
Study Group - *Madhyamakavatanama*

Commentary by the Venerable Geshe Doga
Translated by the Venerable Tenzin Dongak

དབུ་མ་ལ་འཇུག་པ་ཞེས་བྱ་བ་བརྟུགས་པོ།

11 November 2003

Please generate a virtuous motivation as usual.

The outline that we previously reached was the outlines refuting an inherent existing potential to exist in the past, present, and future, which is the Prasangika's reply to the Mind Only assertion of an inherently existent consciousness lacking external objects. We have already completed the refutation of the potential existing inherently in the present, and in the future.

3.5.1.1.1.2.2.1.2.1.2.2.3. Refuting potential to exist inherently in the past

In the root text, in the first line the Mind Only say,

If will be from the ripening of the potential that ceased,

The **Realists** say that the later consciousness will be generated from the ripening of the potential of the consciousness that has ceased. At the time of the potential the earlier consciousness has ceased. However the potential for the generation of a later consciousness is placed on the universal mind foundation, and then from that potential the later consciousness will be generated.

The following eleven lines contain the Prasangika's reply, and there's also a further debate.

*Then other arises from the potential of other
Those with continuums are mutually different.*

Therefore all arises from everything.

If, for those possessing a continuum of multiplicity.

They don't have different continuums, therefore

There is no fault. This is a premise to be proved.

Because an occasion for one continuum is illogical

The dharmas based on Maitreya and Upagupta

Aren't of one continuum because of being other

Whatever is inherently individual (multiple)

Is unsuitable to be of one continuum.

Here the Realists show why they don't see the contradiction in a moment of consciousness being generated from an inherently existent other moment of consciousness. They say that those moments of consciousness form a continuum. The Mind Only point of view is that these moments of consciousness, which are inherently existent other from each other, form a continuum. Then the **Prasangika** of course say that this is impossible.

The **Mind Only** assert that consciousness exists inherently. They also say that there is this continuity of earlier and later moments of consciousness that are inherently different. They are mutually inherently other, but because they belong to the same class, or type, they are earlier and later moments of that same class or type.

Therefore they form a continuum and are inherently existent.

To that the **Prasangika** reply, 'If that is the case then,

It follows that *another* effect *arises from the* intrinsically existing potential of other - because *continuums* arising sequentially *are mutually* intrinsically *different* earlier and later moments. If 'Accept'. *Therefore all* functionalities *arise from every* cause and non-cause because of your 'acceptance'.

Here the Prasangika say that the Mind Only talk about the continuity of earlier and later moments belonging to the same class or type. Then the Prasangika say, 'So it follows that a later moment that is of a different type from the earlier moment can arise from that earlier moment. Why? Because those earlier and later moments of consciousness are intrinsically mutually other.

The **Mind Only** assert that the earlier and later moments of consciousness of similar type are mutually and intrinsically different from each other. Then the **Prasangika** say that within that premise there is the fault that if this were to be the case then also a later moment that is of a different, discordant type from the earlier moment of consciousness could arise from that earlier moment of consciousness. Why? Because we accept that two intrinsically different moments of consciousness can arise from each other. One moment of consciousness, which is intrinsically different from the earlier moment of consciousness, can arise from that earlier moment of consciousness. If that were to be the case then also later moments that are of different type, or class, from the earlier moment could arise from that earlier moment.

Here of course we have a continuity of consciousness where the later moments of consciousness arise from the earlier moments of consciousness. The later moments of consciousness are the effect, and the earlier moments of consciousness are the cause. But then the **Mind Only** say that those earlier and later moments of consciousness are intrinsically mutually other, so they are intrinsically different from each other. That is what the Prasangika find fault with, and that's what you have to understand when *Mirror* says,

Therefore all functionalities *arise from every* cause and non-cause because of your 'accept',

By accepting that cause and effect can be intrinsically different from each other then the fault that arises is that everything could arise from anything. Then all effects could arise from any and every cause. That is something that you have to understand.

