

## Transcript of teachings by Khen Rinpoche Geshe Chonyi

**Root text:** *Presentation of Tenets* by Jetsün Chökyi Gyaltzen, translated by Glen Svensson. Copyright: Glen Svensson, April 2005. Reproduced for use in the FPMT Basic Program with permission from Glen Svensson

Lightly edited and some footnotes added by Joan Nicell, Istituto Lama Tzong Khapa, October 2005.

All page references refer to this root text unless otherwise stated.

**Lesson No: 10**

**Date: 2<sup>nd</sup> April 2013**

### *Sutra School*

The explanation of the Sutra School (*Skt. Sautrantika*) has seven outlines:

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

#### 1 Definition

**The definition of a Proponent of Sutra** is: a person propounding Lesser Vehicle tenets who accepts both self-cognizers and external objects.

Proponent of Sutra (*Skt. Sautrantika*) and Exemplifier (*Skt. Darstantika*) are equivalent (Page 7).

The difference between a Proponent of Sutra and a Proponent of Great Exposition lies in whether one asserts a self-knower or not. A Proponent of Sutra is a proponent of Hinayana tenets who accepts self-knowers whereas the Proponent of Great Exposition does not accept self-knowers. We covered self-knowers in the previous module on lo-rig.

#### **Self-knowers<sup>1</sup>**

Let us use the illustration of an eye consciousness apprehending blue. The eye consciousness apprehending blue has blue as its object. According to the Proponent of Sutra, this eye consciousness apprehending blue has two aspects:

- There is an aspect that apprehends an object other than itself, in this case, blue. Blue is that which is being apprehended. This aspect is said to have the aspect of the apprehended.
- There is also another aspect that has the potential or power to merely

---

<sup>1</sup> Pg. 198 of *Cutting Through Appearances*.

experience itself. This aspect has the entity of clarity and knowing. This is what we call the self-knower and it is said to have the aspect of the apprehender.

### ***Accounting for memory***

The Proponent of Sutra and the proponents of other tenets who assert self-knowers have their reasons for asserting self-knowers. Their main reason is to account for memory. People who assert self-knowers assert that there must be, within the consciousness itself, that which can experience itself. In the case of an eye consciousness apprehending blue, there must be a part of this eye consciousness apprehending blue that experiences itself. Having seen blue, subsequently at a later time, it is then possible for one to remember having seeing blue.

Why do you remember seeing blue? According to those who assert self-knowers, the only reason for remembering having seen blue is because we had experienced it in the past. In the past, our eye consciousness apprehended blue. Because blue was experienced earlier, therefore at a later time, it is possible to remember having seen blue.

Without a consciousness actually experiencing the object, we cannot remember the object later on. Just as we can remember blue because our eye consciousness had apprehended blue earlier; similarly there is a reason why we can remember, at a later time, the experience of having seeing blue itself. We can actually remember later, “My eye consciousness had apprehended blue.”

Let us say you remember, “In the past, I had the experience of blue.” You remember you were aware of blue. Here we are not talking about blue (the object) but the subject (the consciousness). Earlier on, your eye consciousness apprehended blue. You remember this.

*Why* is it that you are able to remember that there was an eye consciousness earlier on that apprehended blue? The reason is that there must have been something that experienced that eye consciousness that apprehended blue. Self-knowers are asserted because of this.

Based on this line of reasoning, it is asserted that, in the case of the eye consciousness apprehending blue, within the collection of the eye consciousness apprehending blue, there must be a part of it that is able to experience itself. Without that, it is not possible to remember at a later time that there was an eye consciousness apprehending blue generated earlier.

We need to understand this line of reasoning. When you understand the line of reasoning, then it is not difficult at all.

This is how a sentence is formulated according to logic:

The subject, the eye consciousness apprehending blue, has an experiencer because at a later time, it is possible to have a memory of that eye consciousness apprehending blue.

- The subject is the eye consciousness apprehending blue.
  - The thesis or the predicate to be proven is that it has an experiencer.
  - The sign or reason is the memory of the eye consciousness apprehending blue.
- This is how a logical way of presenting an argument is formulated.

