

---

# Mind and Awareness

Commentary by the Venerable Geshe Doga

Translated by the Venerable Tenzin Dongak

14 September 2001

---

As usual please generate a virtuous motivation for listening to the teachings.

## 4. Other Divisions of Awareness

Last time there was a further division of awareness into:

1. Conceptual thoughts which take as their held object a meaning generality;
2. Non-conceptual, non-mistaken knowers which take as their held object a self-characterised phenomenon; and
3. Non-conceptual, mistaken awarenesses which take as their held object a clearly appearing non-existent.

### 4.1 Conceptual Awareness Taking Meaning Generality as its Held Object

There is a three-fold division of conceptual thought into determinative knowers which hold only the sound generality, determinative knowers which hold only the meaning generality and determinative knowers which hold both.

#### 4.1.1 Definition

The definition of a *conceptual thought* is a **determinative knower which holds sound and meaning suitable to mixed**. Here 'sound and meaning' refers to sound generality and meaning generality respectively.

##### 4.1.1.1 Based on Sound Generality

A person, who doesn't know that the meaning of vase is a flat bottomed, bulbous object able to fulfil the function of carrying water, hears the words 'vase' or 'golden vase'. Then a conceptual thought forms in the continuum of that person. The conceptual thought takes as its held, or appearing object, that which appears as the reverse of golden vase. It is a sound generality, as the appearance is formed only in dependence upon hearing the words 'golden vase,' without actually knowing the meaning of 'vase'. This conceptual thought is a determinative knower holding only the sound generality, because the appearance of golden vase, and the appearance of the reversal of non-vase (which is not actually a vase but appears as vase), are mixed.

##### 4.1.1.2 Based on Meaning Generality

Then there is the opposite. We have a person who understands the meaning of vase. They understand that a vase means a flat bottomed, bulbous object, which is able to fulfil the function of carrying water, without having applied the name 'vase' to that meaning. A conceptual thought which only holds the meaning generality is the conceptual thought forming in the continuum of that person apprehending that which is a flat bottomed, bulbous and able to fulfil the function of carrying water.

To that conceptual thought, there is the appearance of flat bottomed, bulbous and able to fulfil the function of carrying water, and the appearance of the reversal of flat bottomed, bulbous and able to fulfil the function of carrying water. So the meaning of vase and the meaning generality are mixed. Because no name is applied, this conceptual thought is a determinative knower, which only holds the meaning generality.

##### 4.1.1.3 Based on both Sound and Meaning Generality

Then we have the conceptual thought apprehending vase in the continuum of a person who understands the meaning of vase, and has applied the name of vase to that meaning. The conceptual thought in the continuum of such a person is a determinative knower holding both the sound and meaning.

#### 4.1.1.4 The Held Object

In general the held object of the conceptual thought apprehending vase, and the appearing object, are synonymous. The appearing object or the held object is the meaning generality of vase.

There is the apprehended object, the engaged object and the determined object of the conceptual thought apprehending vase. These three are also synonymous.

- Vase is the apprehended object of the conceptual thought apprehending vase;
- Vase is the object of engagement, or the engaged object of the conceptual thought apprehending vase; and
- Vase is the determined object of the conceptual thought apprehending vase.

#### 4.1.2 Applying Name and Meaning

We can divide conceptual thoughts into conceptual thoughts applying name and conceptual thoughts applying meaning. An example for a conceptual thought applying name is the conceptual thought applying the name 'vase' to the meaning of vase, (a flat bottomed, bulbous and able to perform the function of carrying water). After applying the name to the meaning of vase, they think, 'This is a vase'.

#### 4.1.3 The Concordance of Conceptual Thoughts with Reality

There is another two-fold division into conceptual thoughts concordant with reality and conceptual thoughts not concordant with reality.

The definition of *conceptual thoughts concordant with reality* is a **determinative knower concordant with reality, which holds sound and meaning suitable to be mixed**. And

The definition of a *conceptual thought not concordant with reality* is a **determinative knower not concordant with reality, which holds sound and meaning suitable to be mixed**.

Examples for the first would be the conceptual thought apprehending vase, apprehending sound and so forth. Examples for the second would be the conceptual thought apprehending permanent sound, or self of a person and so forth, or the conceptual thought apprehending the horns of a rabbit.

In short if the conceptual thought apprehends something which exists it is a conceptual thought concordant with reality. If the conceptual thought apprehends something which doesn't exist, it is a conceptual thought discordant with reality.

### 4.2 Non-Conceptual, Non-Mistaken Knower Which Holds A Self-Characterised Appearing Object

Now we come to the second of the three divisions of awareness with which we started out, which is a *non-conceptual, non-mistaken knower that holds a self-characterised appearing object*. The definition is a **non-conceptual consciousness, which is non-mistaken with regard to its clearly appearing object**.

The definition specifies that it has to be a knower with clear appearance. This refers to a non-conceptual knower. For example the eye consciousness apprehending a vase has the clear appearance of vase. Or, put the other way around, vase appears clearly to the eye consciousness apprehending a vase. Vase is the engaged or apprehended object (both these objects are synonymous) of the eye consciousness apprehending vase, and vase is also the appearing or held object of the eye consciousness apprehending vase. Vase appears clearly to the eye consciousness apprehending a vase.

Next we consider the conceptual thought apprehending vase. Vase does appear to the conceptual thought apprehending vase, but it does not appear clearly. So the conceptual thought apprehending a vase realises 'vase' implicitly. Vase appears to the conceptual thought apprehending vase, vase is realised implicitly by the conceptual thought apprehending vase, but vase is not realised directly by the conceptual thought

---

apprehending vase, and vase does not appear clearly to the conceptual thought apprehending vase. It does not appear clearly to the conceptual thought, apprehending vase and it is not realised directly.