The crux of the fault that the **Prasangika** posit is that you cannot have a cause and an effect that are intrinsically different from each other. They are different but not intrinsically different. The later moment of consciousness arises from the earlier moment of consciousness, and in such a way is the effect of the earlier moment of consciousness. Now if those two moments of consciousness were to be intrinsically or inherently different from each other, then the implication is that they are mutually independent - that they are totally independent from each other. If you have an effect arising from a cause with which it is totally unrelated, then that

means that the effect can arise from everything. That is what the Prasangika are saying.

Then comes an answer by the **Mind Only** to the Prasangika's point that everything would arise from everything and anything if an inherently existent effect were to be generated from an inherently existent cause. The Mind Only say that the fault that everything will arise from everything doesn't arise just because an inherently existent later moment of consciousness is generated from an inherently existent earlier moment of consciousness. The reason why that fault does not arise is because those earlier and later moments of consciousness belong to the same continuity. 'They form a continuum of early and later moments', they say, 'and therefore the fault you are positing, that just because they are mutually inherently existent others therefore everything has to arise from everything, doesn't have to apply. Why? Because those moments of consciousness form a continuum.' That's what they are saying here in these next few lines,

If, for those possessing a continuum of multiplicity. They don't have different continuums, therefore

Mirror:

To this the Realists reply, 'The fault that everything would arise from everything doesn't exist because *those* sequentially arising earlier and later intrinsically *different* moments don't form a multitude of *continuums* but only one continuum'.

The Mind Only think that because those intrinsically existing earlier and later moments of consciousness form a continuum, then the fault that the Prasangika posit, that everything would arise from everything, does not exist.

To this the **Prasangika** reply,

This is a premise to be proved. Because an occasion for one continuum is illogical

Mirror:

It follows that those being intrinsically different can be of a single continuum is a premise that isn't established

So the premise of the Mind Only, that those intrinsically different earlier and later moments can be of single continuum, is a premise that is not established. Why?

because it is *illogical* to have an occasion for oneness with something that is naturally different - because it is impossible for those that are intrinsically multiple to be *of one continuum*.

So the **Prasangikas** say that it is impossible for intrinsically different early and later moments to form one continuum. If one takes the subject intrinsically existing earlier and later moments of consciousness - they can't form a continuum - because they form an intrinsic multiplicity. So they are intrinsically different from each other.

Mirror:

the qualities of *Maitreya and Upagupta* belong to individual people and therefore are not of *one continuum*.

It says here 'Maitreya', but Maitreya is just the Sanskrit

word for Jampa, which means love. Here it doesn't actually refer to Maitreya buddha but it is just given as a name, like Jampa, or Tashi, or Dondhup, or whatever.

Here it is just giving the example of two people named Jampa and Upagupta, or it could be any two people like Tashi and Dondhup, saying that those two people don't form a single continuum, because they are two different people. Likewise intrinsically different earlier and later moments can't form a continuum, because they are intrinsically different from each other just as Jampa and Upagupta are different from each other in the example.

3.5.1.1.1.2.2.2.1.2.1.2.2. Refuting again the existence of consciousness without outer object

3.5.1.1.1.2.2.2.1.2.1.2.2.1. Presentation of the view

First there is the presentation of the **Mind Only** view, which is given in these three verses,

The generation of visual consciousness - from its potential

It is wholly generated immediately subsequent. The potential that is the basis of one's consciousness

Is realised as that called the physical eye.

Here, knowers arising from sense powers Generate the mere appearance of blue etc.

From their seeds without holding outer objects. Not realising that, beings accept mind holding outer objects.

During dreams, without form of different essence, Mind in that aspect arises from the ripening Of its potential. Likewise here while awake Mind without outer objects exists.

Mirror:

There are no outer objects that are of different substance from consciousness because *the generation of visual consciousness* means that consciousness *is wholly generated immediately subsequent* to the ripening of *its potential* placed on the universal foundation.

The Mind Only say that consciousnesses such as the visual consciousness apprehending blue is not generated in dependence upon an externally existing blue, but rather the apprehended object 'blue', and the visual consciousness apprehending blue, are both generated simultaneously from a potential that existed on the universal mind foundation.

