

*Tara Institute Study Group 2004 - 'Introduction to the Middle Way'*

EXAM

NAME:

BLOCK: **1**

WEEK: **6**

ASSIGNED: 16<sup>TH</sup> MAR 2004

MARK:

**/28**

- 
1. The Mind-Only describe the self knower to be 'an awareness that is not concomitant with another mind or mental factor'. Compare and contrast the self-knower to an awareness that **is** 'concomitant with another mind or mental factor'. [4]
- 

- 
2. Explain why the story of the prairie-dog and the poisonous rat is relevant in disproving the self-knower. [4]

***Tara Institute Study Group 2004 - 'Introduction to the Middle Way'***

---

3. How do the Prasangika School explain memory? [2]

---

---

4. Why do the Mind-Only School fuss so much about this self-knower? Give two reasons that support their case. [2]

---

5. Explain the difference between the Prasangika's definition of a valid cognisor and the lower schools definition. What is the significance of their difference? [4]

---

***Tara Institute Study Group 2004 - 'Introduction to the Middle Way'***

---

6. How do the lower schools distinguish between an imputed existent and a substantial existent? Why don't the Prasangika's make this distinction? [4]

---

7. Why does the Mind-Only School stray from the two truths, and what hurdle does this present to gaining personal liberation? [5]

8. What does the Prasangika School liken the existence of a mule's foal to? [1]

---

9. It is incredibly important to understand the distinction between not existing inherently and not existing at all. What do we mean when we say that something is non-existent? [2]