
Mind and Awareness

Commentary by the Venerable Geshe Doga

Translated by the Venerable Tenzin Dongak

10 August 2001

Please establish a virtuous motivation by thinking, 'I have to become enlightened for the benefit of all mother sentient beings. In order to do so, I have to eliminate ignorance from my mental continuum, and for that purpose I am going to listen to this teaching tonight!'

As you all know, this course is going to be taught for six weeks on Friday nights. Everybody is required to attend all of those six sessions, apart from one or two people who personally asked me for an exemption because they could only come for two weeks or four weeks. Apart from those few exceptions, which I granted personally, everybody has to attend all six weeks.

There are two major divisions in the text, which is called *Mind and Awareness*. They are objects and object possessors.

1. Objects

The definition of *an object is to be known by awareness*.

In general, object and objects of knowledge are synonymous. However when we distinguish object possessors from objects, then object refers to all objects of knowledge apart from mind, and object possessor refers only to mind.

We have already mentioned the many divisions of objects before, but now we particularly have what is called the determined object, the appearing object and the object of engagement. The appearing object is synonymous with the held object, and every consciousness has an appearing or held object. Determined objects are found only with conceptual consciousnesses.

To explain the various objects in relation to a direct perception apprehending blue: blue is the object of engagement; it is the apprehended object and it is also the appearing object of the eye consciousness apprehending blue.

That direct perception apprehending blue induces a conceptual thought apprehending blue. Here the objects vary slightly. Blue is the determined object of the conceptual thought apprehending blue, as well as the object of engagement. However it is not the appearing object, which is the meaning generality of blue.

That completes the explanation of objects. We have already been through all of that when we explained the tenets. We have defined the determined object, the object of engagement, and the appearing object. As this is completely clear, we will now go on to object possessors. (*Laughter*)

2. Object Possessors

The definition of *an object possessor is that which is endowed with a variety of its own objects*. It is divided into three: person, awareness, and (expressive) sound.

These three divisions of object possessors relate to the threefold division of impermanent phenomena into non-associated compounded phenomena, awareness, and form.

The first kind of object possessor, the person, is a non-associated compounded phenomenon; awareness is awareness and sound is form¹.

2.1 Person

The first object possessor, person, is that which circles within cyclic existence, and which is liberated from cyclic existence.

It is important that we identify what a person is. *The being that is labelled on any of its five aggregates is the definition of person*. The synonyms for a person are self and being.

The five aggregates are the form aggregate, the aggregate of feeling, recognition, compositional factors and consciousness. The person, or the 'I', is imputed on any of those five aggregates, where 'any' means either four or five of the aggregates. This is because in the formless realm the aggregate for form is non-existing, and there are only four aggregates.

Even though we say the person is circling within cyclic existence, one important point to consider is that cyclic existence in relation to human beings is actually the base of imputation of the person, which are the five aggregates. In relation to human beings the aggregates of form, feeling, recognition, compositional factors and consciousness (sometimes called the contaminated or afflicted aggregates), are actually what we refer to as cyclic existence.

If we generate the thought of renunciation truly then it should be a thought wishing to be free from those five aggregates, and not wanting to take those five aggregates again in the future. We can generate the wish of wanting to be free from one's friends or other outside conditions very easily, but that is not what renunciation actually means. Renunciation is the wish of wanting to be free from those five contaminated aggregates.

When explaining the phenomena of the afflicted side, the aggregate of form is explained first. Although I have done that before, we can go through it again.

Because we are so attached to form, then in our continuum the view of form is first developed. Once we have started to look at form, we then develop various kinds of feelings with regard to that form. These feelings are either pleasurable or unpleasurable feelings, which is the second of the five aggregates. After we have generated a feeling towards the perceived form, then mistaken recognition, which is the third aggregate, will be generated in our continuum. Then, in dependence upon that mistaken recognition, attachment and anger, or like and dislike are generated. This is the fourth of the five aggregates. From that, the contaminated consciousness is generated once again.

These five aggregates are called the base of imputation because they are the base on which the mistaken perception of self of a person arises. At a time when our various sense or mental consciousnesses are engaging the six kinds of objects, such as form, smell and so forth, we generate the apprehension of a person existing substantially in terms of being self-supporting engaging in those six objects. If our sense consciousnesses are engaging nice smells or tastes and so forth, then at that time, the apprehension of a person existing substantially in terms of being self-supporting engaging those smells and tastes and so forth appears within the mind on the basis of the five aggregates. The text says that the mistaken apprehension of the self of a person arises in dependence on the community of form, which refers to form and the other four aggregates.

The five aggregates are the basis for the mistaken perception apprehending a self existing substantially in terms of being self-supporting. That self of a person generated by our mind then engages the various aggregates. How it engages the form aggregate has already been explained. In relation to the aggregate of feeling, through the ripening of karma we experience the ripening results, which are the various feelings of suffering and happiness. At that time there is also the appearance of a self existing substantially, in terms of being self-supporting, which is experiencing those feelings.

In dependence upon the five aggregates the view of the transitory collections is then generated. Because they are changing moment by moment the five aggregates are transitory. In dependence upon the five aggregates there is the

¹ Form is synonymous with matter and not to be confused with the entry of form, which applies only to the object's eye consciousness.

apprehension of the self of a person. The mind, which apprehends that self of a person, is called the view of the transitory collections.

We have to understand that this appearance of self is a mistaken appearance, and generate the wisdom realising the absence of such a self existing substantially in terms of being self-supporting. This wisdom becomes the wisdom realising the selflessness of a person. This wisdom realising the selflessness of a person, and the grasping at the self of person are completely opposite in the way they apprehend their object. They cancel each other out. Once we have generated that wisdom realising the selflessness of a person we will recognise that the grasping at the self of a person is a wrong mind, and that the wisdom realising the selflessness of a person is a valid cogniser.

Just briefly, with regard to the first kind of object possessor or person, it is very useful to understand the way the various wisdoms act as antidotes to oppose the various delusions. Then one can apply them, and use them within one's own mind.

With regard to the base of imputation, the five aggregates are sometimes called the afflicted aggregates. Afflicted refers to the delusions. There are two reasons why these five aggregates are called the afflicted aggregates. One is from the point of view of the cause, and the other is from the point of view of the result.

From the point of view of the cause, they are called afflicted aggregates because these five aggregates are caused by delusions. They can also be called afflicted aggregates because they act as the cause for further delusions in the future. So they are called afflicted aggregates from the point of view of the cause as well as the result.

Because we have afflicted aggregates, at the time of our death a kind of craving is generated within our mind, which focuses on the kind of rebirth we will take in the future life. Then through the force of that craving, a stronger wish is generated within the mind. This wish grasps for this particular future life already focussed upon by the earlier craving. This particular wish, induced by the craving of wanting to obtain this future life, is called grasping. Then through the force of craving and grasping a particular karma will be ripened within the mind. When all these three come together, they will cause us to take rebirth, and so take another aggregate of form.

Here we can see the sequence of how future aggregates are generated from the delusions of this life. If you follow it further back, the afflicted aggregates are generated from karma and delusions, and the root of the delusions is ignorance. So the final cause of everything is ignorance.

2.2 Awareness

The next object possessor is awareness. *Knower* is the definition of awareness and *clear and knowing* is the definition of consciousness. Consciousness, awareness and knower are synonymous.

Here, the 'clear' in 'clear and knowing' refers to the fact that consciousness is free from any kind of form. Because of that clarity within the mind, various outer objects can appear within the mind just like reflections. So outer objects are reflected within the consciousness, because of the clarity of consciousness. We have already explained some of this before.

Awareness is divided into valid cognisers and awarenesses that are not valid cognisers. We have already been through these definitions before. Actually, I want to get to mind and mental factors.

2.2.1 Valid Cognisers

The definition of a *valid cogniser*² is a *newly incontrovertible knower*. The Sautrantikas, Mind-Only and Svatantrika-Madhyamikas assert this definition of a valid cogniser.

Why does the definition of valid cogniser include the word 'newly'? The reason is to eliminate subsequent cognisers from being considered as being prime cognisers.

The second part in the definition of a valid cogniser, 'incontrovertible', is mentioned to eliminate correct assumptions as being valid cognisers.

Correct assumptions are a type of mind that apprehends an existing object. For example, as beginners we start to meditate on impermanence, and then through our meditation we generate a certain understanding of impermanence without actually having realised impermanence. Such a mind is called correct assumption. As this correct assumption becomes stronger and stronger it becomes a valid cogniser. This inclusion of 'incontrovertible' in the definition makes it clear that as a valid cogniser one has to realise one's object, and to have eliminated all super-impositions with regard to the object. A correct assumption has not yet done this.

Even though the object that is understood by a correct assumption is an existing object (such as the correct assumption understanding impermanence), it hasn't actually realised impermanence. Therefore a correct assumption is actually a controvertible knower, which then later becomes the valid cogniser realising impermanence. So in order to eliminate correct assumptions as valid cognisers, the definition of valid cognisers includes 'incontrovertible'. This shows that to be a valid cogniser one has to actually realise the object.

The third part in the definition of valid cogniser is 'knower', which is synonymous with consciousness and awareness. It is mentioned in order to eliminate the physical sense powers from being valid cognisers.

Valid cognisers can be divided into direct valid cognisers and inferential valid cognisers.