The apprehended object, blue, and the apprehender, the eye-consciousness apprehending blue are both generated simultaneously, immediately subsequent to the ripening of the potential that existed on the universal mind foundation. That's why the Mind Only say that there's no need for an external object, or that in fact the external object doesn't exist. Whereas the tenets asserting the existence of external objects say that the consciousness is generated in dependence upon the external object.

The **Mind Only** say that consciousnesses are generated from an immediately preceding potential on the universal mind foundation. A consciousness such as the visual consciousness apprehending blue is generated immediately subsequent to the ripening of the potential on the universal mind foundation. Even though the eye-

consciousness is generated in dependence upon the eye-sense power, the Mind Only say that the eye-sense power appears to the universal mind foundation. One of the characteristics of the universal mind foundation is that it focuses on the sense-powers.

The Mind Only say that those who are possessed of ignorance imagine this appearance of the eye-sense power to the universal mind foundation as being an external eye-sense power. Then they think that the eye-consciousness arises in dependence upon that externally existing eye-sense power. However that is only because they are possessed by ignorance. In actuality there is no such thing as an externally existing eye-sense power of different substance from the universal mind foundation.

Actually the eye-sense power is of one substance with the universal mind foundation. That's what it says in,

***The potential that is the basis of one's consciousness
Is realised as that called the physical eye***

Here 'realised' means fabricated. 'The potential that is the basis of one's consciousness is' fabricated as that called the physical external eye, 'and there is no eye of different substance from consciousness'.

The Mind Only say that there are those who are possessed by ignorance, by which they mean the Prasangika, who think that the visual eye-consciousness is generated in dependence upon an externally existing eye-sense power. However there is no eye-sense power that is of different substance from consciousness. So according to the Mind Only the eye-sense power that the Prasangika imagine to be the eye-sense power is but the mere appearance of the eye-sense power to the universal mind foundation. 'That potential, the appearance of the physical eye, is what the visual consciousness is generated from, and you, the Prasangika, imagine that it arises from an actual external eye. In fact it is just a mere appearance on the universal mind foundation', they say.

When the Mind Only say in *Mirror*, 'and there is no eye of different substance from consciousness', 'eye' means the eye-sense power, and there is no eye-sense power of different substance from consciousness. The consciousness that it is referred to here is the universal mind foundation, and the sense powers are a focus of the universal mind foundation. Therefore the eye-sense power is not of a different substance from consciousness, but of one substance with it. It is of one substance with the universal mind foundation as it forms the focus of the universal mind foundation. What is called an eye has to be understood as an image, or an appearance. They refer to the Prasangika as being ignorant, saying they imagine this mere appearance of the eye-sense power to be the externally existing eye-sense power.

The Mind Only say. 'The eye-consciousness is generated from the ripening of the karmic imprint on the universal mind foundation, and at the time of the ripening of that imprint the universal mind foundation focuses on the eye-sense power. This image of the eye-sense power that appears to the universal mind foundation is imagined by you the ignorant Prasangikas to be the external eye-sense power.'

***Here, knowers arising from sense powers
Generate the mere appearance of blue etc.
From their seeds without holding external objects.***

According to the worldly appearance it looks as if the various sense consciousnesses arise in dependence upon the condition of the external objects such as blue and so forth. However in reality there is no external object. Those different knowers arise from their seeds; they arise in the aspect of blue from those seeds and there is no external object. However not realising this, beings merely accept those images of blue, etc and so forth that appear to the mind as external objects.

On the one hand during dreams mind arises without form, of different essence from the ripening of its potential in the aspect of that form. During dreams without form of different essence, mind in that aspect arises from the ripening of its potential. In a dream, mind arises in the aspect of an object without the contact with an external object.

Without any external object actually being there, the dream consciousness still arises in the aspect of that external object from the ripening of potential on the universal mind foundation. It is similar to being awake when the consciousness also arises in the aspect of the object without the actual presence of an external object, just from the ripening of karmic imprints on the universal mind foundation. This refutes the Prasangika point of view that without the condition of an external object the visual consciousness couldn't arise. Here one has to understand a subtle point that is a bit semantic, which is that the Mind Only won't accept that blue is a condition for the eye-consciousness apprehending blue, but they will still call it the focal condition. They don't accept it as being an actual condition, so although it is still called a focal condition it is not regarded as a condition. It is what they call the appearing focal condition.

