness is produced:

Non-conceptual mistaken consciousness/ Non-conceptual facsimile of a direct perceiver has two division: 1) Sense consciousness 2) Mental consciousness			
1) Sense consciousness			
a) Cause of error which exists internally:		b) Cause of error which exists externally:	
1) Cause of error existing internally in the <u>basis</u> (in dependence on an internal condition): e.g., an eye impaired by obscuring disease, which causes the appearance of one moon as two. This is not due to the existence of two moons, but is due to an impaired condition existing in the eye.	2) Cause of error existing internally in the <u>immediately preceding condition</u> (in dependence on an internal condition): e.g., a mind disturbed by hatred. Appearance of the surroundings as unpleasant, due to being upset/ disturbed.	1) Cause of error existing externally in the <u>object</u> (in dependence on an external object): e.g., a quickly whirling firebrand. This appearance of a firebrand as a wheel is not due to an integral cause of error but an external condition.	2) Cause of error existing externally in the <u>abode</u> (in dependence on an external object): e.g., sitting in a car. The appearance of moving trees is again due to external condition.
By understanding how mistaken appearances occur in dependence upon external conditions, one can also understand how mistaken appearances can arise due to internal conditions.			
In this system, the explanation of mistaken consciousnesses is not done from the perspective of there being a long lasting cause of error but mere temporary causes of error. For example, even though an eye consciousness may have a lifetime of internal impaired condition that seems like a permanent condition, nevertheless, this is asserted as a temporary condition.			
This is because, in this system, for something to be a permanent error condition, it must be related to the grasping of a self of person. Therefore, everything that is not related to this would be considered as temporary causes of error.			
A non-conceptual facsimile of a direct perceiver which is a sense consciousness is generated in dependence upon an external or internal condition. Whatever it may be, they are posited as temporary conditions. Therefore, they can be averted, by identifying the cause of error and seeking to avert it.			
On further identification of the final/ ultimate cause of error, one is lead to the presentation of ignorance, which is a grasping of a self of person. Once this is averted/ destroyed, all mistaken conceptions will be removed. Therefore, by depending on such a presentation, the presentation of the Path is also given.			
Non-conceptual wrong consciousness, non-conceptual facsimile of a direct perceiver and consciousness that has a clear appearance of a nonexistent are synonymous.			
An eye consciousness which has an appearance of a whirling firebrand is an illustration of these three. This is because, there is no fire-wheel in reality, but this eye consciousness has a clear appearance of a fire-wheel, a nonexistent. Therefore, it is a consciousness that has a clear appearance of a nonexistent.			
Other examples are: seeing trees moving while sitting in a moving car. Seeing eye floaters as something else falling in front of the eyes. Eye consciousness seeing the ground as red due to strong anger. These are all consciousnesses having a clear appearance of a nonexistent.			

SQ: 1) What is 'facsimile'? 2) Why does one need to learn about this facsimile of a direct perceiver?

KR: 1) Facsimile is likened to 'not the real one'. An eye consciousness that sees a whirling firebrand has a clear appearance of it. Even though this consciousness is non-conceptual, it is generated in dependence upon a physical sense power, therefore, is like a direct perceiver. However, it is mistaken, therefore, it is not an actual direct perceiver.

2) There are many types of mistaken consciousnesses, both sense and mental. This is to learn what these are and what caused them, whether these causes can be averted or not. Through knowing them, one can gradually avert and eventually eliminate them altogether. One then develops correct minds/ valid cognizers.

How to determine whether something exists or not:

An established base, that which is established, verified by a valid cognizer, is mutually inclusive with an existent, that which is observed/ realized by a valid cognizer.
By understanding the definition, one understands that the determinative factor that is able to distinguish between an existent and a nonexistent is whether the object in question is observed/ realized/ comprehended by a valid cognizer/ valid mind or not. If it is, then the object in question is said to exist, otherwise, it is not.
Therefore, for something to exist, it has to be <u>realized, verified, certified</u> by a <u>valid cognizer</u> , and not merely appearing to a valid cognizer.
Therefore, it is not the case that whether something exist, is due to it appearing to a valid cognizer or any minds; and does not exist, due to it not appearing to any minds.
This is because there can be many valid appearances and many invalid appearances that can appear to the mind.
Since, from the very beginning, for a phenomenon to be an existent, it has to be realized/ verified/ certified by a valid cognizer, therefore, valid cognizers exist from the very beginning.
However, how does one define a valid cognizer? How does one know that the valid cognizers themselves exist or not? Just like an existent is verified by a valid cognizer, then what is it that verifies a valid cognizer itself?
In this system, it is asserted to be the self-knower, the verifier of the existence of a valid cognizer.
This self-knower necessarily has to be in the same collection as the valid cognizer it is experiencing, not from a different collection of the valid cognizer it is verifying.
This is because, if the 'verifying' self-knower is from a separate collection from the valid cognizer it is experiencing and verifying, then another self-knower would be needed to verify this valid cognizer that verifies the self-knower verifying the first valid cognizer. One would then incur the fallacy of infinite regression.
Although self-knowers do not exist in reality, nevertheless, those asserting self-knowers maintain that this is one of the essential reasons to assert self-knowers: to verify that valid cognizers [do exist, to in order to verify the existence of phenomenon].

SQ: Since this system asserts that phenomenon is established/ exists from its own side, why does it still need a valid cognizer to verify its existence?

KR: This school does assert external objects. However, whether any phenomenon is an external object or not, is ultimately dependent on a valid cognizer that posits external objects.

SQ: Let's say if there are no valid cognizers, would there still be an existent?

KR: No. Even though, in this system, all phenomena exist by way of its own character, nevertheless, the very existence of all phenomena has to be posited by a valid cognizer.

SQ: If a tree fell in a remote area where no human beings heard it, would the sound of the falling tree exist?

KR: If there are no valid cognizers realizing that sound, then one has to say that although the tree fell and made a sound, there was no sound.

K: Therefore, whether something exist or not, is totally dependent on whether there is a valid cognizer verifying it. If one does not accept such an assertion, then one has to provide another reason to assert how something exist or not.

K: Just because there's no humans around the area where the tree fell, does not mean no other sentient beings have heard it. Valid cognizers are not necessarily only present in the continua of human beings. Therefore, if there is no valid cognizers, how would one be able to say there is sound or no sound?

SQ: How does one reconcile the seeming differences of a single valid base, say some liquid, being posited as three different existents by three different valid cognizers, as pus by a hungry ghost, water by a human and nectar by a god?

KR: One has to say that all three are valid cognizers. From the perspective of the higher tenets, it is easier to understand how it is acceptable for all three to be valid cognizers in their own ways:

- From the perspective of the Mind Only School, all phenomena are in the nature of mind only. Since that is the case, then it is easier to assert these three cognizers being valid. This is because phenomena are established from their own minds, in the nature of their minds. Due to that, one has a particular appearance and so on. However, if one were to assert that not only is there an external object, but also that it exists from its own side, then it would be difficult.
- The Consequent Middle Way School asserts that everything [exists merely] by being imputed by mind. From this, it is evidently clear [how things can exist].
- However, from the perspective of the lower tenets, whether all three cognizers are asserted as valid or not, needs to be analyzed.
- The three different appearances are not asserted to exist merely because there is such an appearance [from its own side]. Therefore, just because something appears as pus, does not necessarily mean it is real pus.
- The reason why the beings in these three different realms have three different experiences is because of their respective karmas that they have accumulated, which cause them to undergo their respective experiences.
- One has to say that, for a human, there is water there, due to being established by his/ her karmic results/ karmic appearances. If it is not, then the entire presentation of cause and effect falls apart. Therefore, this shows that all three are valid (cognizers).

K: It is the same when analyzing the sufferings of the hungry ghosts and hell realms, whether such realms and sufferings exist or not. Such sufferings are asserted to exist due to the karma that has been accumulated for such sufferings. If one does not assert karma, the cause, then how does one posit the existence of such sufferings?

1) Non-conceptual facsimile of a direct perceiver which is a sense consciousness: produced in dependence upon the four causes of internal or external errors. These four causes of error are therefore used to explain how these consciousnesses are produced.

2) Non-conceptual mistaken consciousness/ Non-conceptual facsimile of a direct perceiver which is a mental consciousness: an illustration would be a mental consciousness to which a dream elephant appears as an elephant.

Four examples [of mistaken mental consciousnesses] that relate to the four attributes of the Truth of Suffering, the first of the Four Noble Truths:

1) One's contaminated appropriated physical and mental aggregates, particularly, one's contaminated physical body, is by nature dirty/ filthy. However, one instinctively apprehends it to be clean and nice. Such kind of apprehension is a mistaken mind and a wrong consciousness. This is because, in this world, it is conventionally designated/ accepted that the body is considered as clean once it is washed. Due to such conventional designation, one apprehends the body as 'clean' after a bath. One therefore instinctively believe strongly that one's body is clean and not otherwise. Such a mind is a mistaken mind. If one concludes that this mind is a perverse mind/ wrong consciousness, then what is its cause?

2) Likewise, it is conventionally designated/ accepted that, in this world, if one were able to acquire all of one's desires, all attractive, desirable objects, one would regard this as having achieved perfect, real happiness and becomes elated. Such an elated mind is essentially a mistaken and a wrong consciousness.

3) When one saw someone the day before, and seeing the same person the day after, one would conventionally regard/ believe this to be the exact same person with the same color and shape. One would never regard/ feel that it is not the same person. Such a mind is mistaken and a wrong consciousness.

4) When one accepts reincarnation, one believes that a person moves from life to life, coming from the previous life to this, and moving from this to the next. One would regard/ believe there is essentially just this one same person, not a different person. It is therefore possible to believe this to be a permanent, unchanging person. This is because, if it were different, then the person who created the cause and the person who experienced the results would be different. Such a mind is mistaken and a wrong consciousness.

Understanding how the definitions of the seven-fold division of consciousnesses is totally related to achieving the path:

Just as the non-conceptual facsimile of a direct perceiver which is a sense consciousness is produced in dependence upon the four causes of errors, likewise, the four examples shown above can be related to the four attributes of the first Noble Truth, True suffering:

a) Impermanent b) Suffering c) Empty and d) Selfless. These attributes definitely exist.

Conceptions holding on to the opposites to these four [are as shown in the four examples above].

Therefore, on one hand, there are mistaken conceptions, and on the other, there are conceptions realizing reality as it is.

This shows that everything depends on practice. Therefore, it is very important to understand the differences between a valid and a mistaken mind, a valid cognizer and a wrong consciousness.

This is because, it is through giving in to **wrong consciousnesses**, believing in them [as real], that one is let into problems and sufferings, all that one does not wish for.

It is only by following a **valid mind**, that one gets the results of happiness. Therefore, this shows that it is extremely important to distinguish between the two, a valid mind and a wrong consciousness.

A **subsequent cognizer** is a knower that realizes that which has been realized. Just as above, it is not the main point merely to know that it is a second moment of an eye consciousness apprehending vase; or that these are not valid cognizers and so on.

The main point of knowing what a subsequent cognizer is, is to know that one has to repeatedly familiarize what one has already realized. Therefore, it is about repeated familiarization of one's mind with what one has realized.

Such a familiarization has to be repeated continuously until it is transformed into a mind having a very clear appearance of the object it has realized; or in some cases, transforming this mind into the entity of a direct perception.

Therefore, the point is not merely about knowing the definition of a subsequent cognizer, that it is realizing what has already been realized, but rather, to apply what one understands into the path, which is a continuous familiarizing of what one has realized until one develops very clear appearance of the object or in some cases until the mind transforms into the entity of direct perception. This is what one needs to get at, from the definition of a subsequent cognizer.

A **correctly assuming consciousness** is a factually concordant determinative knower which is controvertible with regards to determining its object. It is never sufficient merely to have such a correct assumption/ belief.

This is because, whatever imprint that is planted in the mind with mere correct belief, although factually concordant, is nevertheless not enough until one has removed every superimpositions/ misconceptions with regard to the object. Until one has removed all doubts and ascertained the object completely through such a process, whatever imprints [accumulated] will not be stable, one will not have realized what needs to be realized. Therefore, one necessarily needs to work towards a valid cognition of the object.

Therefore, this has everything to do with practice, the point being that to place strong and stable imprints from one's practice in one's mind, one necessarily needs to remove any superimpositions or doubts in one's mind regarding the object. Once this is achieved, the imprints left in one's continuum will be very stable and decisive.

Once one has gained full ascertainment with regards to one's practice, whatever it may be, one will naturally have joyous perseverance with one's practice.

A **doubting consciousness** is a knower which has qualms two-pointedly by its own power. When one attempts to practice with such a mindset, nothing will come out of it. In the first place, one does not even get started when one still has doubts, as this is a huge obstacle to entering the path.

Doubting consciousnesses can be divided into those that are beneficial and not beneficial ones. The doubt that is not beneficial is the one being examined here.

1) Doubt itself is an obstacle that prevents one from even starting any practice or entering the path.
2) Even with something better, a correct belief , one has strong belief but is unsure or do not know exactly the reasons for such beliefs. The vast majority of people are at this level of practice, with mere belief. Since it is not of any good quality, this is why the practice does not lead to any experiences or realizations. This is where people are prevented from progressing along the path. With mere belief, one has no ascertainment as one has yet to remove any superimpositions or doubts. Therefore, even though it is better than having doubts, correct assumption alone is never enough. One necessarily needs to transform one's mind into a valid cognizer.
3) Even with such a transformation into an [inferential] valid cognizer , this again is still not enough. One necessarily needs to transform it into a direct valid cognizer.
4) A direct valid cognizer is able to directly perceive whatever objects being analyzed. This means one has complete realization of the object. With such a valid cognition, whatever practice one is doing becomes easy and of superior quality.

Lessons 13 and 14

2 August and 31 July 2012

Clarifying doubts relating to objects of engagement and wrong consciousnesses:

An object of engagement primarily refers to the principal object that is engaged in/ realized by a valid cognizer.
This being the case, therefore, a wrong consciousness is the exact opposite of a valid cognizer.
This is because, a valid cognizer gets at its principal object/ object of engagement, whereas it is the complete opposite for a wrong consciousness as it does not get at the principal object.
Therefore, objects of engagement are not posited for wrong consciousnesses.
Nevertheless, it does not mean that all consciousnesses that have an object of engagement are necessarily valid cognizers.
This is the position of Sera Jhe college, which defines a wrong consciousness as a knower which engages its object erroneously. Whereas other colleges define wrong consciousness as a knower that is mistaken with regards to its object of engagement.

Further explanations on Generalities and Instances:

Generality: it pervades/ encompasses its type (own manifestations) of phenomenon	The relationship between generality and instance: 1) The two are related by causality or or 2) The two are related as being one nature/ entity	Instance: phenomenon pervaded by its generality
Illustration: Object of knowledge, which pervades horse		Illustration: Horse is an instance of object of knowledge
However, horse itself can also be a generality, as there can be instances of horse that are white horse, black horse etc.		The three necessary criteria of something being an instance of a generality:
<i>Note: Generality and meaning generality are different.</i>		1) Horse has to be an (instance of an) object of knowledge (an instance of its generality)
		2) Horse has to be one nature/ entity with object of knowledge (one nature with its generality)
	3) Able to posit another phenomenon which is non-horse but is an object of knowledge (another type of instance belonging to the same generality)	

Valid cognizers:

Valid cognizers can be divided into: 1) Direct valid cognizers and 2) Inferential valid cognizers		
One of the division of direct perceiver is a sense direct perceiver, which is generated in dependence upon three conditions: 1) Uncommon empowering condition, a physical sense power 2) Immediately preceding condition 3) Observed object condition.		
In the same way a sense direct perceiver is produced, in dependence upon these three conditions, a sense direct valid cognizer is also produced.		
Inferential valid cognizer: a new incontrovertible determinative knower that is directly produced in dependence on a correct sign which is its basis.		
1) Inferential valid cognizer by the power of fact: e.g., an inferential valid cognizer which realizes that sound is impermanent through the sign of being a product.	2) Inferential valid cognizer through renown: e.g., an inferential valid cognizer which realizes that it is suitable to express the rabbit possessor by the term moon from the sign of its existing among objects of thought.	3) Inferential valid cognizer through belief: e.g., an inferential valid cognizer which realizes that the scripture, “from giving, resources, from ethics, a happy migration,” is incontrovertible with respect to the meaning indicated by it by the sign of its being a scripture free from the three contradictions.
Since an inferential valid cognizer is generated in dependence upon a correct sign which is its basis [of being generated], therefore, it is very important to understand what a correct sign is.		

The criteria for being a correct sign:

Structure of a syllogism:	1) (The) Subject	2) (Is the) Predicate (to be proven)	3) (In dependence upon the correct) Sign/ Reason/ Proof	
The need for a correct sign:	Since the sign being used to prove a thesis can be correct or mistaken, therefore, it is important to identify what constitute a correct sign. This is because, it is in dependence upon a correct sign that an inferential valid cognizer is generated.			
Main sample syllogism:	The subject, sound	Is an impermanent phenomenon	Because of being a product	
	Here, product is the sign to prove that sound is an impermanent phenomenon. [This will be the main syllogism for all analysis below]			
Manner of stating a syllogism:	When one asserts a syllogism, one can state/ prove that the subject has either of these:			
	1) IS existentially being/ Does exists in being something/ that property/ that characteristic [of the predicate]		1) Is NOT existentially being/ Does not exist in being something/ that property/ that characteristic [of the predicate]	
	2) HAS something/ some property/ some characteristics [of the predicate].		2) Does NOT have something/ some property/ some characteristics [of the predicate].	
	Example of <u>existentially being</u> :	There <u>is</u> fire in the mountain pass because there is smoke. Here, one is attempting to establish there <u>is something</u> there, fire existing there in the mountain pass, by the sign: smoke.	There are elephants in the thick forest, because of the trumpeting of elephants. [Here, one is attempting to establish <u>there are</u> elephants in the thick forest, by the sign: the trumpeting of elephants.]	
	Example of <u>not existentially being</u> :	One who sees a cow with horns but does not know that it is a cow, then wonders: “Is that a horse?” One then advices him/ her: “That <u>is not</u> a horse, because it has horns”. [As horses do not have horns]		

Definition of a Correct Sign : That which is the three modes -		1) Property of the Subject	2) Forward pervasion	3) Counter pervasion	
1) [The sign being the] Property of the Subject	a) Sign necessarily existing on the subject/ subject IS the sign	If the thesis is to prove that the subject <u>is</u> something – then the subject <u>must be/ is</u> the sign [sign necessarily pervades the entirety of the subject]. Subject: Sound, Sign: Product. Since sound is product, therefore, the sign fulfills the criteria of being a property of the subject.			
		If the subject <u>is not</u> the sign, then property of the subject does not exist, if that is the case, then it does not fulfill the criteria of a correct sign. E.g., The subject, sound, is an impermanent phenomenon, because it is an object apprehended by the eye consciousness. This is not a correct sign as sound (subject) <u>is not</u> an object apprehended by an eye consciousness (sign), thus property of subject is not established.			
	b) Faultless subject (whether the subject being ascertained, an object to be realized, is faultless)	i) Someone has ascertained/ realized through valid cognition, that sound is a product (realized subject is the sign, as above).			
		ii) This person, however, has yet to realize that sound is impermanent (yet to realize the thesis).			
		iii) One is then attempting to prove/ induce ascertainment to this person that sound is impermanent (subject is the predicate), and this person has the wish to know whether this is the case. Therefore, for such a person, sound becomes a faultless subject.			
	Example of not being a faultless subject: The subject, sound, is an impermanent phenomenon, because it is impermanent. If one has already realized that the subject (sound) is the sign (impermanent phenomenon), then one would have no more doubts as to whether sound is impermanent or not. The property of subject is thus not established, as it is not a faultless subject which is an object that one wishes to realize.				
c) Subject and sign must be different	Sound and product are different. Here, since all three [sub-criteria] are fulfilled, the property of the subject is satisfied.				
	If the same example as above is re-stated: the subject, sound, is an impermanent phenomenon because of being sound. This would also not be a faultless subject and a correct sign as it is not the three modes. This is because, since someone has already realized that sound is impermanent [sign being the same with the subject], then how could this person still have doubt about sound being an impermanent phenomenon? Therefore, the property of the subject is not established as b) and c) are not fulfilled.				
2) Forward pervasion [of the sign]	If the sign <u>IS</u> the predicate to be proven, then [this sign] <u>IS</u> the forward pervasion. This means, the <u>sign must exist exclusively</u> and be concordant <u>in its similar category</u> with the <u>predicate</u> . In the main syllogism, the forward pervasion [of the sign] is established. This is because, whatever is a product (sign), <u>IS</u> necessarily impermanent (the predicate), that is, the sign, product, exists exclusively and is concordant with its similar category, impermanent phenomenon.				
	To analyze whether the property of the subject is established or not through a sample syllogism:	The subject, a sense consciousness to which one moon appears as two moons	IS a <u>direct perceiver</u> (predicate)	Because of being a <u>sense consciousness</u> (sign)	
		Here, the property of the subject (a) is established. This is because the sense consciousness to which one moon appears as two (subject), is a sense consciousness (sign), as the sign exists in the subject. c) Subject and sign are different. b) The subject, the sense consciousness to which one moon appears as two, is a faultless subject. This is because, there can be a person who has realized that, the sense consciousness to which one moon appears as two, is a sense consciousness but is unsure whether it is a direct perceiver or not. Therefore, for these reasons, the property of the subject in this syllogism is established.			
To analyze whether the forward pervasion is established or not:	Although the property of the subject is established, this does not necessarily mean that it is a correct sign. A forward pervasion has to be established also. In this example, it is not. This is because, whatever is a sense consciousness, is not necessarily a direct perceiver, as the sign has to exist on the predicate. [A sense consciousness is not necessarily a direct perceiver as there can be a wrong consciousness that is a sense consciousness but it is not a direct perceiver as it engages its object erroneously.]				

3) Counter pervasion [of the sign]	In the main syllogism, the predicate is an impermanent phenomenon. The dissimilar category that is opposite to this predicate, impermanent phenomenon, is non-impermanent.
	The sign is product, the dissimilar category that is opposite to this sign, product, is non-product. If it is non-impermanent, it is also non-product. Therefore, the counter-pervasion is this: if the <u>opposite of the sign</u> IS the <u>opposite of the predicate</u> , then the counter-pervasion is established. Put another way, the sign must not exist in the dissimilar category. Product, the sign, must not exist in its dissimilar category, non-impermanent, that is, <u>no common locus between sign and dissimilar category of the predicate</u> . Therefore, in the main syllogism, the counter-pervasion is established.
	If the main syllogism is re-stated: The subject, sound, is permanent, because of being a product, the sign would then be contradictory. This is because, whatever is a product is necessarily impermanent. [Here, the <u>sign exists</u> (product) <u>exclusively in the dissimilar category of the predicate</u> (impermanent). Hence, the counter pervasion of this syllogism is not established.]

Summary of the analysis of a correct sign:

An inferential cognizer is a knower that is generated in dependence upon its basis: a correct sign. However, the reasons put forth to prove a thesis are not necessarily correct as there can be incorrect reasons. Therefore, one has to ascertain what a correct sign is, as shown above.	
For a reason to be a correct sign for someone, using the main syllogism, that person necessarily needs to have already:	
The three components of the syllogism -	1) Realized sound (the subject) 2) known what is impermanent phenomenon (the predicate) and 3) known what is product (the sign).
The three modes -	1) Known that the subject, sound, is a product (the sign) 2) Realized that product (the sign), is necessarily impermanent (the predicate) and 3) Realized that, if it is a non-product (opposite of the sign), it is necessarily non-impermanent (opposite of the predicate).
What is the only doubt left in the syllogism -	Whether sound (the subject), is impermanent (the predicate) or not.
For this person, who is unsure/ have not realized whether sound is impermanent or not, nevertheless, have satisfied all the criteria of a correct sign. For such a person, when one states a correct sign in the syllogism, all the necessary conditions for this person to realize that sound is impermanent are there. With all the necessary conditions present, when a correct sign is stated, this person will realize the thesis, sound is an impermanent phenomenon immediately. One can then state that this person has developed an inferential valid cognizer (with respect to the thesis).	

Other examples of correct and incorrect signs:

Indefinite sign:	The subject, sound	Is impermanent	Because of being an existent
	Here, the sign, existent, is an indefinite reason. This is because, whatever is an existent, is not definitely established as being impermanent, as there can be an existent that is permanent. Hence, a correct sign is not established here.		
Correct sign:	The subject, the sense consciousness to which one moon appears as two	Is a wrong consciousness	Because it is a knower that engages its object erroneously
	Here, one is attempting to establish that (the subject), a sense consciousness to which one moon appears as two, is a wrong consciousness (the predicate to be proven) , through (the sign) that it is a knower that engages in its object erroneously. The correct sign is established.		

Indefinite sign:	The subject, the sense consciousness to which one moon appears as two	Is a direct perceiver	Because it is a sense consciousness
	Here, even though the subject is the sign (sense consciousness), the sign is indefinite (not a definite sign). This is because, whatever is a sense consciousness is not necessarily a direct perceiver.		
Incorrect sign:	The subject, the sense consciousness to which one moon appears as two	Is a direct valid cognizer	Because it is a wrong consciousness
	Here, the sign is incorrect. This is because, it is impossible that a wrong consciousness can be a valid cognizer.		

The importance of correct sign:

When one becomes familiar with the concepts of establishing correct signs, then one can apply such tools to one's own mind (apply the Lam Rim meditation), to see whether one is impermanent and a product and so on. One then uses the tools of establishing correct signs to gain ascertainment with respect to the Lam Rim meditations.	
For example, the subject of death and impermanence:	The subject, I, am definitely going to die, because there is nothing that can stop death.
	The subject, I, am definitely going to die, because my lifespan is constantly depleting and cannot be increased.
	The subject, I, am not certain when I will die, because the time of my death is uncertain. This is because the lifespan of the beings in this world is not certain.
When ascertaining the existence of past and future lives, this is not something that can be directly perceived by most beings. Therefore, the only way to generate an initial realization is through generating an inferential cognizer on this subject. Since that is the case, one necessarily needs to posit a correct sign to establish that reincarnation definitely exists.	
The subject, the mind of an infant at the moment of conception, was preceded by a mind of a similar type, because it is mind. As mentioned in the treatises, this is posited to be a correct sign as this is how one establishes past lives.	
The subject, an ordinary person's mind at the last moment time of death, is a substantial cause consciousness which will produce an effect consciousness in the immediate future, because it is a continuum of an awareness which has attachment as its accompanier.	
Roughly stated: The subject, the mind at the time of death, will continue on, because it is mind. (To state it with precise language as above is to eliminate qualms)	

Divisions of Inferential valid cognizer:

Inferential cognizer by the power of the fact:	'Power of the fact' refers essentially to the way it exists in reality. One is mainly stating a factuality as a reason, therefore, it is called by the power of the fact. (The correct sign which has been taught so far is this power of fact).
Inferential cognizer through renown:	E.g., an inferential cognizer which realizes the subject, earth's satellite, is suitable to be expressed by the term 'moon', because it exists among objects of thought.
Inferential cognizer through belief:	E.g., an inferential cognizer which realizes the subject, 'from giving, [comes] resources, from ethics, [comes] a happy migration,' because it is a scripture that is free from the three contradictions.

Limits of pervasion of the sign:

Limits of Sign = Limits of predicate	Correct sign	For a sign that is stated in a syllogism, even though the extent of the pervasion [of the sign] may be the same [as the predicate], nevertheless, it is not necessarily so.
Limits of Sign < Limits of Predicate	Correct sign	This is because, if the sign being posited has a lesser extent/ limits of pervasion than the predicate, it is also acceptable as a correct sign.
		E.g., The subject, sound, is impermanent, because of being an instance of product. [Sign, instance of product, is lesser in extent than impermanent, the predicate.]
Limits of Sign > Limits of Predicate	Incorrect sign, as forward pervasion is not established	However, if the limits/ extent of pervasion of the sign is greater than the predicate, then it will not be a correct sign [as it will be an indefinite sign]. Hence, the forward pervasion would not be established.
		E.g., The subject, the sound of a conch, is impermanent, because it arises through human effort. [This is an indefinite sign], because, whatever is the result of human effort is necessarily impermanent, but whatever is impermanent is not necessarily a result of human effort.

Non-valid consciousnesses: among the seven-fold division of consciousness, the following five are non-valid awarenesses -

Subsequent cognizer	Correctly assuming consciousness	Awareness to which an object appears but is not ascertained	Doubting consciousness	Wrong consciousness
---------------------	----------------------------------	---	------------------------	---------------------

Subsequent cognizer

A knower which realizes what has already been realized (by a valid cognizer)	
The essential point about understanding a subsequent cognizer, is not merely knowing that it is a knower that realizes what has already been realized, but to understand the significance that, whatever a subsequent cognizer is realizing, it is <u>induced/ brought about through the force of an earlier realization of an object by a valid cognizer.</u>	
1) Directly perceiving subsequent cognizer that is a:	a) Sense direct perceiver – e.g., the second moment of a sense direct perceiver apprehending blue.
	b) Mental direct perceiver – e.g., the second moment of a clairvoyance knowing another's mind.
	c) Self-knowing direct perceiver – e.g., the second moment of a self-knowing direct perceiver experiencing an eye consciousness.
	d) Yogic direct perceiver – e.g., the second moment of an uninterrupted path of a path of seeing.
	e) None of the above four – e.g., the second moment of a direct perceiver
	This is an appropriate division, as whatever is a directly perceiving subsequent cognizer is not necessarily one of the above four.
	This is because, the <u>second moment of a direct perceiver is neither any of the following</u> : a directly perceiving subsequent cognizer that is a, a) sense direct perceiver b) mental direct perceiver c) self-knowing direct perceiver d) yogic direct perceiver.

		[This is because, if the second moment of a direct perceiver is: a) directly perceiving subsequent cognizer that is a sense direct perceiver, then it follows that the second moment of a direct perceiver is also b) directly perceiving subsequent cognizer that is a mental direct perceiver and also c) and d).]
		[If that is the case, then this would incur two fallacies: 1) There is a common locus between a) and b), and 2) the second moment of a direct perceiver is all four a) b) c) d).]
		Since this is the case, then it is a directly perceiving subsequent cognizer that is none of any of the four a) b) c) d).
2) Conceptual subsequent cognizer	a) Conceptual subsequent cognizer that is induced by a direct perceiver.	
	E.g., a factually concordant ascertaining consciousness ascertaining blue that is induced by a sense direct perceiver apprehending blue. Firstly, a sense direct valid cognizer ascertains blue, subsequently, a remembering consciousness is then able apprehend/ think of blue.	
	b) Conceptual subsequent cognizer that is induced by an inferential cognizer.	
	E.g., the second moment of an inferential cognizer realizing sound to be impermanent. By depending on a sign, product, an inferential valid cognizer realizing sound to be impermanent is generated in the first moment. Subsequently in the second moment, a conceptual subsequent cognizer that is induced by this inferential cognizer is produced.	
	c) Conceptual subsequent cognizer that is neither of the above two. E.g., a conceptual subsequent cognizer that is induced by a subsequent cognizer.	
3) Subsequent cognizer that is neither of the above two	E.g., a subsequent cognizer.	