2.2.1.1 Direct Valid Cogniser

The definition of a *direct valid cogniser* is *being newly incontrovertible and free from conceptions*. There are four divisions: direct sense cogniser, direct mental cogniser, direct self-knowing cogniser and direct yogic cogniser.

2.2.1.1.a. Direct Sense Perception

The definition of a *direct sense perception* is *an un-mistaken knower free from conception, which is generated in dependence upon its uncommon empowering condition of a physical sense power*.

In relation to the eye consciousness, the uncommon empowering condition is the eye sense power. The eye sense power is a certain type of subtle clear form. I have had it explained to me that medical science asserts that there is a similar subtle clear form, which is somewhere here in the head behind the ear. I am not sure whether that is actually the eye sense power which is asserted in Buddhism. The eye sense power is a kind of clear form in which the outer form to be seen is reflected.

In relation to the ear consciousness we have a subtle physical sense power of the ear. Here we have this very thin skin within the ear, which is which is said by medical science to be responsible for us being able to hear sounds. Again, I am not sure whether that is the physical sense power of the ear that is explained in Buddhism. This remains to be analysed, but there is something similar asserted by medical science.

² A more literal translation at this time is prime cogniser. So valid cogniser is the equivalent of prime cogniser.

It is explained that the various sense consciousnesses arise in dependence upon those physical sense powers, and when those physical sense powers degenerate, then the various consciousnesses that are dependent upon those sense powers become weaker, and also degenerate. This is something we can observe very clearly. If the power of our eye lessens, then also the eye consciousness generated in conjunction with the eye sense power gets weaker, or completely disappears.

Because the strength of the various consciousnesses depends upon the strength of the sense powers, I always say that it is very important to take good care of one's physical body. When our physical body degenerates the physical sense powers also degenerate, and then the various sense consciousnesses, which are associated or depend upon those sense powers, also degenerate. So it is important to become very familiar with one's physical form, and to know all its various aspects. This is because knowing the various aspects of our physical form acts as an antidote to the delusion of desire. In relation to lay people it will prevent adultery and sexual misconduct. To go further, in relation to ordained people it prevents the breaking of one of the root vows and so forth. So knowing the generality of our physical form is very important, because it seems one is not allowed to do just anything. (*Laughter*)

The cause for the physical body is the blood of the mother and the sperm of the father, the red drop and the white drop. It is very important to know the cause for the physical body because of the reasons already explained. There is a certain power in the red and white drop, which sustains the physical form, yet there are various kinds of substances that harm that sustaining power of the red and white drop. Then the power of our physical form degenerates, and also the coarse consciousnesses, which depend upon the physical form as their base, also degenerate. For example diabetes is a sickness that harms the sustaining power of the white and red drops. In order to stop the negative influence of diabetes, one has to take a certain type of medicine.

Having a healthy body is very important for the success of one's Dharma practice. For that reason I always advice everybody to take good care of his or her physical health. It is also very important that we take personal responsibility for our physical health. Of course in general we will follow the advice of our doctor, but having that advice doesn't mean that we can abandon our own sense of judgement. For example, when I went to hospital the doctor gave me some pills to take, but because those pills caused me constipation I stopped taking them. When I went back the next day and the doctor asked me if I took my medicine, I said 'no', and explained to him the reasons why I hadn't taken it. Then the doctor said, 'It was actually very correct for you not to take the medicine if it causes you those problems'.

Even though we might have the advice of our doctor, that doesn't mean that we can just give up our personal responsibility for ourselves. As was explained before, the strength of the coarse consciousnesses depends upon the strength of the physical sense powers. So we have to take good care of our physical sense powers. Translated this means that we have to take care of our physical form, because otherwise it will create obstacles for our Dharma practice.

Direct sense perception has three divisions: valid cogniser, subsequent cogniser and awareness to which the object appears but is not ascertained.

In the context of an eye consciousness that apprehends form, the first moment of the eye consciousness apprehending form is a **valid sense cogniser**. The second moment of the eye consciousness apprehending form is a **subsequent sense cogniser** realising form. The third category is the eye consciousness **apprehending form to which form appears but**

is not ascertained. This is the situation where even though form appears to the eye consciousness mentally, we are distracted by some beautiful melodious sound. At the time when our mental consciousness is distracted, then the eye consciousness cannot ascertain its object of form.

So mental consciousness becomes very important. For example, at the time of meditation when we focus inwards on our mental consciousness, then even though our eyes are open and gazing over the tip of our nose that shouldn't actually disturb one. Some people say they are distracted when their eyes are open, but actually when one engages one's mental consciousness, the eye consciousness will not be distracted by any kind of form.

Further there are five groups of sense direct perceptions; sense direct perception apprehending form, sound, smell, taste and tactile objects.

Where is the taste consciousness apprehending taste?³

The tongue.

The taste consciousness is most likely situated more towards the inner end of the tongue. For example we will not be able to identify a sweet taste with the tip of our tongue. Only when it gets further into the mouth towards the back of the tongue can we identify the sweet taste. That is an indication that the taste consciousness is situated more towards the root of the tongue.

Maybe some of you can get the tea? Sweet tea!

What is the difference between conceptual awareness and non-conceptual awareness?

Conceptual awareness is purely mental.

That is correct. The five sense perceptions are non-conceptual. All sense perceptions are non-conceptual.

As we mentioned before, at first our eye consciousness (or other sense direct perception) apprehends outer objects, and after that in our mental space we generate craving for that object. First we see a certain object, and then later we start to think about it, and then we generate a mental image and craving for that object. To a direct perception the object appears in the raw, while to a conceptual mind the object doesn't appear in the raw, but through the help of the meaning generality.

What is the difference between realising an object directly and realising an object explicitly?

We explicitly realise it via a generic image

One part of your answer was correct. To realise an object directly means to realise the object without the help of the meaning generality. The mind realises its object explicitly if it realises it by arising in the aspect of the object. If the mind realises its object without arising in the aspect of that object, then the mind has realised the object implicitly. So there are two modes of realisation, explicit realisation and implicit realisation. The difference lies in whether or not the mind arises in the aspect of that object. Both conceptual awarenesses and non-conceptual awarenesses have those modes of realisation.

If a mind realises its object without the help a meaning generality then it realises its object clearly.

What is the meaning of consciousness?

Clear and knowing.

Is there a pervasion that if it is consciousness then it has to be clear and knowing?

Yes.

So there is a pervasion that if it is consciousness then it has to be clear and knowing?

Is there a pervasion that if it is consciousness then it realises its

³ In the discussions that follow, student responses are in italics, and Geshe-la's questions and responses are in normal typeface. Sometimes the audience response is inaudible.

object?

Yes.

We can posit the wrong mind. If you were to say 'yes' to that then you would posit the wrong mind, which doesn't realise its object but is consciousness.

If you assert that all consciousnesses have realised their objects then you are saying that wrong minds realise the object. So what is realised by self-grasping?

[Inaudible]

The definition of a wrong awareness is a knower that mistakenly engages its object. Since it mistakenly engages its object, how can you say that it realises its object?

[Inaudible]

What does it mistakenly realise?

[Inaudible]

It engages its object mistakenly.

Self-grasping apprehends the self of a person. Then if we meditate on selflessness we clearly understand that the self of a person is non-existent. If self-grasping realises its object, that would mean that the self of a person would exist. In the same way if grasping at permanence of a vase realises its object, then that would mean that a vase was permanent. However we clearly understand that a vase is impermanent, therefore if we were grasping at the permanence of a vase we would be mistakenly engaging the object.

The cogniser understanding impermanent vase, having taken vase as its object, then realises the impermanence of vase. The grasping at permanent vase, after having taken vase as its object apprehends vase as being permanent. However this apprehension of permanent vase is a mistaken apprehension, which is confirmed by the correct apprehension of impermanent vase by the realiser understanding impermanent vase.

How many kinds of awareness are there?

Seven

What are those seven?

Direct, inferential, subsequent, wrong consciousness, doubt, correct assumptions, and a consciousness to which an object appears without being ascertained.

In that enumeration of seven kinds of awareness, how many awareness's are classified as being realisers?

Two

What about subsequent cognisers? Since you posit only two realisers, aren't subsequent cognisers realisers?

As a definition of a subsequent cogniser, the awareness realising the realised is posited. So how can you say that a subsequent cogniser is not a realiser?

What is the definition of a subsequent cogniser?

[Inaudible]

Is there a pervasion that, if it is a direct perception, it is a direct valid cogniser?

[Inaudible]

The eye consciousness apprehending a blue snow mountain is not a direct perception, because the definition of a direct perception is **an un-mistaken knower free from conception**. So a direct perception has to be an un-mistaken mind. The eye consciousness to which the blue snow mountain appears is not an un-mistaken mind.

We have already mentioned that in the Sautrantika tenet all direct perceptions are non-mistaken consciousnesses, and in the Mind-Only tenet there is no pervasion.

Which common locus do the Mind-Only assert between the

direct perception and the mistaken consciousness? Now we have gone to the Mind-Only tenet. As was mentioned the other day in the Mind-Only tenet, all sense direct perceptions in the continuum of an ordinary being are mistaken consciousnesses. That is because they are contaminated by the karmic potentials of ignorance, because of which they have the appearance of outer existence.

© *Tara Institute*

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

Mind and Awareness

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

17 August 2001

Please establish a virtuous motivation for listening to the teaching.

