

---

## Study Group - Bodhicharyavatara

བྱང་ཆུབ་སེམས་དཔའི་སྡོད་པ་ལ་འཇུག་པ་བརྒྱལ་སྲོལ་

Commentary by the Venerable Geshe Doga

Translated by the Venerable Tenzin Dongak

12 July 2005

---

Please sit comfortably and think, 'I have to attain complete enlightenment for the welfare of all sentient beings. For that purpose I am going to listen to this profound teaching, and then I am going to put it into practice as much as possible'.

**2.2.1.2.2. Refuting that the cause of feeling is inherently established (cont.)**

**2.2.2.1.2.2.2. Refuting that contact with primary consciousness is inherently established**

Feeling is generated from the contact between object, sense power, and primary consciousness.

*Meeting primary consciousness [96]  
Lacking a body is simply invalid;  
There is also no phenomenon on the collection,  
Similarly to the earlier analysis*

The first two lines say it is invalid to say that primary consciousness meets with the particles of the object because it lacks form. Of course this is from the point of view of the object and the primary consciousness existing inherently.

Primary consciousness also does not meet with the more coarse accumulation of particles such as atoms, molecules and so forth. That is because there is no truly existent coarse form to be found on the collection of parts and so forth, as explained earlier. Previously we found, for example, that the arms are not the body, the legs are not the body and so forth. Through this analytical process, we refuted the existence of an inherently existent body.

**2.2.2.1.2.2.3. The contact arising from the meeting of the three is also not inherently established**

*Since contact does not exist in such a way [97]  
From what does feeling arise?  
What is the purpose of this exertion?  
What is giving harm to what?*

As there is no inherently existent contact, then from what should a truly existent feeling arise? If there is a truly existent feeling then its causal contact should also be truly existent. A truly existent feeling cannot arise from a contact that exists falsely. Since there is no truly existent contact there is also no truly existent feeling.

As there is no truly existent feeling, then what is the purpose of exhausting oneself accumulating wealth and so forth to attain feelings of happiness?

*When there is no one experiencing feelings, [98ab]  
And when feelings do not exist as well,*

**Opponent:** 'The point is to eliminate inherently existent suffering.'

**Madhyamaka:** 'Where is the person that is harmed by what suffering? They do not exist since there is no truly existent suffering.'

Up to this point the analysis has been focussed on the cause of feeling, which is contact. By refuting that the cause of feeling exists inherently, then the existence of inherently existent feelings is also refuted. This leads to the conclusion that on the one hand, if there is no inherently existent feeling of happiness, then why exert oneself to attain happiness? On the other hand if it is for the purpose of alleviating suffering, that also does not make sense, because there is no inherently existent feeling of suffering.

Now comes the analysis of the effect.

*At the time of seeing this situation [98cd]  
Why should craving not be opposed?*

When one sees the lack of inherent existence of feeling, and the person who experiences the feeling, then there is no reason why craving should not be counteracted. Craving is generated in a person's continuum because feelings of happiness and suffering are perceived as being inherently existent. Because of perceiving an inherently existent feeling of happiness, the person generates craving for happiness. Through the perception of inherently existent suffering, the person generates a craving for the absence of that suffering. In both cases, the craving is based on the perception of the feeling as being inherently existent. By realising that there is no inherently existent feeling that can be experienced, and no inherently existent person who experiences the feeling, then there is absolutely no reason why craving should not be opposed.

As it is explained in the sutras, for a bodhisattva the experience of happiness does not produce craving, but it produces compassion. The reason for this is that when bodhisattvas experience happiness they are reminded of how the perception of that feeling of happiness as being inherently existent produces craving and further suffering for ordinary beings.

One should try to avoid craving as much as possible. For example, one can eat with the motivation of bodhicitta thinking, 'I am not going to eat this food for ordinary means, but I am going to eat it in order to have a strong body; to be able to practice the Dharma well and in order to be able to attain enlightenment and work for sentient beings'. One can also meditate that one is eating this food in order to feed all the different microscopic beings within one's body.