Reasons to show why a self-knower does not exist in reality:

The factor that enables a remembering consciousness to think of blue, for example, is due to having realized blue in the past by a valid cognizer.
Therefore, the valid cognizer that realized blue is the condition that induces the remembering consciousness thinking 'blue'.
In general, to remember something, there must have been a valid cognizer that realized it earlier.
However, without an initial realization of an object by a valid cognizer, is it still possible to remember that object later that was not realized by a valid cognizer earlier?
For those systems that propounds self-knowers, from the Sutra School up to the Autonomy Middle Way School, the main reason for asserting self-knowers is to account for memory conception, in particular, the memory of the experience/ consciousness that apprehended the object and not about remembering the object itself.
Therefore, for them, if there is no realization of an object earlier, it is not possible to have a remembering consciousness of that object later.
Likewise, the reason that there can be a <u>memory of an eye consciousness</u> apprehending blue at an earlier time is due to a <u>self-knower</u> (valid cognizer) <u>experiencing that eye consciousness</u> apprehending blue at that time.

Therefore, for example, it is possible to remember the appearance of two moons at a later time if one has had an experience of seeing two moons earlier.
Likewise, one can remember one's dream. For example, one can remember at a later time of having dreamt of an elephant earlier.
Even though a dream consciousness is not a valid cognizer, nevertheless, at a later time, it is possible to remember one's dreams.
Therefore, this shows that, for a remembering consciousness to arise, it is not necessarily preceded by a valid cognizer.
If that is the case, then it follows that [the notion that self-knowers are needed to remember a consciousness apprehending an object] is not necessary.
Therefore, even though many tenet systems assert self-knowers, these are not reality. This is because, their reasons for positing self-knowers are flawed.
In general, one would not be able to remember something one did not realize in the past. E.g., it is not possible to remember blue for someone who has never experienced/ realized blue before.
This shows that it is very difficult to posit a memory consciousness without having realized the object earlier.
According to the Consequent Middle Way School, if it is a dualistic mind, it is necessarily valid with respect to whatever appears to it. However, this does not necessarily mean that it is a valid cognizer, it is merely valid with respect to whatever appears to it.
Therefore, even though a dream consciousness (apprehending a dream elephant) is a wrong consciousness [therefore non-valid cognizer], nevertheless, this consciousness is valid with respect to the appearance of a dream elephant. Therefore, the dream consciousness does realize the dream elephant. [This shows that, if it is a consciousness that is valid, it is not necessarily a valid cognizer.]
Therefore, according to the Consequent Middle Way School, this shows that, it is possible to remember at a later time the appearance of dream elephant that was experienced earlier [without the need for a self-knower to experience that dream consciousness].
Therefore, whether the Autonomy Middle Way School, Mind Only School and the Sutra School assert the same needs to be analyzed.

Correctly assuming consciousness is generated in dependence upon a reason or without any reasons. Five divisions: Correctly assuming consciousness -

1) Which do not have a reason:	E.g., in dependence on someone saying to one: "Sound is impermanent", but does not provide any reasons. One hears that and believes that it is so without any reasons.
2) Which have a contradictory reason:	E.g., one thinks that 'sound is impermanent, because it is unable to perform a function'. The reason is contradictory, because whatever is empty of being able to perform a function is necessarily permanent and not impermanent.
3) For which the reason is indefinite:	E.g., one concludes that 'sound is impermanent, because it is an object of comprehension'. The reason is indefinite, because whatever is an object of comprehension is not necessarily impermanent.
4) For which the reason is not established:	E.g., one concludes that 'sound is impermanent, because it is an object of apprehension of an eye consciousness'. The reason is not established, because the sign is not established on the subject/ subject is not the sign.
5) For which a reason exist but not settled:	E.g., although in general, 'product' is a correct sign (reason exists) in the proof that 'sound is an impermanent phenomenon, however, for it to be a correct sign for someone, that person necessarily has to establish/ realize the three modes [see page 36]. It is only after someone has established the three modes would an inferential valid cognizer be generated. If that person has not realized the three modes of this correct sign, then it is still not a correct sign for him/ her. Therefore, the reason exists but is not settled by this person.

How ordinary beings cannot directly realize subtle impermanence or the coarse or subtle selflessness of persons, while yogic direct perceivers can do so:

SQ: According to the Sutra School, can an ordinary being directly realize impermanence?

KR: No. According to them, the mind that directly realizes impermanence would be a yogic direct perceiver, which exists only in the continuum of a Superior [therefore, not in an ordinary being].

SQ: Since that is the case, then, in the main syllogism, can an ordinary person directly realize that product is an impermanent phenomenon?

KR: In the context of realizing impermanence, it is referring to subtle impermanence.

The characteristics of a yogic direct perceiver is: in dependence upon its uncommon empowering condition, a meditative stabilization that is a union of calm abiding and special insight and is an other-knowing exalted knower in the continuum of a Superior which is free from conceptuality and non-mistaken, newly and **directly realizes** either **subtle impermanence or the coarse or subtle selflessness of persons**. Since that is the case, an ordinary being cannot realize subtle impermanence directly. Also, a mental direct perceiver in the continuum of an ordinary being is an awareness to which an object appears but is not ascertained. This is because it exist for the shortest moment of a time unit. Also, if this direct perceiver realizes its object, then it fallaciously follows that ordinary beings can realize subtle impermanence, which fallaciously follows that ordinary beings are Superiors.

How a yogic direct perceiver **directly realizes impermanent phenomena explicitly** and also **directly realizes permanent phenomena implicitly**:

SQ: Functioning thing/ manifest phenomena is explicitly realized by a direct perceiver. Since that is the case, a permanent phenomenon cannot be explicitly realized by a direct perceiver. Since that is the case, how does a yogic direct perceiver realizes selflessness of persons, a permanent phenomenon, without realizing it explicitly?

KR: For this system, a yogic direct perceiver realizes the selflessness of persons through depending on [explicitly] realizing the base of selflessness of persons, which is a composed phenomenon, e.g., the aggregates, to be devoid of a self of persons. In dependence on such an explicit realization, the yogi implicitly realizes the selflessness of persons [uncomposed].

KQ: Whatever is a functioning thing is necessarily an appearing object of a direct perceiver. Based on this understanding, then is the 'selflessness of person' (which is permanent), an appearing object of a direct perceiver? Does the 'selflessness of person' appear to a yogic direct perceiver? R: No.

K: Since 'selflessness of person' does not appear to a yogic direct perceiver apprehending 'selflessness of person', therefore, **the 'selflessness of person' is not directly realized by a yogic direct perceiver, nevertheless, the yogic direct perceiver does directly realize 'selflessness of person'**.

Qualm: It follows that 'selflessness of person' is the appearing object of a direct perceiver. This is because 'selflessness of person' is realized directly by a yogic direct perceiver.

Reply: 'Selflessness of person' is **not** the appearing object of a direct perceiver. This is because there is not any 'selflessness of person' that is directly realized by a direct perceiver.

SQ: Is the appearing object of a wrong consciousness not necessarily an existent?

KR: Perhaps. A non-conceptual facsimile of a direct perceiver which are sense consciousnesses/ non-conceptual wrong consciousness, has a clear appearance of a non-existence. So, since that is the case, then the appearing object of a wrong consciousness apprehending one moon as two moons could be two moons or appearance of two moons.

KQ: However, to the consciousness where one moon appear as two moons, does one moon appear? R: yes.

K: Since that is the case, then would 'one moon' be the appearing object?

SQ: Can there be a valid cognizer which is a mental direct perceiver in the continuum of an ordinary being?

KR: Not all mental direct perceivers in the continua of ordinary beings are awarenesses to which objects appear but are not ascertained.

For example, the mental direct perceiver in the continuum of an ordinary being apprehending form is an awareness to which object appears but is not ascertained.

However, there can be a valid cognizer which is a mental direct perceiver in the continuum of an ordinary being, e.g., the first moment of clairvoyance in the mind of an ordinary being that knows another person's mind.

An awareness to which an object appears without being ascertained (AAA):

A knower that is a common locus of:

- 1) Having a clear appearance of the specifically characterized phenomenon, which is its **object of engagement**, and
- 2) Being unable to induce ascertainment with respect to this specifically characterized phenomenon which is its **object of operation/ object of engagement**.

However, one should not define this awareness as: a knower that is a common locus of:

- 1) Having a clear appearance of the specifically characterized phenomenon, which is its **object**, and
- 2) Being unable to induce ascertainment with respect to this specifically characterized phenomenon which is its **object**.

The essence is this: the clear appearance of the specifically characterized phenomenon to this knower, is its **object of engagement** and not merely an object.

This is because, if the clear appearance of the specifically characterized phenomenon to the knower is merely an object (and not its object of engagement), then it would incur the fallacy that an eye consciousness apprehending a blue snow mountain (which is a wrong consciousness) would fulfill this definition and therefore be an awareness to which an object appears without being ascertained.

Since the clear appearance to the knower is its object of engagement, this effectively eliminates any wrong consciousnesses to be this knower.

Also, since the clear appearance to the knower is a specifically characterized phenomenon, this effectively eliminates any non-existents as the apprehended object.

KQ: Nevertheless, is an awareness to which an object appears without being ascertained, based on its definition, necessarily a factually concordant consciousness?

KQ: An illustration of an AAA is a sense direct perceiver apprehending blue which induces the doubt that wonders, "Did I see blue or not?". Is such a mind a factually concordant knower?

There are times when one sees something but not sure whether one actually saw it or not. Thus, there can be such a sense direct perceiver that induces such doubt later.

Factually concordant knower: A mind that apprehends an object in the way [the object] exists in reality.

Factually discordant knower: A mind that apprehends an object in the way [that the object] does not exist in reality.

Doubting consciousness/ Doubt: A knower which has qualms two-pointedly by its own power

'By its own power' is inserted in the definition. This is because, there is a main mind that is concomitant with the mental factor of doubt. In the retinue of this main mind, there are also other mental factors like feeling, discrimination and so on. This main mind and its mental factors are also knowers that have qualms two pointedly. However, this main mind and its mental factors in its retinue that doubt is concomitant with, although having qualms two-pointedly, nevertheless, do not have qualms two pointedly by their own power, but arise through the power of doubt, which does so by its own power. Therefore, this main mind itself that doubt is concomitant with, as well as its retinue mental factors, are not the mental factor of doubt/ doubting consciousness.

1) Doubt tending towards the factual	E.g., doubt which thinks that sound is probably impermanent	In reality, sound is impermanent. Here, this knower, even though still having doubt, nevertheless, thinks sound is probably impermanent. Although a doubt, it is factual as it [apprehends] in concordance with how the object exists.
2) Doubt tending towards the non-factual	E.g., doubt which thinks that sound is probably permanent	In reality, sound is not permanent. Here, this knower that thinks sound is probably permanent, is a doubt that tends towards the non-factual.
3) Equal doubt	E.g., doubt which wonders whether sound is probably permanent or impermanent	
According to Sera-Je's position, there is a common locus between doubt and wrong consciousness: e.g., a mind thinking: "reincarnation probably does not exist." Such a mind is doubt, which tend towards the non-factual, and also a wrong consciousness. It is a wrong consciousness because it is a knower which engages in its object erroneously. The object of this mind is 'reincarnation', which is engaged erroneously by this mind.		
There are those that assert that wrong consciousness and doubt are mutually exclusive. This is because, a wrong consciousness is decisive about its object, whereas doubt is two-pointed about its object.		

How to determine whether the seven-fold division of consciousness are main minds or mental factors:

SQ: Of the seven-fold division of consciousness, doubt here is necessarily a mental factor. Are the other six types of consciousnesses necessarily main minds?	
KQ: Is a direct perceiver or an inferential cognizer necessarily a main mind?	
K: A sense direct valid cognizer is a new incontrovertible knower that is free from conceptuality and non-mistaken, which arises in dependence upon its own uncommon empowering condition, a physical sense power.	
KQ: Since that is the case, is a sense direct valid cognizer necessarily a main mind? In the retinue of a sense direct valid cognizer, there is a mental factor of discrimination. Is this mental factor of discrimination necessarily a valid sense cognizer? R: Yes	
In general, mind refers to the main mind. Therefore, mind, sentience and primary consciousness/ perceiver are synonymous/ mutually inclusive with main mind .	
Since that is the case, these four are not mutually inclusive with the three: awareness, knower and consciousness.	
Since that is the case, therefore, there are four possibilities between <u>sentience</u> and <u>mental consciousness</u> :	1) Something which is a sentience but not a mental consciousness: Eye primary consciousness. It is a sentience but not a mental consciousness
	2) Something which is mental consciousness but not a sentience: Mental factor of feeling that is concomitant with a mental primary consciousness. It is a mental consciousness and also not a sentience because it is a mental factor.
	3) Something which is both sentience and mental consciousness: mental primary consciousness. It is a sentience and also a mental consciousness.
	4) Something which is neither sentience nor mental consciousness: mental factor of feeling that is concomitant with an eye primary consciousness: It is not a sentience because it is a mental factor. It is also not a mental consciousness because it is a sense consciousness.
There are three possibilities between a <u>sense consciousness</u> and <u>sense primary consciousness</u> :	1) Something which is a sense consciousness but not a sense primary consciousness: mental factor of feeling in the retinue of/ accompanying an eye consciousness apprehending blue. It is a sense consciousness as it is in the retinue of a sense consciousness but not a primary sense consciousness as it is a mental factor.
	2) Something which is both a sense consciousness and a sense primary consciousness: an eye primary consciousness apprehending blue.
	3) Something which is neither: [mental factor of feeling in the retinue of conceptual consciousness apprehending blue].

One should also know the four possibilities between sentience and sense consciousness, the four possibilities between exalted wisdom and mental consciousness and the three possibilities between a mental primary consciousness and a mental consciousness.

Based on comparisons, it would seem that there are differences between a sense consciousness and a sense perceiver/ sense primary consciousness. Likewise, there would be differences between a mental consciousness and a mental perceiver as well.

Since that is the case, then it would seem that, in the seven-fold division of consciousness besides doubt, there are both main minds and mental factors.

Examples: [Wrong consciousness that is a main mind: eye primary consciousness apprehending blue snow mountain.

Wrong consciousness that is a mental factor: mental factor of feeling in the retinue of an eye primary consciousness apprehending blue snow mountain].

SQ: In the sequence of apprehending blue for the three, sense direct perceiver, mental direct perceiver and conceptual consciousness (page 18), the mental direct perceiver in the continuum of an ordinary being is an awareness to which an object appears but is not ascertained. Since this mental direct perceiver does not realize blue, how does it induce the conceptual consciousness, a subsequent cognizer, to realize blue which the mental direct perceiver does not realize?

KR: A subsequent cognizer is a knower that realizes what has been realized. Therefore, it has to be induced by a valid cognizer. [Here, in this question], that which induces the conceptual subsequent cognizer need not be the mental direct perceiver apprehending blue. It is essentially the eye consciousness apprehending blue which is that which induces the conceptual subsequent cognizer to apprehend blue. This is difficult to experience for ordinary beings precisely because the mental direct perceiver lasts for the shortest moment of time.

SQ: Is the appearing object of an eye consciousness apprehending blue snow mountain a white snow mountain or a blue snow mountain?

KR: This issue is complex. If one posits that the appearing object of an eye consciousness apprehending blue snow mountain, to be snow mountain or white snow mountain, then does white snow mountain appears to this eye consciousness? R: Yes.

K: Since that is the case, one would have to posit that **'white snow mountain appears but white snow mountain does not appears as white'**.

K: However, it seems like it is mentioned in some texts that **'whatever appears to a specific non-conceptual consciousness is its appearing object'**. Since that is the case, then one would also have to posit that blue snow mountain is the appearing object of the consciousness to which blue snow mountain appears.

K: Even though blue snow mountain is the appearing object of the consciousness to which blue snow mountain appears, however, blue snow mountain is not an appearing object in general.

SQ: When a forward pervasion is explicitly established, one implicitly establishes the counter-pervasion. Since that is the case, would the counter-pervasion be necessary?

KR: In general, if the sign is exclusively present in the similar class [with the predicate], then it is necessarily universally absent in the dissimilar class [of the predicate]. However, when establishing the correct sign to be the three modes, this is in relation to an attempt to prove this to someone for which the three modes are not yet established. For such a person, therefore, it is not merely sufficient that the sign exists only in the similar class [of the predicate]. This is because, this person may still have doubts whether the sign is universally absent in the dissimilar class [of the predicate]. Therefore, the correct sign is that which is the three modes.

SQ: If it is an established base, it is necessarily an object of the mode of apprehension of both a conceptual and non-conceptual consciousness. Since that is the case, how could, say, an uncompounded space be an object of the mode of apprehension of a non-conceptual consciousness?

KR: Is there a valid cognizer that directly realizes uncomposed space? SR: Yes.

K: Since that is the case, then an uncomposed space would be the object of the mode of apprehension of a non-conceptual consciousness.

The seven-fold division of presenting mind is a way to understand the general process of mind. In the study of main mind and mental factors in the following lessons, the emphasis is on mental factors. This is done by identifying their respective entities. These mental factors definitely can be related to the seven-fold division of mind.

End of Part 1

Part 2: Mind and Mental Factors – A Necklace for Those of Clear Awareness Clearly Revealing the Modes of Minds and Mental Factors

Lesson 17

16 August 2012

Division of the five aggregates from functioning thing:

In the Heart Sutra, the five aggregates are mentioned: the aggregates of form, feeling, discrimination, compositional factor and consciousness.				
All impermanent phenomena can all be subsumed into these five. If it is an impermanent phenomenon, it is necessarily one of these five:				
Functioning thing:				
A) Form/ matter	B) Consciousness			C) Non-associated compositional factor
	B1) Main mind	B2) Mental factor		
1) Form	2) Consciousness	3) Feeling and	4) Discrimination	5) Compositional factor
All forms/ matter are subsumed by the aggregate of form, which is the aggregation of many heaps/ piles coming together. Primarily refers to one's contaminated appropriated physical body. However, this category also includes all instances of form, such as cup and so on.	All main minds are classified into the aggregate of consciousness.	In general, there are 51 mental factors, among these, the two mental factors of feeling and discrimination are highlighted separately [as two of the five aggregates].		The rest of the 49 mental factors are subsumed here. Therefore, the remaining 49 mental factors and all non-associated compositional factor would be subsumed under the aggregate of compositional factor.

Reasons showing why the aggregates of feeling and discrimination are specifically highlighted as two of the five aggregates:

Treasury of knowledge:	Aggregate of Feeling	Aggregate of Discrimination
1) How the two are basis of conflict:	Due to attachment for objects of desire, pleasant feelings arise. Such pleasant feelings become a basis for conflict.	Due to discriminating that which is dharma to be non-dharma and discriminating that which is non-dharma to be dharma, such discriminations become a basis for conflict
2) How they perpetuate cyclic existence:	Due to being emotionally involved with feelings, one generates very strong desire for them. Due to this, very strong attachment towards such feelings would then perpetuate cyclic existence.	Due to discriminating erroneously with reference to objects, one accumulates projecting karma for cyclic existence.
Therefore, to highlight how they are bases of conflicts and perpetuates cyclic existence, these two mental factors are specifically highlighted.		

Root text page 8: Purpose of explaining Mind and Mental Factors –

Intelligent beings who have in mind their welfare in future lives, not being content simply with acquiring food and clothing for the duration of this life, thinking, “What will become of me in future rebirths?” should wonder, “I have circled powerlessly in the three realms of cyclic existence since beginningless time, continuously experiencing suffering. What is the root of this?”

Those who wonder about this are people who are looking beyond [just] this life, who are not merely concerned about this life [alone]. These are the intelligent ones. Such intelligent ones, those who are looking beyond this life should investigate what is the cause of oneself circling endlessly in the three realms of cyclic existence. To such a person, the profound advice in the buddhist teachings is given. For this purpose, the extensive presentation of Mind and Mental factors are given.

Here, the intelligent ones refer to those looking beyond the happiness of this life. Those who are primarily concerned with the happiness of this life, in this context, are not intelligent beings.

For such an intelligent person, he/ she should discover and contemplate on the root cause of cyclic existence.

This is because, when one circles in cyclic existence, one is fundamentally experiencing suffering.

Having contemplated in this manner, you must come to understand that these sufferings of cyclic existence neither arise without cause, nor arise from a discordant cause; rather, they arise from their own causes – actions and afflictions.

One should understand that the sufferings and problems that one experiences in cyclic existence do not arise without a cause. It is also not sufficient to be able to merely mouth these words, one should derive ascertainment in one's heart why this must be the case.

Above this, one should also be able to understand the reason that sufferings of cyclic existence do not arise from a discordant cause.

It is only on understanding clearly the reasons, would one ascertain that the sufferings of cyclic existence must arise from a cause and from a concordant cause as well.

Therefore, one should induce definite ascertainment of these points [through a correct sign].

Gaining ascertainment that unwished-for sufferings come from its concordant causes, karma and afflictions, by using an example:

For an eye consciousness apprehending blue to be generated, it must arise in dependence upon its own uncommon empowering condition. Here, the uncommon empowering condition has to be an eye physical sense power. It cannot arise in dependence upon an ear sense power and so on.

Therefore, without an eye sense power, there will not be an eye consciousness apprehending anything. Therefore, the eye sense power is the basis to which an eye consciousness is able to see visible forms.

When an eye consciousness apprehending blue is generated, it is generated into the entity that which is clear and knowing, a consciousness as well.

What caused it to be generated into such an entity is not its physical eye sense power, rather, it is the immediately preceding condition, the consciousness which existed one moment prior to the generation of this eye consciousness.

Therefore, using the production of an eye consciousness apprehending blue as an example, one sees that effects can only arise from suitable and correct concordant causes.

From such an understanding, one then applies this to that which really matters: how to avoid the sufferings that one does not wish for.

All sufferings that one does not wish for, arise from its own concordant cause. When one analyzes using many logical reasonings [correct signs], one would then conclude that the primary cause of one's unwished-for sufferings all originate from one's karma and afflictions.

Therefore, it is of utmost importance to gain ascertainment of this using logical reasonings [correct signs].

One can then rationalize within oneself whether one's experiences are merely due to luck/ fate: one's sufferings that one does not wish for, and one's happiness that one craves for, whether they arise arbitrarily or from causes one has created oneself in the past.

If someone were to assert that one's unwished-for sufferings arise from discordant causes, would one be able to accept that assertion?

When one asserts that the sufferings one experiences do not arise without a cause, one is essentially establishing that one's unwished-for sufferings arise from a cause.

When one asserts that one's unwished-for sufferings do not arise from discordant causes, one is essentially establishing that one's unwished-for sufferings arise from concordant causes.

In the final analysis, the primary causes of suffering are essentially one's karma and afflictions.

One therefore needs to arrive at an infallible ascertainment about this and not merely able to speak the sentence.

Citing quotations to gain further ascertainment:

The many quotations cited below serve as scriptural authority to establish that karma and afflictions are the primary causes of cyclic existence:

The Protector Nagarjuna says [in his Precious Garland]:

As long as the aggregates are misconceived, there will be the conception of an I. When there is conception of an I, there is also action. Due to that there is rebirth.

In dependence upon an apprehension of a self of phenomenon, there comes to be an apprehension of a self of person, which is posited to be ignorance. Due to ignorance, one accumulates karma. This is how the twelve links of dependent origination is set forth.

The thesis one needs to prove [to oneself] is this: Cyclic existence arises primarily from karma and afflictions.

Nagarjuna [in his Treatise on the Middle Way] says: *The root of cyclic existence is compositional actions. Therefore, the wise do not create compositional actions. Hence, the unwise are creators; the wise are not, because of seeing thusness.*

The root of cyclic existence, in the context of the twelve link, is compositional activity, the second link.

Those who create compositional actions are the unwise ones. The wise do not accumulate projecting karma for cyclic existence. This is because they have seen the truth directly, whereas those who have yet to see the truth directly continues to accumulate projecting karma.

This is essentially the way to differentiate between a Superior and an ordinary being: Superiors do not accumulate new projecting karma while ordinary beings do so.

Superiors do not newly accumulate projecting karma because they do not have the category of ignorance from the ignorance of the twelve links of dependent arising.

Since they lack that ignorance [in their continua], therefore, they do not accumulate compositional activity, the second link.

It is not the case that once a Superior sees the truth directly, all ignorance [in his/ her continuum] will be removed immediately.

Nevertheless, from the moment when that Superior sees the truth directly, he/ she will not accumulate new projecting karma.

This is because, the category of ignorance from the twelve links of dependent origination no longer functions.

Due to this, even though there is still ignorance in the Superior's continuum, it is not powerful enough to lead to the accumulation of new projecting karma.

Aryadeva [in his Treatise of Four Hundred Stanzas] is saying the same: *The consciousness that is the seed of [cyclic] existence has objects as its objects of activity.*

The seed of cyclic existence is consciousness. Here, consciousness refers to the apprehension of true existence, which is an affliction.

Objects here, refer to forms and so on, which becomes the objects of observation of ignorance, the apprehension of true existence.

This ignorance focuses on these objects and apprehends them to be truly existent. Through this, karma is accumulated.

Chandrakirti says [in his Supplement to the Middle Way]: *The very diverse worlds of sentient beings and their environment are established by the mind itself. It is taught that all migrating beings without exception are born from actions.*

Chandrakirti is saying the same: The two, the environment, the world itself and the inhabitants in it, sentient beings, are the results of actions [karma].

Vasubandhu says [in his Treasury of Knowledge]: *The various worlds are produced from actions. [And] The root of [cyclic] existence is the six subtle-increasers [six root afflictions].*

Shantideva's Engaging in the Bodhisattva Deeds says: *The propounder of the Truth has taught that in this way, all fears and the immeasurable sufferings arise from the mind. [And] Those who do not understand this secret of the mind, the great objective of the Dharma, wander aimlessly, even though they wish to attain happiness and destroy suffering. Therefore, I should hold well and guard well this mind of mine.*

The reason for citing quotations, from such authoritative texts of Nagarjuna, his spiritual son and other great Indian masters, is to show what they themselves have already ascertained: all the suffering of cyclic existence is the result of karma and afflictions.

Since these texts are taken as authoritative, what one needs to do then, is to learn these teachings, analyze them, and arrive at an ascertainment oneself, that the root cause of cyclic existence is karma and the afflictions. One necessarily has to develop such ascertainment for oneself.

Likewise, it has been taught that all the excellent qualities of the paths and grounds of the three vehicles, as well as all the exalted inconceivable qualities of the buddhas, in the final analysis, have to come from a cause and a concordant one. This cannot be anything external from one's continuum, rather, it has to be a virtuous wholesome state of mind.

In essence, all the problems and sufferings that are unwished for that one experiences in cyclic existence have as its origin in one's mind.

Similarly, all the happiness, from the smallest pleasure up to the state of one's ultimate happiness, full enlightenment, have its origin within one's mind as well.

How the mind of ignorance grasping at appearance is the chief cause of one's suffering:

Whatever appears to the mind, appears in a particular way in general. One then believes in it [wholeheartedly] that the object exists in the way it appears to one's mind.

Due to such a belief, holding on to that appearance as so real, one then accumulates actions/ karma.

- 1) The object that **appears** to one's mind, which one holds onto as so real, is merely an **appearance** to one's mind.
- 2) Even though the object appears [to the mind, however], without the mind, one would not have such an appearance.
- 3) Without such an appearance, one would cease to grasp at the appearance.
- 4) Without grasping at such an appearance, one would cease to accumulate actions/ karma.

Therefore, without the mind/ consciousness, that factor of appearance cannot appear to the mind/ consciousness.

Therefore, in dependence on this factor of appearance to the mind, one apprehends that factor to be utterly real, to exist in the way it appears, one then accumulates actions.

Therefore, such a factor of appearance to the mind is dependent on the mind. Without the mind, such a factor of appearance is not possible.

This is the same for friend and enemy: what it is, is merely an appearance to the mind, how [the way, the manner, the mode] that person appears, as friend or as enemy.
Based on whatever is appearing to one's mind, one then gets emotionally involved with that appearance . From that, there arises either attachment or anger.
By grasping at that appearance of an enemy as an utter reality, strong anger arises; by grasping/ believing at an appearance of a friend, existing in the way it appears, strong attachment arises.
Such a factor of appearance, an appearance of an enemy or a friend, is something which arises from the mind .
Without realizing that it is merely this, one feels [strongly] that it is something that occurs outside/ separately from one's mind, to be a real enemy or a real friend.
One then gets involved with such a belief. This is where either strong hatred or strong attachment happens.
From here, one can see how essential it is to realize that the appearance of objects, the appearance of friends and enemies, is [merely] a factor of appearance to the mind.
If one realizes that the appearance of these objects is [merely] an appearance of the mind, that these appearances arise from the mind , then it will absolutely help to reduce one's afflictions of anger, attachment and so forth.
One feels/ thinks that the appearance to the mind and the mind itself is completely separate , not understanding that, in fact, the two are closely related .
Due to that, one reacts to those appearances and thereby experiences unhappiness.
For one, this is how the mind works. However, with [correct] practice, when the mind develops and advances, one would be able to reach a point where the dualistic appearances [of appearance and mind] subsides/ diminishes .
There are various types of dualistic appearances, one of which is this dualistic appearance of object and subject as being very distinct/ separate .
Like the present moment, one has the appearance/ feeling that the mind is here and that which is appearing to the mind is something utterly different from the mind.
However, with practice and advancement, one can narrow the distance between these two, and come to understand that these two are not really exactly separate/ different.
By narrowing the distance between these two [subject and object]: 1) Through understanding that whatever appears to the mind is merely that factor of appearance, a mere appearance to the mind. 2) Based on this understanding, one should also understand how all phenomena are in the nature of emptiness.
When one gains ascertainment by combining 1) and 2) together, one will definitely reduce/ weaken one's negative actions.
When one understands/ realizes: 1) how all appearances arise from the mind and 2) how such appearances are mere display of emptiness, when the two realizations are merged together, this is how one reverse/ turn back [the continuation of] cyclic existence.
Therefore, one should analyze how the mind is the creator of all [phenomena], how everything essentially arises from the mind: 1) All sorts of appearances appear to the mind 2) When one mistakenly believes in all such appearances to the mind to exist in the way it appear 3) This is when one gets emotionally involved with those appearances [with anger, attachment and so on] 4) One then accumulates actions 5) Such accumulated actions will lead to results, the experiences of unwished-for suffering.
One therefore needs to understand and experience for oneself, how: Thesis: All appearances to one's mind arise from one's mind itself, how suffering arises from one's mistaken beliefs in all appearances to the mind. Sign: This is because, the mind is the root of everything, the creator of all, which also includes the mind being the creator/ root of one's unwanted suffering.

Root text page 10: 1. The individual entities and divisions of minds and mental factors –

Hence, it is of utmost importance to understand the modes of minds and mental factors. Thus, here I shall compose a brief presentation on minds and mental factors. This has two parts:

1. The individual entities and divisions of minds and mental factors [This will be dwelt with first]
2. A summary of the salient points and their application to practice

Lesson 18

21 August 2012

Root text page 10: How everything, happiness or suffering, come from the mind –

Summary: It is said here that all the qualities of full enlightenment, which are inconceivable, arise from the mind.