Last week we finished objects, mentioning the definition of objects, and then went on to object possessors. We gave the definition of object possessors, and said there were three divisions of object possessors: person, conscious awareness and expressive sound. We have finished the division of person. Then we said that clear and knowing is the definition of awareness, and that awareness has a two-fold division into awarenesses that are valid cognisers, and awarenesses that are not valid cognisers. Under the heading of valid cognisers, we reached the definition of direct perceptions. I am going to explain direct valid cognisers and inferential valid cognisers later.

2.2.1.1. Direct Perceptions (contd)

The definition of *direct perception is a non-mistaken knower free from conception*. Direct perception has a four-fold division into sense direct perception, mental direct perception, self-knower and yogic direct perception.

2.2.1.1a. Sense Direct Perception

Last time we said that the definition of *a sense direct perception is the unmistakable knower free from conception, which is generated in dependence upon the uncommon empowering condition of a physical sense power*. Sense direct perception again has a three-fold division into valid sense direct perception, subsequent sense direct perception and inattentive sense direct perception.

The first one, **valid sense direct cogniser**, has a five-fold division, into sense direct perception apprehending form, sound, smell, taste and tactile objects.

In this five-fold division into sense direct perception apprehending form, sound, smell and so forth, those five objects are referred to as the five objects of the desire realm. Beings of the desire realm are normally most attached to the five objects of the five sense direct perceptions.

The five sense direct perceptions are first of all generated upon the individual empowering condition of the five physical sense powers. In dependence upon the five physical sense powers, the individual consciousnesses engage each of those various objects of the desire realm. Through engaging those objects of the desire realm, various karmas and so forth are accumulated. Then one grasps at, and becomes attached to, those five objects of the desire realm.

Of those five sense direct perceptions, the first one is the sense direct perception apprehending form. The forms that we see with our eye consciousness are mainly

colours and shapes. Ear consciousness apprehends sounds and so forth. Those objects of the five sense consciousnesses are also referred to as sources. The objects of the eye consciousness, colour and shape, are referred to as the form source. Sound is referred to as the sound source, and there is also smell source, taste source and tactile source.

Why are those objects of the desire realm referred to as a source? It is because they are the doors through from which those various sense consciousnesses are generated or increased. In addition to the five physical sources there is also a source called the dharma source, which refers to the objects of mental consciousness. So altogether there are six sources, which act as the door through which the various consciousnesses are generated and increased.

Taking the sense direct perception apprehending form as an example, we will explain its **four conditions**: the causal condition, the empowering condition, the focal condition, and the immediately preceding condition. They are the same for all the other sense consciousnesses. So once we have understood these conditions in relation to the form consciousness, we can also apply them to the other consciousnesses.

In general all compounded phenomena have what we call **causal conditions**. In the case of sense direct perception apprehending form, the **uncommon empowering condition** refers to the eye sense power. This is because the definition of the sense direct perception apprehending form is the unmistakable knower, which is free from conception, and is generated in dependence upon the uncommon empowering condition of the eye sense power. Then we have the **focal condition**, which is form. The **immediately preceding condition** is a mental sense power, which acts as a cause for the eye consciousness to arise.

Here there are two empowering conditions, the mental sense power, which acts as one empowering condition, and the eye sense power, which is also an empowering condition. However the eye sense power is referred to as the uncommon empowering condition, while the mental sense power is a common empowering condition. For an empowering condition, all consciousnesses need to have a preceding moment of clear and knowing that can cause their own clear and knowing. This is the immediately preceding condition. Of the five sense consciousnesses, the eye sense power acts as the empowering condition only for the eye consciousness. Therefore it is referred to as the uncommon empowering condition.

Now we have covered all the conditions. There is the immediately preceding condition, which refers to a mental consciousness; just before the eye sense consciousness is generated. At that moment there is a moment of mental consciousness already paying attention towards the future object of form. This immediately preceding condition causes the clear and knowing of the eye consciousness. Then we have the focal condition, which is form itself. The focal condition is the main cause for the aspect in which the eye consciousness arises. The empowering condition

independently causes the eye consciousness. This concludes the conditions.

The five sense consciousnesses are based on the five physical sense powers. There is also the mental sense power. What is the function of the five physical sense powers? Their power is to cause a beautiful human body. Without a nose a person would be ugly. We might also ask, why do we have two eyes? It is because although it is enough that we can see with one eye, it would not look nice if you had only one eye! They are called sense powers, as their power is to cause a beautiful body.

The power of the eye consciousness and the ear consciousness is also to distinguish between beautiful and ugly forms, between pleasant and unpleasant forms or pleasant and unpleasant sounds. Those two sense powers distinguish between outer forms in this way. The other three sense powers, (physical, nose and tongue sense power), mainly deal with the objects that we need to sustain our physical body. That is their area of power.

The sixth power is the mental sense power. The mental sense power is very important because it is the sense power with the greatest power. This is because our actions of body and speech will follow our mental state. If we have a positive mental state, then the actions of body and speech will also be positive, and if we have a negative mental state, then the actions of body and speech will be negative. So the function of the mental sense power is to cause positive or negative actions of body and speech.

This completes sense direct perception, and we can now turn to mental direct perception.

2.2.1.1b. Mental Direct Perception

The definition of a *mental direct perception is a non-mistaken other knower, free from conception, which is generated upon its uncommon empowering condition of the mental sense power.*

That finishes mental direct perception!

Mental direct perception has a three-fold division into valid direct mental cogniser, subsequent mental cogniser and inattentive mental direct perception. An example for a **valid mental direct cogniser** is the first moment of the clairvoyance knowing the mind of others. The example for the **subsequent direct mental cogniser** is the second moment of the clairvoyance knowing the mind of others. An example for **inattentive mental direct perception** is the mental direct perception apprehending sound when some beautiful form distracts the mind. This concludes mental direct perception.

2.2.1.1c Self-Knowing Direct Perception

The third of the direct perceptions is *self-knowing direct perception*, the definition of which is *being in the unmistakable aspect of the apprehender, free from conception.*

Of the various Buddhist tenets the Vaibashikas don't accept self-knowers, the Sautrantikas accept self-knowers, the Mind-Only posit self-knowers, the Yogic Svatantrika-Madhyamika posit self-knowers. The

Svatantrika-Madhyamika don't posit self-knowers and also the Prasangika Madhyamika don't posit self-knowers.

The self-knower is a clear and knowing which knows only the subject and doesn't know the object. So the self-knower is an awareness that is directed only inwards. Directed only inwards means that it is directed only towards awareness, and not towards any other kind of object.

Every consciousness has two parts. One part of the clear and knowing knows the object, and there is another part of the clear and knowing which knows the subject, or the knower itself.

Some of the tenets, like the Vaibashika for example, assert that this is not possible. In the same way as a sharp knife cannot cut itself, they say, a mind cannot possibly know itself.

Those tenets positing a self-knower assert that, for example, there are two parts to the clear and knowing that is the eye consciousness. One part of the clear and knowing knows the object, the outer form. Then also, they say, there is another part of the clear and knowing which knows the eye consciousness itself. That is how the tenets positing a self-knower look at it.

The tenets that don't posit a self-knower say that perception comes about when the eye consciousness meets with the outer object of form. There is no part in the clear and knowing that knows the clear and knowing itself.

Those tenets that posit a self-knower give as their reason for positing a self-knower, that we have two types of memory. For example, in the case of the eye consciousness apprehending blue, we have the memory of the object blue. We also have a memory of the subject; we have a memory of the apprehension of blue itself. For the memory of the apprehension of blue itself to come about, one needs a self-knower, something that knows the apprehender.

Self-knowers also have a three-fold division into self-knowing valid cognisers, self-knowing subsequent cognisers and inattentive self-knowers. The example for a **self-knowing valid cogniser** is the self-knower which experiences the first moment of the eye consciousness apprehending form. The example for a **self-knowing subsequent cogniser** is the self-knower which experiences the second moment of the eye consciousness apprehending form.

There are various examples for **inattentive self-knowers**. The first two examples relate to self-knowers in the continuum of various mistaken tenet holders. Here the text refers to two Indian tenets, the Particularists (Veisesika) and the Hedonists (Kyangpenpas).

The Particularists don't accept that happiness is awareness. Since they don't accept that happiness is awareness, the self-knower who experiences the mental feeling of happiness becomes an inattentive self-knower.

The Kyangpempas don't accept the existence of inferential cognisers. Although they don't accept the existence of inferential cognisers in the continuum of

those tenet holders, they still have self-knowers who experience inferential cognisers. These become inattentive self-knowers. This is because the inferential cogniser appears to them, but it cannot be ascertained.

As a third example, one can give self-knowers who experience various kinds of mistaken awarenesses. The mistaken awarenesses will appear to that self-knower, but are not ascertained.

2.2.1.1d. Yogic Direct Perception

The fourth division of direct perceptions is yogic direct perception. The definition of *yogic direct perception* is a *non-mistaken other knower, free from conceptions, which is generated in dependence upon the uncommon empowering condition of the union of calm abiding and special insight*. The significance of saying 'other knower', in relation to yogic direct perception, (as we also did with the definition on mental direct perception), is to distinguish the self-knowing awarenesses from other knowers. Self-knowers focus only inwards, and the other ones are focussed outwards.

In the definition of the yogic direct perception the uncommon empowering condition is the union of calm abiding and special insight. So what does calm abiding mean? What does special insight mean?

Calm abiding is the concentration that can remain on the object of meditation for however long the meditator wishes, and which is held by the bliss of pliancy.

