



Answer:

*That which is presently being produced, 372*  
*Though incomplete, is other than unproduced.*  
*Yet also since other than produced,*  
*The unproduced is being produced.*

The answer in relation to this verse is, as the commentary explains:

Since a thing in the process of being produced is associated with the activity of production, you assert that even though it has not completed that activity, it is other than unproduced and future.

The meaning of the verse, as the commentary explains, is that 'you assert that even though it has not completed the activity, it is other than unproduced and future'. This means that at the time of the seed the sprout is actually considered a future sprout because it is not yet produced, i.e. at the time of the seed, which is a cause, the effect, which is a sprout, has not yet been produced. So because it is not produced it is the future of the seed, and not the present. Having the not-produced or the future actually existing in the present would be an absurdity. That is one of the main things being pointed out here: at the time of the seed that which is not-produced and in the future cannot be asserted as being part of the present.

As the commentary further explains:

Yet in that case, since a thing in the process of being produced is other than something produced, you are saying that the unproduced is being produced.

The absurdity that is being pointed out is that the opponents are asserting that the activity of production is what is produced, and that anything associated with that activity can be asserted as being produced. The refutation to that assertion is pointing out the absurdity of asserting that something is produced because it is associated with the activity of production, when in fact it cannot be produced because it is the future. 'If it is produced then how can something that is yet to be produced, already exist at the time of the cause? How can the sprout exist at the time of the seed if it is the future of the seed? However what you are in fact implying is that the not-produced is being produced, and that is an absurdity.'

**1.1.3.2.4.3. Necessity of accepting that the unproduced is being produced, if that which is in the process of being produced is produced by way of its own entity**

*That which is presently being produced, 373*  
*Though not yet existent, is later said to exist.*  
*The unproduced is thus being produced –*  
*But the non-existent does not arise.*

In explaining the meaning of the verse the commentary reads:

Since that which is presently being produced is other than something produced, you must accept that it is unproduced. You might claim that anything in the process of being produced exists as a thing, because, even though it did not exist previously, it has afterwards become associated with the activity of production. If on this account you say that an entirely unproduced thing associated with the activity of production is being produced, that too is incorrect. An unproduced thing, referred to as non-existent, as

not attained its entity. It does not undergo production, because it is not engaged in that activity.

As the commentary explains, 'you might claim that anything in the process of being produced exists as a thing', however that implies 'that an entirely unproduced thing associated with the activity of production is being produced'. That is incorrect as something that is unproduced or not produced is non-existent, so it cannot have an entity; a sprout that has not been produced cannot have the entity of being a sprout because it has not been produced yet. Thus that which is in the process of being produced cannot function as a produced thing. The assertion is indicated in the outline itself - the necessity of accepting that the not-produced is being produced. So, what is being refuted is something that is not produced as being produced. The absurdity that is being pointed out is if that which is in the process of being produced is produced by way of its own entity, then the not-produced is being produced. That is the main point made here.

The reason why the not-produced cannot be asserted as being produced is because of the fact that what is to be produced depends on causes and conditions; it has to depend on something for it to be produced. So if the cause itself, or if the process of being produced exists by way of its own entity, then that implies that it exists without depending on causes and conditions. If that which is being produced doesn't depend on causes and conditions for its existence, then the produced could already exist at the time when it is in the process of being produced, and that is a falsity.

#### 1.1.3.3. SUMMARIZED MEANING

*The completed is called existent. 374*  
*The uncompleted is called non-existent.*  
*When there is nothing in the process of production*  
*What is being referred to as such?*

As the commentary explains:

That which has completed the activity of production is said to exist as a thing, and that which has not performed the activity of production is said not to exist as a thing. If neither that which has nor that which has not completed the activity of production is in the process of being produced, what is being referred to as presently being produced? Anything in the process of being produced does not have the least existence by way of its own entity.

This explanation of the verse is quite clear: 'Anything that is in the process of being produced does not have the least existence by way of its own entity'. The refutation is made in relation to how they assert the production of something. Earlier the opponent asserted that that which is considered as being produced is something that is half produced and half not-produced. However those assertions have been refuted by pointing out that the part that is already produced would have to be considered as something that is already produced, and so it is redundant to be produce it again, and the part that has not been produced does not yet exist. So that which is half produced (completed) and half not-produced (uncompleted) can in no way be asserted as existing by way of its own entity.

## 1.2. Concluding summary of the refutations of inherent existence

*Since without a cause  
There is no effect,  
Both starting and stopping  
Are not feasible.*

375

As the commentary explains the meaning of the verse:

Investigation by reasoning shows that there is no effect without a cause. Since cause and effect, then, do not truly exist and since the bases therefore do not truly exist, the sprout's starting to be produced and the seed's stopping to exist are not feasible by way of their own entity.

In summary, through investigation of the reasoning that was established in earlier verses it is clear that there cannot be an effect without a cause. As cause and effect do not truly exist and as the bases do not truly exist, there cannot be an effect without a cause. Likewise through investigation one finds that there cannot be an effect from a truly existent cause. Here bases refer to that which is the reliant and that which it relies upon, which is cause and effect. The reliant is the effect and that which it relies upon is the cause. A basis that is truly existent does not exist, so there cannot be a truly existent relationship between cause and the effect.