Let us start with blue. Do you remember blue? Yes, because you had seen blue before. If you had not seen or experienced blue before, is it possible to remember blue later on? No. It is 100% certain that if you had not seen or experienced blue before, it is not possible for you to remember something that you had not seen. You would not remember blue.

Now let us talk about remembering the eye consciousness that apprehended blue:

- Is it possible to remember that you had an eye consciousness apprehending blue if you did not experience that eye consciousness apprehending blue earlier on?
- Can you remember something that you had not experienced earlier?
- That being the case, therefore, it follows that there must be an experiencer of that eye consciousness apprehending blue.
- That experiencer is called a self-knower.

This is the main reason for proving the existence of self-knowers, but it does not mean that this reason accords with reality. When you think about reality, there are no self-knowers.

The Proponent of Sutra asserts self-knowers. The Proponent of the Mind Only and the Proponent of the Autonomy Middle Ways also assert self-knowers. It is only the GES and the CMWS that do not assert self-knowers.

## 2 Divisions

There are two divisions:

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

An example of a Follower of Scripture is a Proponent of Sutra who follows [Vasubandhu's] *Treasury of Manifest Knowledge*.

An example of a Follower of Reasoning is a Proponent of Sutra who follows [Dharmakirti's] *Seven Treatises on Valid Cognition* (Page 7).

A Follower of Scripture is a Proponent of Sutra who follows Vasubandhu's *Treasury of Manifest Knowledge* (*Abhidharmakosha*). Their assertions are in almost every way similar to those of the Proponents of the Great Exposition.

A Follower of Reasoning is a Proponent of Sutra who follows Dharmakirti's *Seven Treatises on Valid Cognition*. Dharmakirti was a great logician who composed the *Seven Treatises on Valid Cognition*, one of which is called the *Pramanavartika*. It has four chapters and is a difficult text but it is perhaps the most extensive text on valid cognition. It is still studied today in the monasteries.

## 3 Etymology

Why are they called 'Proponents of Sutra'?

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

#### 4 Way of asserting objects

**The definition of existent** is: that observed by a valid cognizer.

There are two types of existents:

1. conventional truths and
2. ultimate truths.

**The definition of an ultimate truth<sup>2</sup>** is: a phenomenon that is ultimately able to perform a function.

Ultimate truth, truly existent, thing, product, impermanent phenomenon, compounded phenomenon, substance, and specifically characterized phenomenon are equivalent (Pages 7 – 8).

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

Conventional truth, falsely existent, permanent phenomenon, and generally characterized phenomenon are equivalent (Page 8).

#### The two truths

According to this school, you have to remember:

<b>Ultimate truth</b>	<b>Conventional truth</b>
<b>Definition:</b> It is a phenomenon that is ultimately able to perform a function.	<b>Definition:</b> It is a phenomenon that is ultimately not able to perform a function.
Ultimate truth, truly existent, thing, product, impermanent phenomenon, compounded phenomenon, substance, and specifically characterised phenomenon <sup>3</sup> are mutually inclusive.	Conventional truth, falsely existent, permanent phenomenon, and generally characterised phenomenon are mutually inclusive.

Another way of defining the two truths:

<b>Ultimate truth</b>	<b>Conventional truth</b>
<b>Definition:</b> It is a phenomenon that is able to exist from its own side without being imputed by conceptuality and terminology.	<b>Definition:</b> It is a phenomenon that comes into existence by merely being imputed by conceptuality and terminology.

#### *Ultimate mind/awareness*

We can talk about the mind in terms of the ultimate mind and the conventional mind. Mind is sometimes translated as awareness, so the ultimate mind and the ultimate awareness, and the conventional mind and the conventional awareness refer to the same thing.

In this context, an ultimate mind refers to a direct perceiver. A direct perceiver is a knower that is free of conceptuality and is non-mistaken. A direct perceiver

<sup>2</sup> This is according to the Followers of Reasoning. The Followers of Scripture assert the two truths in the same way as the Proponents of the Great Exposition.