The definition of *special insight* is *the wisdom that is held by the bliss of pliancy, which is induced through analysis on the object while remaining in calm abiding.*

Calm abiding consists of two words 'calm' and 'abiding'. 'Calm' refers to the calming down of disturbing conceptual thoughts. Having calmed down the disturbing thoughts one can then 'abide' single pointedly, focussed inwards. When one reaches this state, the meditator can meditate for however long he or she wishes, and their mind will not be disturbed in any kind of way by mental excitement, or mental sinking.

In fact, of the nine stages of calm abiding, mental excitement is abandoned at the fifth stage, and mental sinking is abandoned at the sixth stage. The attainment of superior insight depends upon the attainment of calm abiding. Some people will not accept this but that is how it is!

For example a bodhisattva on the great Path of Accumulation will have attained calm abiding while focussing on emptiness. Then, through continuously meditating on this realisation of calm abiding focussing on emptiness and, as was explained, performing analysis on the object of emptiness while remaining in calm abiding, the bliss of pliancy is induced through the force of this analysis. The wisdom is being held by that bliss of pliancy. The meditator then progresses to the Path of Preparation and has attained superior insight into emptiness which is called the union of calm abiding and special insight focussing on emptiness.

Why is it called special insight? Because as mentioned in the definition it is an insight that has come about through the force of analysis. The understanding of

emptiness, which is generated while meditating mainly on calm abiding, is an insight that is generated through the force of abiding calmly. There is also another insight generated through the force of analysis, and that is called superior insight.

The bodhisattva, having reached the union of calm abiding and special insight, has progressed to the Path of Preparation. At this point the union of calm abiding and special insight is a conceptual understanding realizing emptiness with the help of a meaning generality.

Then through familiarising, when that realisation deepens, the meditator progresses along the Path of Preparation, until through the force of meditation, the meditator realises emptiness directly. He or she can see truth directly, and because they can see truth directly they have reached the Path of Seeing. At that time the meditator becomes what is called an Arya or superior being.

Until the last instant of the Path of Preparation the meditator is called an ordinary being. Then from the first moment of the Path of Seeing onwards, the meditator is a superior being. Some people ask, why are they called a superior being? It is because they are superior to beings on the Path of Preparation and below.

However I don't think that is the meaning. I think they are called a superior being, because from that moment onwards the meditator becomes superior to the self-grasping in his or her continuum. Until that moment, self-grasping was stronger and had the upper hand. From the Path of Seeing onwards, the realisation of emptiness completely has the upper hand over self-grasping, and therefore the meditator becomes superior towards self-grasping. As is mentioned in one quote, on the Path of Seeing, there is no throwing karma. From the Path of Seeing onwards the meditator will not generate any kind of throwing karma, because they have gained superiority over self-grasping.

The understanding you should generate here is that the wisdom realising selflessness has become the antidote to self-grasping. From this point the wisdom realising selflessness (the antidote against self-grasping), has been generated in the mind.

Direct yogic perception doesn't have a three-fold division like the other direct perceptions. It has only a two-fold division into direct yogic cognisers, and subsequent yogic cognisers. Yogic direct perceptions are always cognisers or realisers, realising their object. There is no inattentive yogic direct perception to which the object only appears, and is not realised.

An example for a **valid yogic cogniser** is the first moment of a yogic cogniser realising emptiness. An example for a **subsequent yogic cogniser** is the second moment of a yogic cogniser realising emptiness.

In relation to omniscient mind, both the first moment of omniscient mind and the second moment of omniscient mind are valid yogic cognisers. There are no omniscient minds that are subsequent yogic cognisers. All omniscient minds are valid yogic cognisers for the reason that the first moment of omniscient mind realises

its object through its own power, and therefore it becomes a valid yogic cogniser. The second moment of omniscient mind doesn't become a subsequent yogic cogniser, because its realisation of the various objects is not induced by the understanding of the various objects of the first moment.

For example in the case of the Path of Seeing, which is also a yogic cogniser realising emptiness directly at the level of the Bodhisattva on the Path of Seeing, the first moment that realises its object under its own power is a valid yogic cogniser. The second moment of the Path of Seeing, becomes a subsequent yogic cogniser. This is because the realisation of emptiness of the second moment of the path of seeing is induced by the first moment of the realisation of emptiness of the Path of Seeing. That is the difference between yogic cognisers on a learner's level and on the Buddha's level.

On the Buddha's level, the omniscient mind that is a yogic cogniser will always be a valid yogic cogniser. The second and third moments and so forth will always be valid yogic cognisers because their understanding of the object is not induced through the understanding of the first moment.

While the second moment of yogic cogniser on the learner's levels, such as the Path of Seeing, will be a subsequent yogic cogniser, because its understanding is induced through the understanding of the first moment. It doesn't come about through its own power.

2.2.1.1 Valid Direct Perceptions

The definition of a *valid direct perception is a newly incontrovertible knower free from conception*. Recall that the definition of a direct perception was a non-mistaken knower free from conception.

We can finish here; otherwise we will get too tired. Can some people go and get the tea.

Sometimes we have awarenesses that realise the object and awarenesses that don't realise the object. What is the difference?

One is a subsequent awareness, and the other is an inattentive awareness¹.

Please give an example for both a mind that realises its object, and an awareness that doesn't realise its object.

A mind that realises its object, is the first moment the mind looks at a cup. An example of an inattentive awareness is when I drive along the road and I don't notice the sky.

Your answer is correct. Inattentive awarenesses are awarenesses that don't realise the object, and the first moment of the eye consciousness understanding cup is an awareness that realises its object. You could also posit self-grasping as an example for a mind that does not realise its object, because it is a wrong mind. Wrong minds never realise their object. One could posit the wisdom realising selflessness as an example of a mind that realises its object.

One has to say that if the awareness is mistaken with regard to a particular object, then that awareness does not realise that object.

Is the conceptual thought apprehending a vase a mistaken awareness?

No

Because it is a conceptual thought?

It is mistaken in relation to its appearing object but not its observed object.

First we have to decide whether or not it is a mistaken awareness. After you have decided that, then one can move on to the next point. Do you agree that the conception apprehending a vase is a mistaken awareness?

If the meaning generality is presumed to be the vase, then it is mistaken.

The object is a vase, because the determined object is a vase isn't it?

It is a conceptual mind only.

The conception apprehending blue is of course not mistaken with regard to blue. It is mistaken with regard to the appearing object.

Here one has to make a small clarification because otherwise there will be a certain mistake coming up later. It is not mistaken with regard to the appearing object, but it is mistaken with regard to the part of the appearance of the meaning generality as the meaning. All conceptual thoughts are mistaken awarenesses, because they are mistaken with regard to the part of the meaning generality appearing as the meaning.

The Path of Preparation realising emptiness (which is a conceptual understanding) realises the meaning generality of emptiness, and therefore it is said that one mind can realise the two truths directly at the same time. At the same time, as a conceptual thought, it is a mistaken awareness. Why is it a mistaken awareness? It is because it is mistaken with regard to the part of the appearance of the meaning generality as the meaning.

Just because conceptual thoughts are mistaken awarenesses, doesn't mean that they don't realise their object. For example the inferential cogniser realising impermanent sound is mistaken with regard to the part of the appearance of the meaning generality as the meaning. However it is still non-mistaken with regard to the object of engagement (which is synonymous with the determined object), which is impermanent sound. Then of course there is the special case of the Prasangika, where it is said that all minds are valid cognizers with regards to their own appearance.

Because of the lack of time, we won't go through the various debates mentioned in the text, which are actually very important. This is because the various points brought up in the debates deepen our understanding. Debate will also generate new ideas, and generate and then clear up doubts. You should debate.

When one debates another, the first person asks the other a question and will be given a perfectly reasonable

¹ Ed: As was the case last week, text in italics is audience response, and normal typeface is that spoken by Geshe-la.

explanation. Then one asks them a further question and then it becomes more difficult, and if one asks a third or fourth question then it becomes more and more difficult for the other. So the process of debate deepens our understanding, because we ask questions and have to generate new answers.

What is the definition of a person?

The 'I' which is imputed on the five aggregates.

How many synonyms do we have for 'I'?

Self and being.

So self exists?

Not inherently.

But the self exists doesn't it?

Actually this tenet accepts an inherently existent person. Only the Prasangikas make the distinction between whether or not the person inherently exists, and then make a decision on selflessness based on that distinction. Of course in the lower tenets there can be some debate about whether or not the self is self-characterised.

So we have the self and we have a person. Why can't we have the self of a person?

If you can find it you can have it, but you can't find it.

But we can find the self.

Where?

You say, 'I'm going' or 'I am'. The view that we cannot find the meaning that has been imputed at the time of analysis is an assertion specific to the Prasangika.

We do say, ordinarily, that self exists, and that it says, 'I go', 'I am', and so forth.

The lower tenets assert that one has to be able to find something at the time of searching for the imputed meaning. As Bhavaviveka asserted, 'On the basis of the mental consciousness one can generate a very good understanding'. What this quote means is on the base of mental consciousness one can understand the self.

There are differences between some of the tenets as to what is used as the of imputation for the self. The lower tenets assert that the basis of imputation can be found at the time of analysis. Therefore they won't accept the special point of view of the Prasangika, which says that we can never find the imputed meaning at the time of analysis. The point of difference is whether one can find the basis of imputation at the time of analysis. The lower tenets say one can find it and the Prasangika say one cannot. For that reason, the Prasangikas assert the unfindability of the imputed meaning at the time of analysis, and the lower tenets assert the find ability of the imputed meaning at the time of analysis.