The Mind Only say that without having the external focal condition of blue present, the eye-consciousness apprehending blue can still arise in the aspect of blue from the ripening of potential on the universal mind foundation, similar to the dream consciousness.

In a dream we generate dream consciousnesses that arise in the aspect of certain smells, or certain visual objects such as blue and so forth, without those real objects or smells and so forth actually being present. The dream consciousness is generated in the image of those objects from the ripening of karmic imprints on the universal mind foundation. Similarly, when awake the sense consciousnesses are generated from the ripening of karmic imprints in the image of those different sense objects such as forms and smells.

Here the Mind Only say that we have these intrinsically existing consciousnesses that lack external objects, and by the object and the consciousness arising simultaneously from the karmic imprint on the universal mind foundation, one refutes the existence of external objects.

3.5.1.1.1.2.2.2.1.2.1.2.2.2. Its refutation

***Mental consciousness to which blue and so forth appears
Arises during dreams for one without eyes.
Why doesn't a blind person generate one here***

likewise
From the ripening of its seeds without the eye-sense power.
If the ripening of the sixth's potential, existing during dreams,
Becomes non-existent during waking as you said,
Why is it unsuitable to say the ripening of the sixth's potential
Is as non-existent during dreams as it is here.
Similarly to the eye's non-existence not being its cause
During dream sleep also isn't a cause.

If during dreams the mental consciousness arises from the ripening of mere karmic imprints, then why not also, for example, for the blind and so forth when they are awake?

Mental consciousness to which blue and so forth appears
Arises during dreams for one without eyes.
Why doesn't a blind person generate one here
likewise
From the ripening of its seeds without the eye-sense power.

During dreams, even though we have a dream eye-sense power the actual eye-sense power is not functional.

Mirror:

Mental consciousness to which blue etc. appears arises inherently during dreams for one without eyes. Why doesn't a blind person generate consciousness to which blue appears clearly here during waking time likewise from the ripening of its seeds without the eye-sense power.

The Mind Only gave the dream consciousness apprehending blue arising from the ripening of karmic imprints on the universal mind foundation as an example of an inherently existing consciousness without outer object.

Then the **Prasangika** say, 'Well then, why isn't it also the case that for a blind person a mental consciousness to which blue clearly appears arises from the ripening of karmic imprints on the universal mind foundation? Regardless of whether it is a dream, or whether one is awake, according to you the consciousnesses are generated primarily from the karmic imprints on the universal mind foundation. Therefore it should also be possible for a blind person to generate a mental consciousness to which blue appears very clearly from karmic imprints on the universal mind foundation.

The Prasangika say that the consciousness is generated from the karmic imprints, and since it is the same for both an awake blind person and a person who is dreaming, then a blind person should also be able to generate a mental consciousness to which blue appears clearly whilst being awake, which is actually not possible. Normally while one is awake the mental consciousness has no clear appearance of external objects such as blue. The sense objects such as blue and so forth appear very clearly to the sense consciousnesses, and then the mental consciousness just generates a mere remembrance of that clear appearance. However the external objects don't appear clearly to the mental consciousness. Similarly to

the dream consciousness generating a clear image of blue and so forth whilst asleep, then also from the ripening of karmic imprints a blind person whilst being awake should be able to generate a mental consciousness, with a clear image of blue from the ripening of karmic imprints.

Here the **Mind Only** say that this doesn't have to be the case. Karmic imprints ripen for one person but not another, because karmic imprints ripen depending upon causes and conditions. They say that one of the conditions here is sleep. Because of the condition of sleep the karmic imprint that can generate this clear appearance of blue for the mental consciousness ripens, and one has this dream of blue. However when awake the condition of sleep is obviously absent, so because of the absence of that condition then the karmic imprint doesn't ripen, hence there is no clear mental appearance of blue for the awake blind person.

Transcribed from tape by Mark Emerson
Edit 1 by Adair Bunnett
Edit 2 by Venerable Tenzin Dongak

Edited Version

© **Tara Institute**