<sup>3</sup> Generally characterised phenomena and specifically characterised phenomenon: What is their distinction? It depends on whether or not the phenomena must be understood by a thought consciousness. See table for definitions at end of transcript on page 12.

has two features. It is a mind that is (1) free from conceptuality and (2) not mistaken.

We should not forget what we studied earlier. If you had forgotten what a direct perceiver is, then you have to start all over again. Here we are looking at the Sutra School. Now we are looking at the two truths and how they are connected to the two kinds of mind: an ultimate mind and a conventional mind.

In this context, a conventional awareness refers to those minds that are not direct perceivers, i.e., facsimiles of a direct perceiver. A facsimile of a direct perceiver is a knower that is mistaken with regard to its appearing object. There are facsimiles of a direct perceiver that are (1) conceptual and (2) non-conceptual. In this context, according to the discussion here of what constitutes a conventional awareness, we are talking primarily about the conceptual facsimile of a direct perceiver.

In this context, an ultimate awareness is not just a direct perceiver. Specifically, it has to be a direct valid cogniser<sup>4</sup>. In this context, a direct valid cogniser is an ultimate awareness. Why is it an ultimate awareness? Because it is a non-mistaken mind, therefore it is an ultimate mind. It is a correct mind. Therefore it is called an ultimate awareness. What is the meaning of ultimate? Ultimate means correct. In this case, a direct valid cogniser is an ultimate awareness because it is non-mistaken. It is non-mistaken, therefore it is an ultimate awareness.

An illustration of an ultimate awareness is an eye consciousness apprehending blue. An eye consciousness apprehending blue is (1) a direct valid cogniser, (2) an ultimate awareness, and (3) is non-mistaken. The object, blue, exists in the way it appears to the eye consciousness apprehending blue. There is concordance between what appears and what exists. Blue exists in the way it appears to the eye consciousness apprehending it:

- An eye consciousness apprehending blue is a direct valid cogniser. Therefore it is an ultimate awareness.
- Why is it an ultimate awareness? Because it is not mistaken.
- Blue is an ultimate truth because blue is true in the perspective of this ultimate awareness.

Now we are looking at the etymology of the term, “ultimate truth.” In order to understand that, you first have to understand what an ultimate awareness is. Once you understand what an ultimate awareness is, the word “ultimate” in “ultimate truth” refers to *that* ultimate awareness. In this case, blue is the ultimate truth. It is *true* in the perspective of the direct valid cogniser apprehending it because it exists in the way it appears, i.e., it is true in the perspective of this ultimate awareness.

### ***Conventional mind/awareness***

In this context, the conventional awareness is a mistaken mind. In this context, we can also understand it to be a mind that obscures one from seeing the truth. The conventional awareness is not only a mistaken mind, it is also a conceptual mind. Conceptual consciousnesses are necessarily mistaken. Why?

---

<sup>4</sup> Definition: A direct valid cogniser is a new incontrovertible knower that is free of conceptuality.

- Because all conceptual consciousnesses necessarily cannot see directly specifically characterised phenomena. The conceptual consciousness is the obscurer that obscures one from directly perceiving the specifically characterised phenomenon.
- In order for a phenomenon to appear to a conceptual consciousness, that phenomenon always appears to be mixed with the meaning generality of the object. The phenomenon cannot appear *without* being mixed with the meaning generality of the object, i.e., the conceptual consciousness engages the object through the object and the meaning generality appearing to be mixed.

Therefore all conceptual consciousnesses are necessarily mistaken because the conceptual consciousness engages its object by mixing the actual object with its meaning generality. Although what appears to the conceptual consciousness is *not* the actual object, it appears as if it *is* the actual object. This is how it engages its object through that appearance.

We need to sort out, from the beginning, that there are these two kinds of awareness: an ultimate awareness and a conventional awareness. In this context, an ultimate awareness is a direct valid cogniser and a conventional awareness is a conceptual consciousness.