The text refers to 'the sprout's starting to be produced and the seed's stopping to exist are not feasible by way of their own entity'. A sprout starts to be produced and a seed ceases to exist, but even though they exist conventionally they cannot exist by way of their own entity. To support this the commentary refers to a sutra, which reads as follows:

Sentient beings, humans, those born from power  
whoever they may be,  
None that were born and died here were born  
[inherently].  
The nature of all things is empty like magicians  
illusions,  
But the Forders are unable to recognize it.

The commentary explains this quote from the sutra in the following way:

For instance, the men and women conjured by an illusionist cause the spectators of the magic, who think of them as men and women, to feel attraction and aversion. [With that analogy of illusory men and women the commentary continues] Though they also appear to the magician, he does not think of them in this way. They do not even appear to those who are unaffected by the spell.

The analogy is of the different circumstances in which a magician conjures men and women; to some the illusion actually appears as real men and woman, and they feel attraction or aversion towards them. The illusion also appears to the magician himself but he does not see them as being real, while nothing appears to those who are not subjected to the spell. In relation to this example, the three different types of persons are:

1. Those on whom the magician has cast a spell who see the illusions and believe in them; they see the men and women.

2. The magician whose spell affects his own eyes; he see the conjured men and women but does not believe that they exist.

3. Those who do not have the spell cast over their eyes; they do not see the illusion - so even the appearance of men and women is not there.

In explaining these examples the commentary further reads:

You must understand that these analogies apply respectively to the perception of common beings who have not understood dependent arising's emptiness of inherent existence, to the wisdom of subsequent attainment of the Exalted, and to the meditative equipoise of the Exalted.

The three types of persons mentioned earlier in the analogy correspond to these three types of people.

1. The first type of person is the spectator who experiences the magic spell, and who see the illusory men and women and believes in them. This corresponds to an ordinary being who has not understood dependent arising or the emptiness of inherent existence. Without the realisation of emptiness, and due to the strong imprint of grasping at the self, all phenomena appear as inherently existent. Not only do phenomena appear as being inherently existent, but ordinary beings also believe that they exist in the way that they appear.

2. The magician sees the conjured men and women, but does not believe that they exist in that way. This corresponds to 'the wisdom of subsequent attainment of the Exalted'. 'Subsequent attainment' refers the post-meditative state after meditative equipoise. When you come to the post-meditative state then the appearance of inherent existence will still be there, but due to the realisation of emptiness there is no belief in the appearance.

3. For the Exalted, meaning an Arya, who is in meditative equipoise there is neither the appearance nor the belief.

Though this has been explained several times before, I will repeat the essence again: An Arya being who is in meditative equipoise does not have any dualistic appearances, which means that they don't have any of the three dualistic appearances; the appearance of any conventional phenomena, the appearance of inherent existence, and the duality of subject and object appearing as being separate. For an Arya who is in meditative equipoise these three appearances are completely cut off. The only appearance to the meditative equipoise of the Exalted is the appearance of emptiness, so there is no appearance of any discrepancy between subject and object, no appearance of conventional phenomena and no appearance of inherent existence.

For the Exalted who is the post-meditative state, the opposite is true. There is the appearance of conventional phenomena and inherent existence as well as the appearance of subject and object as being separate. Of course the exception is for an enlightened being, so a buddha would not have these appearances at any time.

The commentary explains:

You should learn how Conventional phenomena are established by Conventional valid cognition and

---

Ultimate Truth by conceptual and non-conceptual reasoning consciousness from the presentation in [*Gateway for Conqueror Children*], *Explanation of [Shantideva's] "Engaging in the Bodhisattva Deeds"* and so forth.

This refers to the definition of conventional phenomena and ultimate phenomena. Conventional truth and ultimate truth were explained earlier when the ninth chapter of Shantideva's text was taught. What is to be noted is that the definition of conventional and ultimate truth given in the *Madhyamika* text and the definition given in *The Bodhisattva's Way of Life*, are presented in different ways. In relation to the *Madhyamika* text, as it mentions here, 'you should learn how Conventional phenomena established by Conventional valid cognition and Ultimate Truth by conceptual and non-conceptual reasoning consciousness'. Whereas in Shantideva's text the explanation is different: that which sees the object with duality is conventional truth, and the consciousness or perception that sees things without duality is ultimate truth. The two definitions come to the same thing but the way each is presented is different.

The summarising stanza by Gyaltzab Rinpoche is:

Production and disintegration of composite things  
Are like dreams and like illusion.  
When they are mere terms and mere imputation,  
How could non-products be truly existent?

The meaning of the first two lines was explained earlier. When the stanza says that all appearing phenomena 'are like dreams and illusions, when they are mere terms and mere imputation', this relates to the earlier explanation about how phenomena lack any inherent or true existence and are just mere terms or imputations. Here 'terms' means being merely labelled conceptually and verbally. Finally, 'how could non-products be truly existent?' is a rhetorical question, implying that products could not possibly be truly existent in any way.

## 2. Presenting the name of the chapter

*This is the fifteenth chapter from the Four Hundred on the Yogic Deeds, showing how to meditate on the refutation of that which constitutes products.*

This concludes the commentary on the fifteenth chapter, showing how to meditate on refuting [the inherent existence of that which constitutes products, from *Essence of Good Explanations, Explanation of the "Four Hundred on the Yogic Deeds of Bodhisattvas"*.

*Transcribed from tape by Judy Mayne  
Edit 1 by Adair Bunnnett  
Edit 2 by Venerable Michael Lobsang Yeshe  
Edited Version  
© Tara Institute*

Verses from *Yogic Deeds of Bodhisattvas* used with permission of Snow Lion Publications.