Furthermore, one can meditate on the lack of inherent existence of the feeling that the eating of the food produces. One can also meditate on the lack of the inherent existence of the person who is eating, and the lack of inherent existence of the food. That is one of the best ways to eat.

One does a lot of eating and drinking, and as one considers oneself a Dharma practitioner, then one's mode of eating and drinking should be different from that of an ordinary person. Eating and drinking should support one's Dharma practice; it should become a virtuous practice and not a cause for non-virtue and affliction. It is

---

good to train one's mind in these different ways of eating and drinking, such as meditating on the emptiness of the food and drink, and avoiding eating out of craving. One should try to eat on a basis of love and compassion, on the basis of bodhicitta - either generated bodhicitta or spontaneously arising bodhicitta.

One needs to start one's practice somewhere, and through continued training of one's mind, repeating the experience again and again. Then was in the beginning a state of mind generated with effort, will become spontaneous. Initially one trains in effortful bodhicitta but, with continued training, there will come a time when bodhicitta will be generated spontaneously in one's mind.

### 2.2.2.1.2.3. Refuting that the object possessor of feeling is inherently established

*Whether seen or felt, [99ab]  
Through the dreamlike illusory nature*

Since objects seen or felt are dreamlike and illusory in the sense that they lack true existence, then also the feelings that they produce do not exist inherently due to their dreamlike illusory nature.

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

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

*Since there is absolutely no one with feeling, [101]  
Then feeling is not that very nature.  
In this way, how can this selfless collection  
Be harmed by this?*

If it is a truly existent feeling, then if it exists it has to exist all the time, and if it does not exist, it has to be non-existent all the time. The feeling generated from the dream-like illusory object is generated simultaneously with the mind. *Because it is generated simultaneously with the mind, feeling is not seen by* the mind. That experienced and that which experiences are of mutually different unrelated substance.

In addition neither the feeling that was generated earlier, nor the feeling that will be generated later is experienced. For a feeling to be experienced, it has to be in the present. But the inherently existent feeling is not seen by a mind that is simultaneous with it, and the earlier and later instances of truly existent feeling are not experienced at all. Feeling does not experience its own nature, and it is also not experienced by something else.

For those reasons feeling is not established within suchness. In this way how can this selfless collection of aggregates be harmed by non-truly existent feeling?

This way of meditating on the close placement by mindfulness on feeling is the uncommon Mahayana way. According to the lower tenets the common way of meditating on the placement by mindfulness on feeling is by meditating on feeling as being in the nature of impurity, misery and so forth.

The difference between mind and mental factors is that the mind primarily apprehends the general identity of the object, while mental factors primarily apprehend

different characteristics of the object. One can view the primary consciousness that is synonymous with mind, and its accompanying entourage of the five ever present mental factors, as being like a king and his ministers.

### 2.2.2.1.3. Meditating on the close placement by mindfulness on mind

#### 2.2.2.1.3.1. Showing that mental consciousness does not exist inherently

*Mind does not abide on the faculties, [102]  
Not on form etc., and also not in the middle,  
There is also no mind in or outside,  
And it is also not found apart.*

*It is not the body; it does not exist apart, [103]  
It does not merge, there is also nothing elsewhere.  
Because it is absolutely not. Therefore  
Sentient beings are naturally gone beyond misery.*

Mind and primary consciousness are synonymous. In Tibetan there is a third word, *yid*, for which, unfortunately, we don't have an English equivalent. Sometimes it is translated as *mentality*, but that is mistaken, as *yid* is synonymous with mind. Mind does not abide on, or in, the faculties, which are the sense powers. The faculties are referred to as sense powers because they empower the apprehension of the object. For example, the eye-sense-power empowers the apprehension of form and so forth.

If mind were to exist inherently then it would have to be findable at the time of analysis. Mind is not findable on the faculties, or on external form, and is not to be found in the middle. The words 'not in the middle' mean it is also not found on the combination of faculties or form. There is also no mind inside or outside; it is not found apart; it is not the body; it does not exist apart from the body; it does not merge with the body; it is also not found anywhere else. Therefore at the time of analysis the inherently existent mind is not found.