Likewise, the world/ environment and its inhabitants/ sentient beings, are also the creation of/ arise from the mind.

This includes all the experiences of happiness and suffering, all of which arise from the mind.

Many scriptural quotations from great Indian masters were cited earlier to highlight this fact.

Therefore, everything arise from the mind. In the final analysis, that which delimits an existent or a non-existent has to be posited from the perspective of mind:

- 1) If it is observed/ verified by a valid cognizer, then it is posited to exist/ be a phenomenon.
- 2) If it is not observed/ verified by a valid cognizer, then it is posited to not exist.

Therefore, whether a phenomenon is or is not something, is ultimately created by the mind.

Nevertheless, this does not mean that whatever the mind conceives of necessarily exists in the way it is conceived by the mind.

Likewise, everything that a mind does not conceive of to exist, also does not necessarily mean that the phenomenon is a non-existent.

Therefore, to establish what is and is not, what exists and what does not exist, detailed explanations on the various types of mind are given. To further emphasize this, a division of mind into valid and non-valid, as well as its explanations are also given.

Nevertheless, the main import is not merely to understand what is [and is not] phenomenon and so forth, but rather to apply such understanding to one's own experiences of happiness and suffering: that all of one's happiness and suffering are the creation of one's own mind/ arise from one's own mind.

In the final analysis, that which causes one's unwanted suffering is essentially one's afflictions, resulting in actions/ karma.

Based on having such convictions, in one's daily life, one would be able to correctly apply mindfulness and vigilance to guard and protect one's mind.

How the **belief in phenomenon to exist in the way it appears** is the main cause of suffering:

As discussed in the previous lesson, all of one's experiences of happiness and suffering come from one's belief that everything that appears to one's mind are real and true.

By apprehending the appearance to **exist in the way it appears** to one's mind, all of one's feelings of pain and pleasure arise.

One's experiences of pleasure and pain come from one's belief in all the various mental appearances appearing to the mind.

Such appearances do not exist externally with the object, but rather are the projections of the mind/ appearances of the mind.

Since one needs to understand or explain how everything arises from the mind/ are the creation of the mind, one needs to know that:

- 1) One reacts to/ believes in/ gets involved with the appearances to the mind.
- 2) One then experiences its outcome of pleasure or pain.

Since it has been said that all phenomena arise in dependence on the mind, therefore, it is very important to gain a thorough understanding of mind and how it works.

For this reason, the presentation of Lorig, the study of mind and its functions are given.

How happiness comes from a subdued mind and suffering comes from an unsubdued mind:

When one's mind is not disciplined, everything that appears, the world/ environment and the inhabitants/ sentient beings, appear as problems/ sufferings [to one's mind].

However, if one's mind is subdued/ disciplined/ well trained, then one will perceive one's environment as the celestial mansion and sentient beings as its deities within.

Therefore, all such appearances depend on whether one's mind is disciplined/ subdued or not. As it has always been advised in the teachings:

Happiness comes from a subdued mind and suffering comes from an unsubdued mind

From here, one can understand that:

Whether it is an ordinary suffering environment or a pure land, essentially depends on one's mental perspective, how the appearance appears to one's mind.

If the mind is subdued/ disciplined, then everything appears as pure. This shows that it all depends on one's mind.

However, if the mind is unsubdued/ undisciplined, then everything appears as ordinary, filled with suffering and so on. This again shows that it all depends on one's mind.

Therefore, it is sometimes alright to say that: pure land is in the mind; ordinary suffering world is also in the mind. Pure land is therefore not something far away out there

Stating the distinctions between main mind and mental factor:

Main mind	Mental factor
Engages mainly in the entity of the object.	Engages [mainly] in the specific features/ characteristics of the object.
A knower that engages in the mere entity of an object by its own power	A knower that engages in the features of an object by its own power [its shape, size etc].
Example: Eye consciousness apprehending blue.	
Eye primary consciousness apprehends the mere entity of blue.	In the retinue of this primary consciousness, there can be a mental factor of mindfulness which induces a remembering of blue and holds onto it. This mindfulness that performs the function of holding onto an object without forgetting, does so through engaging an object by way of its attributes/ features, therefore, its a mental factor.
From the perspective of the mind apprehending the mere object blue, it is called a main mind.	From the perspective of the mind's functioning to not forget the object blue, it is labeled as [the mental factor of] mindfulness.
The eye primary consciousness apprehending blue and the mental factor of mindfulness in its retinue are different/ not one. This is because, mind is not its mental factor and its mental factor is not mind. Therefore, these two are not mutually inclusive.	
Even though these two are not one [because they are different] , they are nevertheless one entity . Therefore, these two are one entity but different isolates .	

Using a vase (form) and a person (non-associated composed phenomenon) to show how a mind and its mental factors (consciousness) are one entity but different isolates:

A vase and the vase's impermanence, these two are <u>one entity but different isolates</u> .
The vase's impermanence is one entity with vase. However, this does not mean that vase's impermanence is vase.
Vase's impermanence is only found on vase, vase's impermanence would not be found/ posited on a non-vase.
Therefore, vase's impermanence cannot be found/ posited as a separate entity from the entity of vase. Therefore, vase's impermanence does not exist on a non-vase.
'Self', 'person' and 'I' are mutually inclusive. The self and the aggregates are asserted to be one entity.
Therefore, the “self/ person/ I” would not be found/ posited as a separate entity from the entity of the aggregates. Therefore, the 'self' does not exist on a non-aggregate.
Treasury of Knowledge: <i>A mind and its mental factors are definitely simultaneous</i> . Therefore, the main mind and its mental factors are one entity.
One would not be able to posit/ find a mental factor that is of a separate entity from the main mind, just as one cannot posit/ find a main mind that is a separate entity from its mental factors.
This is a complex issue: when asserting mind and mental factor as being one entity, it is as if one is labeling or referring to one thing with different names.
Some scholars assert that main mind and mental factors are essentially the same phenomenon being labeled with different names.
Our system posits that main mind and [its] mental factors are one entity but different isolates. The two are posited differently due to them performing different functions.
Therefore, our system does not posit mind and mental factors to be the same.
Root text says that the mind and its mental factors are one entity and not different entities, not like a pillar and a vase.
A pillar and vase are different entities. This is because, one can posit/ find a vase that is of a separate entity from a pillar, and also posit/ find a pillar that is of a separate entity from a vase. The mind and its mental factors are not like this.

The definitions of main mind and mental factor, establishing the boundaries of what are main minds and mental factors:

The First Dalai Lama, Gedun Drub's Ornament of Reasoning, the Great Treatise on Valid Cognition stated precisely the definition of main mind and mental factor:	
1) Main mind – that which is concomitant by way of the five similarities with the mental factors in its retinue.	2) Mental factor – that which is concomitant by way of the five similarities with the main mind.

The five similarities between a main mind and its mental factor in its retinue according the Treasury of Knowledge :

Using the example of an eye consciousness apprehending blue and the [mere] mental factor of feeling in its retinue [there are many other mental factors in the retinue of any primary consciousness, this is just one of them] – These two share similar:	
1) Support	Just as the eye primary consciousness apprehending blue is generated in dependence upon an eye sense power, similarly, the mental factor of feeling in the retinue of this eye primary consciousness apprehending blue is also generated in dependence upon the eye sense power. Therefore, these two share similar support.
2) Object of observation	The object of observation of an eye primary consciousness apprehending blue is blue. Therefore, an eye primary consciousness apprehending blue is generated in dependence upon the object of observation, blue. Similarly, the mental factor of feeling in its retinue is also observing blue, therefore, its object of observation is also blue. Therefore, these two share similar object of observation.

3) Subjective aspect	Just as the eye primary consciousness apprehending blue is generated in the aspect of blue, similarly, the mental factor of feeling in the retinue of this eye primary consciousness apprehending blue is also generated in the aspect of blue.
4) Time	A mind and its mental factors are simultaneous with respect to their production, abiding and cessation.
5) Substance	In the retinue of an eye consciousness apprehending blue, there can only be one mental factor of feeling that shares similar support, object of observation, aspect and time. Essentially, there cannot be another mental factor of feeling in this retinue of an eye primary consciousness apprehending blue. Therefore, just as there is only one main mind/ substantial phenomenon/ main substance, similarly, there can only be one substance of the mental factor of feeling accompanying it. Therefore, the two are similar in being distinct substances. This means these two are substantially established as one each: both the main mind and the mental factor of feeling in its retinue are substantially established as one each.

SQ: Does the primary consciousness apprehend the entirety of its object whilst its mental factors apprehend merely a portion/ certain features of its object?

KR: Not so. Both share the same object of observation and subjective aspect:

- 1) Therefore, just as the eye primary consciousness apprehending blue observes blue, likewise, the mental factors in its retinue necessarily observe blue as well.
- 2) Since the eye primary consciousness apprehending blue knows the mere entity of blue, likewise, the mental factors in its retinue necessarily know the mere entity of blue as well. Therefore, whatever the main mind knows, the mental factors in its retinue also know.

For these reasons, some texts posit that it is not sufficient to posit a main mind to be a knower that knows the mere entity of an object; and the mental factors know the specific features of that object. Rather, “by its own power” needs to be included. Therefore,

- 1) A main mind is a knower that knows the mere entity of an object by its own power
- 2) A mental factor is a knower that knows the specific features of an object by its own power.

This is the same with doubting consciousness: It is a knower that has qualms two-pointedly by its own power [which is its subjective aspect]. It is a mental factor which is in the retinue of its main mind, a mental consciousness. This primary mental consciousness also has qualms two-pointedly about its object [which is its subjective aspect], but not by its own power.

Therefore, some texts mention that: Both main mind and its mental factors 1) know the entity as well as 2) the features of the object. However:

- 1) The main mind knows the mere entity of the object by its own power, while its mental factors also know the mere entity of the object, not by its own power [but through the power of its main mind].
- 2) The mental factors know the features of the object by its own power, while the main mind also knows the features of the object, not by its own power [but through the power of its mental factors].

Therefore, this again shows that the main mind and the mental factors in its retinue are not one/same but different.

SQ: When the main mind or mental factor knows the mere entity of its object, does this mean that it is collectively engaging everything about the object?

KR: Not so. In terms of an eye consciousness, it is a non-conceptual consciousness and a collective engager. It can be a main mind, or it can also be a mental factor. All the mental factors, in the retinue of a non-conceptual consciousness, such as a sense consciousness, are also sense consciousnesses. Therefore, this shows that it is not the case that all mental factors are eliminative engagers whilst all main minds are collective engagers.

Just as a primary eye consciousness apprehending blue is a collective engager, all the mental factors in its retinue are also collective engagers.

Therefore, a main mind is not necessarily a collective engager just because it is a knower that knows the mere entity of an object.

Likewise, a mental factor is not necessarily an eliminative engager just because it is a knower that knows the features of an object.

Summary of what mind and mental factors are:

It is taught in buddhist teachings that everything is created by mind, particularly, one's experiences of happiness and suffering. Since that's the case, then it is important to understand what mind is all about. This is the reason the presentation of mind and mental factors are given in this text.
In this way of dividing consciousness, there are main minds and mental factors. The main minds are considered primary whereas the mental factors accompanying them are secondary. The main mind and the mental factors in its retinue can be likened to a king and his ministers.
A main mind is posited from the perspective of it knowing the mere entity of the object, whereas a mental factor is posited from the perspective of the different functions it performs/ knowing the specific peculiarities of the object. For example: the mental factor of mindfulness functions to not forget an object.
Even though the main mind and the mental factors in its retinue are one entity/ same entity, they are nevertheless not one/ same. This is because, one would not be able to find a main mind that is of a different entity from the mental factors in its retinue, likewise, one would also not be able to find a mental factor that is of a separate entity from the main mind.
A main mind is concomitant by way of the five similarities with the mental factors in its retinue, in Vasubandhu's Treasury of Knowledge, these are similar: a) Support b) Object of observation – both observe the same object c) Aspect d) Time – both arise, abide and disintegrate at the same time e) Substance – just as there is one main mind, e.g., eye consciousness apprehending blue, there can only be one mental factor of feeling in the retinue of this main mind.

How the five similarities in Asanga's Compendium of Knowledge is different in terms of entity, realm and level:

Asanga's Compendium of Knowledge, has a slightly different presentation on the five similarities between a main mind and the mental factors in its retinue: Similar –	
1) Substance 2) Object of observation and subjective aspect 4) Time : These are the same as in the Treasury of Knowledge.	
3) Entity	If a main mind is afflicted/ contaminated, then the mental factors in its retinue will also be afflicted/ contaminated; if a main mind is not afflicted/ uncontaminated, then the mental factors in its retinue will also be not afflicted/ uncontaminated as well.
5) Realm and level	In general, there are the three realms and nine levels. The three realms are: a) Desire realm b) Form realm c) Formless realm. The nine levels [within the three realms] are: i) Desire realm, ii) Four concentrations of the Form realm iii) Four levels of the Formless realms : Infinite space, Infinite consciousness, Nothingness and Peak of cyclic existence. If the main mind is a mind of the desire, form or formless realms respectively, then the mental factors in its retinue are also mental factors of the desire, form or formless realms respectively. For the same measure, apply this understanding to the nine levels.

SQ: Since the main minds and the mental factors in its retinue are already included in the continuum of a person in the realm of that lifetime, why are realm and level taught as sharing five similarities?

KR: For a person who is a desire realm being, it is not necessarily that all his or her minds are minds of the desire realm. For a desire realm being to be born in the form realm, this desire realm being must accumulate the projecting karma to be born as a form realm god. Over and above that, the actualizing karma for rebirth in the form realm must also manifest. For a desire realm being to accumulate the karma to be born in the form realm, this person necessarily has to initially actualize the realization of calm abiding/ meditative serenity. It is only with such a realization would this person be able to accumulate the projecting karma for rebirth in the form realm. Since it is possible for a desire realm being to realize calm abiding, therefore, a desire realm being can accumulate projecting karma for a form realm rebirth. Since that is the case, one cannot conclude that all the minds of the desire realm beings are necessarily minds of the desire realm.

The Five Omnipresent mental factors: necessarily accompanies all main minds –

If it is a main mind, it is necessarily accompanied by these five mental factors in its retinue. Whether it is a sense primary consciousness or a mental primary consciousness, these five omnipresent mental factors are definitely in the retinue of these main minds. These five are:

1) Feeling 2) Discrimination 3) Intention 4) Contact 5) Attention

1) Feeling:

The entity of feeling is essentially **experience**. Through the entity of experience, it experiences individually the fruitional results of virtuous and non-virtuous actions.

This means, whatever feelings of pleasure or suffering that arise in one's mind, all of them are the fruitional results of one's own karma/ action.

This is related to the presentation of the general characteristics of karma in the Lam Rim texts: how karma is definite, how one would not experience the results of actions one did not create and so on.

Therefore, whatever experiences of pleasure or suffering in one's mind, no matter how great or small it may be, all are the fruitional results of one's own karma/ action.

Is it even slightly possible to experience even the smallest happiness in one's mind that is due to the smallest non-virtuous action? From the general presentation of how karma is definite, whatever happy results that one wishes, it cannot arise without a cause. Above that, it also necessarily has to arise from a concordant cause.

Therefore, it is impossible for a pleasurable feeling, regardless of how big or small it is, to arise from non-virtue.

Feeling, the entity of experience, is the result of having accumulated virtuous or non-virtuous actions – Root text page 17:

Nagajuna's Precious Garland: From non-virtue comes all sufferings and likewise all bad migrations. From virtue comes all happy migrations and the happiness within all rebirths.

Therefore, happiness and suffering neither arise without cause nor arise from discordant causes such as the fundamental nature, Ishvara and so forth. Rather, in general, happiness and suffering come from virtuous and non-virtuous actions [respectively], and even the various instances of happiness and suffering arise individually, without even the slightest mix-up, from the various instances of these two types of actions. Hence, gaining certainty regarding this definiteness or infallibility of actions and their results is known as “the correct view of all Buddhists” and is praised as the foundation of all wholesome qualities.

Therefore, it is very important to gain an understanding/ conviction that karma/ action is definite in that virtue only results in happiness and non-virtue only results in suffering and one will never experience the result of a cause one did not create.

By understanding how causality works in detail externally, one should relate such understanding to one's experiences of happiness and suffering: that essentially, the law of causality definitely applies to oneself.

For example: using the understanding of an eye consciousness apprehending blue as a subject matter, for this consciousness to arise, there must be an observed object condition, blue. Without blue, eye consciousness apprehending blue cannot arise. Likewise, without an eye sense power, this mind also cannot arise.

Therefore, without a cause, there cannot be an effect, an effect necessarily has to be preceded by a cause.

Therefore, the main import is this: By applying this understanding to one's inner world of experience of happiness and suffering, one's experiences of happiness can only arise after the cause has been created. This cause can only be a virtuous action.

Using the Noble Eightfold Path as an example to show how important it is to gain ascertainment on karma and its effects – Root text page 17:

Therefore, gaining certainty regarding this definiteness or infallibility of actions and their results is known as “the correct view of all Buddhists” and is praised as the foundation of all wholesome qualities.	
Gaining conviction/ ascertainment of actions and their effects in one's own mind is the foundation for all good qualities to arise in one's mind. Thus, this is like the root of [one's dharma practice], whether one can succeed in one's spiritual transformation/ practice or not, depends very much on one's wholehearted faith of conviction in karma and its results, without which, it will be very difficult to practice dharma.	
The first of the Noble Eightfold Path is Correct view. This also refers to the correct view about the convictions on actions and their effects.	
Since this is the very foundation, the root of one's spiritual transformation, therefore, from the onset, it is very important to reflect correctly on the natural principle of causality/ principle of cause and effect. On this basis, one would then be able to understand or gain faith of convictions on actions/ karma and their results.	
Once one has gain such a conviction, with this as a basis, one's life's perspective changes. Whatever it is that one thinks of, however way one looks at things, all will be placed in the correct perspective by such a conviction.	
<p><i>[From the Ornament for Clear Realization, page 64]</i> The Noble Eightfold Path are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Correct view 2) Correct thought 3) Correct speech 4) Correct aims of actions 5) Correct livelihood 6) Correct effort 7) Correct mindfulness 8) Correct meditative stabilization 	1) Correct view: On the basis of correct understanding of the principle of cause and effect, all of one's views will be correct.
	2) Correct thought: On the basis of correct view, having faith of conviction in karma, all of one's perspectives/ thoughts will be correct.
	3) Correct speech: On the basis of correct thought, all of one's speech will be correct.
	4) Correct aims of actions: refers to pure physical action, all of one's physical actions will be correct.
	When one accumulates karma, one does so via one's body, speech and mind. Therefore, on the basis of 1) Correct view, one accumulates virtuous karma with one's mind, speech and body [to generate 2) Correct thought 3) Correct speech and 4) Correct aims of actions].
	Therefore, this shows very clearly that it is only by having “the correct view of all Buddhists”/ faith of conviction on actions and their effects, would one be able to accumulate virtues, without it, one would only be accumulating non-virtues.
	5) Correct livelihood: On the basis of correct view, it would also be possible to have correct livelihood.
	6) Correct effort: On the basis of correct view as well, one would also have correct effort. Whatever endeavors embarked on would be correct.
	7) Correct mindfulness: When one is embarking on correct effort, one uses correct mindfulness as a tool to develop single-pointedness of mind/ calm abiding.
8) Correct meditative stabilization: When one develops a strong and stable calm abiding, one then develops correct meditative stabilization.	
From here, one understands how extremely important it is to gain the faith of conviction in karma and its effects. This is the foundation of all wholesome qualities.	
Without such a conviction in karma and its results, it is really difficult to say one is engaging in virtues.	
Since one is unable to generate any wholesome qualities due to lack of faith in karma and its results, then liberation and enlightenment will never occur.	
One also needs to ascertain how all of one's unwanted suffering is the result of one's own actions and afflictions: The first Noble Truth is True suffering.	
This is to understand what one's own suffering is all about. While one is tormented by it and does not wish for it the slightest bit, it nevertheless comes.	
This is because, one has already accumulated the cause, non-virtue. Therefore, whether one wishes for it or not, it will occur.	

How love and compassion can never be generated when one does not realize one's own suffering:

It is only when one has gain the faith of conviction how one's own suffering is due to one's own accumulation of non-virtues, would one be able to transfer such an understanding to others, how others' sufferings are the result of their own negative actions.
Therefore, without a thorough and complete understanding of how and why oneself is tormented by sufferings and their causes, it would not be possible to gain thorough understanding why and how others are suffering.
Without this, it would be impossible to develop love and compassion when one focuses on these suffering sentient beings.
This is simply because, one would not understand why and how others are suffering.
Therefore, whether one's love and compassion can be generated or not, depends entirely on having initially realized how oneself is suffering.
This is the reason why when Buddha first turned the wheel of dharma, He taught the Four Noble Truths. The first thing He taught within that was the Truth of suffering.
One therefore necessarily needs to look at suffering from one's viewpoint and not from the perspective of others. This is extremely important.

How gaining faith of conviction in karma and its effects is vital for developing the Noble Eightfold Path for others:

On the basis of correct understanding/ correct view, understanding how all of one's suffering comes from one's own karma and afflictions, when one sees/ focuses on other sentient beings, one would also be able to understand how this is the case for others.
One would then be able to develop love and compassion for others rather than having perverse thoughts. This is the correct thought.
On this basis, correct speech and correct aims of actions and so forth in relation to others would naturally arise.
Therefore, one necessarily needs to gain an infallible faith of conviction how action and its effects are the root of all good qualities.

Division of feelings: Root text page 18 –

When feelings are divided, there are three: pleasant feelings, suffering feelings and neutral feelings.		
When these three types of feelings are divided into the two supports of body and mind, there are six types:	1) Three bodily feelings:	Pleasant, suffering and neutral bodily feelings.
		Refer to the mental factor of feeling accompanying sense primary consciousness.
	2) Three mental feelings:	Pleasant, suffering and neutral mental feelings.
		Refer to the mental factor of feeling accompanying mental primary consciousness.
When these six types of feelings are differentiated into the two – materialistic and non-materialistic, then there are twelve types:	1) Materialistic feelings: Feelings that are concomitant with the craving for the contaminated appropriated aggregates.	
	2) Non-materialistic feelings:	Feelings that are concomitant with the exalted wisdom directly realizing selflessness.
		Qualm: How can a suffering feeling be present in those who possess the exalted wisdom directly realizing selflessness?
		Reply: There are many such cases. For example, the <i>Scripture on Discipline (Vinayagama)</i> says that even foe-destroyers who have abandoned the conception of self experience suffering feelings such as headaches due to the fruition of past actions.

When feelings are divided by way of objects of abandonment and antidote, there are two:	1) Feelings that support adherence: Feelings that are concomitant with the craving for the attributes of the desire realm.
	2) Feelings that support deliverance: For example, feelings that are concomitant with the mental consciousness that, having turned away from the attachment to the attributes of the desire realm, is included within the actual first concentration.

In some texts, it is stated that feelings can be further divided into five types: 1) Pleasant feelings 2) Suffering feelings 3) Feelings of mental happiness 4) Feelings of mental unhappiness and 5) Neutral feelings.

With such a division, pleasant and suffering feelings are categorized as sense consciousnesses, whereas feelings of mental happiness and unhappiness are mental consciousnesses. Neutral feelings [can be both].

Summary of the presentation of feeling:

Feeling is essentially experience. The main mind is necessarily accompanied by feeling. For example, in an eye consciousness apprehending blue, there is the mental factor of feeling in its retinue. Since feeling is essentially experience, then the feeling in the retinue of this eye consciousness is essentially experiencing blue.

Lessons 20 and 21

30 August & 4 September 2012

2) Discrimination: Entity – Root text page 20

Compendium of Knowledge: It has the characteristics of knowing upon aggregation, It has the entity of apprehending the sign and apprehending the mark, through which one designates an expression to objects of perception, hearing, differentiation and knowledge.

Just as it has been said above, it is a knower that, upon the aggregation of the three – object, sense power and primary consciousness – apprehends the uncommon sign of an object.

Discrimination apprehends the uncommon sign of an object. What is the uncommon sign of any object?

For example: blue and yellow. Blue holds its own entity and yellow also holds its own entity. Therefore, blue is not yellow and yellow is not blue.

Essentially, discrimination is that which apprehends such uncommon signs of an object.

Therefore, that which enables one to know an object to be blue is this discrimination which apprehends the uncommon 'blue'.

Division:

This mental factor of discrimination occurs in the retinue of both the sense and mental consciousnesses.

1) Discrimination apprehending a sign, which is [mainly] related to sense consciousnesses, is the discrimination that accompanies/ is in the retinue of the sense primary consciousness that which apprehends the sign.	2) Discrimination apprehending a mark, which is [mainly] related to mental consciousnesses, is the discrimination that accompanies/ is in the retinue of the mental primary consciousness that which apprehends the mark.
---	---

Therefore, in the retinue of an eye primary sense consciousness apprehending blue, there is a mental factor of discrimination that enables this eye primary sense consciousness to apprehend the uncommon blue and not, for example, apprehend yellow. Therefore, it is discrimination that causes this eye primary sense consciousness apprehending blue to apprehend the uncommon blue that is unshared with other objects.	In the retinue of a conceptual primary consciousness apprehending blue, there is also a mental factor of discrimination. It enables this conceptual primary consciousness not to be mistaken between blue and yellow, for example. It also allows this conceptual consciousness apprehending blue to conventionally designate blue and not yellow.
Treasury of Knowledge: This discrimination is that which apprehends a sign with regard to an object.	Treasury of Knowledge: This discrimination is that which apprehends a sign with regard to a convention.
When discrimination is differentiated in terms of support, there are six: From discrimination arising from contact upon the aggregation of a visible form, an eye sense power and an eye consciousness and so forth [up to aggregation of a phenomenon, a mental sense power and a mental consciousness.]	

SQ: Can one also say that discrimination apprehending the uncommon sign of an object is apprehending the opposite of whatever is not the object? In other words, apprehending the isolate of the object?

KR: If one wishes to assert it that way it is fine, as blue is essentially the opposite from non-blue. Opposite from non-blue is essentially necessarily blue, which exists on blue only and nothing else. Therefore, this is unshared with other objects.

SQ: How does one understand designating/ positing/ labeling by discrimination accompanying a non-conceptual consciousness?

Root text page 21: The bases of engagement for these two types of discrimination are : 1) Perceptions 2) hearing 3) differentiation 4) Knowledge –
1) Perceptions involve designating an expression to objects manifestly perceived.
2) Hearing involves designating an expression in dependence on hearing credible words.
3) Differentiation involves designating an expression to objects ascertained in dependence on signs.
4) Knowledge involves designating an expression to objects ascertained directly.
Usually, it is conceptual consciousness that designates terms, or determines 'This object is such and that object is such' [discrimination apprehending a mark]. However, it is unsure whether discrimination in the retinue of a sense consciousness 'designates' expressions to an object or not [discrimination apprehending a sign].
For example, when an eye consciousness apprehends blue, almost immediately, there can be a mind that designates 'blue'. Whether the mind that designates 'blue' is the eye consciousness or not has to be analyzed. When an ear consciousness apprehends sound, it would have to be a conceptual consciousness that distinguishes what type of sound it is. Therefore, when one designates an 'expression' or a 'term', it is usually <u>mainly</u> done by conceptual consciousnesses.
As discussed before, with regards to how the different types of consciousnesses arise, there can be a sense consciousness apprehending an object, followed by a non-conceptual mental consciousness and then the conceptual consciousness is then generated. The manner that these consciousnesses arise are rather quick in succession.
Therefore, it is unsure whether a sense consciousness 'designates expressions/ terms' or not.
Since it is the discrimination in the retinue of a sense consciousness that apprehends a sign, whereas it is the discrimination in the retinue of a conceptual consciousness that apprehends a mark, therefore, it is <u>mainly</u> the mental [conceptual] consciousness that 'designates'.
Nevertheless, it is not necessarily for designation/ imputation to be done by conceptual consciousnesses [only].

3) Intention – Root text page 23:

Compendium of Knowledge: Intention is a compositional mental action of the mind. It has the function of engaging the mind in virtue, non-virtue, or the unspecified.

Just as it has been said above, the mental factor which rouses and moves the mind that is concomitant with it to an object is called “intention”. This is said to be the principal among all the mental factors; it is taught that any mind or mental factor engages an object due to the power of this mental factor. For example, just as iron is helplessly drawn by a magnet, the mind helplessly engages an object due to this mental factor intention.

Intention/ action is karma. This is the mental factor that moves the mind towards an object.

In general, there are two types of actions:	1) Actions that are intentions – mental actions.	
	2) Intended actions: physical and verbal actions which are condensed into:	a) Three physical actions – [The non-virtuous actions of] killing, stealing and sexual misconduct [and their virtuous opposite of refrain from these three].
		b) Four verbal actions – [The non-virtuous actions of] lying, divisive speech, offensive speech and senseless speech [and their virtuous refrain from these four].
Therefore, there is a mental factor [called physical action] that moves the mind to engage in physical [activity], a mental factor [called verbal action] that moves the mind to engage in verbal [activity].		

When intention/ action/ karma is divided into three: 1) Physical action 2) Verbal action 3) Mental action.

Therefore, intention is an omnipresent mental factor that accompanies and moves all main minds and their mental factors in their retinues towards an object. It is therefore likened to a piece of iron that is helplessly drawn by a magnet.

4) Contact – Root text page 24:

Compendium of Knowledge: Contact distinguishes the transformation of the sense power upon the aggregation of the three. It has the function of acting as a support for feeling.

Contact is a knower that, upon aggregation of the three – object, sense power and primary consciousness – distinguishes an object in accordance with whatever subsequent feeling, pleasant and so on, that is to be experienced.

While intention rouses and moves the mind towards its object, contact causes the mind to come into contact/ meet with the object.

When contact causes the mind to meet with an unpleasant object, unpleasant feelings arise, when it causes the mind to meet with a pleasant object, pleasant feelings arise.

Therefore, contact distinguishes an object in accordance with whatever feelings that are to be experienced.

SQ: Since the five omnipresent mental factors arise, abide and disintegrate simultaneously, how does one reconcile that contact is the cause for the other four, which are its result? Would this not mean that these five do not share similar time?

KR: It is certain that the main mind the mental factors in its retinue are concomitant by way of the five similarities, one of which is similar time. Therefore, one cannot say that the five omnipresent mental factors are generated at different times. This is because, as soon as the main mind is produced, these five omnipresent mental factors are also produced simultaneously. However, in the presentation of the twelve link of dependent arising: on the basis of contact, there is feeling, from feeling there is craving, from craving there is grasping, from grasping there is potential existence, and from potential existence there is birth.

Since it is stated that feeling and contact are established simultaneously, then how does one explain [this sequence in the twelve link]? Since there cannot be no feeling when contact is generated, therefore, there is feeling at that time. However, one can say that, perhaps, with contact as a basis, it is then possible for the mental factor of feeling to strengthen/ increase.

