

EXAM

BLOCK: **2**
WEEK: **8**
ASSIGNED: 3RD MAY 04

1) Lord Buddha once said "the universe is merely your mind". What did he mean? (Explain both the Prasangika's interpretation and the Mind Only School's interpretation of the Buddha's intention)

2) What would be the problem with the world being *intrinsically* mere mind? [3]

3) The Mind-Only School denies externally existing objects, and at the same time asserts an inherently existing consciousness. How does the Prasangika School prove to the Mind-Only that they can't have their cake and eat it too? [3]

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

4) How do you know when a teaching from Lord Buddha is to be taken literally or is to be interpreted? Using the medical example given, explain why there are interpretable and definitive Buddhist teachings. [4]

5) In which two famous scriptures did Lord Buddha proclaim that form and consciousness are equal in the way they exist? What was said in these two sources to prove this point? [4]

6) The Buddha said 'you have always had an unmanifest fully enlightened Buddha within you. You just have to awaken it'. What was Lord Buddha's hidden intention and purpose behind saying this and why isn't the teaching on this tatagata essence ultimately true? [3]

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

7) List the four sutras that are taken to be definitive by Mind-only School and interpretive by the Prasangika School. [4]

8) Give definitions for the following:

- I) A definitive sutra according to the Mind-only school
- li) An interpretive sutra according to the Mind-only school
- lii) A definitive sutra according to the Prasangika School
- IV) An interpretive sutra according to the Prasangika School

9) What examples do the Charvakas use to prove that things need not have a cause?

10) If things aren't generated from any of these four ways (self, other, both, or neither), then how are they generated? [2]

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

11) How does Chandrakirti convince the *realists* that nominal existence is different from inherent existence? What is the significance of this argument? [3]

12) What does it mean to be "*born in suchness*"?

13) The lower schools have been trying to argue that if things did not exist inherently then they would not exist at all, like the son of a barren woman. How does the Prasangika show that this example is indefinite?