For example, if the Mind-Only are asked where the person be found, they will say that the Mind-Basis-of-All is the person. This type of awareness, which acts as the basis for all the virtuous and non-virtuous karmic potentials, is the person. That is what we find as the person if we look for it.

The Prasangikas will posit as the person the 'mere I'. The Prasangikas will not assert any type of awareness as

an example for the 'I', but they do posit the 'mere I'. So where is the 'mere I'?

It arises on the basis of the five aggregates.

No. You have to posit the 'I'.

The mere I?

We have gone down to the lower tenets. I mean the 'I'. We all are 'I', so where is this 'I'.

The whole body

In the mind

So is it OK to say that consciousness is the 'I'?

No, the 'I' arises in the mind.

What I posit as the 'I', is the object in dependence upon which the thought 'I' arises. So when we think 'I am', the basis upon which this thought arises is the 'I'. This thought, 'I am' does not arise in dependence upon consciousness. It does not arise in dependence of having focussed on the consciousness, or on the physical form. This thought, 'I am' arises after having focussed on the 'I'. That is the final view of the Madhyamika Prasangikas!

We generate thoughts of 'my body' and 'my mind', but we do not think of the body or the mind as 'I'. The thought 'I am' arises only in relation to the 'I'.

This object, the basis on which this thought, 'I am' is directed, and the basis upon which it is generated, is the 'I'.

So where is the 'I'?

The 'I' is related to the body.

But where is it?

The various ways that the thought 'I am' can arise are in relation to the body, to the mind, to our name. For example if somebody asks us, 'Who are you?' then we say, 'I am such and such'. Or we hear our name and we think, 'That is who I am.'

Then we also have the thought 'I am' which is not related to any of those objects. We have a thought that thinks, 'I am', or grasps at 'I am', and which does not arise in relation to the name, or the body or the mind. This is the thought thinking, 'I am', which arises unrelated to those objects, and which goes from life to life. If the thought thinking, 'I am', always arose in relation to our name, our mind or our body, then when we die there would be no continuity of self. But the self still continues, because there is a thought thinking 'I am', which arises unrelated to those various objects. The object, which is the basis to which this thought 'I am' refers, is the 'I'.

We have these different ways in which the thought 'I am' can arise in relation to the name of this life, or the body and the mind. But unrelated to the name of this life, or the body and so forth, we also have this thought, 'I am', which wants happiness, wants to be free from suffering, is experiencing the various sufferings and so forth. One can use this also as a reasoning to prove past and future lives. If there was the thought 'I am' that arises only in relation to the basis of this life, that would posit certain difficulties when we are born. Where do all

those other kinds of thoughts thinking, 'I am', which are unrelated to the basis of this life, come from?

That is the way one has to debate.

To conclude, we have a person, and we have a self, but we don't have the self of a person. We do not have a self of a person, because at the time of this tenet, the self of a person is the self that is self-supporting in terms of being substantially existent. The self that is self-supporting and a substantially existent at this time is the object of negation of selflessness. That is what we call the self of a person.

© *Tara Institute*

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

Mind and Awareness

Commentary by the Venerable Geshe Doga

Translated by the Venerable Tenzin Dongak

24 August 2001

Please try to generate a virtuous motivation, if possible the motivation of Bodhicitta. If that is not possible at least generate the motivation thinking that, 'I am going to listen to these teachings in order to clarify my ignorance'. In order to clarify our ignorance, we need to develop wisdom and understanding. In particular, to clarify the ignorance of true grasping, we need to identify exactly what true grasping is.

When listening to the teachings please develop either one of these two motivations.

2.2.1.1 Direct Valid Cogniser

Last week we talked about direct valid cognisers. The definition of a *direct valid cogniser* is **a newly incontrovertible knower, free from conception.**

The difference between direct valid cogniser and a direct perception, was that a direct valid cogniser has to be both new and incontrovertible, while a direct perception does not have to be new or incontrovertible, but it does have to be unmistakable.

We have already mentioned the four-fold division of direct valid cognisers, which are sense direct valid cognisers, mental direct valid cognisers, self-knowing direct cognisers, and yogic direct cognisers.

2.2.1.1c Self Knowing Valid Cogniser¹

The definition of a *self-knowing valid cogniser* is **a newly incontrovertible knower, which is single and focuses only inwards.** Focussing only inwards refers to the fact that self-knowers have only awareness as their object. They don't take other phenomena as their object. It is single, because it is not concomitant with a main-mind, and there is no main-mind concomitant with it. It is also, of course, free from conception and newly incontrovertible.

Of the various Buddhist tenets, the Vaibashikas and the Prasangikas don't assert self-knowers, whereas the Sautrantikas, the Cittamatrins and the Yogic Svatantrika-Madhyamikas do assert self-knowers.

2.2.1.1a Sense Direct Valid Cogniser

The definition of a *sense direct valid cogniser* is **a newly incontrovertible knower, free from conception, which is generated in dependence upon its uncommon condition of a physical sense power.** We talked last week about the physical sense power, and why it is uncommon. It is uncommon because out of the five sense consciousnesses it acts only as the empowering condition for the individual consciousness it is causing, and is not shared with the other sense consciousnesses. There is also the common empowering condition, which is a mental sense power. The mental sense power is shared as an empowering condition by all the sense direct valid cognisers.

A sense direct valid cogniser has a five-fold division into direct sense cogniser apprehending form, sound, smell, taste and tangibles.

The five objects of the five sense direct cognisers are also referred to as the five qualities of the desire realm. This is

because these five objects are the main objects of desire of the beings living within the desire realm.

Sense direct valid cognisers are incontrovertible knowers, which means that they realise their object. This means that they understand the object exactly in the way it exists. This is a very important point to understand. It is also important to know the difference between a sense direct valid cogniser apprehending form, sound, smell and so forth, (the qualities of the desire realm), and the desire which craves these objects of the desire realm. This is because the various delusions exaggerate the object. Instead of understanding the object as it is, they exaggerate the object, putting something there that is not actually there. Knowing this difference is very important.

2.2.1.1b Mental Direct Valid Cogniser

The definition of a *mental direct valid cogniser* is **a newly incontrovertible knower, free from conception, which is generated in dependence upon its uncommon empowering condition of a mental sense power.** A direct mental valid cogniser has a six-fold division, which we can understand in relation to the six sources.

The first five sources refer to the five objects (also belonging to the sense direct cogniser), of form, sound, smell, taste and tangibles, which are here referred to as the form source, sound source, smell source, taste source and tangible source.

- ∞ The definition of *form source* is **that which is to be held by the eye consciousness.**
- ∞ The definition of *sound source* is **that which is to be heard by the ear consciousness.**
- ∞ The definition of *smell source* is **that which is experienced by the nose consciousness.**
- ∞ The definition of *taste source* is **that which is experienced by the taste consciousness.**
- ∞ The definition of *tactile source* is **that which is experienced by the body consciousness.**

In addition to these five sources, we have what is called the dharma source, or phenomena source. So there is a six-fold division of direct mental cognisers, with regard to these six objects.

If we elaborate a little in relation to these six sources, we have twelve sources, six sources relating to the object, and six sources relating to the sense powers, (the five physical sense powers and the mental sense power). This can be elaborated further into what is called the eighteen spheres. These eighteen spheres can be divided into three families: the family of sense power, the family of the object, and the family of consciousness. So we have six sense powers, six kinds of objects and six types of consciousness, which constitute the eighteen spheres.

2.2.1.1d Yogic Direct Valid Cogniser

The definition of a *yogic direct valid cogniser* is **a newly incontrovertible other knower in the continuum of an Arya being, which is generated in dependence upon the empowering condition of the union of calm abiding and special insight, and realises subtle impermanence, coarse or subtle selflessness.**

The empowering condition of a yogic direct valid cogniser, the union of calm abiding and special insight, was explained last week.

Subtle impermanence refers to the momentary nature of compounded phenomena. Subtle impermanence is not a glass breaking or person dying. Rather, it refers to the non-abiding and momentary changing nature of phenomena.

¹ This section is a review of last week's teaching but in a different order. The numbering of last week has been retained for cross referencing.

This we can gradually understand by meditating on it, and then slowly, slowly, we can gain a more and more subtle understanding of subtle impermanence.

We have the idea that we are permanent - that we are the same person today that we were yesterday. Actually we are changing second by second, and moment by moment. A clock is very useful for the meditating on impermanence, because one hour has sixty minutes, and one minute has sixty seconds. Once the first second has passed, the hour has already finished. From that point of view a clock is very useful when meditating on impermanence. The clock is also very useful because we see how the second arm is going round and round, not standing still even for one moment. That is also how we are changing moment by moment.

Coarse impermanence is, for example, the breaking of a vase, or the breaking of the glass, whereas the momentary nature of the glass or the vase is subtle impermanence. The absence of a permanent, single independent self is coarse selflessness and the absence of a self-sufficient substantially existent person is the subtle selflessness of a person.

The text says that a yogic direct valid cogniser has to be a newly incontrovertible knower. Here 'newly' is used to eliminate subsequent cognisers from being considered as yogic direct valid cognisers. A yogic direct valid cogniser is not an awareness that has already been realised, but it is a new and fresh knower, and it exists in the continuum of an Arya being.