5) Attention – Root text page 25:

<i>Compendium of Knowledge: It is an engagement of the mind. It has the function of holding the mind to the object of observation.</i>
Just as it has been said above, it is a knower that focuses the mind which is concomitant with it on a particular object of observation. What is the difference between intention and attention? Intention moves the mind to general objects, whereas attention directs the mind to a particular object.
Essentially, attention causes the mind to hold onto the object. However, this is not meditative stabilization but somewhat like it. It allows the mind to focus/ hold onto the object without being distracted/ thinking about something else.
Therefore, intention moves the mind towards an object, whereas attention holds the mind to that object without moving [away from it].

The distinctive features of the five omnipresent mental factors:

Feeling	Discrimination	Intention	Contact	Attention
Allows the mind to experience the object: suffering, happiness or something neutral.	Allows the mind to apprehend the uncommon sign/ entity of an object and nothing else.	That which moves the mind towards the object.	Allows the mind to distinguish/ meet with the object.	Directs the mind to an object and allows it to hold onto the object without moving.
What is the reason for calling these five mental factors, feeling and so forth, “omnipresent”? They are so-called because they are mental factors that accompany all minds. Furthermore, if any of the five omnipresent mental factors are missing, then the utilization of an object will not be complete:				
1) If feeling is absent, then there will be no experience	2) If discrimination is absent, then there will be no apprehension of the uncommon signs of the object	3) If intention is absent, then the mind will not be directed to an object	4) If contact is absent, then there will be no support for feeling	5) If attention is absent, then the mind will not be focused on a particular object of observation
If it is a main mind, it is necessarily accompanied by these five omnipresent mental factors. This is because:				
1) If there is no feeling, there is no way to experience the object	2) If there is no discrimination, one would not be able to distinguish the uncommon sign of the object	3) If there is no intention, the mind would not be directed to an object	4) Without contact, the mind would not be able to meet with the object	5) If attention is absent, the mind would not be able to stay on the object

The five object ascertaining mental factors:

1) Aspiration 2) Belief 3) Mindfulness 4) Meditative stabilization 5) Wisdom

1) Aspiration – Root text page 26:

Compendium of Knowledge: It is the very wish to be endowed with this or that attribute of a desired thing. It has the function of acting as a support for [joyous perseverance].

Just as it has been said above, it is a knower that, upon observing some intended thing, seeks it.

The way in which aspiration acts as a support for joyous perseverance is as follows:

Maitreya's Discrimination of the Middle and the Extreme: The support and that supported by it; the cause and the result.

The three features/ characteristics: a knower which possesses these three features is aspiration –

1) Object: the attribute of a desired thing	2) Subjective aspect: the very wish to be endowed with this desired thing	3) Function: support for joyous perseverance
---	---	--

This mainly refers to the mental factor of aspiration in the retinue of a virtuous main mind.

The importance of aspiration: how it functions as a support for joyous perseverance –

The quote in the root text (page 27) from the Lam Rim Chen Mo highlights the importance of aspiration. This is because, it is only with aspiration that joyous perseverance is possible. Therefore, all the excellent qualities come from joyous perseverance.

With respect to attaining meditative stabilization, a single-pointedness of mind, it is also very important to possess a strong aspiration for it. The cause for such strong aspiration for attaining single-pointedness of mind is the faith of conviction. This faith in turn, is acquired through hearing about the advantages of single-pointedness of mind and then reflecting on what one has heard. Based on this, one develops the cause to aspire to attain such single-pointedness of mind. Using this as an example:

Strong faith of conviction in the existence and qualities of calm abiding leads to strong aspiration in attaining it.	Strong aspiration in attaining calm abiding leads to strong joyous perseverance, which is a mind that is enthusiastic about virtue, that which works joyously to attain it.	Strong joyous perseverance leads to physical and mental pliancy.	Physical and mental pliancy allows one to overcome every laziness.
--	--	---	---

It is therefore laziness that obstructs any form of attainments. Here, it is merely using single-pointedness as an object/ example. One should therefore understand how important aspiration is, this is because, it is only with strong aspiration that it is possible to really engage in perfect virtue.

Summary: the essential point is to lessen and remove non-virtuous minds, generate virtuous ones and increase whatever virtuous minds generated –

- 1) With strong foundation in hearing and reflecting on the teachings (cause) comes strong and stable faith of conviction (result)
- 2) With strong and stable faith of conviction (cause) comes strong and stable aspiration (result)
- 2) With strong and stable aspiration (cause), this acts as a support for strong and stable joyous perseverance (result)
- 3) With strong joyous perseverance (cause), one develops new qualities yet to be developed (result)
- 4) Whatever qualities already developed will be maintained without degeneration
- 5) Whatever qualities maintained will be increased

Therefore, Lama Tsong-kha-pa exhorted on the importance of hearing, reflection and meditation. This is because, without hearing/ studying/ learning and without reflection, nothing great will happen. This is because, without stable learning, reflection and meditation, strong and stable faith will not arise. Since whatever faith one has is weak and inconsequential, this will likewise lead to similar weak and inconsequential aspiration, which leads to weak and inconsequential effort [to practice].

Therefore, this shows that whether [one achieves any concrete results in one's spiritual attainments or not], essentially depends on whether one has stable learning and reflection or not.

Even through reflecting merely on this alone, one gains faith in [the importance of] study and reflection.

Division of aspiration:

1) Aspiration wishing to meet	2) Aspiration wishing not to be separated	3) Aspiration that seeks
-------------------------------	---	--------------------------

2) Belief: Root text page 28 –

Compendium of Knowledge: It holds an ascertained thing to be just the way it has been ascertained. It has the function of non-captivation.

Just as it has been said above, it is a knower which holds the object that has been ascertained by its valid cognition, thinking, “It is just like this and not otherwise.” Here its function is specified as “non-captivation”.

The three features/ characteristics: a knower which possesses these three features is belief –

1) Object: something that has been ascertained/ realized	2) Subjective aspect: with respect to its object, it understand/ holds onto it to be just this and nothing else	3) Function: non-captivation, which means not being allured by other conditions and thus would not be swayed/ captivated to change one's conviction on the object
--	---	---

Its function is specified as “non-captivation,” because when one has gained firm belief in the object that has been ascertained, an opponent cannot steer one away it. For example, reflecting upon the difference between the Buddhists and non-buddhist teachers in the context of going for refuge, one analyses, “Which is an infallible refuge?” and ascertains that only the Teacher, the Buddha, is an infallible refuge. Then, when the doctrine taught by him and the spiritual community properly practicing this doctrine are also ascertained by valid cognition to be infallible refuges, a firm belief in them as final refuges is gained. Thereupon, Forders and so forth cannot lead one astray and one has then joined the ranks of Buddhists. Based upon this, all wholesome qualities will increase. Furthermore, *Engaging in the Bodhisattva Deeds* says:

The Muni has taught that belief is the root of all that belongs to the class of virtue, and the root of that is constant meditation on the fruitional results.

The importance of belief: How it is the root of all virtues –

Belief is a mind that holds onto a previously ascertained object to be just the way it has been ascertained and nothing else.

Thus, it is important to have stable belief in the virtuous class of phenomena. As cited from Shantideva above, belief here is the stable regard in the class of virtue as true.

The root of belief is the [faith of] convention in the Law of cause and effect. Since that is the case, belief is the root of all virtues/ wholesome qualities. Therefore, to be able to strive in virtue, one necessarily needs belief. However, to possess strong and stale belief, one necessarily needs strong and stable faith of conviction in the Law of cause and effect.

As explained previously, the faith of conviction in actions and their results is the “correct worldly view”. Once one possesses such a conviction, every attainment is possible: With conviction in actions and their results, one can have aspiration and belief.

The inferential cognizer can be generated through belief. When one reflects on these topics, this is how one generates inference through belief.
Therefore, to gain ascertainment/ belief in karma and its effects, it is important to learn/ study and reflect on these topics.
However, through learning and reflecting, it is also possible to develop qualms/ doubt about the Law of cause and its effects. Nevertheless, this qualm can be a doubt that tends towards the fact.
On the basis of this, through further study and reflection, one can gain a correctly assuming consciousness in relation towards karma and its effects. This is like a realization [although it is not actually].
Having such a correct assumption/ correct belief in karma and its effects can enable one to live a life through practicing on the basis of belief in karma and its effects.
Of course, it would be the best if one were to gain a faith of conviction in karma and its effects. This is when one generates an inferential valid cognition of karma and its effects in dependence on correct logic and reasoning [correct sign]. Such a faith would be very stable and irreversible.
With such a stable and irreversible faith in karma and its effects, one's practice would be greatly enhanced, one would achieve the goals of one's practice.
Here, belief is taught in the context of the five object ascertaining mental factors. If one has belief in karma and its effects, it is not mere belief as one understands it normally.
This is because, it is a knower that holds the object that has been ascertained by valid cognition. This means, the object of observation of belief is something that has been ascertained/ realized by valid cognition. Belief essentially holds onto such an ascertained object as it is and nothing else.
Therefore, belief is very important for one's spiritual development/ training in the dharma. Once one has ascertained through valid cognition and holds onto that realization, whatever practices one sets out towards would be achieved.
Nevertheless, whatever one does in life in general, one also necessarily need such a belief.

The difference between belief and subsequent cognizer:

Subsequent cognizer	Belief
A knower that realizes what has already been realized.	It is not a knower that realizes something that has already been realized, it is merely a knower that holds onto an object, believing that it is just that and nothing else.
Can either be a main mind or a mental factor	Necessarily only a mental factor

SQ: Since intention is the mental factor that moves the mind towards the object, can it also move the mind away from the object?

KR: Before intention moves the mind towards an object, it is essentially moving the mind away from another object. One can understand this in terms of how this mental factor of intention can move the mind from a non-virtuous state towards a virtuous state. Therefore, intention is the mental factor that moves the mind and does not stay where it is.

SQ: How are the observed objects of mental consciousness, a sense object and a phenomenon source form, differentiated?

KR: Phenomenon source form is a form which is not an object of observation of any sense consciousnesses, it is only an object of observation of a mental consciousness. An example of this is an elephant that appears in a dream. However, this does not mean that whatever appears to a sense consciousness does not appear to a mental consciousness. For example, when referring to 'blue', whether it is an eye consciousness apprehending blue or a mental consciousness apprehending blue, blue, a sense object, is the same observed object for both consciousnesses. The blue that appears to a conceptual consciousness apprehending blue is a visible form and not a phenomenon source form. Therefore, this blue is not the “blue that cannot appear” to a sense consciousness [“the blue that cannot appear to a sense consciousness” is a phenomenon source blue].

3) Mindfulness: Root text page 28 –

<i>Arya Asanga's Compendium of Knowledge: Mindfulness is a non-forgetfulness of the mind with respect to a familiar object. It has the function of non-distraction.</i>		
Just as it has been said above, it is a knower that possesses three features:		
1) Object: a familiar object	2) Subjective aspect: a non-forgetfulness of upon having observed that object	3) Function: non-distraction
Since mindfulness is not produced with respect to that which has not been previously familiarized with, the objective feature is stated as “a familiar object.”	Even though the mind might have previously familiarized itself with an object, if it does not presently dawn as an object of the mind, mindfulness will not occur. Thus, the subjective aspect feature is specified as “non-forgetfulness of the mind.”	Since the stability of the mind is enhanced in dependence on special mindfulness, its functional feature is specified as that of “non-distraction.”
One cannot have mindfulness with respect to an object one is not familiar with.	Therefore, mindfulness is essentially a mind that does not forget the object.	

The importance of mindfulness: How it protects the mind from non-virtues and thereby safeguards one's virtues. Root text page 29 –

<i>Engaging in the Bodhisattva Deeds says: Even though learned, faithful and diligent in effort, many become tainted by downfalls due to committing the fault of lacking introspection.</i>
Even though this verse is referring to introspection, it is also highlighting the importance of mindfulness. Mindfulness and introspection/ vigilance are very important.
Even though one may be learned, have faith and hardworking, however, if one does not know the essential points of the practice, then one can be tainted by various downfalls and faults as a result of lacking mindfulness.
<i>Though they have amassed merit, it is pilfered by the thief of non-introspection who follows upon degeneration of mindfulness; they proceed to a bad migration.</i>
If one loses mindfulness of a virtuous object of observation, if one forgets to place/ focus the mind on a virtuous object, if the mind forgets that virtuous object/ mindfulness degenerates, then all the merit that one has amassed may decline. One then may fall into the lower realms.
<i>This band of thieves, the afflictions, looks for an opportunity; upon finding an opportunity, it pilfers my virtue and even destroys the life of a good migration.</i>
The moment one forgets to place/ focus/ loses mindfulness of a virtuous object, then in its place all sorts of afflictions will come readily.
Due to that, one's merits/ virtues will also decline. When one's virtues are stolen by the afflictions, one will not be able to obtain a good rebirth.
<i>Therefore, mindfulness should never be displaced from the door of the mind; if it does go, recalling the anguish of bad migrations, place it back.</i>
These verses are reminding one the great importance of mindfulness, to not forget to focus the mind on a virtuous object.
If one finds one's mindfulness has degenerated or is degenerating, one should recall the sufferings of the lower realms, thinking: “If I forget to place my mind in virtue, this is what will happen to me. With this thought, one then places one's mindfulness back again on the virtuous object.

Due to association with spiritual teachers, the teachings of the abbot, and fear, fortunate ones who act respectfully easily generate mindfulness.

This verse highlights the external condition for generating mindfulness: one's virtuous friend/ guru.

Mindfulness and introspection are said to be indispensable for developing good qualities.

Let my gain and honor, my body and livelihood vanish; let even my other virtues degenerate, but may my mind never degenerate. I [place my palms together to plead], those who wish to guard their minds, guard your mindfulness and introspection even at the cost of your lives!

Shantideva is essentially advising one to rely on mindfulness and introspection always to protect and guard one's mind. Just as one would normally protect and guard one's body, possessions and so forth, likewise, one should also protect and guard one's mind with mindfulness and introspection.

Between protecting/ guarding one's body and protecting/ guarding one's mind, it is said that protecting and guarding one's mind is more important.

Whichever way one reflects, one would come to understand how important it is to protect [and guard] one's mind with mindfulness and introspection.

This is because, comparing physical and mental suffering, mental suffering is more difficult to bear. Also, between physical and mental bliss, mental bliss is more important. It is not the body but the mind that goes on to the next life. It is therefore the mind that determines what sort of rebirth one would get in the next life, from life to life.

How does one differentiate between a good and a bad person? The difference is not determined based on how they look physically, the size of their bodies and so on. It is determined by the state of their minds. Therefore, a good person is differentiated from a bad person simply because this person has a better quality of mind, being more good hearted, for example.

When one has love for someone, likes or shows affection for someone, it is actually more related with the person, which is related with the person's mind. When the person is alive, when the mind is still within the body, one has such feelings towards him/ her. However, when the person has left the body, when the mind is no longer within the body, when one looks at the body, one would not have that same level of feelings towards the dead body. One may even feel aversion towards it.

The essence is this: the state of one's mind is so important, therefore, just as one protects and guards one's body and possessions, likewise, Shantideva urges, implores and even pleads by putting his palms together, to request that one should protect and guard one's mind.

Such a discussion of the mental factor of mindfulness is under the context of being in the retinue of a virtuous mind. Since it is so important to protect and place the mind on a virtuous object, it is therefore important to understand what mindfulness is and why it is important.

4) Meditative stabilization/ concentration: Root text page 30 –

With good mindfulness and introspection, one can achieve meditative stabilization/ concentration.

Arya Asanga's Compendium of Knowledge: It is a one-pointedness of the mind with respect to an imputed thing. It has the function of acting as a support for knowledge.

Just as it has been said above, it is a one-pointedness of mind that, within observing an imputed thing, is continuously set upon it.

The three features:

- | | | |
|-----------------------------|--|--------------------------------|
| 1) Object: an imputed thing | 2) Subjective aspect: single-pointedness | 3) Function: developing wisdom |
|-----------------------------|--|--------------------------------|

The objective feature of meditative stabilization is specified to be “an imputed thing,” because, when cultivating meditative stabilization, one holds the mind to an object of observation that is imputed by the mind.

Any objects of observation being used to develop meditative stabilization can be posited, however, these are condensed into four categories:

1) Objects of observation for purifying behavior	One observes one's minds/ afflictions to identify the predominant afflictions: anger, attachment, pride and so forth. Through this, one then applies the [appropriate] antidotes to such predominant afflictions.
	If the afflictions are too strong, it would be difficult to develop single-pointedness of mind even if one tries very hard to do so.
	Therefore, to overcome this, one needs to purify one's behavior, by observing one's predominant afflictions and apply the antidotes.
	For example, if one's predominant affliction is desire/ attachment, one can meditate on ugliness. If it is anger, one meditates on love. If it is ignorance, one reflects on dependent arising. If it is pride, one recalls the myriad objects of knowledge in the universe that one does not know or understand. If it is discursive thoughts, one meditates on the breadth.
2) Objects of observation for purifying afflictions	Purifying afflictions here refers to gaining control over one's manifest afflictions.
	This is done by observing the qualities of next higher [desire, form and formless] realms, seeing how coarse the state of one's current realm is, compared to that [Mundane path of preparation bearing aspects of calmness (of higher realms) and coarseness (of the realm below it)].
	One sees how coarse one's current realm is, how it is not as alluring as the next higher realm. One is then captivated by that and wishes to achieve that.
	Similarly, the meditation on the sixteen aspect of the four noble truths is done in the same way.
3) Pervasive objects of observation	Refers to all phenomena.
4) Objects of observation for developing skill	Refers to selflessness of persons or selflessness of phenomena.
	For example, analyzing in meditation whether the self exists on the body or aggregates or not.

Elaboration of the object of observation: what is an “imputed thing” –

Meditative stabilization is related only to the mental consciousness. It is not produced in the sense consciousness but rather in the mental consciousness. Therefore, concentration is not produced in the eye [sense] consciousness. Since that is the case, the visible form that appears to an eye consciousness is not the observed object of meditative stabilization.

Therefore, one does not develop concentration merely by 'staring' at a visible object without closing one's eyes, or merely focusing one's concentration without distraction on a cup. This is not how one develops one's meditative stabilization.

Therefore, the object of observation of meditative stabilization is not a form that appears to a sense consciousness. Rather, it is only a mental object imputed by the mind.

When one trains to develop concentration by focusing on an object, one initially looks at that and develops a clear appearance of how it looks like. One then reproduces that appearance within one's mental consciousness as a mental image and focuses on that instead. This then becomes one's object for developing meditative stabilization.

SQ: Can there be an imputation by a non-conceptual meditative stabilization? In general, an object is not necessarily imputed by a conceptual consciousness.

With regards to the 'imputed thing', one can posit that the object of observation for developing meditative stabilization is essentially an appearance which is appearing to a mental consciousness. Since it is an appearance which is appearing to a mental consciousness, therefore, one posits that it is imputed.

This is what the root text is asserting with respect to the object of observation being an "imputed thing": an appearance which is appearing to a mental consciousness.

Root text page 31: Nowadays, it seems that there are some instructions at odds with the wording of the Conqueror's scriptures that clearly teach the method of performing staring meditation within observation of a form appearing to the eye consciousness. However, Arya Asanga clearly stated that meditative stabilization is not produced in sense consciousnesses; rather, it is only produced in a mental consciousness. Moreover, its object of observation is not form appearing to a sense consciousness; it is only a mental object imputed by the mind.

Proving that meditative stabilization cannot be attained with the sense consciousness through a simple example:

If one stares at a picture and wishes not to be distracted, one should render a blur vision of it. If one has a clear vision of the picture, one's eye consciousness would be distracted. This is because, if one's vision is a clear one, one would [tend to look at the various aspects of the picture and thereby become distracted]. However, if one's eye consciousness is very focused, even if there are distracting objects coming in between one's focus, one would not be distracted as one's vision [towards the picture] is unclear. [Therefore, to have an undistracted staring meditation, one necessarily has to have a blurred vision of the object].

When one develops a meditative stabilization focusing on an object, there is the factor of stability and a factor of clarity. These two factors are necessary for the attainment of meditative stabilization.

However, when one focuses on an object with one's eye consciousness [with a staring meditation], one may stay focused on it but [as it is shown in the example above], one's clarity would not be good.

This is likened to the laxity experienced by those who are attempting to develop concentration: even though one may place one's mind on an object and stay focused, however, the object is not clear and vivid. This is laxity.

Therefore, in essence, meditative stabilization is generated in a mental consciousness and not a sense consciousness. The object of observation is not a form that is appearing to a sense consciousness. Rather, through initially having a clear appearance of a visible object, one recreates a mental image of that object in one's mental consciousness and focuses on that mental image [until concentration is achieved].

KQ: Can one achieve meditative stabilization by focusing on the breath? [See page 86].

Root text page 31:

Qualm: Well then, does the object of meditative stabilization definitely have to be a real object?

Response: No. Whether the object be real or erroneous, if one attentively familiarizes oneself with it internally over and over again, clear appearance and non-conceptuality with respect to that object will arise. It is just as it has been said in Dharmakirti's Commentary in Dignaga's 'Compendium of Valid Cognition':

Therefore, utmost familiarization with whatever, whether real or unreal, results in a clear non-conceptual mind when that familiarization is thoroughly completed.

KQ: How does one posit between a real and unreal object? Does it depend on whether the object is an existent or not?

K: Even though there is no rabbit's horns, nevertheless, one can still conceive of a rabbit's horns and meditate on that. Rabbit's horns are non-existent and therefore the existence of which is impossible. From here, one can see that real and unreal [objects of observation] may not refer to existent and non-existent [objects of observation].

If one chooses to meditate on a rabbit's horns, this object is not something that appears to the sense consciousness as it is a non-existent. However, it is absolutely possible to create a mental image of it. This 'mental image of a rabbit's horns' then becomes one's object of observation in the meditation.

The functional feature of meditative stabilization is specified to be “acting as a support for knowledge”.

Knowledge here refers to special insight. The root of cyclic existence/ afflictions is ignorance. Therefore, to destroy this, one necessarily needs to achieve calm-abiding, in dependence of which, one achieves special insight focusing on emptiness, one would then have the direct antidote to the afflictions [chiefly ignorance].

Root text page 31: Engaging in the Bodhisattva Deeds says: Having understood that afflictions are destroyed by special insight that is fully endowed with calm-abiding, first seek calm-abiding; that is achieved through taking joy in non-attachment to the world.

Also, the *Scripture on Discipline* repeatedly teaches the ways in which the training in meditative stabilization depends on the training in ethics, and the training in wisdom depends on the training in meditative stabilization. In this manner, those who wish for liberation from their hearts should regard these great texts as supreme quintessential instructions.

This shows how greatly important it is to learn/ study the teachings. Even in the context of one seeking to develop single-pointedness of mind, one necessarily needs to know exactly what one is attempting/ what meditative stabilization is all about. One needs to know the objects one can choose to focus on, how it is only achieved in the mental consciousness and not the sense consciousness, and so on. Without learning/ knowing/ studying the [correct methods], one may spend one's entire lifetime trying to practice and thinking one is actually practicing the right methods to achieve calm-abiding. Unfortunately, one will never reach one's goal and in so doing waste one's lifetime thinking one is achieving something.

Lama Tsongkhapa also emphasized how important it is to study the great treatises, in particular, the texts of the great Indian masters as all the [commentaries] are traced back to them. In the context of developing meditative stabilization, the primary source that is often cited is the texts of Arya Asanga.

All the great treatises, the explanations and commentaries of the Indian masters themselves are also traced back to the Buddha himself. Therefore, it is important to rely on the purity of the source/ unmistakable explanations.

While it is really difficult to achieve meditative stabilization, the single-pointedness of mind, at the very least, one should place special predispositions to achieve it in the future by gaining a complete and correct understanding of its features. Through such [dependent-arising], there is hope [one would achieve] this in the future.

The extensive explanations on cultivating meditative stabilization is found in the Lam Rim Chen Mo. In the context of explaining the 51 mental factors, the root text here is merely explaining its entity.

The distinctive features of the five object ascertaining mental factors:

Aspiration	Belief	Mindfulness	Meditative stabilization	Wisdom
It is a knower that focuses on a desired object and wishes to be endowed with it. Therefore, it is a mind that seeks/ desire an object.	It is an ascertainment of an object. It is a mind that apprehends/ holds an object that has been ascertained by its valid cognition, thinking, “It is just like that and not otherwise.”	It is a mind that does not forget a familiar object that has been ascertained.	It is a single-pointedness of the mind that holds onto an imputed object.	It individually differentiates what qualities to cultivate and faults to abandon.

Reasons showing why all the five object ascertaining mental factors are needed in the cultivation of virtue:

To achieve any goals, one necessarily needs to have an aspiration for it, therefore, it is important to understand what aspiration is, its entity, object, functions and so on.
When one has aspiration, one would likely put in effort/ joyous perseverance, which is induced by aspiration. When one has joyous perseverance, one would likely to achieve one's desired goals.
Belief is very important. One may have aspiration and based on that, joyous perseverance. However, if one does not possess belief, then one's aspiration and joyous perseverance induced by it can change.
Therefore, it is important to have stable belief. Since belief is an ascertainment of its object by holding onto it and views it as it has been determined and not otherwise, one's aspiration and its result, joyous perseverance, would not change.
Even if one possesses aspiration and belief, that is, even if one is familiar with one's object, however, if one lacks mindfulness , then it would be difficult to sustain one's practice of virtue, to accomplish one's goals and see them come to fruition. Therefore, this shows how important mindfulness is.
In this context, root text is teaching about mindfulness of a virtuous object, placing/ focusing one's mind on a virtuous object and not forgetting it.
As it is mentioned in the text, the very moment one forgets to place/ focus one's thoughts on a virtuous object, the afflictions would creep in/ manifest immediately.
Therefore, to not allow this to occur, it is very important to be mindful/ not forget to place/ focus one's mind on a virtuous object. Therefore, this again shows why mindfulness is important.
Meditative stabilization / concentration/ single-pointedness of mind is also important as it is not sufficient merely to not forget to place one's mind on a virtuous object. This is because, when one lacks single-pointedness of mind, whatever antidotes one may possess to counteract the afflictions would not be effective.
Of course, merely by having single-pointedness of mind alone would not enable the destruction of the afflictions. It is on the basis of having single-pointedness of mind that one would be able to develop the special wisdom of insight which is the [sole] antidote to the afflictions. Therefore, wisdom is taught next:

5) Wisdom: Root text page 32 –

While it is true that when one has single-pointedness of mind, when one's mind is fully concentrated, it is possible that the afflictions do not manifest. One can stay focused on an object with such a mindset for one's entire lifetime, even for eons. Due to that, one's afflictions do not manifest, however, this does not mean that one has eliminated one's afflictions as these are still within one's continuum.
Therefore, to eliminate one's afflictions from the root [of one's continuum], one necessarily needs wisdom, in particular, the wisdom of individual analysis.
On the basis of developing concentration, one comes to achieve calm abiding/ meditative serenity. On the basis of having calm abiding, one generates special insight. It is this special insight that acts as the direct antidote to the afflictions.
<i>Arya Asanga's Compendium of Knowledge: Wisdom strongly differentiates the qualities of things that are to be examined. It has the function of overcoming doubt.</i>
Just as it has been said above, wisdom is a knower that individually differentiates the faults and good qualities of things that are to be examined.
The three features:
1) Object: virtuous, non-virtuous and the unspecified 2) Subjective aspect: distinguishes what to abandon and cultivate 3) Function: overcoming doubt

Using the four ways of reasoning to gain ascertainment of how phenomena are the way they are by nature:

To distinguish between what faults to abandon and what qualities to cultivate, one relies on the four ways of reasoning/ four principles:	
1) Reasoning of nature: reality is such that by nature, phenomena are established to be different	For example, it is the very nature of the three division of functioning thing of form, consciousness and non-associated composed factors to be mutually exclusive. This is what these things are by nature.
2) Reasoning of dependence: phenomena come into being in dependence on their respective substantial causes	Consciousness has to come from its substantial cause, a previous moment of consciousness. Therefore, it is dependent upon its substantial cause for its production. Likewise, form comes into being in dependence on its own substantial cause: a previous moment of form. This is how one understands the reasoning of dependence.
3) Functional reasoning: phenomena can perform their respective functions due to coming into being in dependence on concordant causes.	A consciousness is clear and knowing, able to know its objects and a form can obstruct other forms. The reason why these phenomena can perform such functions is because they have arisen from a concordant cause. Since these phenomena have arisen from their concordant causes, therefore, they are able to perform their respective functions in the way they are supposed to perform.
4) Logical reasoning: one gains understanding of the above through logical reasoning	One gains understanding of these principles through, for example, using three and four possibilities or a correct sign. One would then be able to generate an inferential cognition of such phenomena.
To understand phenomena, one either perceives them directly or one gains an inferential cognition of them through : 1) a correct sign, which is inference by the power of fact, or 2) inference through belief. [The latter has been discussed here]	
Through the process of generating the wisdom that differentiates between qualities to be cultivated and faults to be abandoned by relying on these four reasoning, one enhances one's wisdom even further.	

Discussion on these five object ascertaining mental factors:

1) Not necessarily virtuous mental factors	In the context of discussing the five object ascertaining mental factors, it is done from the perspective of these being in the retinue of a virtuous main mind. Since that is the case, are these five mental factors necessarily limited to virtuous main minds? Can they not accompany any main minds? Are object ascertaining mental factors necessarily virtuous? In general, it is not necessarily so.			
2) Mainly accompany mental consciousnesses	Can these five object ascertaining mental factors arise in the retinue of a sense primary consciousness? In general, these five accompany mental consciousnesses.			
3) When one is present, the others are also present [in the context of a virtuous main mind]	In the retinue of a virtuous main mind, would all five object ascertaining mental factors be present? It seems likely so:			
	For example, a) the mental factor of belief in the three jewels within the retinue of a main mind, this main mind itself would also have belief in the three jewels [albeit not by its own power]. In the retinue of this main mind, the other four object ascertaining mental factors would be there as well:			
	b) Mindfulness: that which does not allow forgetting the three jewels is mindfulness.	c) Aspiration: that which is focused on the three jewels [and wishes to become them].	d) Concentration: not necessarily for a long time, while it is a single-pointed placement of mind on the three jewels, it is concentration.	e) Wisdom: that distinguishes/ differentiates the qualities and [lack of] faults in the three jewels.
When a virtuous main mind is manifest: there is an aspiration to seek those virtues. One does not forget the virtuous object with mindfulness. One's mind is also having single-pointed focus on the object with concentration. Wisdom is also present to differentiate qualities from faults. Belief is also present.				

Root text does not term these five object ascertaining mental factors as “virtuous mental factors” or explain that they necessarily focus on virtuous objects. They are only taught as object ascertaining mental factors.

Therefore, if these five mental factors are in the retinue of a virtuous main mind, then these five would be virtuous.

One can also consider these five object ascertaining mental factors in the retinue of a non-virtuous main mind. When these five are in the retinue of a non-virtuous main mind, then one would have to say that these five object ascertaining mental factors would also be non-virtuous as well.

For example, in the retinue of a non-virtuous main mind, there is belief in the object of a non-virtuous mind. However, can one term such a mental event as “belief”? Likewise, there is also a single-pointedness of this non-virtuous main mind [on its object].