<b>Ultimate Mind/Awareness</b>	<b>Conventional Mind/Awareness</b>
It refers specifically to a direct valid cogniser.	It refers to a conceptual facsimile of a direct perceiver. It is obscured from directly perceiving specifically characterised phenomena.
It is a mind that is able to directly perceive its object.	It is a mind that is unable to directly perceive its object as it always perceives its object through the medium of a meaning generality or mental image.
A direct valid cogniser is an ultimate awareness because it is not mistaken.	It is a conceptual consciousness that is necessarily mistaken as it engages its object through the object and the meaning generality appearing as mixed.

We will try to understand what a conventional truth is by using the example of uncompounded space. I am talking about the etymology of these terms in order to help you to understand what an ultimate truth and a conventional truth are. We are not talking about their specific definitions here:

- According to this school, uncompounded space is a conventional truth. Why is uncompounded space a conventional truth? This is because uncompounded space is true only in the perspective of a conventional awareness, i.e., a conceptual consciousness.
- According to this school, blue is the ultimate truth. Why is blue the ultimate truth? This is because blue is true in the perspective of the ultimate awareness.

The definition of an ultimate truth that is given here is a phenomenon that is ultimately able to perform a function. Blue is an example of an ultimate truth in this system. Blue is a cause. The fact that it is a cause means that, by nature from its own side, it has the potential to produce an effect. This is the very nature of a cause. If it is a cause, from the moment it came into existence, by nature from its own side, it had the potential to produce an effect. Something that has this characteristic makes it an ultimate truth.

A conventional truth refers to a phenomenon that by nature cannot produce an effect. Therefore the definition of a conventional truth is a phenomenon that is not ultimately able to perform a function.

When we understand this, we can see why in this system:

- Permanent phenomena are mutually inclusive with conventional truth.
- Impermanent phenomena are mutually inclusive with ultimate truth.

In this context, substance is said to be mutually inclusive with ultimate truth. This is not the same as what was discussed in the GES. Substance here refers to that which has the potential to perform a function.

What we have to do is to gain an understanding and an appreciation of what the two truths are in accordance with the SS.

- What is an ultimate truth? It is a functioning thing, an impermanent phenomenon. These are ultimate truths because they are true in the perspective of the ultimate awareness. The best way to further understand the two truths is to see its relationship with the two kinds of awareness: an ultimate awareness and a conventional awareness.
- Uncompounded space is a conventional truth because it is true only in the perspective of a conceptual consciousness, i.e., a conventional awareness. What is space? It is none other than that which is merely imputed by conceptuality. There is no space other than this.

When you understand this, it is the same as the statement made at the beginning of the lo-rig module:

- Appearing objects of a direct perceiver are necessarily impermanent, are necessarily functioning things.
- Appearing objects of a conceptual consciousness are necessarily permanent.<sup>5</sup>

Perhaps the easiest way to understand the two truths in this system is to think about the entity of the phenomenon in question.

- If the phenomenon in question, by nature from its own side, has the potential to be able to perform the function of producing an effect, it is an ultimate truth.
- If the phenomenon in question, by nature from its own side, does not have the potential to produce an effect, it is a conventional truth.

Then we have the two kinds of awareness: an ultimate awareness and a conventional awareness:

- An ultimate awareness is a mind that is able to directly perceive its object.
- A conventional awareness is a mind that is not able to directly perceive its object. It always perceives its object through the medium of a meaning generality or mental image. A conventional awareness is a conceptual consciousness, which is an obscurer because it obscures the direct perception of the object. Therefore it is called a conventional awareness.