An Arya being is a person who has realised selflessness directly. Once one realises selflessness directly, one becomes an Arya being, and so one becomes the actual Sangha refuge. Out of the three refuge objects, the Sangha refuge refers to people who have realised selflessness directly.

Realising selflessness directly means realising selflessness without the medium of a meaning generality. If we realise an object directly without the medium of a meaning generality, that doesn't necessarily mean that we have realised it clearly. As we mentioned before, we can realise an object directly in two modes. An object can be realised directly implicitly, and an object can be realised directly explicitly, or directly clearly.

We can observe from our own experience that when we first meditate on a subject such as impermanence or selflessness, it will not appear very clearly to our mind. Then as our meditation progresses, we get a clearer mental image of the object of our meditation. If we continue to meditate, then through the force of familiarisation with the object of meditation, at some point we will realise the object 'in the raw', or directly.

This is the way one attains the omniscient mind of a buddha. Our consciousness has a quality of 'being suitable to be made familiar with the object of meditation'. If we engage with the object of meditation with effort, trying to make our mind familiar with it, there is no question that the mind will become familiar with the object of meditation, that we will generate realisations and an omniscient mind.

There is a three-fold division of yogic direct *valid* cogniser into yogic direct *valid* cogniser realising subtle impermanence, yogic direct *valid* cogniser realising course selflessness and a yogic direct *valid* cogniser realising subtle selflessness. In the definition of yogic direct *valid* cogniser it mentions 'other knower' rather than 'knower'. This is to show that there is no common base between a yogic direct *valid* cogniser and a self-knower. For example in the definition of valid cogniser, an other knower is not mentioned. This is because there is a common base between

a valid cogniser and a self-knower, and there is a common base between a direct perception and a self-knower. However in order to show that there is no common base between a yogic direct *valid* cogniser and a self-knower, 'other knower' is included in the definition. Yogic cognisers are always paths.

Here we complete the chapter on direct perception.

2.2.2 False Direct Perception

The definition of a *false direct perception* is a *knower mistaken with regards to its appearing object*. False direct perception and a mistaken awareness are synonymous. False direct perception has a two-fold division into conceptual and non-conceptual. There are six conceptual false direct perceptions, and one non-conceptual false direct perception.

2.2.2.1 Conceptual False Direct Conception

1. The first conceptual false direct perception is a **mistaken conception**. An example would be grasping at permanent sound.

2. The second is **conventional conception**. An example is an inferential cogniser realising impermanent sound.

3. The **conception apprehending the reason**. This refers to the substantial cause of an inferential cogniser. It is a conception remembering simultaneously the three modes of the perfect reason, which is the base for the generation of the inferential cogniser. A conception remembering simultaneously the three modes, is the definition of the conception apprehending the reason. This conception exists just before the inferential cogniser is generated, and is the substantial cause for the inferential cogniser.

4. The **conception induced through the inferential cogniser**. An example is the second moment of the inferential cogniser understanding impermanent sound. The subsequent cogniser comes after the inferential cogniser.

5. The fifth is **memory**, which are conceptions remembering that which has been previously realised.

6. The sixth one is the **conceptual mind looking towards the future**, thinking that, 'In the future I am going to do this or that'. For example thinking that in the future I want to get one hundred million dollars. Whether we will get it or not, from time to time everybody thinks how nice it would be to have that much money.

We have two kinds of thoughts, one remembering what happened in the past, and the other thinking about and making different kinds of plans for the future. It is very important to understand the psychological impact of those concepts on our mind and our life. For example, maybe something bad happened in the past. Even though it is completely finished and just a mere reflection appearing in our mind, when we remember it, the past gives us suffering, worry and so forth.

It is the same with regard to the future. We worry very much about the future and, for example, how much longer are we going to live. Then, if we can expect to live for so many years, will our money going to last for all of those years? Actually we don't know how many more years we are going to live.

In this way, we create needless mental suffering for ourselves by remembering useless things from the past, or thinking in that way about the future.

It is very important to understand the impact of our conceptual thinking on our life. There is a certain kind of

person who is very direct. If they want to achieve something they will just go straight ahead and do it. Another person won't engage in any actions to achieve what they want, but they will spend lots of time worrying about it. Through spending most of their time worrying, they create lots of unhappiness for themselves.

If we have enough merit then there is no need to worry about our livelihood. Somebody who has enough merit will always have enough on which to live. Then there is no need to worry. Without enough merit then in the morning you might have lots of money and be very happy, and in the evening you might end up as a beggar with many, many debts. If people have enough merit they don't worry too much about the future, and they can live comfortably from day to day with enough to sustain them.

If on the other hand we constantly worry and think about the things that make our mind unhappy, then it causes mental unhappiness, and that is not what we need. Everybody needs a happy mind. It is better, therefore, to remain in a healthy and happy mental state. If we worry too much, thinking about things that make our mind unhappy, then we may not see the good things that are right in front of us.

Some people are worriers, and regardless of their situation they will always worry. They will worry whether or not they have money; if they have lots of money they will worry; if they have a nice family they will worry; if they have a good car they will worry. So they worry all the time. That comes about through having established a mental pattern, and it causes them a lot of additional suffering.

Habitual worriers start to think of their mental suffering as *my* suffering. They even argue, 'It's not *your* suffering, it's *my* suffering', with their friends. They say 'It is such a strong habit in my mind. I am completely overwhelmed by it, and I cannot free myself from these strong mental patterns'. In this way they put themselves in the losing role. They have already decided that they cannot free themselves from their mental patterns, and that those mental patterns are stronger than they are. Then they start to think of them as 'my problems' and then it becomes very difficult to change their mind.

There was a geshe who came from Tibet with some of his students, one of whom was also a geshe. When they were walking the geshe started to worry about how they would find food and so forth. Then one of his students said to him, 'Look you don't have to worry about food and so forth. We are walking towards a certain country, and whatever they eat there, we will have for food. We will definitely get there, and then once we are there, there will be food. So there is no need to worry.' Then this geshe said, 'Today I received a very good teaching from my companion.'

2.2.2.2 Non-Conceptual False Direct Perception

False direct perception has a two-fold division into sense false direct perception and mental false direct perception.

The definition has been mentioned above.

False sense direct perception has various divisions depending upon how the fault comes about.

1. First of all the fault can lie within the **base of the sense power**. If there is a certain fault within the eye, then through that fault a person can have double vision; instead of seeing one moon, they see two moons. Sometimes we can't see the letters very clearly when we read, because of a fault in our sense power.

2. In another instance, the fault comes about through

conditions in the place. For example when we are travelling in a boat, even though the banks of the river, and the people and the trees are stationary, it can appear to us as if they are moving, and we are standing still. This kind of mistaken appearance comes about because of place.

3. In the third instance, the fault comes about through the **object**. For example if we have a firebrand which we are whirling around very fast, then it appears to the eye consciousness as if there is actually a wheel of fire. This comes through the object, and there is no fault within the eye sense power.

4. In another instance the fault lies within the **immediately preceding condition** of the eye consciousness. For example it is said that to somebody who is under the very strong influence of anger, the environment etc. appears as red! We can see that such a person is already very red in the face.

This ends the chapter of false direct perception and we go to the next point, direct inferential cognisers.

2.2.3 Inferential Valid Cognisers

The definition of a *inferential valid cogniser* is a *newly incontrovertible, other knower, generated directly in dependence upon its base, which is a valid reason*. As we can see in the definition, inferential valid cognisers are generated through inference, by depending upon valid reasons. For example, by depending upon the sign of smoke on a smoky mountain path, one can infer that there has to be fire on the smoky mountain path. In addition, the inferential *valid* cogniser understanding impermanent sound can be generated upon the reason of sound being produced. From being produced we can infer that it has to be impermanent. In the definition it says that the inferential valid cogniser has to be generated directly from the reason. Inferential valid cognisers have no common base with self knowers as indicated by other knower in the definition.

Inferential valid cogniser has a three-fold division into inferential cogniser through fact, renown and faith.

2.2.3.1 Inferential Valid Cogniser Through Fact

An example for the inferential valid cogniser through fact would be the inferential valid cogniser understanding impermanent sound through the reason of product. These phenomena such as impermanence, selflessness and so forth can be understood through the reason of fact.

2.2.3.2 Inferential Valid Cogniser Through Renown

An example for the inferential valid cogniser through renown would be the inferential valid cogniser realising that a moon is suitable to be called a rabbit possessor, or the home of a rabbit, by depending upon the reason that it is an object of conceptual thought. One of the many Tibetan names for moon is the word that is translated as rabbit possessor. In the English language we also have various names for various objects. One of the Tibetan names for moon is translated as rabbit possessor, because one can see the shape of a rabbit in the moon. An inferential valid cogniser through renown, is always an inferential valid cogniser by fact.

2.2.3.3 Inferential Valid Cogniser Through Faith

An example for the third inferential *valid* cogniser, inferential *valid* cogniser through faith, is the inferential cogniser realising that the quotation, 'From generosity comes wealth, and from morality a higher rebirth', is incontrovertible with regard to its meaning. This is obtained in dependence upon the reason of being a quotation free from the three contradictions. By understanding that this quotation, which states that, 'From generosity comes wealth

and from morality a higher rebirth', is free from the three contradictions, then one can realise that the meaning expressed in that quotation is incontrovertible or true. One will realise that indeed from generosity comes wealth, and from morality a higher rebirth.