Therefore, one has to consider whether one can posit these object ascertaining mental factors in the retinue of a non-virtuous main mind. Root text teaches these five mental factors primarily in the context of a virtuous main mind.

While this is so, nevertheless, when these five are grouped together, they are merely called object ascertaining mental factors. The terms virtuous or non-virtuous are not affixed. Moreover, their respective definitions also do not indicate that these are necessarily virtuous.

The eleven virtuous mental factors:

1) Faith 2) Shame 3) Embarrassment 4) Non-attachment 5) Non-hatred 6) Non-ignorance 7) Joyous perseverance 8) Pliancy 9) Conscientiousness 10) Equanimity 11) Non-harmfulness

1) Faith:

Compendium of Knowledge: It is a conviction, clarity, and wishing with respect to an existent that is endowed with excellent qualities and power. It has the function of acting as a support for aspiration.

Just as it has been said above, faith is a knower that has the aspect of conviction, clarity, or wishing, and it serves as the direct antidote for non-faith.

When divided, faith is of three types: a) Faith of conviction b) Clarifying/ clear faith c) Wishing/ aspiring faith

1) Object	2) Subjective aspect	3) Function
a) Faith of conviction – existent	For example, having faith of conviction in the existence of past and future lives, the law of cause and its effects, that good actions leads to happiness and bad actions leads to suffering and so on. It is essentially having the infallible conviction that such a phenomenon exists and it functions as just like it has been determined. To do so, one has to learn and reflect on these topics, without which it would be difficult to arise.	Acting as a support for aspiration
b) Clarifying faith – excellent qualities	It is having a clear mind that is generated in dependence upon seeing , for example, the qualities of the Three Jewels and having a liking for them. When this occurs, one's mind is separated from all the pollutants/ afflictions and so on. This enables mental space for the mind to develop spiritually, making it suitable to cultivate the path.	
	For example, when one places a water-purifying gem in dirty water, the murkiness of the water is immediately cleared away. One is then able to see the images being reflected on the surface. Likewise, through seeing the qualities of the Three Jewels, the mind becomes clear of mental pollutants which allows possibilities to develop the three jewels within oneself. Therefore, faith from seeing qualities [of its object] becomes very important.	

How having clarifying faith in one's guru enables one to quickly develop qualities:	The LamRim topic on correctly relying on the virtuous friend teaches that the root training is developing faith. This comes from focusing on and seeing the qualities [of one's virtuous friend] such that one's mind becomes suitable to pick up and develop the very qualities of one's guru within oneself . This happens only when one focuses on one's guru's qualities that enables one to generate a clear mind [of faith] .	
	However, if one were to conceive [one's guru] negatively, generating a mind of non-faith , this essentially blocks one's mind from developing those qualities [of one's guru] .	
	When one's mind manifests and becomes [gentle, tender and subdued] through seeing the qualities/ having clear faith [in one's guru], one's mind is clear, peaceful, calm and happy.	
	When this occurs, it then becomes very easy to accomplish whatever the virtuous friends advises. The reason why one finds it difficult to accomplish what he advises is simply due to the mind being very [hardened/ unyielding/ unsubdued]. One lacks the happy mind to do it.	
	When one has faith in one's virtuous friend through seeing his qualities, then accomplishing his works/ his wishes becomes easy. One would not be unwilling to do so.	
	This applies to everything in life: when one understands the importance of whatever one wishes to do, this becomes easy to do. One would not find it difficult at all.	
c) Wishing/ aspiring faith – power	Wishing faith, is, for instance, having contemplated the modes of the four noble truths, ascertained true sufferings and true origins as objects of abandonment, and true cessations and true paths as objects of attainment, and having understood that these can be attained if one makes the proper effort, the faith thinking, “I shall definitely obtain them.”	

Comparing between faith and liking, and between liking and respect:

Faith is commonly thought of being the same as liking. However, this is not necessarily so as one can use the four possibilities between faith and liking to understand this.

Liking and respect are also commonly thought of as the same, however, this is not so:

Root text page 34: In the world we speak of them as if they are the same, but in fact they are not. Liking a spiritual friend is faith, but respect for him involves contemplating his kindness, knowing shame, and valuing him highly. Hence, when [faith of] liking and respect arise in the continuum, they are separate mental factors.

Through recollecting the qualities of one's virtuous friend, one generates faith [of liking] in one's virtuous friend. Through recalling the kindness of one's virtuous friend, one generates respect for one's virtuous friend. Therefore, these two mental factors are not the same: respect is, to a certain degree, induced by faith.

Reasons to show why it is so important to engage in studying the great philosophical treatises through correctly relying on one's virtuous friend:

If, in accordance with how they appear on the great treatises, you analyze these modes in detail with the wisdom of individual investigation, examining the way in which they are generated in the continuum by turning your mind inwards, then you will get to know them; you cannot know them merely through words. With these meanings in mind, the Foremost Omniscient Tsongkhapa repeatedly advises that, in order to perform wholehearted practice, you must rely upon a skilful spiritual friend and acquire much hearing on the meaning of the scriptures. However, nowadays, when these great textual systems are explained to foolish beings who are deprived of the gem of intelligence and are inferior in merit, they become frightened, terrified and flee faraway, as though a poisonous snake had sensed the odor of musk, or a little child had caught sight of a whirlpool. Those who view the exalted speech of the great scholars and adepts from the Land of Superiors as pith instructions seem like stars during daytime.

Studying the great philosophical treatises is difficult. However, if one wishes to engage in wholehearted practice and to achieve the actual fully qualified realizations, then studying and learning the meanings of these subjects of the great Indian masters become indispensable. When one lacks such knowledge, it would be rather difficult to accomplish any real realizations or experiences. Therefore, Lama Tsongkhapa always advises to do just that.

Faith functions as a support for [generating] aspiration. Therefore, to develop aspiration, faith is very important. Without faith, it would be impossible to develop it.

Then, how does one develop faith? Faith arises from seeing the qualities of an object, for example, the Three Jewels.

To generate genuine faith in the Three Jewels, one necessarily needs to know exactly what they are, their qualities and so on. Therefore, one necessarily needs to see, understand and realize their qualities. To do that, one has no options but to gain knowledge by learning, studying and investigating.

Without such education, study and learning, it would be impossible to develop any of the three types of faith. If one lacks any of these three kinds of faith, then it would be difficult to develop any further qualities. This is because, faith is the foundation of all qualities. This shows why there is so much emphasis on learning/ studying.

Most people strongly regard/ feel that studying, especially the philosophical subjects, as an intellectual exercise, that it is for the sake of discussion and hence there are no real benefits/ purposes.

If one were to check, the conclusion would be that, if one wishes to genuinely engage in practice, one would necessarily need joyous perseverance. This can only arise when one has strong and stable aspiration. This, in turn, depends on faith. Faith itself, can only arise when one sees the qualities, for example, the qualities of the Three Jewels, what they are exactly and so on. This can only arise in dependence on learning and studying from the great philosophical treatises.

When one sees the process [of coming to a correct conclusion], one would realize the great need and importance of studying such topics. One would then [automatically] treasure and cherish it.

Benefits of faith:

Root text page 35: Buddha taught, in the "Formulae of the Three Jewels' Blaze": Faith is the forerunner, and, like a mother, is the procreator. It guards and increases all excellent qualities. It dispels doubts and frees you from the four great rivers, faith signifies the city of happiness and goodness. Faith is without murkiness and clarifies the mind. It abandons pride and is the root of respect. Faith is a jewel, a treasure, and the best of feet. Like hands, it is the root of gathering virtue.

In the Ten Teachings Sutra, it says: Faith is the best of vehicles through which you will be guided and definitely emerge. Therefore, intelligent people rely on following faith. Wholesome qualities do not grow in people who have no faith, just as green sprouts do not grow from seeds scorched by fire.

Thus, all wholesome qualities are companions of faith. Shantideva's *Compendium of Trainings* stating, "having made firm the root of faith," also teaches that faith is the root of all paths. Even the Great Being, the Protector Nagarjuna, emphatically taught that faith is the foundation of all paths. With these meanings in mind, the Foremost Omniscient Tsongkhapa made the statement "Training in faith, the root, [as] one of the outlines in his *Great Exposition of the Stages of the Path*, and stated that "the root of all happiness and goodness is the faith of conviction."

Therefore, faith is so very important. With faith: 1) one would be able to generate whatever qualities one has yet to generate 2) it guards whatever qualities that are generated 3) it increases these qualities that are generated.

When one has faith, for example, in the virtuous friend: 1) this would reduce one's pride 2) one develops respect for one's virtuous friend, which depends on faith for one's virtuous friend 3) it also stops one's mind from seeking out faults in one's virtuous friend.

Faith is like a jewel, with it, one has in one's hands all the jewels of virtue. It is like a treasury, with it, one would have unending qualities like an inexhaustible treasury.

Faith is the best of feet, just as one depends on one's feet to walk, faith is that which enables one to proceed towards enlightenment. Without faith, it is like one has no feet, one would not be able proceed towards enlightenment.

These are essentially advice for one: by looking at the entity of faith, its objects, functions and so on, these are means to enable one to develop faith within one's mind.

One therefore has to check within oneself/ one's own experience to see whether faith is important or not: when one generates faith, does that benefit one? For example, does it reduce one's pride and increase those qualities as mentioned above?

When one sees that how important faith is, then one would understand that with more faith, one would be able to develop more qualities.

2) and 3) Shame and Embarrassment: Root text page 36 –

Compendium of Knowledge: Shame is an avoidance of misdeeds on account of oneself. It has the function of acting as a support for effective restraint from misconduct.

If one restrains/ stops oneself from committing misdeeds of one's body, speech and mind on account of oneself, this is shame.

For example, one reminds oneself: “I have taken the pratimoksha, bodhisattva and/ or tantric vows, and if I were to engage in misdeeds, it would be wrong.” With this mind of shame, this would cause one to restrain oneself from committing misdeeds.

1) Object: any misdeeds

2) Subjective aspect: avoidance of misdeeds on account of oneself

3) Function: effective restraint from misconduct

Compendium of Knowledge: Embarrassment is an avoidance of misdeeds on account of others. It has the function of acting as a support for effective restraint from misconduct.

Embarrassment is also a restraint from misdeeds, but unlike shame, it is done on account of others.

For example, if one stops oneself from engaging in misdeeds with one's body, speech and/ or mind, by thinking. “If I were to do this, the buddhas and bodhisattvas would be displeased, others would also disagree, then I had better not commit the misdeed.”

1) Object: any misdeeds

2) Subjective aspect: avoidance of misdeeds on account of others

3) Function: effective restraint from misconduct

Therefore, if it is an avoidance of misdeeds on account of oneself, it is shame, if it is an avoidance of misdeeds on account of others, it is embarrassment.

SQ: Is there a difference in terms of the strength of restraint between shame and embarrassment? Embarrassment seems to be a restraint due to what others think of oneself whereas shame seems to arise/ motivated within oneself.

KR: This depends on who one believes in more, oneself or others.

SQ: It would also seem like when the external conditions are not there anymore, then the need to exercise those restraints may no longer be present?

KR: Whether it is shame or embarrassment, it is an avoidance of non-virtues. There would also not be a time for no embarrassment to arise due to the external conditions being absent. This is because the buddhas and bodhisattvas are always observing. Until one gains ascertainment that the buddhas and bodhisattvas have the powers to constantly know what one is doing, then [having the virtue of embarrassment would be difficult].

SQ: What is the difference between mindfulness and concentration?

KR: When mindfulness is there, so will there be concentration. However, they are different because they perform different functions. Mindfulness functions to not forget its object whereas the aspect of concentration is single-pointedness of its object. Nevertheless, all main minds and the mental factors in its retinue are one entity but different isolates, this is because they perform different functions.

Question to ponder:

Non-attachment is the opposite of attachment, non-hatred is the opposite of hatred and non-ignorance is the opposite of ignorance.
[Since that is the case, then] is non-ignorance the same as wisdom? [see pages 79 and 80 below]

4) Non-attachment: Root text page 37 –

Compendium of Knowledge: It is a lack of attachment to cyclic existence and the articles of cyclic existence. It has the function of acting as a support for non-engagement in misconduct.

Just as it has been said above, it is a knower which is disenchanted and lacks attachment.

1) Object: objects for which one develops desire/ attachment	2) Subjective aspect: non-attachment to such objects	3) Function: support for non-engagement in misconduct
--	--	---

Benefits of non-attachment:

Non-attachment is the antidote to: a) attachment b) miserliness c) haughtiness d) excitement e) distraction

It is good to know how non-attachment acts as an antidote to these afflictions, with that, one sees how important it is then to develop faith, aspiration and belief in [cultivating] non-attachment.

Since non-attachment is antidote to attachment, to develop the former, one has to reduce attachment with respect to the objects one has desire/ attachment for.

How to develop non-attachment/ reduce attachment:

To develop non-attachment/ reduce attachment towards one's objects of desire for pleasure/ pleasurable feelings, one has to see for oneself that:

1) No matter how much one enjoys or gets involved in it, such enjoyments are never satisfying/ fulfilling.

2) When one reflects on one's worldly happiness/ perfections, these are never stable.

3) Such worldly happiness/ pleasurable experiences are also in the nature of suffering.

Through such reflections, one would be able to reduce one's attachment.

Other techniques to reduce attachment: to reduce desire for food, one reflects on the drawbacks of having attachment for food. Another example is to meditate on ugliness

There are, therefore, many advice given in the teachings. For example, in the Vinaya, the code of conduct for ordained persons, there is advice for practicing contentment where one keeps just one set of robes, have simplicity with food, dwellings and so on.

Since non-attachment is a virtuous mind, one then needs to correctly identify what it is exactly, how it benefits oneself: when one has non-attachment, this essentially acts as antidotes to all the above mentioned afflictions.

Once one has learnt about this, then one should put this into practice, to reduce one's attachment.

5) Non-hatred:

Compendium of Knowledge: It is a lack of malice with regard to sentient beings, suffering and the sources of suffering. It has the function of acting as a support for non-engagement in misconduct.

Just as it has been said above, it is a knower that conquers the generation of hatred within observation of any of the three objects that generate hatred, sentient beings, suffering and the sources of suffering, and is a lack of malice.

1) Object: sentient beings, suffering and the sources of suffering	2) Subdued aspect: a lack of malice upon observing these objects	3) Function: support for non-engagement in misconduct
--	--	---

Benefits of non-hatred:

When one develops this virtuous non-hatred, one would then have the antidote to: [a) anger] b) belligerence c) resentment d) spite e) jealousy f) harmfulness

How to develop non-hatred:

To develop non-hatred, the way to do so is to try to stop these afflictions. There are many advice given for developing non-hatred, essentially dealing with anger:

1) When one experiences suffering, one should be reminded that it is ultimately oneself that is responsible for this experience. One should think that it is the ripening of one's own non-virtuous karma. Through understanding this, one then voluntarily accepts the experiences of suffering. When one voluntarily accepts that one's experiences of suffering is just like that [due to the certainty of one's karma], then this would help one to overcome belligerence, spite, resentment, jealousy and so on.

2) Buddha has advised in the four trainings to deal with anger: (page 49) a) Even when derided, do not deride in return b) Even when someone gets angry at one, do not get angry in return c) Even when hit, do not hit back d) Even when one's faults are exposed, do not expose others' faults.

Therefore, it is important to know how to develop non-hatred: it can only arise by oneself working at and reducing belligerence, resentment, spite, harmfulness and so on. It is by reducing these [non-virtuous mental factors] that one would be able to develop non-hatred.

When non-hatred arises in the mind, these minds of belligerence, resentment, spite, harmfulness and jealousy would naturally subside/ be pacified.

6) Non-ignorance: Root text page 38 –

Compendium of Knowledge: It is knowledge arisen from fruition, scripture, contemplation or realization, and is a wisdom of individual investigation. It has the function of acting as a support for the non-engagement in misconduct.

Just as it has been said above, it is a wisdom of individual investigation that is able to serve as the antidote to ignorance arising from its cause – being either acquired through birth or arisen through application.

Non-ignorance is a derivative of wisdom and the opposite of ignorance.

If ignorance is asserted as according to Arya Asanga and Vasubandhu, then it is posited as being separate from the view of the transitory collection.

Ignorance, in this context, would then be posited as an afflicted mind of merely 'not knowing something'. For example, an afflicted mind of not knowing what karma is.

1) Object: [phenomena]	2) Subjective aspect: not confused/ [knowing things]	3) Function: support for non-engagement in misconduct
------------------------	--	---

Comparison between wisdom and non-ignorance:

Wisdom (here, it is one of the five object ascertaining mental factors)	Non-ignorance
Aspect: distinguishing what is to be cultivated and abandoned.	Aspect: not being confused/ [able to know things]
Function: overcoming doubt	Function: acting as a support for non-engagement in misconduct

Division of non-ignorance:

1) Non-ignorance acquired through birth/ [arisen due to past lives' effort]	2) Non-ignorance acquired through application/ arisen due to present life's effort
Illustration: some people are just born with very clear intellect/ mind that is unconfused [about things].	In the present life, through the force of hearing, reflection and meditation, one then generates the wisdom arisen from hearing, reflection and meditation.
Such types of birth do not occur from without causes. This is due to a fruition of past efforts/ actions in past lives.	Such a non-ignorance is due to the result of present life's application.

Citations to highlight the importance of hearing: Root text Page 40 –

Therefore, seek much hearing on the three scriptural collections as well as their commentaries – the basis upon which one engages in hearing, analyze again and again the meaning of what has been heard with the four types of reasoning, and generate an ascertaining consciousness. Put the entire path into practice by way of analytical and stabilizing meditation upon that very meaning which the wisdom arisen from contemplation has gained ascertainment of.

These are the assertions of the Great Trailblazers.

Hence, those who are intelligent should engage in such a mode of path that pleases the Conquerors. If you discard much hearing, the excellent cause of wisdom of individual investigation, follow fools stupidly like a sheep, dwell in a relaxed and idle manner without contemplating anything whatsoever, and yet wallow in the conceit of being good-hearted, practicing Dharma, engaging in practice, and so forth, then you will waste your excellent support with its leisures, ruin others who are equal in fortune, and even become a serious condition contributing to the degeneration of the teachings. Therefore, those of you who wish to do yourselves good should generate belief from your hearts regarding the modes of the wisdom of individual investigation as explained above.

The essence of this advice is this:

1) To understand how very important hearing, reflection and meditation is for the development of wisdom. Without these three, there would be no wisdom. Without wisdom, then one would not be able to achieve anything significant.

2) Through hearing, reflecting and meditating on the teachings, this becomes the condition for the buddhist teachings to be upheld.

In this vein, the *Verse Summary of the Perfection of Wisdom in Eight Thousand Lines* says:

How can millions and millions of blind men, without a guide, enter the city without even knowing the path? Without wisdom, the five perfections are without sight; without a guide, they cannot contact enlightenment. At such a time that they are strongly conjoined with wisdom, then eyes are acquired and this name is attained.

The Venerable Maitreya also says in his *Sublime Continuum of the Great Vehicle (Uttaratantra)*:

Conceptualizing the three spheres of agent, action and object is asserted to be a knowledge obscuration. Conceptualizations such as miserliness are asserted to be afflictive obscurations. Apart from wisdom, none other is a cause for abandoning these. Therefore, wisdom is supreme. Its foundation is hearing. Thus hearing is supreme

Acharya Aryasura says in his *Compendium of the Perfections*:

The blind ones of little hearing do not know the modes of meditation. Lacking that, what are they to contemplate? Therefore, you should put effort in hearing. Due to that cause, contemplate and meditate, whereby vast wisdom will arise.

The supreme scholar Vasubandhu also says in his *Treasury of Knowledge*:

By abiding in ethics, possessing hearing and contemplation, there is strong application in meditation.

To develop non-ignorance, one needs wisdom. To develop wisdom, one necessarily needs to engage in the threefold process of hearing, reflecting and meditating.

Again here, one can compare non-ignorance and wisdom. It seems these two are referring to the same entity [but does not seem to be so from the above statement].

7) Joyous perseverance:

Compendium of Knowledge: It is a mind that is enthusiastic in regard to armoring, application, non-inferiority, irreversibility, and non-complacency. It has the function of fulfilling and accomplishing the class of virtue.

Just as it has been said above, the mind that is enthusiastic about virtue is joyous perseverance.

Acharya Vasubandhu says in his A Discussion of the Five Aggregates: Joyous perseverance is the antidote for laziness and a mind that is enthusiastic about virtue.

1) Object: virtuous activity

2) Subjective aspect: enthusiasm [with respect to its object]

3) Function: fulfilling and accomplishing virtue

The Compendium of Knowledge teaches five types of Joyous perseverance:

1) Armor-like joyous perseverance: a strong **enthusiasm prior** to embarking in virtuous activity.

2) Joyous perseverance of application: occurs when one is **in the process** of applying oneself in that virtuous activity, the mind that is **enthusiastic** about it. It is of two types: a) Constant application b) Respectful application.

3) Joyous perseverance of non-inferiority: occurs when one is **in the process** of applying oneself in that virtuous activity, the mind that is **not discouraged** about it

4) Joyous perseverance of irreversibility: occurs when one is **in the process** of applying oneself in that virtuous activity, the mind that **will never turn away** from it.

5) Joyous perseverance of non-complacency: occurs **after** having completed one's virtuous activity, the mind that is not complacent/ **not content** with what one has achieved but rather wishes to achieve **more** qualities.

Therefore, prior to engaging in one's chosen virtuous activity, one needs joyous perseverance in the form of an enthusiastic mind. When one starts the process of this activity, one needs to do so with a mind of enthusiasm, during which it is important not to get discouraged and stop. Even after one has accomplished the activity, one should not be contented with it but strive to do better, to attain more qualities.

The main obstacle obstructing joyous perseverance: Laziness –

The main incompatible factor to joyous perseverance is laziness, which is the basis for the afflictions to arise. It deprives one of virtue in the present life and future lives.

Buddha taught in one sutra that laziness is like the basis for all the afflictions. Having laziness in the mind is like having nothing good at all in the mind.

There are three types of laziness, their respective antidotes are as

- a) Laziness of procrastination (postponing virtuous activity)
- b) Laziness of (attachment to) ignoble activity

Reflections on the human life of freedoms and endowments, death and impermanence, sufferings of the lower realms and reflections of the paths shared with persons of medium capacity, such as reflections on faults of cyclic existence.

given in the Lam Rim teachings:	c) Laziness of despondency	For example, to understand the nature of mind, how, when it is trained/ accustomed, then change is absolutely possible.
		As it is said in <i>Engaging in the Bodhisattva Deeds</i> : There is nothing that cannot become easier when one's mind becomes accustomed to it.
		Therefore, by understanding the presentation of mind, particularly, how it is in the nature of the mind to change when one's mind is familiar with the process, how everything is possible, one then stops such discouragement.
In essence, joyous perseverance is that which allows one to develop qualities yet to develop; and laziness is that which stops one from developing new qualities.		
Therefore, it is important to apply oneself to joyous perseverance.		

8) Pliancy: Root text page 45 –

<i>Compendium of Knowledge: It is a serviceability of body and mind due to severing the continuum of unfavorable states of body and mind. It has the function of eliminating all obscurations.</i>		
Just as it has been said above, it is knower that deposits an imprint so that the mind can be applied, however one wishes, to a virtuous object of observation, and that severs the continuum of unfavorable states of body and mind.		
1) Object: virtuous object	2) Subjective aspect: able to use one's body and mind in whatever way one wishes (serviceability)	3) Function: eliminating all obscurations
Obscurations that are eliminated with pliancy are five: a) aspiration for desired object b) malice c) sleep and lethargy d) excitement and regret e) doubt		

Division of pliancy:

When divided, there are two, physical and mental pliancy. Here, it is primarily referring to mental pliancy, therefore, a consciousness. This is because, physical pliancy is posited as a special type of bodily tangible object.
As mentioned in the Lam Rim, the order of attainment is this: mental pliancy, physical pliancy, bliss of physical pliancy, then bliss of mental pliancy.
To achieve calm abiding, it is necessary to achieve the bliss of pliancy and not merely pliancy alone.
This is because, in the nine mental states for the attainment of calm abiding, the ninth state [Setting in equipoise] is posited as the single-pointed mind of the desire realm. This, however, is still not calm abiding. One needs to attain the bliss of [mental] pliancy before this mind is called the mind of calm abiding. When this is achieved, one achieves the first mind/ level of the form realm.
Therefore, calm abiding is defined as the concentration that is conjoined with the bliss of physical and mental pliancy.
When one achieves calm abiding, one achieves the mind of the higher realms, which are higher compared to the desire realm.

SQ: What is the difference between renunciation and non-attachment?

KR: These are not the same. Renunciation is not just non-attachment but probably something stronger. Non-attachment is merely a lack of attachment, whereas renunciation is the mind that wishes to turn away from cyclic existence.

SQ: Is the mental factor of anger necessarily non-virtuous?

KR: It is taught that anger is necessarily non-virtuous, there probably isn't any instances of anger that is virtuous. According to the *Compendium of Knowledge*, all the mental factors that are in the retinue of anger would be non-virtuous. This is because, they share similar entity, object of observation and aspect. Also, as taught in both the *Treasury and Compendium of Knowledges*, anger is the mind of the desire realm, therefore, there is no anger in the higher form and formless realms. Since there are no non-virtues in the higher realms, therefore, anger is absent in these realms.

Continuation of the division of pliancy:

- 1) Physical pliancy: is such that, through the power of meditative stabilization, unserviceability of the body is purified, whereupon the body is buoyant and light, like a ball of cotton, and can be applied to virtuous activity according to one's wish.
- 2) Mental pliancy: is such that, through the power of meditative stabilization, the mind becomes free of unserviceability, whereupon it becomes amenable to application to an object of observation without hindrance.

Mental pliancy is a mental factor. However, it is uncertain whether physical pliancy is a mental factor or not as it is posited as a special bodily tangible object.

9) Conscientiousness: Root text page 46 –

Compendium of Knowledge: It is a cultivation of virtuous qualities within abiding in non-attachment, non-hatred, non-ignorance, as well as joyous perseverance, and guards the mind against contaminations. It has the function of thoroughly completing and fully establishing all mundane and supramundane success.

Just as it has been said above, it is an awareness that accomplishes virtue within abiding in joyous perseverance without coming under the influence of afflictions, and it guards the mind against contaminations.

1) Object: any virtue	2) Subjective aspect: guards the mind against incompatible factors of the object of virtue	3) Function: causes the mind to abide in virtue and causes these virtues to increase
-----------------------	--	--

Thus, conscientiousness is essentially a mind that protects virtue, guarding the mind from incompatible factors of virtue. Perhaps this is a mind that **cherishes virtue**.

Five division of conscientiousness according to Asanga's *Bodhisattva Grounds*:

- 1) Conscientiousness with respect to the former – this is with respect to non-virtues created in the past. One generates regret and applies the remedies.
- 2) Conscientiousness with respect to the latter – this is with respect to non-virtues that will be performed in the future. One relies on mindfulness and introspection to stop engaging in it.
- 3) Conscientiousness with respect to the middle – this is with respect to the present restraint from non-virtues. When one realizes with mindfulness and introspection whenever one is about to engage in non-virtue, with conscientiousness, one stops oneself from carrying it out.
- 4) Conscientiousness prior to activity – before one commits any non-virtue, one generates the mind, thinking, “How wonderful it would be if one were to not engage in non-virtue”. This is conscientiousness by way of motivation.
- 5) Conscientiousness of concordant application – thinking, “At all times, I will not engage in non-virtues and guard the mind against it.” This is conscientiousness by way of motivation that is extended to all times.

Importance of conscientiousness:

One should always protect the mind in virtue with conscientiousness. Otherwise, once one loses conscientiousness, the afflictions would creep in almost immediately.

To increase whatever virtues or qualities developed, one necessarily has to rely on conscientiousness.

10) Equanimity: Root text page 47 –

Compendium of Knowledge: It is a discordance with afflictive states, an evenness of mind, a dwelling in a natural state, and a spontaneous abiding, within abiding in non-attachment, non-hatred, non-ignorance, as well as joyous perseverance. It has the function of not allowing an opportunity for afflictions.

Just as it has been said above, in dependence on the techniques for internally setting the mind single-pointedly on an object of observation, the nine mental abidings are gradually accomplished. When the ninth is achieved, one no longer needs not to strive to use the antidotes to laxity and excitement and one attains a spontaneous abiding of the mind.

In general, there are three types of equanimity: 1) Equanimity of application 2) Equanimity which is feeling 3) Immeasurable equanimity. Here, it is referring to 1)

1) Object: imputed object

2) Subjective aspect: engaging in discriminative equanimity

3) Function: not allowing an opportunity for afflictions of the desire realms to manifest

In the development of meditative stabilization, there are the the eight antidotes to counteract the five faults. In this process, to counteract [the fourth fault of non-application to] laxity and excitement, one necessarily needs to apply the [seventh] antidote [called application] as it is a fault not to do so. However, when laxity and excitement are absent, then it would also be a [fifth fault] to apply the antidotes [called over-application] when there is no need.

Equanimity here, is referring to this [eighth antidote], when the mind is in equilibrium without any need to apply antidote or not apply antidote [to laxity and excitement].

Such an equanimity is achieved on the ninth mental abiding [Setting in equipoise]. At such a time, one abides in a state of equanimity as there is no need to apply or not apply antidotes [to laxity and excitement].

Even though on the eighth mental abiding, there probably would not be anymore laxity and excitement, nevertheless, there are still some dangers of them coming up. Therefore, actual equanimity occurs on the ninth mental abiding [and not on the eighth].

On the eighth mental abiding [One-pointed attention], one projects the intention to stay in session and not be affected by laxity and excitement. Even though there are no more laxity and excitement during the session, this nevertheless has to come through putting in effort.

However, on the ninth mental abiding, as soon as one places one's mind on the chosen object, it would be able to abide in the state free from laxity and excitement naturally without putting any effort.

11) Non-harmfulness: Root text page 48 –

Compendium of Knowledge: It is a mind of compassion and is involved with non-hatred, It has the motivation of not inflicting injury.

Just as it has been said above, non-harmfulness is a patience that, lacking malice, observes suffering sentient beings, thinking, “May they be free of suffering.”

1) Object: sentient beings

2) Subjective aspect: compassion

3) Function: not inflicting harm

To develop non-harmfulness, one has to abandon harmfulness. The advice was given in the *Vinaya* for counteracting harmfulness for a trainee-in-virtue:

*Even when derided, do not deride in return. Even when someone gets angry at one, do not get angry in return.
Even when hit, do not hit back. Even when one's faults are exposed, do not expose others' faults.*

One does not only harm sentient beings physically, one can do so verbally and mentally. Therefore, one has to avoid harming others in all three ways.

Therefore, if the intelligent ones analyze and understand this well, they will be able to understand that abandoning harmfulness is the essence of the teachings.

Discussion of the category of virtuous mental factors:

Qualm: With regard to virtue, are the eleven virtuous mental factors which have been explained here exhaustive?

Response: In general, virtues are taught to be of five types, virtues by way of 1) entity 2) relation 3) subsequent relation 4) motivation 5) ultimacy

1) The eleven explained above, faith and so forth, are specified as being virtues by way of **entity** because they are generated in the entity of virtue from their mere establishment without relying on other factors such as motivation. Hence, here I have indicated the eleven principal virtues.