<b>Ultimate truth</b>	<b>Conventional truth</b>
Example: Blue is an ultimate truth.	Example: Uncompounded space is a

<sup>5</sup> Refer Handout No. 2 in module on lo-rig:  
[http://www.fpmtabc.org/teachings\\_files/bp2ndM2.php](http://www.fpmtabc.org/teachings_files/bp2ndM2.php)

<b>Ultimate truth</b>	<b>Conventional truth</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is true in the perspective of the ultimate awareness.</li> <li>• It is a cause because by nature from its own side, it has the potential to produce an effect.</li> </ul>	conventional truth. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is true only in the perspective of a conventional awareness, which is a conceptual consciousness.</li> <li>• It is a phenomenon, which by nature from its own side cannot produce an effect.</li> </ul>
If the phenomenon in question, by nature from its own side, has the potential to be able to perform the function of producing an effect, it is an ultimate truth.	If the phenomenon in question, by nature from its own side, is not established to have the potential to produce an effect, it is a conventional truth.
An ultimate truth is a phenomenon, which exists from its own side without being posited merely through the force of a conceptual consciousness.  Example: A compounded phenomenon cannot be posited by a conceptual consciousness, which is a mistaken mind. Compounded phenomenon can only be posited by an ultimate awareness, which is necessarily a non-mistaken consciousness.	A conventional truth is a phenomenon that is posited merely by conceptuality, i.e., by a conceptual consciousness  Example: Uncompounded space cannot appear to a direct perceiver. It exists merely through appearing to a conventional awareness, the conceptual consciousness that apprehends it.

If you have anything to ask about the two truths according to the SS, you can do so now.

*Question:* Part of a conventional truth is merely imputed by term and it exists from its own side. Can Khen Rinpoche elaborate on the meaning of “imputed by term”?

*Answer:* Let us take uncompounded space as an example.

- First the term arises, “uncompounded space.”
- There is then a conceptual consciousness apprehending that concept.
- You then come to understand “uncompounded space.”

Sometimes, we think of all kinds of things. First when you think, you have a concept or an idea. Later the term comes along. You then affix that term to the concept or to whatever you were thinking about.

*Question:* The object of the conventional awareness is mixed with the meaning generality. Could it also be mixed with the sound generality, in this case?

*Answer:* For the sake of understanding, just think of it as mixing with the meaning generality. The conceptual consciousness engages its object through the object and the mental image (or the meaning generality) of the object mixed as one.

Regarding meaning generality, there are some scholars who assert that, as stated in the definition (of a conceptual consciousness)<sup>6</sup>, “apprehending the

---

<sup>6</sup> A conceptual consciousness is a determinative knower who apprehends a sound generality and meaning generality as suitable to be mixed. (Handout No. 5, Lo-rig



sound generality and meaning generality as suitable to be mixed.” This is one way of saying that, instead of seeing them as separate, we think of them in terms of a meaning generality. We are explaining how a conceptual mind works.

There is a difference between a direct perceiver and a conceptual consciousness in terms of how they engage their object. A direct perceiver can directly perceive an object. When a conceptual consciousness engages its object, it has to do so via a medium, in this case, the mental image of the object.

We had seen earlier what the GES posits to be the two truths. Everyone talks about the ultimate truth and the conventional truth, but everyone has a different take of exactly what an ultimate truth and a conventional truth are. The words, “ultimate truth” and “conventional truth,” may be the same but the understanding of what they really are is very different.

If you remember, the GES asserts that a directionally partless particle is an ultimate truth. Why? Because it cannot be broken up further into anything smaller. Hence the mind cognising that directionally partless particle cannot cease. Therefore it is an ultimate truth.

On the other hand, according to the GES, a vase is a conventional truth because the mind apprehending a vase can cease when the vase is broken into pieces. Once the vase is destroyed, the valid cogniser apprehending vase ceases. So the vase is only a truth in a temporary sense. That makes a vase a conventional truth.

You have to understand what the words, “ultimate truth” and “conventional truth,” are conveying in accordance with the GES. We started to look at the SS and how their explanations of the two truths are different.

According to the SS, what is a conventional truth? A conventional truth is a phenomenon that is merely posited by conceptuality, i.e., a conceptual consciousness. A conceptual consciousness mind is a conventional awareness.

According to this school, an ultimate truth is not like that. An ultimate truth is not something that is merely posited by a conceptual consciousness, a conventional awareness. An ultimate truth is an entity that exists from its own side without being merely posited through the force of a conceptual consciousness.