Phenomena such as impermanence or selflessness can be understood by depending upon factual reasons. For example, we can understand that something is impermanent by applying the reason of it being a product, or by applying the reason of it being momentary. We can understand something as being empty of true existence by applying the reason that it is neither a truly existent 'one', nor a truly existent 'many'.

However if we try to understand that from generosity comes wealth and from morality a higher rebirth there is not really a factual reason we can give. This is because the meaning expressed here, the cause and effect karmic relationship between generosity and wealth, is a very hidden phenomena that we have to understand in dependence upon scripture that is free from the three contradictions. Depending upon this reason of the scripture being free of the three contradictions we can understand that the scripture is incontrovertible with regard to what it expresses. Maybe we will go into this in more detail next time.

Briefly, with regard to the quotation being free from the three contradictions, if something is expressed in the scriptures then it has to fall into one of the three categories of objects of knowledge. It will be a manifest object of knowledge, a slightly hidden object of knowledge, or a very hidden object of knowledge.

Whether or not those three objects of knowledge expressed in the scripture are true is determined by the three kinds of valid cognisers – direct valid cogniser, inferential valid cogniser by fact and inferential valid cogniser through belief. For example, if the manifest phenomena expressed in a certain statement is wrong, as in, 'It is said that a certain flower is blue', but it says somewhere that this flower is actually not blue and has a different colour, then this will be contradicted by our direct valid cogniser. This direct valid cogniser can see very clearly that the flower is not that colour.

In the same way if a scripture states that sound is permanent (and maybe there are some that do), then this can be contradicted by an inferential valid cogniser. If it says somewhere that from generosity no wealth will come then that can be contradicted too.

Whether or not there is a discrepancy between reality and what is stated in the scripture, has to be analysed with these three kinds of valid cognisers. In the same way, when we buy gold we will first test the gold through rubbing, cutting and burning. Only after we have assured ourselves that it is really gold, will we buy it. In the same way we have to analyse a scripture using those three kinds of valid cognisers. Once the scripture has passed the test then it is categorised as being free from the three contradictions. Next time we will go onto that in more detail.

We said that scripture is free from the three contradictions, not being contradicted by the three kinds of valid cognisers. The Buddha said that, 'One should analyse my teachings with the help of direct valid cognisers, inferential valid cognisers through fact, and inferential valid cognisers through belief. The manifest phenomena, expressed in my teachings, can be analysed with a direct valid cogniser.' That is the easiest one, because with our direct perception

we can immediately see whether something expressed in a scripture is contradicted by reality or not. For example if somebody says that this tablecloth is not yellow then immediately we will see that the statement is incorrect. That would correspond to burning gold before buying it, because it is explained that when we burn gold the coarse impurities are very obvious.

Then one has to analyse the slightly hidden phenomena expressed in the scriptures with the help of inferential cognisers through fact. This would correspond to cutting the gold, through which one can find more subtle impurities.

Finally, one has to analyse the very hidden phenomena expressed in the scriptures with inferential cognisers through belief. This corresponds to testing the gold through rubbing, through which one can understand the subtlest impurities within the gold. The Buddha explained that only after one has found his teachings to be free from the three contradictions, with the help of the three inferential cognisers, should one accept the teachings. 'You shouldn't just accept the teachings because I am the Buddha,' he said.

The verse from the Sutras says, 'If you analyse my teachings in the same way you analyse gold before buying it, and accept my teachings only after that analysis, in the same way you would buy gold only after you are convinced of its purity, that is something which will make me very happy'.

Only after we have convinced ourselves through the three tests that the material is really the precious substance called gold, will we buy it. In the same way, only after we have found out that the dharma is really a precious teaching, which it is said to be through the three kinds of analysis, do we accept it.

© *Tara Institute*

Note on authentication

Transcribed from the tape by Sharon Holley

Edit 1: Adair Bunnnett

Edit 2: Ven Tenzin Dongak

Edit 3: Adair Bunnnett

Check & edit: Ven Tenzin Dongak

Mind and Awareness

Commentary by the Venerable Geshe Doga

Translated by the Venerable Tenzin Dongak

31 August 2001

Please generate a virtuous motivation thinking, 'I have to eliminate my ignorance for the benefit of all sentient beings, and for this purpose I have to generate the antidote, which is wisdom.'

2.2.3. Inferential Valid Cognisers (cont)

2.2.3.3. Inferential Valid Cognisers Through Faith

Last week we started [discussing] inferential valid cognisers, which have a three-fold division into inferential valid cognisers through the force of fact, renown and belief.

We said that the sign of an inferential valid cogniser through belief is a quotation free from the three contradictions. The quote stating, 'From generosity comes wealth, and from morality a higher rebirth', is incontrovertible with regard to its meaning, because it is a quote which is free from the three contradictions.

'From generosity comes wealth, and from morality a higher rebirth', is a quote free from the three contradictions. Because it is a quote free from the three contradictions, it is incontrovertible with regard to its meaning, which means that what it expresses is true. There is no discrepancy between what is expressed in that quote, and reality. The object being established by this reason, is a very hidden phenomena, and because it is a very hidden phenomena, it has to be established in dependence upon a quotation [from the teachings].

The inferential cogniser understanding that sound is impermanent realises impermanent sound, which is a hidden phenomena. A hidden phenomena can be understood in dependence upon various kinds of reasons. These include saying that, 'Sound is impermanent because it is a product', or other kinds of reasons which are accessible. Of course, sometimes people can hear a sound and sometimes not, but generally the facts are easily accessible and can be proven through various reasons. However, when we try to prove, 'From generosity comes wealth', one doesn't have many avenues of reason. The only thing one can say is, 'It is so because it is stated like that in the teachings of the Buddha'.

There are various reasons we can employ to understand that sound is impermanent. For example, if we go to a football game, it is very obvious that at certain times everybody cheers, and at other times it is quieter. So it is very obvious that sound is impermanent. Also when the people who cheered a lot at the football game come home, they have lost their voice. So we can see [for ourselves] that sound is impermanent.

When we try to understand very hidden phenomena such as the cause and effect relationship between generosity and wealth, then we have to depend upon a quotation of the teachings. The way one understands this quotation to be free from the three contradictions, and [therefore] incontrovertible, is by first understanding the hidden phenomena that are expressed in the teachings of the Buddha, such as impermanence, selflessness, liberation and so forth. Having understood those profound subjects, one will understand that the very hidden phenomena expressed in the teachings of the Buddha are also incontrovertible. This is stated in a quote by Dharmakirti, 'At first one realises the main teaching, (where 'main' refers to impermanence, selflessness and so forth), and from that one generates faith in the very hidden aspects of the Buddha's teachings.'

Impermanence and selflessness can be realised through

reasoning. By depending upon valid reasoning we can establish those phenomena such as impermanence and selflessness, and in this way realise them with valid cognition.

For a practitioner of sharp faculty it will be necessary, even when going for refuge, to establish the objects of refuge through establishing such phenomena as impermanence and selflessness. By depending upon such reasons as, 'Compounded phenomena are impermanent because they are generated through causes and conditions', or 'A person is empty of a self because it is empty of a single self, or many selves', the practitioner can understand that compounded phenomena are impermanent, and that a person is empty of a self.

Having established these two phenomena, the practitioner then understands that the grasping at compounded phenomena as permanent, and the grasping at the self of a person, are wrong minds, and mistaken with regard to their apprehended object. Once one has generated this understanding of selflessness, one understands that grasping the self of a person is a wrong mind, and can be purified from the mental continuum. Then one understands that liberation and enlightenment are possible.

After establishing that liberation is possible, by understanding that grasping at the self of a person is a wrong mind, one understands that if one purifies ones mind of the karmic imprints of self-grasping and completes the accumulation of merit, it is possible to also attain enlightenment.

First one establishes the delusions, particularly self-grasping, as suitable to be removed from the mind, and through this establishes that liberation is possible. Then one takes it a step further, and establishes that one can purify the mind from the karmic imprints of self-grasping, and by completing the accumulation of merit one can attain complete enlightenment.

We can establish impermanence, selflessness, liberation and enlightenment through reasoning. As just explained, through reasoning we can prove impermanence and selflessness, and through this we can prove liberation, and through this we can prove enlightenment. All these phenomena can be proved through reasoning.

Without relying on scripture, one can purify the karmic imprints from the mind, one can complete the accumulation of merits and so forth. Having done this, one has established what is referred to as the root meaning in the quotation of Dharmakirti, where it says, 'Having established the root meaning, then one will generate faith'. Then one has established the teachings of the Buddha as incontrovertible.

After establishing impermanence, selflessness, liberation and then enlightenment we have established that the teachings of the Buddha, which teach these phenomena, are incontrovertible. Once we have established these teachings as incontrovertible, then automatically the teachings of the Buddha that express what is called highest status (meaning higher rebirth within cyclic existence and such phenomena as 'from generosity comes wealth' and so forth), will also be established in the mind as incontrovertible. Once one has established the teachings expressing higher status as incontrovertible, one establishes the Buddha as a 'valid being'. This is the sequence.

Because the Buddha taught after having realised those teachings [for himself], he expresses them incontrovertibly. So we realise that what the Buddha taught is incontrovertible, and from that one understands that the Buddha is a valid being.