The eleven virtuous mental factors explained earlier are virtues from their mere establishment without depending on motivation.

2) Virtues by way of **relation** are minds and mental factors that are concomitant by way of the five similarities with the eleven, faith and so forth.

3) Virtues by way of **subsequent relation** are imprints of virtue.

4) Virtues by way of **motivation** are, for instance, physical and verbal actions motivated by faith.

5) Virtues by way of **ultimacy** are explained to be thusnesses (emptinesses), because all obscurations will be purified if one meditates within observation of thusness; therefore, they are designated as “virtues” but are not actual [fully qualified] virtues.

“Thusness or emptiness” are not virtue, this is because they are uncomposed phenomena and therefore permanent. Virtues are composed phenomena and therefore impermanent.

“All obscurations will be purified if one meditates within observation of thusness”. How does that happen?

Discussion of virtue from the perspective of circumstances:

When the virtues explained above are divided from the viewpoint of circumstances, there are virtues by way of: 1) attainment at birth 2) application 3) activity directed in front 4) benefiting 5) bearing 6) acting as an antidote 7) pacification 8) concordant cause

1) Virtue by way of **attainment at birth** is, for instance, the faith that arises through mere rebirth due to the imprints from past lives without depending on familiarization in this lifetime.

One can observe that some children naturally take an interest in the dharma since at a very young age and some dislike killing from young, having thoughts like, “It is not good to kill.” Therefore, there are some who are born with the mind of non-harmfulness.

2) Virtue by way of application is, for instance, the generation of the wish to attain buddhahood in dependence on the four conditions, a) relying on a virtuous spiritual guide, b) listening to the excellent doctrine, c) properly taking such to mind, and d) practicing doctrines that are concordant with the attainment of nirvana.

3) Virtue by way of **activity directed in front** is, for instance, actions of making prostrations and making offerings [such as the practices of the seven branch worship] within observation [invocation] of the special field of accumulation.

4) Virtue by of **benefiting** is, for instance, actions such as ripening sentient beings by way of the four means of gathering disciples:

a) giving Dharma and material necessities to disciples – by focusing on sentient beings, one generates the wish to bring them into the path. To do that, one first attracts them by giving material gifts to please them and then one gathers them in.

b) speaking pleasantly – one speaks in the manner that is conventionally regarded as pleasant or good. More importantly, this refers to giving advice/ dharma teachings that fits the person's disposition.

c) applying the meaning – after speaking pleasantly, one then helps that person to put those advice into practice.

d) acting in accord – means setting an example by practicing what one teaches. Therefore, whatever advice one gives, oneself necessarily has to practice it.

This is what is mentioned in the Lam Rim, on the topic of the ethics of benefiting sentient beings through these four means of gathering disciples.

5) Virtue by way of **bearing** is, for instance, special wholesome actions which act as the means for attaining high status and definite goodness.

6) Virtue by way of **acting as an antidote** is, for instance, virtuous actions that possess the special power to directly destroy the objects of abandonment and the discordant class.

7) Virtue by way of **pacification** is explained to be, for instance, true cessation, just as it is said in a stanza of homage to the Dharma:

Purity separating from attachment, virtue liberating from the bad migrations, unique, ultimate, supreme – pacifying Dharma...

8) Virtue by way of **concordant cause** is, for instance, the five clairvoyances and the ten powers that arise through the force of attaining true cessations.

These virtues explained above are either actual or designated.

Virtues can be classified into these terms as explained above. Some are actual virtues whereas others are designated as virtue but not [fully qualified] actual virtues.

Discussion of non-virtues: Root text page 51 –

Similarly, non-virtues are also divided in the same way. For example, cyclic existence is explained as non-virtue. However, is cyclic existence an actual non-virtue?

Non-virtues by way of **ultimacy** are phenomena included within cyclic existence. Since these are the sources from which superiors generate despondency, they are called “non-virtues by way of ultimacy.” Nonetheless, it is not definite that everything included in cyclic existence is an actual non-virtue.

Also, it appears that in regard to the non-virtues explained above, there are many distinctions to be made between actual and designated, and regarding their divisions and functions.

SQ: How are the eleven virtuous mental factors related in terms of one being a cause for the effect of another?

KR: When the eleven virtuous mental factors are explained, they are explained individually. This is to highlight their individual importance and necessity for one's cultivation. This is done through explaining their functions. For example, is joyous perseverance needed for pliancy? Without joyous perseverance, one cannot achieve pliancy.

KQ: What is the object of observation of meditative stabilization? Any imputed object.

K: It follows that the mental image of rabbit's horns is an object of observation of meditative stabilization.

K: Also, the object of meditative stabilization is not necessarily virtuous. However, the object of observation of joyous perseverance is necessarily virtuous [virtuous activity]. Therefore, to actualize meditative stabilization, one does not necessarily need [to focus on a virtuous object].

KQ: To achieve meditative stabilization, does one need a mind that is enthusiastic about virtue?

K: There are definitely some connections between these mental factors. However, how they are connected needs to be analyzed.

Qualm regarding the imputed object of meditative stabilization:

When meditative stabilization focuses on an imputed object, what is it? Is this object a generally characterized phenomenon or is it a specific isolate?
According to the Sutra School, the generally characterized phenomenon is permanent whereas the specifically characterized phenomenon is impermanent. Therefore, according to this school then, it would seem that an imputed object is a permanent phenomenon.
Since that is the case, then does this mean that one can developed meditative stabilization only by choosing a permanent object, that is, one cannot meditate on anything that is impermanent?
The reason for stating that the object of observation of meditative stabilization to be an imputed thing, is mainly because, meditative stabilization is developed with the mental consciousness and not the sense consciousness.
If that is the case, then is the object of observation of meditative stabilization necessarily permanent? It does not seem to be so. This is because, all phenomena can be the object of observation of meditative stabilization.
Since that is the case, then one cannot assert that the object of observation of meditative stabilization are only permanent phenomena.
SQ: Can the breath be the object of observation of meditative stabilization?
The movement of one's breath is a tangible object. When one develops meditative stabilization observing a form, this is not done by observing the form but rather, taking that form as an initial object, one creates an image of that object in one's mind. By depending on that, one then achieves meditative stabilization.
This means that a sense consciousness cannot achieve meditative stabilization. Therefore, when one is meditating on the breath, is one actually meditating on the actual breath that is a tactile object, or is one focusing on the mental image of the breath?
It is stated very clearly by <i>Arya Asanga</i> in the root text (page 31) that: <i>meditative stabilization is not produced in sense consciousnesses; rather, it is only produced in a mental consciousness. Moreover, its object of observation is not form appearing to a sense consciousness; rather, it is only a mental object imputed by the mind.</i>
Since that is the case, it would be incorrect to posit that the object of observation of meditative stabilization to be the form that appears to a sense consciousness, rather, it would have to be a mental object imputed by the mind.
When one is developing single-pointedness of the mind focusing on a form, this is therefore not the actual form but an imputed object that has been recreated in one's mental consciousness after one has observed it with one's eye sense consciousness, for example.
Therefore, the imputed object is only an object of thought, a generic image/ meaning generality of that form.
Since that is the case, if one posits the breath to be a tactile object, what then, would be the object of observation when one is meditating on the breath? What exactly is one focusing on? If one were to posit that the movement of the breath, a tactile object, to be the object of observation, then one has to analyze how is meditative stabilization achieved by focusing on something other than an imputed object?
Therefore, when one is 'meditating on the breath', what one is actually meditating on is the meaning generality of the breath. If that is asserted, then perhaps this is easier to posit as this is an imputed object.

SQ: Is the imputed object of a conceptual meditative stabilization also its appearing object? Yes.

SQ: What then, is the appearing object of a non-conceptual meditative stabilization?

Prior to achieving meditative stabilization, the object of observation is the **imputed object**. However, once meditative stabilization is achieved, perhaps one can posit the object of observation to be the **phenomenon source form**.

When the meditative stabilization transforms into direct perception, then there should not be any problem to posit that phenomenon source form to be the observed object.

This is because, when the object is transformed into direct perception, there is no more mental image/ meaning generality. However, one still needs to posit an observed object, this would perhaps be the phenomenon source form.

Lesson 25

20 September 2012

Summary explanations of the benefits and importance of the eleven virtuous mental factors:

These are: faith, shame, embarrassment, non-attachment, non-hatred, non-ignorance, joyous perseverance, pliancy, conscientiousness, equanimity and non-harmfulness. One should have a rudimentary idea of their respective objects, aspects and functions.

The essence of understanding them is this: with a brief understanding of these eleven virtuous mental factors by way of these three features, one should try to develop these in one's own mind. One therefore has to see the point for oneself the benefits of having these eleven virtuous mental factors when they arise in one's mind.

As explained in the root text, these eleven virtuous mental factors are by nature virtuous. They are virtuous entities from their own establishment without the need to depend on any motivation to come about.

It is also mentioned that the imprints/ predispositions of these virtuous mental factors, as well as the physical and verbal actions motivated by these virtuous mental factors are virtuous as well.

These eleven virtuous mental factors can only arise in one's mind through making strenuous effort. Subsequent to their arising, the imprints would be left in one's continuum. When this happens, it would be more likely that one would perform virtuous physical and verbal actions motivated by these eleven virtuous mental factors.

These positive effects do not just occur for the present life, they will stay in one's continuum from life to life. One just has to familiarize oneself with them repeatedly.

One can think about what is obvious: to be able to perform virtuous physical and verbal actions, these have to arise from imprints of virtue. To have these in the first place, a virtuous mind necessarily has to arise.

This shows clearly that, one has to put effort into generating virtuous minds, which leave positive imprints, which then result in virtuous physical and verbal actions.

When one analyzes this, one should conclude that it is extremely important to cultivate and develop virtuous minds.

Root text also mentioned about virtue by way of attainment at birth. This is however, not something that happens without any reasons. To have this virtue by way of attainment at birth, one necessarily has to possess virtue by way of application initially.

This means putting effort to develop virtuous minds. When one does this and virtuous minds do arise, then there is hope in the future when one is born, one would be endowed with these virtues.

Therefore, one should know these entities and their benefits when one cultivates them. As it is said in Engaging in the Bodhisattva Deeds, one just has to depend on joyous perseverance, and with the mind that is enthusiastic for virtue, just do it.

The six root afflictions: Root text page 53 –

These are: 1) Attachment 2) Anger 3) Pride 4) Ignorance 5) Doubt 6) Afflicted views.

Compendium of Knowledge: The definition of an affliction is a phenomenon such that when it arises, the characteristic of being very unpeaceful arises, and due to its arising, the mental continuum arises as being very unpeaceful.

Just as it has been said above, it is an awareness that causes the mental continuum to be very unpeaceful when it arises.

When a mind that arises, causes disturbance in the mind and making it very unpeaceful, this is called an affliction. There are the six root and twenty secondary afflictions.

1) Attachment: Root text page 54 –

Compendium of Knowledge: It is the clinging of the three realms. It has the function of producing suffering.

Just as it has been said above, it is a mental factor that perceives a contaminated thing to be attractive by way of its own entity and thereupon seeks it.

Regarding this, the Foremost Omniscient Tsongkhapa says in his *Great Exposition of the Stages of the Path*:

Attachment observes an external or internal object that is beautiful and attractive and then becomes attached to it. For example, just as oil that has soaked into a piece of cloth is difficult to remove, likewise attachment spreads on and adheres to its object of observation, making it difficult to tear oneself away from it.

1) Object: an external or internal object that is beautiful and attractive

2) Subjective aspect: having difficulty in separating from the object

Function: produces suffering

Division of attachment:

The *Compendium of Knowledge* divides it into three: a) Attachment of the desire realm b) Attachment of the form realm c) Attachment of the formless realm

The *Treasury of Knowledge* divides it into two: a) Attachment of the desire realm b) Attachment for cyclic existence (comprising form and formless realms)

The faults of attachment:

The function of attachment is specified as “producing suffering” for the purpose of making us understand that the root of all suffering within the three realms of cyclic existence is rebirth which connects us to cyclic existence, and the principal cause for rebirth within cyclic existence is attachment, craving itself.

Even though one has accumulated the projecting karma for rebirth in cyclic existence. Merely having this karma alone does not necessarily mean that one will experience its results of rebirth in cyclic existence.

That which nourishes the imprint of this projecting karma is attachment and craving. These two give the projecting karma the power such that it can project/ actualize rebirth in cyclic existence. Therefore, this shows that it is attachment which is the principal cause of rebirth in cyclic existence, the continuation of suffering.

2) Anger: Root text page 55 –

Compendium of Knowledge: It is a malice towards sentient beings, suffering, and phenomena that are sources of suffering. It has the function of acting as a support for not abiding in contact [with happiness] and for misconduct.

Just as it has been said above, anger is a malice that, upon observing the three objects of observation of anger, cannot tolerate them and wishes to harm them.

The three objects of observation of anger are: 1) sentient beings 2) one's own sufferings and 3) the sources from which these sufferings arise.	2) Subjective aspect: malice	3) Function: acting as a support for not abiding in contact and for misconduct.
To get angry, there must be an object of one's anger. These are the three.	Malice is essentially a gross/ hard mind that wishes to harm.	Not abiding in contact means not being in contact with happiness.
Regarding the teachings on “the nine bases of malice”, the <i>Precious Garland</i> says: <i>Harmful intent arises from nine causes of intending to harm others: Bearing senseless misgivings in the three times with regard to oneself, one's friends and one's enemies.</i>		
a) With regard to oneself being applied to the three times: I was harmed, I am being harmed and I will be harmed. Anger arises due to these reasons.		
b) With regard to one's friends, people we regard to be on one's side: They were harmed, they are being harmed and they will be harmed. One gets angry because of these.		
c) With regard to one's enemies, people who are not on one's side: They were benefited, they are being benefited and they will be benefited. One again gets angry.		
These are the nine causes of malice: with regard to oneself, one's friends and one's enemies, one looks at them in terms of the past, present and future.		

The faults of anger:

This is as it has been said in the *Great Exposition of the Stages of the Path*:

Anger is a malice, a harsh mind that observes sentient beings, suffering, and the sources of suffering such as weapons and thorns, and intends to harm those objects.

It has the function of causing one not to abide in happiness in this lifetime, and produces immeasurable suffering in future lives.

1) Even though one can be feeling happy, composed and peaceful, however, the very moment anger arises, all these degenerates.

2) When one gets very angry, one forgets every beneficial that one has received from the person one is angry at.

3) Anger produces many enemies for one. Even one's loved ones, those who have benefited one also becomes one's enemies as a result of anger. It therefore essentially functions to increase the number of enemies one has.

4) Even though one usually sleeps well, however, when one gets very upset/ angry, one would find it difficult to fall asleep.

5) When one is angry, this would also damage one's reputation.

6) Due to anger, one is basically not happy in the present life. Anger also ruins one's future lives where one would have to experience unbearable sufferings.

Engaging in the Bodhisattva Deeds says:

If one maintains a painful mind of hatred, mind does not experience peace, nor obtain joy and happiness; sleep does not come and there is no stability.

Essentially, with anger, one cannot experience physical nor mental happiness.

He saddens his friends. He gathers them with generosity but is not served. In brief, joy does not exist in one where anger abides comfortably.

With anger, one destroys relationships/ friendships. In summary, joy does not occur in one whose anger abides comfortably.

The *Garland of Birth Stories* also says:

Due to the fire of anger, one colors unflatteringly, even adorned with ornaments, one does not look good. Even though one may lie on a comfortable bed, one's mind suffers due to the agony of anger. Forgetful of the benefits one has enjoyed, tormented by anger, one proceeds on a bad path. One's reputation and achievements degenerate, like the waning moon, one's glory fades. Although supported by friends, due to anger, one plummets senselessly into the abyss. One's contemplation of benefit and harm degenerates; one becomes erratic and confused. Due to anger, one becomes habituated to misdeeds, and will experience suffering for hundreds of years in the bad migrations. Even an enemy who goes to great lengths to inflict great harm cannot manage more than this.

When one sees a person who is generally regarded as attractive and pleasant, who can be adorned with lush make-ups and jewelries, the moment that person gets very angry, one would not find that person attractive anymore.

By not controlling one's anger but getting upset repeatedly, one would then become very used to anger. This creates causes for one to be born in the lower realms and experience sufferings for a long time. This is something an external enemy cannot do.

One just needs to check within one's mind, when anger is present/ manifest, would one feel happy/ peaceful or not?

The essential advice is therefore to see anger as a fault/ problem, analyze how it functions to do harm one. Thinking this way, when one starts to become upset/ angry, one then has to remind oneself of what one has reflected on and then try to manage it/ reduce its duration/ [frequency].

3) Pride: Root text page 56 –

Compendium of Knowledge: It is a puffing up of the mind in dependence on the view of the transitory collection. It has the function of acting as a support for disrespect and suffering.

Just as it has been said above, it is a mental factor that has the aspect of puffing up of the mind upon observing the basis for puffing up, one's own wealth, qualities and so forth.

1) Object: one's own wealth, qualities and so forth	2) Subjective aspect: puffing up of the mind	3) Function: acting as a support for disrespect and suffering
---	--	---

The faults of pride:

All the disrespects one shows towards others essentially come from pride. Following from this comes all the other negative actions.

One's mind either gets inflated, feeling very superior/ elevated by focusing on one's wealth or qualities.

The Lam Rim Chen Mo says: *Pride is based on the view of the transitory collection and is a puffing up of the mind upon observing an external or internal phenomenon that is high or low, good or bad; it involves an aspect of loftiness.*

“In dependence on the view of the transitory collection” is specified because all pride is generated in dependence on the innate conception which thinks “I”.

Division of pride:

Pride is of seven types: 1) pride 2) exceeding pride 3) pride beyond pride 4) pride thinking of “I” 5) pride of vanity 6) pride of slight inferiority 7) wrongful pride
1) Pride is a puffing up of the mind, thinking that one is superior to lower persons.
2) Exceeding pride is a puffing up of the mind, thinking that one is superior to peers.
3) Pride beyond pride is a puffing up of the mind, thinking that one is greatly superior even to other superior persons.
4) Pride of thinking “I” is a puffing up of the mind, thinking “I” within observing the appropriated aggregates.
5) Pride of vanity is a puffing up of the mind, thinking that one has attained what has not been attained.
6) Pride of slight inferiority is a puffing up of the mind, thinking that one is just slightly lower than others who are actually greatly superior.
7) Wrongful pride is a puffing up of the mind, thinking that one has attained excellent qualities when one has actually gone astray.
An example of 7) would be: feeling very proud when one has inflicted harm on others. One feels one has done well.
In the <i>Precious Garland</i> , the seven types of pride are also mentioned. However, the descriptions of the first two: pride of selfhood and exceeding pride are explained slightly differently:
<i>Regarding these, being conceited that one is lower than the lowly, or equal with the equal, or greater than or equal to the lowly is called the (1) pride of selfhood/ pride.</i>
<i>Being conceited that one is equal to those who by some quality are superior to oneself is (2) exceeding pride.</i>
<i>Being conceited that one is superior to the superior; thinking that one is higher than the very high, is (3) pride beyond pride; like sores on an abscess, it is exceedingly virulent.</i>
<i>Conceiving through obscurations an “I” in the five empty aggregates which are called “the appropriated” is explained to be the (4) pride of thinking “I”.</i>
<i>Thinking that one has attained fruits not yet attained is the (5) pride of vanity.</i>
<i>Praising oneself for committing negative actions is known by the wise as (6) wrongful pride.</i>
<i>Deriding oneself, saying, “I am useless,” is called the (7) pride of lowliness.</i>
Here, pride of lowliness is actually putting oneself down. How is it considered as pride? Since pride has the aspect of puffing up of the mind, then how does putting oneself down, in this case, have the aspect of puffing up of the mind?
Similarly, here, the first type of pride, refers to, for example, “ <i>being conceited that one is lower than the lowly, or equal with the equal, or greater than or equal to the lowly</i> ”. How then, does feeling one is lower than the lowly becomes pride?
Is this not the practice of the Bodhisattva, whereby it is taught that one should consider oneself lower than the lowly? When one feels lower than the lowly, one feels comfortable, is that not the practice of the Bodhisattva? How is this considered pride?
SR: Could these two be explained as: within observing the “I” which is the view of the transitory collection, the aspect of them being puffed-up refers to having the wish to greatly cherish this “I”, for it to be happy. This view then becomes inflated and seeks attention when thinking “I am lower than the lowly, I am useless.” and so on.
Comparing this to the bodhisattva who cherishes others, thinking, “I am lower than others,” within observing and cherishing others, then there would be a huge difference between these two types of mind.

Faults of pride:

Pride has the function of obscuring any new attainment of the Dharma of scriptures and realization due to its disrespect for those who possess excellent qualities, causes rebirth in bad migrations in future lives, and even when reborn as a human, acts as the cause for rebirth in a low caste, as a servant and the like. Therefore, it produces the undesirable in both this and future lives.

In this way, the *Precious Garland* says:

Through being inflated comes a bad lineage, through jealousy little magnificence. Through anger comes a discolored face, and through not questioning the wise, stupidity. These are the results for humans, but prior to all of them there is a bad migration.

The *Stages of the Path to Enlightenment* says:

Since pride is the greatest hindrance in developing the path in this life, and is the cause for becoming a servant and the like in future lives, abandon it.

In essence, in the present life, pride functions to obstruct the generation of qualities and in future lives, it causes lowly rebirths. Through thinking of these faults, one should try to reduce it in this life.

4) Ignorance: Root text page 59 –

Compendium of Knowledge: It is unknowing of the three realms. It has the function of acting as a support for the arising of wrong ascertainment, doubt and afflictions with respect to phenomena.

Just as it has been said above, it is the mental factor of unknowing that is obscured regarding the mode of abiding of all phenomena. It is of two types:

1) obscuration that is the mental factor of unknowing 2) an awareness that apprehends erroneously.

From among these two, the explicit indication in the *Compendium of Knowledge* explains ignorance to be the mental factor of unknowing. Since Acharya Vasubandhu also explained it in this way in his *A Discussion of the Five Aggregates*, the assertions of both Asanga and his brother agree. However, Acharya Dharmakirti asserts ignorance to be an awareness that apprehends erroneously. In this way, although there are two types of assertions with regard to ignorance – 1) the assertion that it is a wrong conception and 2) the assertion that it is an awareness that does not realize – both are alike in asserting that the principal antidote to ignorance is the wisdom realizing selflessness.

Ignorance is of two types: 1) a mind that apprehends erroneously or 2) a mind that simply does not know. The lower and higher Abhidharma (Treasury and Compendium of Knowledges) both agree that ignorance refers to the mind that does not know (2). In this context, then, ignorance is the opposite of knowledge, which is the mind that does not know.

Ignorance [under the context of not knowing] is of two types:

1) ignorance that is obscuration with respect to actions and their results: causes one to accumulate actions for rebirth in the lower realms.

2) ignorance that is obscuration with respect to the meaning of suchness: causes one to accumulate actions for circling in the good migrations.

Its function is specified as "acting as a support for the arising of wrong ascertainment, doubt and afflictions with respect to phenomena," because other afflictions arise in dependence on ignorance; in dependence on them [i.e., afflictions] actions arise; in dependence on actions all sufferings of cyclic existence arise. Therefore, all afflictions and faults arise in dependence on ignorance.

In brief, this ignorance is the root of circling in the three realms of cyclic existence. Since it is the basis for all actions and afflictions, ignorance is taught at the beginning of the twelve links of dependent-arising.

1) Object: any phenomenon	2) Subjective aspect: unknowing of the three realms	3) Function: support for the arising of wrong ascertainment, doubt and afflictions with respect to phenomena.
---------------------------	---	---

5) Doubt: Root text page 61 –

Compendium of Knowledge: This is being two-minded with regard to the truths. It has the function of acting as a support for not engaging in the class of virtue.

Just as it has been said above, it is a mental factor that wavers between two points within observation of the four truths, cause and result, and so forth. This doubt hinders all virtuous activities and especially hinders the seeing of the truth. Since it will be overcome when one sees the truth, it is said to be a thorough entanglement that is an object of abandonment of the path of seeing.

1) Object: four noble truths, karma and its results, and so forth	2) Subjective aspect: being two-minded with regards to its object	3) Function: support for not engaging in virtue
---	---	---

Doubt, here, is an afflicted doubt, is an object of abandonment of the Path of Seeing. Unlike anger, ignorance, afflicted views and so forth, which are not abandoned by the Path of Seeing, afflicted doubt is abandoned by this Path.

When one has doubts regarding karma and its results and the four noble truths, then one would not abandon that which needs to be abandoned and not cultivate that which needs to be cultivated. Therefore, this is why it acts as a support for hindering virtue.

Lesson 26

25 September 2012

Summary of the first five root afflictions:

1) Attachment: a mind that is desirous/ attached to an object 2) Anger: a malice towards sentient beings and sources of suffering 3) Pride: an inflating of the mind in dependence of the views of the transitory collection 4) Ignorance: according to the presentation of the higher and lower Abhidharma, it is a mind that does not know its object 5) [Doubt: a mind that is two-pointed with its object]

6) Afflicted views: Root text page 61 –

Afflicted views are of five types: 1) view of the transitory collection 2) view holding to an extreme 3) conception of a [bad] view as supreme 4) conception of [bad] ethics and modes of conduct as supreme 5) wrong view

6.1) View of the transitory collection:

Compendium of Knowledge: It is any endurance, desire, intelligence, conception, or view which views the five appropriated aggregates as a real I and mine. It has the function of acting as a support for all views.

Just as it has been said above, it is an afflicted wisdom that observes the appropriated aggregates and apprehends them* to be a real I and mine.

* See subjective aspect below

<p>What is the reason for calling this view the "view of the transitory collection"? It is just as it has been said in the <i>Great Exposition of the Stages of the Path</i>: <i>Regarding this, since the "transitory" is impermanent and a "collection" is manifold, the basis which it views is simply phenomena that are impermanent and manifold.</i> <i>However, one designates the name "view of the transitory collection" in order to indicate that "a permanent and unitary person does not exist."</i></p>		
1) Object: the contaminated appropriated aggregates within one's continuum.	*2) Subjective aspect: On these bases, a sense of "I" arises. One then apprehends/ conceives this "I" to be self-sufficient substantially existent.	Function: acting as a support for all views.
<p>When one focuses on one's contaminated body and mind, the sense of "I" arises, one then conceives of this "I" to be self-sufficient, substantially existent. Such a conception is, in this context, called the view of the transitory collection.</p>		

How non-buddhists assert the "I", "self", "person":

When one refers to the "I", "person" or "self", this absolutely exists. However, the main question is: how does it exist?
There are many views on how this "I" exists. For example: Is the "I" impermanent or permanent?
All philosophical traditions assert that there is a "self", "person", "I". Therefore, there is no question that it does exist, however, the question remains as to how it exists.
Even though the vast majority of non-buddhist systems assert that there is a "self", an "I", however, they conceive it to be: a) permanent [– not undergoing momentary disintegration] b) unitary/ single [– not depending on parts to make the whole] c) independent [– not dependent on causes and conditions to come about].
Essentially, they are asserting a "soul" that is "permanent, unitary and independent." While this is so, among them, there are differing opinions as to whether such a "soul" / "person" has a beginning and whether such a "person" would have an end.
They assert that the "I", the "self" is something that is different from the body and mind, and it is permanent, unitary and independent.
While from the time of one's birth up to the present moment, one's body has undergone numerous changes. However, when one thinks or looks at oneself, one would instinctively conceive/ feel as if one is still the same person that has not changed from the first day up till now.
Therefore, on the basis of such "concept/ feeling", the vast majority of non-buddhist philosophical systems conclude that there is a "self"/ "I" that is separate/ different from one's body and mind. The body and mind may change, but the "I" is always permanent, unitary and independent.

How the buddhist assert the "I", "self", "person":

The buddhist position is radically different: Even though the "I", "self", "person" do exist, however, it is not permanent, unitary and independent.
Therefore, they assert that such a permanent, unitary and independent "I", "self", "person" or soul does not exist whatsoever and therefore becomes selfless.
In this context, when one refers to the "lack of a self" or "selflessness", the "self" that does not exist is the "self", "I", "person" that is self-sufficient substantially existent. Self-sufficient means being able to exist on its own power, independent of the body and mind, and acts as its controller/ owner.
Therefore, selflessness, here, refers to a "lack of self-sufficient substantially existent person."
Essentially, here, it is asserted that there is not a "self" whose existence does not depend on the body and mind. That is, there is no such "self" that: a) does not depend on the body and mind to exist b) nor is separate/ different from the body and mind c) nor is it an owner/ controller of the body and mind.
Therefore, there is not a "self", "person" that is self-instituting, able to exist on its own without depending on the body and mind. Such kind of "self" does not exist at all.
Therefore, the person exists by being imputed in dependence upon any of its five aggregates. Therefore, the "I" can only be conceived of in relation to the body and mind.

Faults of the views of the transitory collection, how it becomes the cause for/ induces all other afflictions:

- | |
|--|
| 1) Based on holding on to the self-sufficient, substantially existent “I”, one conceives of “I” and “others” strongly. |
| 2) On this basis, one then becomes attached to those whom one considers to be on one's side, and becomes angry towards those who are against one/ not on one's side. |

Division of the view of the transitory collection:

- | |
|---|
| Essentially, this can be divided into two: 1) Conception of “I” and 2) Conception of “mine”. |
| When one holds on to the “I” as self-sufficient, substantially existent, then this is the view of the transitory collection that is the conception of “I”. On that basis, then there can be a conception of “mine”. |
| From these two, the view of the transitory collection can be divided into twenty: 1) view of forms as a self 2) view of the self as possessing forms 3) view of forms as mine 4) view of the self as abiding in forms. Similarly, due to the divisions into four each with respect to feelings, discriminations, compositional factors, and consciousness [i.e., the remaining four of the five aggregates], there are twenty views [altogether]. |
| 1) View of forms as a self: while the form aggregate is not the self, this [view of the transitory collection] apprehends it as a self. |
| 2) View of the self as possessing forms: while the self does not possess form, there is this view of the self as possessing forms by its nature. |
| 3) View of forms as mine (view of form as depending on the self): while the form does not abide nor depend on the self, this view sees the form as abiding or depending on the self by its nature. |
| 4) View of the self as abiding in forms: while the self does not abide in forms, there is the view of the self as abiding in forms by its nature. |
| One has to analyze these four in terms of whether it is possessing forms or abiding in forms by its nature. |

How the self exists and does not exist in relation to the aggregates:

- | |
|---|
| The self and the aggregates are different, however, they are not essentially different/ not different in nature [not different essence/ not different entities]. |
| Likewise, one can apply this understanding to the above discussion, for example, the view of the self as possessing forms: seeing the self as possessing forms by its nature. |
| In the selflessness teachings, it is taught that: the self is not truly existent, because it is not truly one with the aggregates nor truly different from the aggregates. |
| The view of the transitory collection is essentially this: while the “self, person or I” is not self-sufficient, substantially existent, this mind of the view of the transitory collection apprehends it to be so. This view then conceives the “self” to be either “I” or “mine”. |
| One normally thinks of one's “self” as something essentially different/ different nature/ different entities/ something independent from one's body and mind. Due to that, one behaves like an owner/ controller of one's aggregates. |
| When one thinks of “my body”, “my mine”, and the “I, self” that possesses the body and mind, one feels very strongly that these are something essentially separate/ different nature/ different entity from the body and mind. One has this strong feeling that the “I” is like an owner/ controller that is separate/ independent from the body and mind, that owns and controls them. |
| Such a mind is the view of the transitory collection. It is an afflicted view, not wisdom. This is because, it is holding on to/ believing in something that does not exist. |
| While there are occasions that the view of the transitory collection is given the name “intelligence or wisdom”, it is not actually wisdom but mere [afflicted] intelligence. |

Summary of the buddhist position on the self and its relationship with the aggregates:

The “self, I person” definitely exist. Therefore, the question is not about whether it exists or not, rather, the question is about how it exists.
The buddhist position is that the “self, I, person” is imputed in dependence on any of the five aggregates. It does not know how to explain a “self, I, person” that can exist without depending on the aggregates.
Also, the “self, I , person” and the aggregates are one entity and not separate entities. It is therefore incorrect to conceive of the self and the aggregates as essentially different, just as one conceives of the vase and pillar as essentially different entities.
If one were to conceive the self and the aggregates to be different entities like the vase and pillar, then one would be wrong.
The reason to assert the self and the aggregates to be one entity is this: if they were different entities, then if one were to eliminate the aggregates one by one, when this is done and one were to search for the self, if they were different entities, then one would be able to find the self apart from the aggregates. However, this is not the case.
If one is able to point to a self after one has eliminated all the aggregates, then one would be able to posit that the self and the aggregates to be different entities.
The vase and pillar are not only different [as in not one but separate], they are also different entities. They are different entities because, if the pillar is eliminated/destroyed, one would still be able to point to a vase that is of a different entity to the pillar, no matter what one does to the pillar.
For this reason, one can conclude that the self and the aggregates are one entity, as it is not possible to posit a self that is of a different entity from the aggregates.