According to the SS, all compounded phenomena are ultimate truths. Compounded phenomena cannot be merely posited by a conceptual consciousness, a conventional awareness that is a mistaken mind. According to the SS, an ultimate truth can be posited only by an ultimate awareness which, in this context, is necessarily a non-mistaken consciousness. An ultimate truth has to be posited by a non-mistaken mind, an ultimate awareness, i.e., a direct perceiver. In this school, a phenomenon that has to be posited by a direct perceiver, an ultimate awareness, is an ultimate truth.

Uncompounded space cannot appear to a direct perceiver. Uncompounded space is a conventional truth. It exists but how do you know it exists? It exists because

it merely appears to a conventional awareness, a conceptual consciousness that apprehends it. According to this school, a conventional truth cannot appear to a direct perceiver.

In short, what is an ultimate truth, according to the SS? An ultimate truth is any phenomenon that, from its own side, has the potential to be able to perform the function of producing an effect. Otherwise it is a conventional truth.

Therefore you can see now why an ultimate truth is also truly existent and a conventional truth is falsely existent.

	<b>Great Exposition School</b>	<b>Sutra School</b>
<b>Definition</b>	A proponent of this school is a person propounding Hinayana tenets who: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• does not assert self-cognisers and</li> <li>• asserts truly established external objects.</li> </ul>	A proponent of this school is a person propounding Hinayana tenets who: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• accepts self-cognisers and</li> <li>• accepts external objects.</li> </ul>
<b>Conventional truth</b>	A phenomenon that, when it is broken or mentally separated into parts, the mind apprehending it would cease. Example: a vase is a conventional truth because the mind apprehending a vase ceases when the vase is destroyed.	A phenomenon that is ultimately unable to perform a function. It is falsely existent. Example: Uncompounded space is a conventional truth because it is true in the perspective of a conventional awareness.
<b>Ultimate truth</b>	A phenomenon that, if it were broken or mentally separated into parts, the mind apprehending it would not cease. Example: A directionally partless particle is an ultimate truth because it cannot be broken up further into anything smaller. Hence the mind cognising that directionally partless particle can never cease.	A phenomenon that is ultimately able to perform a function. It is truly existent. Example: A functioning thing is an ultimate truth because it is true in the perspective of an ultimate awareness.

I am not sure what else to look at in the SS. I am not sure whether it is necessary to look at positive and negative phenomena. For its way of asserting object-possessors, we covered that in the previous module on lo-rig. If we go through it again, it will take time. I don't think we need to talk about that.

Then for its way of asserting selflessness, it is the same as the GES:

- The emptiness of the permanent, unitary, and independent self is the coarse selflessness of persons.
- The emptiness of the self-sufficient substantially existent person is the subtle selflessness of persons.

Both the GES and the SS posit the same coarse and subtle selflessnesses of persons.

## 7 Presentation of the grounds and paths

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

The presentation of the obscurations and the way of traversing the grounds and paths and so forth are similar to [the assertions of] the Proponents of the Great Exposition (Page 13).

*Question:* Are the directionally partless particle and the temporally partless moment of consciousness ultimate truths for the SS?

*Answer:* There is no doubt regarding this because they ultimately can perform a function. The directionally partless particle is necessarily form and the temporally partless moment of consciousness is necessary consciousness. Both are necessarily compounded phenomena and impermanent phenomena. That make them ultimate truths.

That is why you have to memorise what are the phenomena that are mutually inclusive with the two truths. In this school, ultimate truth, compounded phenomena, and impermanent phenomena are mutually inclusive. If you have ascertained that these were mutually inclusive, the question would not have arisen.

*Student:* You said that uncompounded space performs a function of allowing things to move within that space. So we cannot say that whatever performs a function is an ultimate truth.