There is no inherently existent mind found in relation to the faculties. There is no inherently existent mind that exists in dependence on the faculties, or that is endowed with the faculties. The inherently existent mind is also not found in the outer objects. It is not found in relation to the outer objects; it is not found in between the outer objects and the faculties; and it is not found on the collection of the faculties and the outer object. It is also not on the inside the body; for example, it is not found on the intestines and inner organs and so forth. It is also not found on the outside of the body such as the arms and legs. Because the mind does not exist in any other way, there is no inherently existent mind to be found in or outside.

There is no inherently existent mind to be found on the faculties. There is no inherently existent mind to be found on external objects. There is no inherently existent mind to be found in between the faculties and the external objects. There is no inherently existent mind to be found on the combination of the external object and the faculties. There is no inherently existent mind to be found in the internal organs of the body. There is no inherently existent mind to be found in the external limbs and external parts of the body. There is no inherently existent

mind to be found in any of the other aggregates such as feeling, recognition and so forth. There is no inherently existent mind to be found in the combination of all of the aggregates. There is also no inherently existent mind to be found as a succinct entity separate from the five aggregates. There is no merging between the mind and body that could be an inherently existing consciousness. Therefore the body is naturally liberated. Being 'naturally beyond misery' refers to the emptiness called natural nirvana, or natural liberation.

#### 2.2.2.1.3.2. Showing that the five primary consciousnesses do not exist inherently

*Should consciousness exist before the object of knowledge [104]*

*In reference to which object is it generated?*

*If consciousness and the object of knowledge are simultaneous*

*In reference to which object is it generated?*

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

If the consciousness and its object were to exist inherently, then they would have to exist simultaneously all the time. Should the five consciousnesses exist before the five objects of knowledge, then in reference to which objects are these five primary consciousnesses generated? So the question is, are the five primary consciousnesses, such as the visual primary consciousness, auditory primary consciousness and so forth, generated before the five objects of forms, sounds and so forth?

If the five primary consciousnesses were to be generated before the five sense objects, then in reference to which object are these consciousnesses generated? For example, in the case of the eye-primary-consciousness, does the eye-primary-consciousness exist before the visual form? In reference to which object is it generated? What is its focal object? The normal sequence is that first one has a focal condition, which acts as the cause for the consciousness to arise.

**Opponent:** 'If it doesn't exist before, then it exists simultaneously with the object of knowledge.'

If the consciousness and the object of knowledge are simultaneous, in reference to which object is the consciousness generated? The eye-consciousness is not really generated in reference to the form, because they are both generated simultaneously. The form cannot act as the cause for that eye-consciousness.

If it exists subsequent to the object, then what is consciousness generated from? There is no inherently existent primary consciousness generated from the object, because there is no such thing as inherent generation.

#### 2.2.2.1.4. Meditating on the close placement by mindfulness on phenomena

2.2.2.1.4.1. The actual

2.2.2.1.4.2. The refutation of objections

##### 2.2.2.1.4.1. The actual

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

The words 'in such a way' refer to all the reasons given in the previous outlines. Neither the generation of all

compounded phenomena, nor the inherent existence of all non-compounded phenomena, is realised. In such a way the inherent generation of all phenomena is not realised.

Because compounded phenomena don't exist inherently, then neither do non-compounded phenomena exist inherently. The inherent existence of non-compounded phenomena is not explicitly mentioned, but once the inherent existence of compounded phenomena is refuted, one also understands the non-inherent existence of non-compounded phenomena. It is explained in this way in *Root Wisdom*: once one has refuted the inherently existent characteristics of compounded phenomena, then one will also see that there are no inherently existent characteristics of non-compounded phenomena.

*Transcribed from tape by Bernii Wright  
Preliminary edit by Adair Bunnett  
Final edit by Venerable Tenzin Dongak  
Edited Version*

© Tara Institute