Based on this, what the view of the transitory collection is asserted to be:

The view of the transitory collection conceives of this “I” that is of a different/ separate entity from the aggregates.
Even though this kind of “I” does not exists at all, however, this mind of the “view of the transitory collection” believes in its existence fully.
Therefore, the view of the transitory collection apprehends such an “I”, not the aggregates.
Nevertheless, the aggregates are the objects of observation of this view of the transitory collection. Based on observing them, a sense of “I” arises, and the view of the transitory collection apprehends this “I” to be self-sufficient, substantially existent, a completely separate entity from the body and mind.

SQ: What is the object of the mode of apprehension for the view of the transitory collection?

KR: The object of the mode of apprehension of this mind is not posited. However, for the purpose of debate, one can posit the [non-existent] self-sufficient, substantially existent “I” [to be the object of the mode of apprehension of this mind], rather than posit the [existent] “I” [to be the object of the mode of apprehension of this mind]. This is because, the view of the transitory collection does not apprehend the [existent] “I” but the [non-existent] self-sufficient, substantially existent “I”. Therefore, in general, the object of the mode of apprehension is not posited for this consciousness, but if for the purpose of debate, then one can put forward such a [non-existent object] as [the object of the mode of apprehension of the view of the transitory collection].

6.2) View holding to an extreme: Root text page 64 –

<i>Compendium of Knowledge: It is any endurance, desire, intelligence, conception, or view which views the five appropriated aggregates as being either permanent or annihilated. It has the function of hindering definite emergence by means of the middle path.</i>
Just as it has been said above, it is an afflicted wisdom which observes the self that is held by the view of the transitory collection and apprehends it to be either permanent or annihilated.

1) Object: the conventionally existent self that is held by the view of the transitory collection	2) Subjective aspect: on the basis of the object, the view of the transitory collection holds on to it to be either permanent or annihilated (does not proceed on to the next life)	3) Function: principal obstacle to progressing on the middle path free from these extremes
---	---	--

The *Great Exposition of the Stages of the Path* says:
The view holding to an extreme is an afflicted wisdom which, observing the self that is held by the view of the transitory collection, views it as either being permanent in the sense of being unchanging, or being annihilated in the sense of not transmigrating to a future life after this life.

Therefore, since this bad view causes one to fall to the extremes of permanence and annihilation, it is the principal obstacle to progressing on the middle path free from these extremes.

6.3) Conception of a bad view as supreme: Root text page 65 –

<i>Compendium of Knowledge: It is any endurance, desire, intelligence, conception, or view which views: views and the locus of the views, that is, the five appropriated aggregates, to be supreme, to be chief, to be superior, and to be excellent. It has the function of acting as a support for strongly adhering to bad views.</i>		
Just as it has been said above, it is an afflicted wisdom that observes other bad views and the aggregates, the locus in dependence on which they arise, and holds them to be supreme.		
In this context the <i>Great Exposition of the Stages of the Path</i> says: <i>The conception of a [bad] view as supreme is an afflicted wisdom which observes: any of the three – the view of the transitory collection, the view holding to an extreme or wrong view – and the aggregates of the viewer in dependence on which they [i.e., the above three views] arise, and holds them to be supreme.</i>		
1) Object: [three] other bad views and the aggregates of the person who holds these bad views	2) Subjective aspect: on the basis of the object, a) having the conception of these bad views as supreme b) having the conception of the aggregates, of the person holding on to these views, as supreme	3) Function: support for strongly adhering to bad views

6.4) Conception of [bad] ethics and modes of conduct as supreme: Root text page 66 –

<i>Compendium of Knowledge: It is any endurance, desire, intelligence, conception, or view, which views: [bad] ethics and modes of conduct and the locus of the [bad] ethics and modes of conduct, that is, the five appropriated aggregates, to be purifying, liberating, and delivering. It has the function of acting as a support for fruitless fatigue.</i>		
Just as it has been said above, it is an afflicted wisdom that observes: [bad] ethics motivated by bad views, [bad] modes of conduct that prescribe physical and mental activities such as wearing animal skins, and the abode of [bad] ethics and modes of conduct – the five appropriated aggregates – to be purifying and liberating.		
There are people who believe that certain bad kinds of ethics are cause for liberation. For example, by adopting certain physical or verbal conduct which are by nature bad, nevertheless, they believe that these are causes for liberation. Such a mind that believes in such is a conception of bad ethics and modes of conduct as supreme.		
Such people strives very hard within having such beliefs thinking that they are making effort to achieve liberation. However, this would not have any such results.		
They also believe that their aggregates are superior. These are the conception of bad ethics and modes of conduct as supreme.		

Summary of the five afflicted views:

1) View of the transitory collection: observes the appropriated aggregates, whereby an “I” is apprehended, which is then conceived to exist independent of the body and mind. The mind which conceives of this “I” to be self-sufficient, substantially existent is the view of the transitory collection.
The “I” that is conceived to be self-sufficient, substantially existent does not exist. Since it does not exist, therefore, it is called selfless.
Majority of the non-buddhist philosophical systems do assert “I, person, self”. However, they assert such an “I” to be a soul, which means it is permanent, unitary and independent.
The buddhist position is that, such “I, person, self or soul” that is permanent, unitary and independent does not exist whatsoever.
Over and above this, it is also the buddhist position that this “I, person, self” is not self-sufficient, substantially existent.
The mind that believes in the soul, as well as conceiving the “I, person, self” to be self-sufficient is therefore called view of the transitory collection.
What this self is, that is being conceived of by this view of the transitory collection, is only referring to that within one's own continuum and not within another person's continuum. Therefore, the view of the transitory collection apprehends the “I” within one's continuum to be self-sufficient, substantially existent.
One can also call this the “apprehension of a self of person”. This is essentially the root of cyclic existence, the root of all of one's problems. All other destructive afflictive emotions arise from this view/ apprehension as a basis.
2) View holding to an extreme: observes the self that is held by the view of the transitory collection and apprehends this self to be either permanent or annihilated.
Permanent refers to being eternal, never undergo any change. Annihilated refers to ceasing to exist at the time of death.
3) Conception of a bad view as supreme: observes the view of the transitory collection, view holding to an extreme and wrong view. It then holds these to be superior.
4) Conception of bad ethics and modes of conduct as supreme: believes in a path that is not a cause leading to liberation to be a path leading to liberation.

6.5) Wrong view: Root text page 66 –

<i>Compendium of Knowledge: It is any endurance, desire, intelligence, conception, or view which deprecates cause, result or functionality, and wrongly conceives existent disintegrating things. It has the functions of severing roots of virtue, holding tightly to roots of non-virtue, and acting as a support for engaging in non-virtue and not engaging in virtue.</i>
Just as it has been said above, it is an afflicted wisdom which views the cause and result of actions, past and future lives, and so forth as non-existent.
5) Wrong view: is essentially a mind which views past and future lives, cause and effects and the four noble truths as non-existent.

SQ: what is the difference between bad ethics and bad modes of conduct in the conception of bad ethics and modes of conduct as supreme?

KR: modes of conduct mainly refers to physical and verbal activities, adopting these demeanors and conduct with the body and speech, whereas bad ethics involve immoral/ unethical mental actions.

The Twenty Secondary Afflictions: Root text page 69 –

1) belligerence 2) resentment 3) concealment 4) spite 5) jealousy 6) miserliness 7) deceit 8) dissimulation 9) haughtiness 10) harmfulness 11) non-shame 12) non-embarrassment 13) lethargy 14) excitement 15) non-faith 16) laziness 17) non-conscientiousness 18) forgetfulness 19) non-introspection 20) distraction

1) Belligerence:

Compendium of Knowledge: It is a malice when the cause of harm abides nearby, and is involved with anger. It has the function of acting as a support for taking up weapons, punishing, and so forth, and preparing to injure others.

Just as it has been said above, it is a malice that wishes to harm, by striking and so forth, when any of the nine bases of malice abides nearby.

1) Object: objects of anger – sentient beings, suffering and the sources of suffering abiding nearby	2) Subjective aspect: upon observing the object, a malice that wishes to harm, by striking and so forth	3) Function: support for taking up weapons, punishing, and so forth, and preparing to injure others.
--	---	--

Discussion on the pair, anger and belligerence:

QUALM: Since anger occurs in the context of root afflictions and belligerence in the context of secondary afflictions, what is the difference between anger and belligerence?

RESPONSE: Perhaps anger is an intolerant malicious mind occurring when the three objects dawn as objects of observation, whereas belligerence is an extremely disturbed state of mind which, upon a great intensifying of anger, wishes to strike physically when the cause of anger abides nearby.

Asanga's *Compendium of Knowledge* refers to: "*malice towards the three phenomena*" in the context of explaining **anger**, and "*when the cause of harm abides nearby*" and "*taking up weapons and so forth*" and so forth in the context of explaining **belligerence**.

Vasubandhu's *A Discussion of the Five Aggregates* explains: "*malice towards sentient beings*" in the context of **anger** and "*abides in causing immediate harm*" in the context of explaining the secondary affliction **belligerence**.

Therefore, having contemplated the presentations in these texts of Asanga and his brother [Vasubandhu], you may wonder whether they are just as they have been explained above. However, since these are very difficult to realize, the intelligent should analyze them in detail further. It is simply to be understood that anger acts as a support for harming others.

Anger is a disturbed mind which arises when one sees, thinks or hears the three phenomena (sentient beings, suffering and the sources of suffering) and cannot tolerate them. **Belligerence** follows from anger: it arises when anger is very strong and wishes to strike one's object of anger.

One can liken anger to a small fire, which can grow bigger when other fuels are added. When it becomes big, then it is like belligerence. Therefore, these two are differentiated in terms of strength.

2) Resentment:

Compendium of Knowledge: It is a refusal to let go of thoughts of harm following that [i.e., belligerence] and is involved with anger. It has the function of acting as a support for intolerance.

Just as it has been said above, it is a mind that, refusing to let go of a continuum of anger, wishes to harm or retaliate.

1) Object: objects of anger – sentient beings, suffering and the sources of suffering abiding nearby	2) Subjective aspect: arising from anger comes belligerence. Resentment is thus holding on to the causes of anger, as well as anger and belligerence in the mind, not letting them go and wishes to retaliate/ return the harm.	3) Function: acting as a support for intolerance
--	---	--

3) Concealment: Root text page 71 –

Compendium of Knowledge: It is a hiding of misdeeds when one is justly accused and is involved with ignorance. It has the function of acting as a support for not abiding in contact with regret.

Just as it has been said above, it is an awareness that wishes to hide faults through the force of ignorance when another person, such as a spiritual guide, benignly points out one's faults. Refusing to accept one's own faults, this concealment causes even small faults to greatly increase. It serves as a cause of not abiding in contact with regret and with happiness, and has the function of impelling one into lower rebirths in future lives.

1) Object: one's and other's misdeeds	2) Subjective aspect: hiding faults	3) Function: prevents one from generating regret [of misdeeds] and thus obstructs one from abiding in happiness
---------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	---

The essential point is this: one should not conceal misdeeds, rather one should confess and purify immediately through applying regret. If one were to conceal [one's misdeeds] and therefore unable to confess them, then even small misdeeds can multiply and increase. This will only result in lower rebirths.

For example: it is mentioned in the teachings that the non-virtues from killing a small insect, if one conceals this without confessing it [through regret], then after a period of time like a month, the karma increases to a similar strength to having killed a human being.

Therefore, it is mentioned in the teachings that one should confess one's misdeeds daily through the force of applying the four opponent powers. This at least would prevent the misdeeds from increasing in strength.

It is often taught in the teachings that if one does the practice of reciting the hundred-syllable mantra of Vajrasattva at least twenty-one times a day, that has the effect of preventing one's misdeeds from increasing.

Even though it is important to confess one's misdeeds and purify them through applying the four opponent powers, however, if one were to examine carefully, the essential point of the application lies in generating **regret** from having committed misdeeds in the past, and generating the mind of **restraint** from future misdeeds.

Therefore, regret is very important and is the main essence of the purification practice. It allows one to [actually] purify [one's misdeeds]. It is also only by having regret that one would have a mind of restraint.

Without applying these two powers [sincerely] but merely reciting the mantra twenty-one times a day and thinking that this [alone] would stop the misdeeds from increasing, is something that should be analyzed.

This is because, without any sincere regret and restraint, by merely reciting the mantra alone, does nothing from stopping one from committing the misdeeds again the next day. One again commits the same misdeeds.

With respect to the object, some commentaries also posit **other's misdeeds** as the **object** as well. If one conceal the misdeeds of others, does it become concealment?

When the motivation is to benefit someone, then there is the need to point out the misdeeds, especially from a spiritual guide to the student. Otherwise, that person may not regret and thus not confess and purify his/ her misdeeds. However, if one were to expose other's faults out of anger and retaliation, then this is another matter.

Therefore, perhaps there is no fault to point out other's faults if this is done with the intention to benefit.

4) Spite:

Compendium of Knowledge: It is a malicious mind that is preceded by belligerence and resentment, and is involved with anger. It has the function of acting as a support for rough violent speech, to increase that which is non-meritorious, and not abiding in contact [with happiness].

Just as it has been said above, it is an awareness which, for instance, lacking thoughts of regret and admission when another points out one's faults, wishes to utter harsh speech out of hateful thoughts driven by belligerence and resentment.

1) Object: objects of anger – sentient beings, suffering and the sources of suffering abiding nearby	2) Subjective aspect: A derivative of anger, spite is preceded by belligerence and resentment. It occurs when anger gets stronger. It causes one to engage in rough violent speech.	3) Function: support for rough violent speech, to increase that which is non-meritorious, and not abiding in contact with happiness.
One can examine the negative development of the derivative of anger in sequence: from anger, comes belligerence [and resentment], from belligerence [and resentment], comes spite. This is when one is almost ready to utter harsh speech.		

Antidotes to anger and its derivatives of belligerence, resentment and spite:

Belligerence, resentment and spite all come from anger. Therefore, the antidote for anger would also be the same antidote for these three:
a) To overcome anger [with respect to sentient beings], one can cultivate love and concern for others.
b) With respect to sources of suffering and one's experiences of suffering, one should understand these are merely the fruitional effects of one's own misdeeds in the past.
One should reflect on the topic of the general characteristics of karma in the Lam Rim,. The first of which is that karma is definite, which means that virtuous actions will only result in happiness and non-virtuous actions will only result in suffering.
When one is able to reflect correctly, one would understand/ realize that karma is definite. In relation to one's own pain, suffering and hindrances from others, one would realize that it is merely an experience of one's own actions created in the past. This definitely helps to manage one's anger.
The four qualities that make one a trainee in virtue taught earlier [on page 49] are essentially methods to help manage one's belligerence, resentment and spite. One has to start by taking the first step using these four practices: <i>Even when derided, do not deride in return. Even when someone gets angry at one, do not get angry in return. Even when hit, do not hit back. Even when one's faults are exposed, do not expose others' faults.</i>
Even when someone gets angry at one, do not get angry in return: this means not getting upset inside as well as not display one's angry demeanor externally. The main point is to relax the mind and not be so uptight with anger.
Even when derided, do not deride in return: one should not immediately retaliate/ react to derision directed towards oneself. Even though one may not be retaliating externally, however, if one is still upset internally/ harboring resentment and so on, it also does not help [one's practice] as one's mind is still not relaxed/ still uptight. Therefore, it is not merely not retaliating but more of loosening up of one's mind, letting go of the anger/ unhappiness.
One can also remember death and impermanence, that one would certainly be gone one day and that that time is really uncertain. When one really understands that, one would not hold on to such [destructive emotions] in the mind for too long. [Realistically], the anger will arise, however, when one reflects on death and impermanence, this would perhaps lessen the length of time that the anger remains within one's mind.
All the antidotes are already taught in the Lam Rim and one has already studied about them. It is therefore a matter of [applying those antidotes to oneself]. There is not any better solutions/ antidotes to all of one's problems than those that one can find in the Lam Rim. [All the solutions are] shown there.

5) Jealousy: Root text page 71 –

<i>Compendium of Knowledge: It is a deep disturbance of mind that cannot tolerate another's marvelous attributes due to excessive attachment to gain and honor, and is involved with hatred. It has the function of [causing] mental unhappiness and of not abiding in contact [with happiness].</i>		
Just as it has been said above, it is a deep disturbance of mind that cannot bear another's success due to attachment to gain and honor. It produces serious undesirable [consequences] in both this and future worlds [i.e., rebirths]; in this life there will be mental unhappiness, and in future lives one will be impelled into bad migrations.		
1) Object: good things of others	2) Subjective aspect: a deep disturbance of mind that cannot bear another's success due to attachment to gain and honor	3) Function: causes mental unhappiness and of not abiding in contact with happiness

6) Miserliness:

<i>Compendium of Knowledge: It is a thorough holding of the mind to possessions due to excessive attachment to gain and honor, and is involved with attachment. It has the function of acting as a support for non-diminishment of possessions.</i>		
Just as it has been said above, it is a tight holding that is unable to let go of possessions through the force of attachment to gain and honor. It produces serious undesirable [consequences] in both this life and future lives.		
1) Object: one's own possessions/ wealth	2) Subjective aspect: a tight holding that is unable to let go of possessions through the force of attachment to gain and honor	3) Function: causes attachment to increase and obstructs development of contentment
Jealousy and miserliness arise mainly due to attachment to material gain and so forth.		

7) Deceit:

<i>Compendium of Knowledge: It is a display of what is not [one's] good quality due to excessive attachment to gain and honor, and is involved with attachment and ignorance. It has the function of acting as a support for wrong livelihood.</i>		
Just as it has been said above, it is a display of good qualities one does not actually possess, due to excessive attachment to gain and honor, as in the case of pretending to be peaceful and subdued with the thought to deceive others, even though one's own mind is far from being subdued.		
1) Object: any good qualities	2) Subjective aspect: a pretense to possess these qualities one [or another] does not have with the intent to cheat others	3) Function: support for wrong livelihood
Wrong livelihood is of five types:		
1) Pretension: an external pretense toward others, feigning good qualities one does not have.		
2) Flattery: to speak smooth words in conformity with the minds of others for the sake of gain and honor.		
3) Hinting: to first flatter others and then praise their possessions out of an attachment to gain.		
4) Extortion: to speak about the faults of great miserliness and the like for the sake of gain.		
5) Seeking gain from gain: to seek gain by praising in the presence of another what one has previously obtained, saying, "Previously so-and-so gave me such-and-such."		

In brief, without guarding the stipulated boundaries of the trainings, even wandering to ask for alms in a village out of attachment to gain and honor is taught to be wrong livelihood. Therefore, if you do not wish to be defiled by wrong livelihood, do not seek to ingratiate yourself with others, and protect without duplicity the stipulated boundaries of the *Vinaya* in a place of solitude.

When one lives among others in society, the opportunity for dangers emerging in engaging wrong livelihoods is always present. Therefore, it is safer to go into isolation.

8) Dissimulation: Root text page 74 –

Compendium of Knowledge: It commits faults due to excessive attachment to gain and honor, and is involved with attachment and ignorance. It has the function of hindering the acquisition of perfect instructions.

Just as it has been said above, it is an awareness that wishes to hide one's faults, not revealing them to others through the force of attachment to gain and honor.

1) Object: any faults

2) Subjective aspect: a wish striving in whatever ways to hide one's [or another's] faults out of attachment to gain and honor

3) Function: hinders the acquisition of perfect instructions

Nowadays, hiding our faults, we act smart and clever if we can get away with it. But going by the yardstick of Dharma, we have deceived ourselves.

Regarding this, *Engaging in the Bodhisattva Deeds* says:

*"I am constantly dwelling in the presence of all the buddhas and bodhisattvas who are always endowed with unobscured vision."
By thinking in this way, I shall likewise develop a sense of shame, respect, and fear.*

Discussion of the pairs - between deceit and dissimulation and between concealment and dissimulation:

Since these two – deceit and dissimulation – hinder the acquisition of perfect instructions in this life, and produce various kinds of undesirable [consequences] in future lives – not meeting with Great Vehicle spiritual guides, not gaining perfect instructions, and so forth – deceit and dissimulation are enumerated among the four black dharmas in the *Questions of Kashyapa*.

Is there a difference between concealment and dissimulation?

Concealment observes one's [and others'] misdeeds and has the aspect of keeping it secret/ concealing it.

Dissimulation has the aspect of striving in whatever ways to conceal those faults.

The essential advice is this: there is no way to hide/ conceal one's faults. This is because these are seen and realized by all buddhas and bodhisattvas. Therefore, the point here is to [generate regret], confess and purify immediately [one' faults] in the presence of all buddhas and bodhisattvas.

9) Haughtiness: Root text page 75 –

Compendium of Knowledge: It is a joy and mental happiness upon seeing one's own good health, youth, signs of long life, or contaminated success, and is involved with attachment. It has the function of acting as a support for all [root] afflictions and secondary afflictions.

Just as it has been said above, it is a puffing up of the mind due to joy and mental happiness upon observing one's own good health, prosperity, and so forth. Since it produces all afflictions, it acts as the root of non-conscientiousness.

The *Exhortation to the Exceptional Resolve* says:

*This haughtiness is the root of all non-conscientiousness. Do not deride an inferior fully-ordained monk;
You will not attain liberation in an eon. This is the sequence in this teaching.*

The *Letter to a Friend* also says:

Look upon haughtiness on account of youth, or greatness of lineage, physique, learning, or power, as an enemy.

In general, having good health, prosperity, being born in a good lineage, having good physical appearance and so forth are ideal [conditions]. However, if one does not know how to think, then such attributes can become a cause for developing haughtiness.

1) Object: one's own good health, prosperity and so on	2) Subjective aspect: a derivative of attachment, a puffing up of the mind due to joy and mental happiness upon observing its object	3) Function: acting as a support for all root afflictions and secondary afflictions
--	--	---

Difference between haughtiness and pride:

Haughtiness is a puffing up of the mind due to joy and mental happiness upon observing one's own good health, prosperity, and so forth	Pride is a puffing up of the mind upon observing the basis for puffing up – one's own wealth, qualities and so forth.
Haughtiness involves mental happiness and joy. One feels good about being puffed up.	Whereas pride does not necessarily come with mental happiness and joy. Therefore, it is unsure whether pride is a puffing up of the mind that necessarily comes with such mental happiness and joy or not.

Lesson 28

2 October 2012

SQ: What is the difference between haughtiness and rejoicing?

Haughtiness is similar to pride. Pride [and haughtiness] is a puffing up of the mind when focused on its observed qualities. It is an obstacle to developing good qualities.	Rejoicing is a mind of liking which arises, for example, when one focuses on one's own virtues. It is a basis for increasing one's qualities.
Pride and haughtiness cannot act as a support for developing respect as the mind is puffed up.	Rejoicing can act as a support for developing respect.
Haughtiness is involved with attachment.	Rejoicing is not necessarily so. It is a possible danger that rejoicing can lead to attachment. Therefore, if one does not know how to rejoice, then when it is mixed with attachment, then there is danger that it will become haughtiness. Therefore, if one rejoices and then becomes puffed up and haughty, then it is not correct. When rejoicing becomes haughtiness, then rejoicing does not become a support for the generation and increase of one's good qualities. This then defeats the purpose of rejoicing, which is to increase one's qualities.

SQ: What does contaminated success in the definition of haughtiness mean?”

KR: It refers essentially to worldly perfections, all the enjoyments of desirable objects of cyclic existence that causes the generation of the afflictions.

10) Harmfulness: Root text page 75 –

<i>Compendium of Knowledge: It is involved with anger. It is non-benevolence, non-compassion and non-mercy. It has the function of harming others.</i>		
Just as it has been said above, it is a wish, bereft of benevolence, to harm sentient beings.		
Here the synonyms – non-benevolent and so forth [in the citation above] – are explained in the commentaries as follows: - since it is a wish to harm by oneself, it is non-benevolence , - since it is a wish to engage others in harming, it is non-compassion , and - since it is a rejoicing upon seeing or hearing others acting [to harm], it is non-mercy .		
1) Object: sentient beings	2) Subjective aspect: a wish to harm its object	3) Function: harming others

11) Non-shame: Root text page 76 –

<i>Compendium of Knowledge: It is a non-avoidance of misdeeds on account of oneself and is involved with attachment, hatred and ignorance. It has the function of assisting all [root] afflictions and secondary afflictions.</i>		
Just as it has been said above, it is an awareness that does not avoid misdeed on account of either oneself or the Dharma. For example, if a fully-ordained monk encounters an intoxicant and avoids a misdeed on account of himself, thinking, "Drinking this intoxicant is not something I should do," then this is shame. The opposite of this is non-shame.		
1) Object: misdeeds	2) Subjective aspect: Shame is a virtuous mental factor, a mind of avoidance/restraint of misdeeds on account of oneself. Non-shame is the opposite of this	3) Function: assisting all root and secondary afflictions

12) Non-embarrassment:

<i>Compendium of Knowledge: It is a non-avoidance of misdeeds on account of others and is involved with attachment, hatred and ignorance. It has the function of assisting all [root] afflictions and secondary afflictions.</i>		
Just as it has been said above, it is an awareness that does not avoid faults on account of others. If one, when about to engage in a misdeed, avoids the misdeed on account of others, thinking, "If the Teacher and the clairvoyant gods were to become displeased and I were to be despised by others, this would be unfitting," then this is embarrassment. The opposite of this is non-embarrassment.		
1) Object: misdeeds	2) Subjective aspect: embarrassment is a virtuous mental factor, a mind of avoidance/restraint of misdeeds on account of others. Non-embarrassment is the opposite of this	3) Function: assisting all root and secondary afflictions

13) Lethargy: Root text page 77 –

<i>Compendium of Knowledge: It is an unserviceability of mind and is involved with ignorance. It has the function of assisting all root afflictions and secondary afflictions.</i>		
Just as it has been said above, it is a heaviness and an unserviceability of the body and mind and is a factor of ignorance.		

The Precious Garland says: Lethargy is a state of inactivity due to heaviness of body and mind.

The *Explanation of the 'Treasury of Knowledge'* says:

It is a heaviness of the body and a heaviness of the mind. It is an unserviceability of the body and unserviceability of the mind.

The *Great Exposition of the Stages of the Path* also explains it in this way. Its function is specified as "assisting all [root] afflictions and secondary afflictions," because all afflictions will increase in dependence upon lethargy.

In this vein, the *Exhortation to the Exceptional Resolve* says:

Phlegm, wind, and bile occur to a great extent in the bodies of those who take joy in sleep and lethargy, their constituents are in disorder.

For those who take joy in lethargy and sleep, their stomachs are unclean due to a bad diet, their bodies are heavy and their complexions unhealthy, even their speech is slurred. And, those who take joy in lethargy and sleep are confused and their aspirations for the Dharma degenerate.

The childish completely degenerate from all excellent qualities, their wholesomeness degenerates, and they proceed to darkness.

1) Object: different kinds of object

2) Subjective aspect: a heaviness and an unserviceability of the body and mind

3) Function: assisting all root and secondary afflictions

Lethargy refers to the mind that induces the body and mind to become heavy, just like pliancy is the mind that induces the body and mind to become serviceable for virtue.

14) Excitement: Root text page 78 –

Compendium of Knowledge: It is an unpeacefulness of mind that subsequently engages an attractive cause. It has the function of hindering calm-abiding.

Just as it has been said above, it is an awareness that, upon observing the attributes of the desire realm previously experienced, mentally scatters outwards to them and engages them with craving.

Regarding this, *the Precious Garland says: Excitement is an unpeacefulness of the body and mind.*

Great Exposition of the Stages of the Path:

1) Object: a pleasant and attractive object

2) Subjective aspect: an unpeacefulness of the mind that is scattered outward and it is involved with attachment. Thus it engages its object with the aspect of craving.

3) Function: hindering the mind from abiding on the object of observation

QUALM: Are all outward scatterings of the mind excitement?

RESPONSE: I do not hold it to be so. Excitement is involved with attachment, but the mind is frequently distracted to objects by way of afflictions other than attachment; the mind even scatters to non-afflicted virtuous objects of observation. Hence, not all scatterings of the mind are excitement.

Excitement is a derivative of attachment as it is involved with it. It obstructs/ hinders the mind from staying focused on an object/ calm abiding. It is a mind that scatters outwards to desirable objects. Hence, it is necessarily non-virtuous.

Even though this is mental scattering, however, not all mental scatterings are necessarily non-virtuous, as it can also be a neutral mind or even a virtuous mind. This is because the mind can scatter towards a neutral or virtuous object. Hence, there can be virtuous mental scattering but there are no virtuous excitement.

Excitement is a scattering of the mind due to attachment, whereas mental scattering does not necessarily occur due to attachment.

Since that is the case, then perhaps one can say that: excitement is necessarily mental scattering whereas mental scattering is not necessarily excitement.

15) Non-faith: Root text page 79 –

Compendium of Knowledge: It is a non-conviction, non-clarity, and non-wishing of the mind with respect to virtuous phenomena, and is involved with ignorance. It has the function of acting as a support for laziness.

Just as it has been said above, it is the discordant class of faith and is involved with ignorance.