*Answer:* Uncompounded space cannot perform any function whereas space, the thing that we see, allows things to move around within it. The vacuity that we can see is the object of an eye consciousness. That is impermanent and is a compounded phenomenon. But uncompounded space is a construct and cannot be seen by the eye consciousness. What is uncompounded space? It is something that is merely posited by conceptuality. It is a mere negation of obstructive contact.

*Question:* Are true cessations ultimate truths?

*Answer:* I guess, in this school, true cessations are posited to be permanent, therefore they are conventional truths. Don't worry about this. Even the AMWS has the same assertion. The MOS and CMWS assert true cessations to be ultimate truths. This will come later.

*Question:* For the GES and the SS, can we say that the innate apprehension of a self of person is a non-conceptual consciousness and an intellectually acquired apprehension of a self of person is a conceptual consciousness?

*Answer:* If you say that the innate apprehension of a self is non-conceptual, then is it a sense consciousness or a mental consciousness? It definitely cannot be a sense consciousness. So it has to be a mental consciousness.

There are conceptual and non-conceptual mental consciousnesses. How many types of mental direct perceiver are there? There are three:

1. the mental direct perceiver that is a valid cogniser
2. the mental direct perceiver that is a subsequent cogniser
3. the mental direct perceiver that is an awareness to which an object appears and is not ascertained

An innate apprehension of a self-sufficient substantially existent person cannot be one of these three mental direct perceivers.

What is left is a facsimile of a mental direct perceiver. If we say that it is non-conceptual, then it has to be a facsimile of a mental direct perceiver that is non-conceptual. A facsimile of a mental direct perceiver can be conceptual or non-conceptual. How about the dream consciousness? It cannot be just dreaming. When you are awake, you have to account for the consciousness that is non-conceptual. If you think about it in this way, you start to eliminate the possibilities.

Probably you would have to say that the innate apprehension of a self-sufficient substantially existent person is a conceptual mind. An apprehension of a permanent, unitary, and independent self is also a conceptual mind. Both of these apprehensions are wrong consciousnesses. Within the division of wrong consciousness, there are conceptual wrong consciousness and non-conceptual wrong consciousnesses. These two apprehensions of a self of person are conceptual wrong consciousness. So between conceptual and non-conceptual, these two apprehensions would be conceptual.

Translated by Ven. Tenzin Gyurme

Transcribed by Phuah Soon Ek, Vivien Ng and Patricia Lee

Edited by Cecilia Tsong

Note (from footnote on page 4):

**Generally characterised phenomena and specifically characterised phenomena**

What is their distinction? It depends on whether or not the phenomena must be understood by a thought consciousness.

<b>Generally characterised phenomena</b> (GCP)	<b>Specifically characterised phenomena</b> (SCP)
<b>Definition:</b> Phenomena that are merely imputed by a term or thought consciousness and are not established as a SCP.	<b>Definition:</b> Phenomena that are established by way of its own character without being merely imputed by a term or thought consciousness.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It must be realised by a thought consciousness depending on a mental image.</li> <li>• GCP are known only in a general way by an imputing thought consciousness. Since they depend on such imputation, they are not established from their own side.</li> <li>• Mutually inclusive with permanent phenomena.</li> <li>• The image of pot that appears to thought consciousness is general in that it serves to represent all pots at different times in different places.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It must be realised by a direct perceiver.</li> <li>• They are phenomena that are established to exist by way of their own character without depending on the appearance of a meaning generality, i.e., a mental image as its medium</li> <li>• Mutually inclusive with impermanent phenomena.</li> <li>• When a SCP appears to the direct perceiver, everything about that object, i.e., all its characteristics, appears to the direct perceiver apprehending it. It is a thing with respect to which place, time, and nature are not mixed.</li> <li>• A specifically characterised pot is unique—of a certain size, shape, colour, in a certain place, at a certain time. All its</li> </ul>

	uncommon characteristics such as shape, colour, impermanence, etc. of a pot appear to the direct perceiver that apprehends it. An ordinary direct perceiver is unable to notice all of them, but a yogic direct perceiver can see and ascertain them.
--	---

Table prepared by Phuah Soon Ek