The eye consciousness apprehending a vase does realise vase directly, as well as explicitly, and it appears clearly to that eye consciousness.

The difference between the non-conceptual eye consciousness, and the conceptual thought apprehending a vase, is that the eye consciousness has a clear appearance of vase. Even though the conceptual thought has the appearance of vase, it does not have a clear appearance of vase. The reason for this is that even though vase appears to the conceptual thought apprehending a vase, it can only appear to that thought in dependence upon the meaning generality of vase. Vase can only appear to the conceptual thought apprehending a vase on the basis of the meaning generality of vase appearing to that conceptual thought. The conceptual thought apprehending vase is mistaken because the appearance of vase is mixed with the appearance of the meaning generality to the conceptual thought apprehending vase.

The conceptual thought is mistaken, because it is mistaken with regard to the appearing object, which is a meaning generality. It is mistaken because it mistakes the meaning generality for the actual object. At the same time the conceptual thought is unmistaken with regard to the apprehended object, which is vase. So there is the appearance of the reversal of non-vase.

Normally we say the reversal of non-vase is synonymous with vase. But here we have something which appears as the reversal of non-vase. If something appears as the reversal of non-vase, that means it appears as vase, and that is the meaning generality. This non-mistaken, non-conceptual consciousness, which is unmistaken with regard to its self-characterised held object is synonymous with direct perception.

Direct perception has already been explained, and it has a four-fold division into sense direct perception, mental direct perception, self-knowing direct perception and yogic direct perception.

### 4.3 Non-Conceptual Wrong Awareness

The third category of the three-fold division of awareness, the non-conceptual mistaken knower that has the clear appearance of a non-existent, is synonymous with a *non-conceptual wrong awareness*. The definition is *a non-conceptual knower, which is mistaken with regard to the clear appearance of a non-existent*.

The definition says, 'mistaken with regard to its clearly appearing object'. Whether or not something is a mistaken awareness is defined by whether it is mistaken with regard to its appearing object. So the definition includes 'mistaken with regards to its clearly appearing object'. Conceptual thought is always mistaken with regard to its appearing object, because conceptual thoughts don't have clearly appearing objects. That is the difference. It is the same from the point of view of being mistaken with regard to the appearing object.

One example that we gave before is the eye consciousness apprehending a blue snow-mountain that has the clear appearance of the colour of the snow-mountain as blue. Therefore it is a consciousness which has the clear appearance of a non-existent. This is what 'non-conceptual, mistaken knower which has the clear appearance of a non-existent' is talking about. Something that is non-existent, such as a blue snow-mountain, appears clearly to that consciousness.

#### 4.3.1 Non-Conceptual Mistaken Knowers

There is a two-fold division into sense non-conceptual mistaken knowers and into mental non-conceptual mistaken knowers. We have already mentioned an example for the first one, with

the eye consciousness apprehending a snow-mountain as blue and so forth. An example for a mental non-conceptual mistaken knower is the dream apprehending the blue of the dream as being blue.

##### 4.3.1.1 Sense Non-Conceptual Mistaken Knower

The definition of a *sense non-conceptual mistaken knower is a non-conceptual mistaken knower, which arises in dependence upon its uncommon empowering condition of the physical sense power*. Or more literally, 'a sense non-conceptual mistaken knower, which has a common basis arising in dependence upon its uncommon empowering condition of the physical sense power', is the definition of a sense non-conceptual mistaken knower'.

##### 4.3.1.2 Mental Non-Conceptual Mistaken Knower

The definition of a *mental non-conceptual mistaken knower is a non-conceptual mistaken knower, which has a common basis with arising in dependence upon its uncommon empowering condition of a mental sense power*.

#### 4.3.2 Self Knowers and Other Knowers

A further division of awareness is a two-fold division into self-knowers and other knowers. The difference between a self-knower and an other knower is, as mentioned before, whether the awareness is solely focussed inwards, or focussed outwards. For it to be a *self-knower* it has to be *an awareness which is solely focussed inwards*.

There is the debate about whether or not the self-knower in the continuum of an Arya Buddha is a self-knower. We say that self-knowers and other knowers are mutually exclusive. Looking at the definition and saying that self-knowers and other knowers are mutually exclusive, the debate comes about by considering what happens with the self-knower in the continuum of an Arya Buddha? The self-knower in the continuum of an Arya Buddha is only a self-knower - it is not an other-knower. There is no common base between other knower and self-knower.

#### 4.4 Mind and Mental Factors

Next comes a further two-fold division of awareness into mind and mental factors. The explanation of this two-fold division of mind and mental factors will take a little longer. I am planning to devote four Fridays in October to the subject of Mind and Mental Factors. One of my previous translators mentioned that it is difficult to convey in English the difference between mind and mental factors, however Tenzin Dongak said it should be possible.

Mind is synonymous with Main Consciousness. Mental Factors can be divided up into fifty-one. There are the five ever-present mental factors, the five ascertaining mental factors, the eleven virtuous mental factors, the twenty secondary delusions, the four changeable mental factors and the six root delusions. We can do this in more detail in October.

We shall start in the first week in October, which is 5<sup>th</sup> October. It will go for four weeks. It will be good if new people can join. People should not feel that if they didn't come to this six weeks then they are not allowed to come to the Mind and Mental Factors classes. They are welcome to join. Those of you who still have enthusiasm can come, and those who are ready to give up....

#### Note on authentication

Transcribed from the tape by Sharon Holley  
Edit 1: Adair Bunnett  
Edit 2: Ven Tenzin Dongak  
Edit 3: Alan B Molloy  
Check & edit: Ven Tenzin Dongak