The [virtuous] mental factor of faith explained earlier has three division: faith of conviction, clear faith and aspiring/ wishing faith. Hence, here, non-faith would be the opposite of these three:

- 1) non-faith of non-conviction in actions and their results and so forth – the discordant class of the faith of conviction;
- 2) non-faith of non-clarity and a mental dislike with respect to the possessors of excellent qualities, such as the three jewels – the discordant class of the faith of clarity;
- 3) non-faith of non-wishing and non-seeking of liberation and so forth – the discordant class of wishing faith.

Non-faith is a derivative of ignorance as it is involved with it. It functions as a support for laziness. This is because, faith functions as a support for joyous perseverance. Therefore, if one does not possess faith, which means one would have non-faith, then one would not have joyous perseverance. When one does not possess joyous perseverance, this would mean that one would be lazy.

The antidote to non-faith would be faith itself. Therefore, one would have to do one's best to develop faith.

1) Object: virtuous object	2) Subjective aspect: a non-conviction, non-clarity, and non-wishing of the mind with respect to its object	3) Function: support for laziness
----------------------------	---	-----------------------------------

16) Laziness: Root text page 80 –

Compendium of Knowledge: It is a non-enthusiasm of the mind engendered by the comfort of lying down, reclining on one's side, and slouching about, and is involved with ignorance. It has the function of hindering application to the class of virtue.

Just as it has been said above, it is a non-enthusiasm of the mind for virtue due to a habit of lying down and so forth. Laziness causes the entire class of virtue to degenerate.

The Close Placement of Mindfulness says:
The one basis for afflictions is laziness. Who has it? Wherever laziness is present, all Dharma is absent.

Laziness is the opposite of joyous perseverance, which is the antidote to laziness. This is a mind that is unenthusiastic in virtue, whereas joyous perseverance is a mind that is enthusiastic about virtue.

Therefore, for joyous perseverance to arise in one's mind, one must be convinced about the benefits of engaging in virtue. Depending on whatever the virtue may be, one reflects on the benefits of its ripening effects, particularly, the beneficial results of achieving liberation and enlightenment.

When one sees the benefits, one would then become enthusiastic about virtue and wishes to engage in it. This is how joyous perseverance can arise.

Therefore, the main key to developing joyous perseverance is to develop faith. Without faith, there would be no joyous perseverance. Without joyous perseverance, one cannot overcome laziness. As it is mentioned in one outline of the Lam Rim: *Developing faith of conviction in karma, the root of all happiness.*

Therefore, developing faith of conviction in karma is extremely important for developing joyous perseverance. With the faith of conviction in karma, one would then be able to cause one's virtues to increase.

This applies to everything in life: even though one does not call it joyous perseverance, whatever one does, the process is essentially the same. Before one is willing to work hard to achieve anything, one has to be convinced about the benefits of one's goal. When one sees how beneficial it is for one, then one would aspire to achieve that goal. With aspiration, then comes effort. One then works hard to achieve that goal.

1) Object: virtues	2) Subjective aspect: non-enthusiasm of the mind for its object	3) Function: hinders joyous perseverance
--------------------	---	--

17) Non-conscientiousness:

Compendium of Knowledge: Abiding with attachment, hatred, ignorance as well as laziness, it is a non-cultivation of virtuous qualities and non-guarding of the mind against contaminated phenomena. It has the function of acting as a support for the increase of non-virtue and the decrease of virtue.

Just as it has been said above, it is an awareness that, not guarding the mind against the hosts of afflictions and misdeeds, gives in to relaxation.

Non-conscientiousness is the opposite of conscientiousness. It is mentioned in the teachings that one has to rely on conscientiousness at all times to guard the mind.

Without conscientiousness, non-conscientiousness would set in. One would then easily allow the afflictions to arise.

1) Object: virtues	2) Subjective aspect: non-cultivation of its object and non-guarding of the mind against non-virtues	Function: support for the increase of non-virtue and the decrease of virtue
--------------------	--	---

18) Forgetfulness: Root text page 81 –

Compendium of Knowledge: It is a mindfulness that is concomitant with afflictions. It has the function of acting as a support for distraction.

Just as it has been said above, it is a knower that is an unclear mind and forgetful with respect to virtue on account of mindfulness of an object of observation of afflictions. Similarly, *A Discussion of the Five Aggregates* also explains forgetfulness to be an afflicted mindfulness, whereby an unclear, forgetful, virtuous mind should be called "forgetfulness." However, since the objects of observation of afflictions – pleasant and unpleasant characteristics and so forth – do not arise as objects of awareness [of such a virtuous mind], perhaps it should not be posited as forgetfulness. Forgetfulness acts as a support for distraction, because, in dependence on afflicted mindfulness, the mind will be distracted to an object of observation of the afflictions.

Since forgetfulness is listed here as a secondary affliction, therefore, one has to posit it as a mind that is unclear about virtue and is forgetful about virtuous objects of observation.

Therefore, forgetfulness is a mind that is focused on a non-virtuous object of observation. Due to that, it becomes unclear with respect to virtuous objects of observation and forgets them.

Function of forgetfulness is acting as a support for distraction. This is because, in dependence on a mind that is focused on a non-virtuous object of observation, the mind is then distracted to that. In that process, it then forgets about virtuous objects of observation.

Since it is an afflicted mindfulness, then it only focuses on a non-virtuous object, holds on to it without forgetting it. Therefore, this acts as a condition for the mind to forget about virtuous objects of observation.

1) Object: basis for developing afflictions	2) Subjective aspect: focusing on its object, it becomes unclear about virtues and forgets them	Function: support for distraction
---	---	-----------------------------------

19) Non-introspection:

<i>Compendium of Knowledge: A wisdom that is concomitant with afflictions and engages unknowingly in activities of body, speech, and mind. It has the function of acting as a support for infractions [non-virtues and downfalls]</i>		
Just as it has been said above, it is an afflicted wisdom that engages unknowingly in activities of the three doors; it is the discordant class of introspection.		
That this non-introspection acts as a support for infractions accords with what is said in <i>Engaging in the Bodhisattva Deeds</i> : <i>Even though learned, faithful and diligent in effort, many become tainted by downfalls due to the fault of lacking introspection.</i>		
Therefore, in the teachings, one is advised to be vigilant (having introspection) at all times. One has to do so continuously.		
Without introspection, one would not be able to guard one's body, speech and mind against negativities. One would also not be able to protect oneself from committing downfalls/ infractions of vows and so on.		
1) Object: activities of one's body, speech and mind	2) Subjective aspect: an afflicted *[intelligence] that engages unknowingly in non-virtues of the three doors	3) Function: support for non-virtues and downfalls

* See page 95

20) Distraction:

<i>Compendium of Knowledge: It is a scattering of the mind and is involved with attachment, hatred, and ignorance. It has the function of hindering separation from attachment.</i>		
Just as it has been said above, it causes the mind to be distracted from its object of observation through the force of afflictions. <i>A Discussion of the Five Aggregates</i> explains it as a scattering of the mind to the five attributes of the desire realm.		
QUALM: Is there no difference between this [distraction] and the excitement that was explained above?		
RESPONSE: Excitement is a scattering to attractive objects previously familiarized with and is involved with attachment, whereas distraction can be distracted to any object and be involved with all three poisons. Thus they are different.		
Therefore, if one were asked if there was a difference between excitement and distraction, then one would have to say that these are different:		
Excitement is involved within attachment, due to that, there is an outward scattering of the mind to an attractive object. Distraction, however, is not necessarily focused on an attractive object. One can be distracted due to attachment, hatred or ignorance. Since it is listed as a secondary affliction, it can be involved with all three poisons.		
When distraction is divided, there are six: 1) distraction by way of its very entity 2) external distraction 3) internal distraction 4) distraction by way of signs 5) distraction by way of unfavorable states 6) distraction by way of attention.		
1) Distraction by way of its very entity is explained to be the five sense consciousnesses. The reason is that, at the time of being set in equipoise on meditative stabilization, if any of the five sense consciousnesses are generated, then [the mind] arises from meditative stabilization. Thus, they are called "outward distraction of the mind away from meditative stabilization."		
From here, one can understand that meditative stabilization is not cultivated by sense consciousnesses. It is achieved only by a mental consciousness. This is because, when the five sense consciousnesses are manifested, one would necessarily be distracted and would not be concentrated.		

2) **External** distraction is, when one is engaged in virtues of the three – listening, contemplation and meditation – the outward scattering of the mind to the attributes of the desire realm without abiding in them [i.e., the virtues]; since it causes scattering to an erroneous object of observation without abiding on the virtuous object of observation, it is called such.

3) **Internal** distraction is laxity, excitement, and craving for the taste of meditative absorption at the time of being set in equipoise on meditative stabilization. What is the reason for calling these "internal distraction"? They are so-called because they are the main obstacles for cultivating meditative stabilization internally.

4) Distraction by way of **signs** is to put effort in virtuous training with the thought, "How wonderful it would be if another person were to develop conviction in me, thinking, 'He has attained a concentration.'"

This is essentially getting involved with the eight worldly dharmas.

5) Distraction by way of **unfavorable states** is a puffing up of the mind conceiving I and mine when the feeling that one is engaging in virtue arises in dependence on the unfavorable states of the view of the transitory collection and pride.

This is essentially a puffing up of the mind/ pride.

6) Distraction by way of **attention** is, for instance, giving up the meditative absorption of the fourth concentration for the meditative absorption of the third concentration or below, or thinking, "Giving up engaging in the great vehicle, I shall abide in the lesser vehicle."

These types of distraction explained here are taught to be general enumerations of distraction, but it is not definite that they are actual secondary afflictions; the first is unspecified (as either virtuous or non-virtuous) and the last one is included within virtue.

Since distraction here is listed as a secondary affliction, therefore it is non-virtuous. Nevertheless, the distractions mentioned above are not all non-virtuous/ afflicted. The last one, distraction by way of attention, is virtuous. In the example of the mind that gives up the great vehicle, that is non-virtuous. However, entering the lesser vehicle is the point of this example, as one enters it upon giving up the great vehicle.

Since it is taught that the distraction that is an actual secondary affliction is, for instance, the external distraction and internal distraction which have been explained here, those of keen intellect need to analyze this in detail.

1) Object: any objects

2) Subjective aspect: scattering towards its object due to any of the three poisons

3) Function: hindering separation from attachment

Discussion of the category of secondary afflictions:

In this way, these twenty – from belligerence up to distraction – are called "secondary afflictions" [near-afflictions] because they are near to or involved with the root afflictions. Furthermore, you should understand them individually – belligerence and resentment being near to anger, and being involved with it [anger] and so forth. Most of them are clear from the *Knowledge* passages that have been previously cited.

These [twenty listed above] are called secondary afflictions because, these are minds that are close/ near to the root afflictions and are derivatives of them.

Belligerence, resentment, jealousy and spite are derivatives of anger.

Miserliness, deceit, dissimulation, haughtiness and excitement are derivatives of attachment, arising with attachment as a condition.

Concealment, lethargy, non-faith and laziness are derivatives of ignorance.

Non-introspection, non-conscientiousness and many others are derivative of all three.

The four interchangeable mental factor:

1) Sleep 2) Regret 3) Investigation 4) Analysis

1) Sleep:

Compendium of Knowledge: It is a withdrawal of the mind in dependence upon sleep, its cause, with respect to: virtue, non-virtue and the unspecified, the timely and the untimely, and the appropriate and the inappropriate, and is involved with ignorance. It has the function of acting as a support for failing to perform actions.

Just as it has been said above, it is an awareness that causes the engagement in objects of the sense consciousness to powerlessly withdraw inwards in dependence upon its causes, such as heaviness of body, weakness, fatigue, and attention to signs of darkness.

1) Object: virtue, non-virtue or unspecified

2) Subjective aspect: focusing on its object, a mind that withdraws powerlessly inwards

3) Function: acts as a support for failing to perform actions

Sleep is essentially a consciousness/ mental factor. However, it is difficult to think of it as a mind.

Here, regarding "the timely and the untimely" [in the citation above], it is just as it has been said by the Protector Nagarjuna [in his *Letter to a Friend*]:

Sensible ones! Occupy yourselves the entire daytime and also the first and last parts of the night.

Sleep with mindfulness between these; then even the time of sleep will not be wasted.

Just as it has been said above, the middle watch of the night is the time for [timely] sleep, whereas the first and the last watches of the night, as well as daytime, not being the time for sleep [as these are untimely sleep], are times for making effort in the application of virtue. Hence it is taught in this way for the purpose of comprehending these modes.

Timely and untimely sleep:

An entire day can be divided into daytime and nighttime. Hence, any form of sleep during daytime is considered as untimely, while the first and last parts of the night are also untimely periods for sleep. Therefore, the only period that is considered timely for sleep is during the middle portion of the night.

Perhaps the first part of the night can start at 7p.m. (Singapore time) up to 10p.m. So, 11p.m. , 12a.m., 1a.m. and 2a.m. would be the middle part of the night. Since that's the case, then last part of the night would perhaps be from 3a.m. to 6a.m.

Appropriate and inappropriate sleep:

Regarding "the appropriate and the inappropriate" [in the citation above], sleeping during the middle watch of the night out of the wish to engage in virtue by developing the elements of the body is appropriate, whereas sleep motivated by afflictions, even during the middle watch of the night, is inappropriate. Hence it is taught for the sake of understanding this.

Since sleep is divided into timely and the untimely, one should engage in timely sleep. Above this, there is also appropriate and inappropriate sleep as well, so one should engage in appropriate sleep. [Therefore, one should engage in timely and appropriate sleep.

Essentially, this is what is taught in the Lam Rim teachings: at this point when one has obtained a human life of freedoms and endowments, one should strive in virtue day and night. Therefore, the discussion on timely and appropriate sleep is taught in this context.

This is really emphasized: if one lives for eighty years, half of that is already spent in sleep. Therefore, during these times, whether this activity of sleep becomes meaningful or not really depends on whether one engaged them in timely sleep and also know how to fall asleep (appropriate sleep) or not.

Otherwise, half of one's life that is spent sleeping would go to waste. Therefore, this is essentially an advice on how one can make the great part of one's life spent meaningfully.

This is essentially dependent on one's motivation: therefore, it is important to fall asleep within a virtuous state of mind and with the intention to wake up early/ at the appropriate time to continue with one's virtuous practice.

When one [does these two things well]. Then this will make whatever time spent on sleep meaningful.

Sleep is classified as a changeable mental factor. This is because it can be either virtuous or non-virtuous. This means that it has to depend on a motivation for it to be so.

Function of sleep:

Its function is specified as "failing to perform actions" because, since sleep is of two types – the virtuous and the non-virtuous – the non-virtuous type, afflicted sleep, causes virtuous activities to degenerate.

"Failing to perform actions" mainly refers to non-virtuous sleep.

Therefore, the essence is to understand that it is important to fall asleep with a virtuous state of mind and with the intention to wake up to continue one's virtuous practice.

SQ: what does “developing the elements of the body” in the root text mean?

KR: the body is made up of the four elements: earth, water, fire and wind. One would be able to perform functions with one's body when the four elements that constitutes one's body are in equilibrium. By engaging in timely sleep, the elements of the body will be in equilibrium. This then promotes health and the ability to engage in actions. However, if the elements within one's body is not in balance, this would then affect one's health and therefore the ability to perform function with one's body.

Therefore, there is the need to develop the body as there is a close connection between one's body and mind. Therefore, this shows that the very purpose of sleep is to allow one to rest and then continue with one's virtuous practice.

When one engages in virtuous practice, one's mind must be very strong and powerful. Since the mind is closely related/ dependent on the state of one's physical health, it is therefore important to develop the elements of one's body.

Therefore, one can fall asleep with such a motivation: “I am going to rest my body so that I can continue my practice.”

2) Regret:

Compendium of Knowledge: It is a remorseful mind dependent on any [proper] activity or improper activity, intended or unintended, with respect to: virtue, non-virtue and the unspecified, the timely and the untimely, and the appropriate and the inappropriate, and is involved with ignorance. It has the function of hindering the stability of the mind.

Just as it has been said above, in dependence on: oneself having performed an appropriate or inappropriate activity deliberately or having been made to do so under duress, being remorseful about that activity which one subsequently comes to dislike is called "generating regret."

1) Object: activities that one has performed oneself or were made to perform by others	2) Subjective aspect: perhaps it is dislike [towards one's object]	3) Function: hindering the stability of the mind
Some text comments that the object can also be: activities of oneself and others. This shows that it is possible to generate regret for others' actions.		

Division: Regret is of three types –

1) virtuous	For instance, regret for past misdeeds belongs to the class of virtue.
2) non-virtuous	For instance, regret for having created merit belongs to the class of non-virtue.
3) unspecified	Regret for something that neither benefited nor harmed others, such as manual work, is unspecified.

Timely and untimely, appropriate and inappropriate (that appeared in the definition):

[This] means that generating regret when something is rectifiable is appropriate, whereas regret when it is not is inappropriate. Moreover, appropriateness of regret when it is rectifiable refers to, for instance, the necessity to confess misdeeds with regret before the fruition has been established in the present. Not rectifiable refers to, for instance, rebirth in a bad migration due to fruition having been established; since having being born blind, physically disabled, and so forth are occasions where the fruition has been established, they are irreversible.

Even in the conventional sense, people also talk about not end up regretting [one's actions] as this is not good. This is in the context of the situation having occurred and there is not much one can do anymore about it. In such situations, it is pointless to regret as it is already untimely. Since it is also not rectifiable, it is inappropriate.

Timely regret is appropriate. This is because, if one generates regret before the consequences come to fruition, one can still do something to rectify them. These can be in the form of confessions to purify those misdeeds.

Regret is said to be a remorse that enables one to subsequently dislike one's misdeeds. When one has such a mind, then it is very helpful for one's confession as this gives power to one's confession. As one did not like what was committed, due to that, one confesses [more sincerely.]

Regret is therefore a state of mind not words [uttered from one's mouth]. Therefore, it is not something for mere recitation, rather, it is being [sincerely] remorseful about one's misdeeds which one subsequently dislikes.

When one engages in confession, one is supposed to be applying the four opponent powers. Regret comes in as one these four. Therefore, at such times, it is important to engage in timely regret.

Therefore, detailed examination of these passages from the *Compendium of Knowledge* seems to be a marvelous method for generating certainty regarding the stages of the path.

If one investigates: regretting others' virtues is probably non-virtuous. Since that is the case, if one regrets others' non-virtues, then that kind of regret would be virtuous.

Regret is also classified as a changeable mental factor. This is because, it could be all three: virtuous, non-virtuous or unspecified. Therefore, there is no certainty about the nature of regret.

3) and 4) Investigation and Analysis:

*Compendium of Knowledge: **Investigation** is a mental expression of inquiry depending on either intention or wisdom; it is a coarse mind. **Analysis** is a mental expression of individual examination depending on either intention or wisdom; it is a fine mind. Their function is to act as a support for abiding in contact and not abiding in contact.*

Just as it has been said above, investigation is an inquiry into the rough entities of objects as well as their names, whereas analysis analyzes with fine discrimination.

Investigation is a coarse mind whereas analysis is a fine mind. 'Fine' refers to looking at objects in detail.

*A Discussion of the Five Aggregates: **Investigation** is a mental expression of inquiry. It is a coarse mind [depending on] the particularities of either intention or wisdom. **Analysis** is a mental expression of individual examination. It is a fine mind [depending on] the particularities of either intention or wisdom. The two brothers [Asanga and Vasubandhu] seem to agree on this explanation.*

1) Object (of both): virtuous, non-virtuous or the unspecified	2) Subjective aspect: Investigation – aspect of coarseness Analysis – aspect of analyzing fine details	3) Function: support for abiding and not abiding in contact [with happiness]
--	---	--

The function of investigation and analysis is specified as "acting as a support for abiding in contact and not abiding in contact," because investigation and analysis are each of two types – the virtuous and the non-virtuous – whereby: investigation and analysis belonging to the class of virtue act to produce pleasant results, thus "acting as a support for abiding in contact" with happiness.

This is essentially an explanation of how these two act as a support for abiding in contact with happiness.

Function of investigation and analysis:

Investigation and analysis belonging to the class of non-virtue act to produce unpleasant results, thus "acting as a support for not abiding in contact" with happiness.

Investigation engages in virtuous objects with the mode of engagement being 'coarse'. Such type of investigation is virtuous.

Similarly, analysis engages in a virtuous object by way of fine details of that virtuous object. Such type becomes a virtuous analysis.

Opposites of these would be non-virtuous.

How virtuous investigation and analysis are rare in the world:

Moreover, investigation and fine analysis of the meaning of selflessness with the thought to definitely emerge from cyclic existence, and so forth belong to the class of **virtue**, investigation and fine analysis of the modes of pleasant or unpleasant objects motivated by attachment, anger, and so forth belong to the class of **non-virtue**, analysis and investigation of work, behavior and so forth that are neither virtuous nor non-virtuous minds are **unspecified**.

Most of one's investigation and analysis are non-virtuous as one usually observes pleasant or unpleasant objects motivated by the afflictions. Therefore, virtuous investigation and analysis are rare in the world.

Discussion of the category of changeable mental factors: whether investigation and analysis are necessarily conceptual –

Why are these four – sleep, regret, investigation, and analysis – called "changeable"? They are called "changeable" because they become virtuous, non-virtuous, or unspecified through the force of being concomitant with the motivating thought.

This is something one should investigate: are investigation and analysis necessarily conceptual?

I personally wonder if these two are necessarily conceptual, and would think that they probably would not be. However, this is to be investigated further.

How investigation and analysis become obstacles to the higher training in wisdom:

Afflicted sleep, regret, investigation, and analysis obscure the entire class of virtue in general, and especially the three trainings [in ethics, meditative stabilization, and wisdom].

The "five obscurations" are taught in sutra. They are just as they have been taught by the Protector Nagarjuna [in *Letter to a Friend*]: [1] Excitement and regret, [2] harmful intent, [3] Sleep and lethargy, [4] aspiration for the desire realm, and [5] doubt are the five obscurations. Be aware that they are thieves who steal away the wealth of virtue.

Furthermore, aspiration for the attributes of the desire realm and harmful intent mainly obscure the training in ethics; sleep, lethargy, excitement, and regret mainly obscure the training of mind [i.e., meditative stabilization]; doubt, investigation, and analysis mainly obscure the training in wisdom.

It is fairly obvious how doubt obscures one's higher training in wisdom. However, how would investigation and analysis obscures the higher training in wisdom?

I am not exactly sure about this, however, if one reads the higher training in wisdom here to mean specifically the meditative equipoise focusing single-pointedly on emptiness, then obviously, investigation and analysis would obstruct the higher training in wisdom.

This is because, when one is in the state of meditative equipoise focusing on emptiness, any investigation and analysis would hinder one's meditative stabilization.

If this is not the case, then one would still need to explain how investigation and analysis obscures the higher training in wisdom.

The *Compendium of Knowledge* teaches that these five obscurations obscure ethics and meditative stabilization, whereas [Shantirakshita's] *Commentary on the Twenty Verses on the Bodhisattva Vows* explains that only meditative stabilization is obscured. In brief, although there appear many modes of explanation in the upper and lower *Knowledges* and numerous lengthy explanations in other texts, since they are very extensive, I cannot discuss them all here.

SQ: How would virtuous sleep and regret obscure meditative stabilization?

Regret is a remorseful mind that dislikes [what has been done]. Since that is the case, this can interfere with meditative stabilization. As for sleep, whether it is virtuous or non-virtuous, it is an obstacle to meditative stabilization.

SQ: Could investigation and analysis be obstacles to the higher training in wisdom due to, while observing the "I" that does not exist,

- 1) For non-buddhists, investigating and analyzing this "I" to be permanent, unitary and independent, and
- 2) For buddhists of the lower tenets, investigating and analyzing this "I" to inherently exist?

One has to see if investigation and analysis be factually concordant minds or not.

Why sleep, lethargy and excitement, regret are counted as one in the context of the five obscurations:

QUALM: Well then, what is the reason for subsuming: lethargy, which occurred in the context of secondary afflictions, and sleep, which occurred in the context of changeable mental factors, into one in the context on the five obscurations?

RESPONSE: Generally, lethargy and sleep are not the same. Since lethargy is involved with ignorance and sleep can either be virtuous or non-virtuous, lethargy is said to be a secondary affliction, and sleep a changeable mental factor.

Similarly, what is the reason for subsuming: excitement, which occurred in the context of secondary afflictions, and regret, which occurred in the context of changeable mental factors, into one there?

Since excitement is involved with attachment, and regret can either be virtuous or non-virtuous, excitement is said to be a secondary affliction and regret a changeable mental factor.

[Each of these two pairs of mental factors] are taken to be one in the context of the five obscurations because: they are produced from the same cause, they are abandoned by the same antidote, and they accord in having the same function.

That they are produced from the same **cause** refers to the following: both lethargy and sleep are produced from overeating, an unhappy mind, a discouraged mind, relishing taste, and so forth. Both excitement and regret are produced from conceptions of having indulged in the attributes of the desire realm, having fun, laughing, and so forth in the past, and from the notion that one will not die and the like.

That they are abandoned by the same antidote refers to the following: both lethargy and sleep are dispelled by the discrimination of illumination, and excitement and regret are dispelled by holding the mind inwards on an object of observation.

That they accord in having the same **function** refers to the following: since both lethargy and sleep cause discouragement within the mind, they hinder meditative stabilization and especially the clarity of the objects of observation, and since both excitement and regret hinder single-pointed abiding, their functions accord.

Concluding discussion:

Here I say: Having strongly tied us with thousands of nooses of karma to the prison of [cyclic] existence since beginningless time, the enemies who torture us with hundreds of unbearable sufferings and agonies are certainly the afflictions themselves. In the wilderness covered by thickets of [cyclic] existence, the intolerable thieves who steal even the slightest benefit and happiness and torment us without allowing a single moment's relief are just those [afflictions]. Alas! Who is more foolish than one who holds this enemy from beginningless time as his dear friend, planting him at the center of his heart, but holds as enemies his kind father and mother sentient beings, The six types of migrators? Hey! Instead, if intelligent discerning people were to uproot the enemy of afflictions from their hearts and cherish their kind parents, planting these wish-fulfilling gems at the very center of their hearts, it would be far better!

This is an advice from the author: the entire reason why one studies these list of afflictions, the six root and twenty secondary afflictions, is to identify them and realize that these are the actual enemies, not sentient beings.

2. A summary of the salient points and their application to practice:

Having thus understood the presentation of minds and mental factors, it is important to know how to use it as a method for subduing one's own continuum. Otherwise, if one takes delight in merely arguing with others, holding forth just to prove one's point or pedantically listing synonyms, then there is not much purpose.

It is just as it has been said in the *King of Meditative Stabilizations Sutra*:

Although I have explained the good doctrine, if you do not put it into practice correctly after having heard it, then you are like a sick person who clutches a bag of medicines, but is unable to cure his sickness.

It is just as it has been said in *Engaging in the Bodhisattva Deeds*:

In brief, to examine the state of body and mind again and again, is the sole defining characteristic of guarding introspection.

The Protector Nagarjuna says [in *Letter to a Friend*]:

*Know that the mind is like a drawing made on water, earth, or stone.
From among these, in regard to the afflicted, the first is best, and in regard to wishing for the Dharma, the last.*

The analogy used here is a drawing made on water, earth and stone. With respect to virtuous minds, these should be like a drawing made on stone. This is because, a drawing made on stone is very stable and long lasting.

With respect to one's afflictions, it is best that these are like a drawing made on water. This is because, a drawing made on water does not last, erases easily and quickly. One should therefore deal with one's afflictions like this.

Therefore, **the essence of studying Mind and Mental factors is this:**

- 1. To cultivate strong virtuous states of mind, making them stable and long lasting.**
- 2. When one's afflictions arise, to ensure that these do not last long by [knowing how to] deal with them immediately.**

Gon-pa-wa said:

In order to abandon the afflictions, you must know the drawbacks, the defining characteristics, and the antidotes of the afflictions, as well as the causes for their production. Having understood their drawbacks, regard them as faults and hold them as enemies.

Without understanding their drawbacks, you will not understand that they are enemies. Once you have come to know the root and secondary afflictions, whenever any affliction, such as attachment or anger, arises in your continuum, identify it, thinking, "This is it! It has arisen!" and combat the affliction right there and then.

Just as it has been said above, as soon as an affliction arises in your continuum, having forcefully recognized it, thinking, "This is it! It has arisen!" you must examine which causes and conditions produced it, and what the object of observation from which it arose is, and then, regarding it as a fault, hold it as an enemy and immediately overcome it with the antidote.

Gon-pa-wa says to Neu-sur-pa:

Ye-[shes]-bar, if, tomorrow or the next day, someone were to ask all your disciples, "What are you practicing as the core of quintessential instructions?" they would answer that it was to attain clairvoyance or a vision of their personal deity.

However, they should answer, "Having become more and more certain about the cause and result of actions, we are practicing to guard purely whatever vows we have committed ourselves to." Therefore, an "attainment of meditation" refers to the afflictions, such as ignorance, becoming weaker and weaker.

Therefore, **to have successfully achieved attainments, whether it is from one's daily practice or from one's retreat, means to have any of the following:**

1. **If one sees one's afflictions becoming weaker over time, then this is a sign of having actualized the attainments.**
2. **If one's conviction in the law of causality, karma, increases, then this is a clear sign of having achieved something in one's practice.**
3. **If one's ability to practice ethics increases, this is also an achievement of attainments.**

Therefore, [achieving attainments] is **not** about being clairvoyant nor about being able to see deities. Even if, through one's practice, one were to see deities, it is of no significance, if one's afflictions does not become weaker over time. Therefore, the essence [of any Dharma practice] is to weaken one's afflictions over time. This is the real result [of any Dharma practice].

Author's confession of mistakes:

I, owing to inferior merit, am born at the end of time; my eye of awareness is hazy and my training poor. Therefore, whatever I have failed to explain or have explained wrongly here, I confess to the wise.

This also applies to me [Khenrinpoche]. In the course of explaining this module, there were perhaps correct and incorrect explanations given. Even if there were incorrect ones given, these were not done intentionally. Therefore, in my case, I also have to confess.

Their eye of awareness polluted by unbearable *dadura* [poison], their hearts agitated by the evil spirits of the eight worldly concerns, even though they belittle me and are infuriated, I shall have nothing to do with them.

Author's dedication of merits:

By this virtue, may I and all migrating beings, come under the care of the holy spiritual guides of the supreme vehicle, and become holders of all the modes of the profound and extensive Dharma without exception. Attaining the eloquence of self-reliance in regard to what is very difficult to fathom, in order to liberate all migrating beings without exception, may I become just like the supreme guru Manjushri!

This is essentially [the author's] dedication/ prayer to be like Lama Tsongkhapa, to be able to engage in extensive hearing and reflection on the profound and extensive teachings of the Buddha, to be always taken care of by the Mahayana gurus, and to be of great benefit to sentient beings.

Khenrinpoche's exhortation to the students:

Whenever one attempts to study the mind, how it of their mental factors function, it is not easy but challenging. In my case, it is the same. Although I have done the years of studying and reflecting on these topics, I still find it challenging. Whatever the case, it is definite that all of us, including myself, have planted [positive] imprints in our minds, so it is something to feel happy about/ to rejoice over.

Therefore, one has to keep in mind the need to continue to learn the Buddha's teachings while one is able to.