The Buddha is a valid being. There is also valid speech and valid consciousness. Valid speech is the teaching on the Four Noble Truths, and a valid consciousness we know already. A valid cogniser has a two-fold division into direct valid cognisers and inferential valid cognisers. This comes about through the two-fold division of objects of comprehension into manifest objects of comprehension, and hidden objects of comprehension.

Because objects of comprehension have a two-fold division, we only need two valid cognisers. Direct valid cognisers understand manifest objects of comprehension. The meaning of manifest objects of comprehension is an object that can be realised without first depending upon inference or reasoning. If we initially need to depend upon reason in order to understand an object, the object is a hidden object. Since objects of comprehension have a two-fold division, the minds that understand objects of comprehension also need just a two-fold division into direct valid cognisers and inferential valid cognisers. Having only one valid cogniser would not be sufficient, and having three or four would be too many.

For example, blue is a manifest object. We don't need to depend upon reasoning to realise blue. We can understand blue by merely looking at blue. However we need to depend upon reasoning when we first try to understand impermanence of blue. We will not be able to understand impermanence of blue merely by looking at blue. We need to infer that blue is impermanent, by depending upon perfect reason. That completes valid cognisers and then we go on to awarenesses that aren't valid cognisers.

3. Awarenesses which are Non-Prime Cognisers

The definition of *an awareness that is not a valid cogniser is a knower that is not newly incontrovertible.*

Awarenesses that are not valid cognisers have a five-fold division into subsequent cognisers, correct assumptions, a mind to which the object appears but is not ascertained, doubt and wrong consciousness. To these we add the two-fold division of valid cognisers and then we have the seven-fold division of awareness.

3.1. Subsequent Cognisers

The definition of *a subsequent cogniser is a knower which realises the realised.* 'Realising the realised' means that a subsequent cogniser realises that which has already been realised by the preceding valid cogniser. The meaning is not that the subsequent cogniser merely understands what a preceding mind has understood. Rather the meaning one has to understand is that a subsequent cogniser is induced through the realisation of the preceding valid cogniser.

There are other minds, like the various subsequent moments of omniscient mind, that of course understand what has been understood by the preceding moment of omniscient mind. However they are not induced through the force of that preceding moment of omniscient mind. With omniscient mind we have to understand that each moment of omniscient mind is a valid cogniser. Each valid cogniser is followed by another valid cogniser, and so forth. The realisation of each following omniscient mind is not induced through the realisation of the preceding moment of omniscient mind.

Subsequent cognisers have a three-fold division into non-conceptual subsequent cogniser, conceptual subsequent cogniser and subsequent cognisers that are neither.

3.1.1. Non-Conceptual Subsequent Cogniser

Examples for non-conceptual valid cognisers are the second moments of the various direct perceptions such as sense direct perception, mental direct perception, self-knower and yogic direct perception.

1. An example for **a non-conceptual subsequent cogniser that is a sense direct perception** is the second moment of the eye consciousness apprehending blue. The first moment of the eye consciousness apprehending blue is a sense valid cogniser, and the second moment is a sense valid subsequent cogniser.
2. An example for **a non-conceptual subsequent cogniser that is a mental direct perception** is the second moment of the clairvoyance knowing the consciousness of others.
3. An example for **a non-conceptual subsequent cogniser that is**

a self-knower is all the various self-knowers experiencing the various other direct perceptions and consciousnesses, such as the self-knowers which are experiencing sense direct perception, mental direct perception and so forth. The second moments of each of those self-knowers which are experiencing sense direct perception, mental direct perception and so forth are subsequent cognisers.

4. An example for **a non-conceptual subsequent cogniser that is a yogic direct perception** is the second moment of the path of seeing. The first moment of the path of seeing is a yogic direct valid cogniser and the second moment is a yogic direct subsequent cogniser.

5. We also have an example of a non-conceptual subsequent cogniser, which is none of those four divisions, which is the second moment of direct perception. The second moment of direct perception is also a non-conceptual subsequent cogniser but it is not a sense direct subsequent cogniser, nor a mental direct subsequent cogniser, nor a self-knowing subsequent cogniser, nor a yogic subsequent cogniser.

Here we have the first two moments of the path of seeing. The first moment of the path of seeing is referred to as the uninterrupted path of seeing. The second moment is referred to as the liberated path of seeing. The uninterrupted path of seeing is the direct antidote to the abandonments of the path of seeing. From the second moment, when one reaches the liberated path of seeing, one has attained the abandonment of the objects of abandonment of the path of seeing. One has generated the truth of cessation within one's mind. When we reach the liberated path of seeing we attain the truth of cessation, which has abandoned the objects of abandonment of the path of seeing.

The sequence is, first one attains the uninterrupted path of seeing. The uninterrupted path of seeing is the direct antidote, which purifies the mind from the abandonments of the path of seeing. Once that purification has happened, and those obscurations have been purified from the mind, at the second moment one reaches what is called the liberated path of seeing. At that moment one is liberated from the objects of abandonment of the path of seeing. When one is liberated from the objects of abandonment of the path, one has attained the truth of cessation, which has abandoned the objects of abandonment of the path of seeing.

3.1.2. Conceptual Subsequent Cogniser

A conceptual subsequent cogniser is the second moment of the inferential cogniser.

What do you posit as a non-conceptual subsequent cogniser?

The second moment of a sense perception, apprehending blue.

With regard to conceptual subsequent cognisers we have a two-fold division into conceptual subsequent cognisers which were induced by direct perception, and conceptual subsequent cognisers which were induced by another inferential cogniser.

3.1.2.1. Conceptual Subsequent Cogniser Induced By Direct Perception

So what do you posit as conceptual subsequent cognisers which were induced by direct perception? That was the question.

The second moment of the direct perception seeing blue. The subsequent cognition is induced by that first moment seeing blue.

I am asking about a conceptual subsequent cogniser?

The memory of a direct perception, seeing blue.

That is OK. If you posit the memory remembering blue induced by the sense direct perception apprehending blue, that is correct.

The sequence is, first we have the sense direct perception apprehending blue, then we have one instant of a mental direct perception apprehending blue, and then we have the memory remembering blue – the conceptual thought remembering blue.

The conceptual understanding ascertaining blue, induced by the sense direct perception apprehending blue, is an example for the first [type of conceptual subsequent cogniser].

3.1.2.2. Conceptual Subsequent Cogniser Induced By An Inferential Valid Cogniser

The second moment of the inferential cogniser realising impermanent sound is an example for a conceptual subsequent cogniser induced by an inferential valid cogniser.

3.2. Correct Assumption

The second awareness that is not a valid cogniser is correct assumption. The definition of a *correct assumption* is a *determinative knower, controvertible with regards to its object and concordant with reality*. This means that the apprehended object exists, and so it is a determinative knower, concordant with reality. However it doesn't realise that object, and therefore it is controvertible.

We have various divisions.

3.2.1. Correct Assumption Without Reason

First is correct assumption without reason. An example for correct assumption without reason is the correct assumption grasping or apprehending impermanent sound, in dependence upon hearing the words 'sound is impermanent'. There is no reason involved. Merely by hearing somebody saying sound is impermanent one generates the conviction, 'Oh yes', Sound is impermanent'. This conviction is correct and concordant with reality, but it didn't come about through any kind of reason. This correct assumption is called a correct assumption without reason, because the words in dependence upon which it is generated do not express any kind of reason proving that sound is impermanent. The words express only the thesis of the proof statement, which is 'Sound is impermanent'. In dependence upon those words the belief that sound is impermanent is generated. Those words don't express any kind of reason, so the assumption is called a correct assumption without reason.

3.2.2. Correct Assumption Contrary to Reason

Next is correct assumption contrary to reason. If we generate the belief that sound is impermanent upon hearing the proof statement that 'Sound is impermanent, because it is empty of being able to perform a function', that belief would be called a correct assumption contrary to reason, because the reason posited is a contrary reason. The reason, 'it is empty of being able to perform a function', is mutually exclusive with impermanence, so it is completely contrary to impermanence, and therefore the correct assumption which is generated in dependence upon that reason is called correct assumption contrary to reason.

3.2.3. Correct Assumption with Inconclusive Reason

The third correct assumption is correct assumption depending upon inconclusive reason. An example is generating the correct assumption that sound is impermanent, in dependence upon the reason of sound being an object of comprehension.

Why is an object of comprehension an inconclusive reason for proving that sound is impermanent?

Because there is no pervasion that all objects of knowledge are necessarily impermanent.

Show.

Space.

Why is space an object of comprehension?

Because it is known by a valid cogniser.

So that finishes inconclusive reason. That [debate] went very well.

3.2.4. Correct Assumption With Non-Established Reason

The fourth correct assumption is correct assumption with non-established reason. The example is the correct assumption that

sound is impermanent, generated in dependence upon the reason of sound being that which is held by eye consciousness. This correct assumption that sound is impermanent, generated in dependence upon the reason of sound being that which is held by eye consciousness, is called the correct assumption with non-established reason.

Why is the reason not established?

Because generally for a normal person, sound is an object of the ear consciousness.

If by hearing sound we could also see sound, then you could make a case, but since it is not like that...

Doesn't the eye consciousness of a Buddha see sound?

I said for a normal person.

Isn't sound that which is held by eye consciousness, because it is held by the Buddha's eye consciousness?

The answer is that there is no pervasion. If you said, 'Take sound, it is that which is held by eye consciousness, because it is held by an eye consciousness of a Buddha', then you would say there is no pervasion. Then again we can ask, isn't sound held by the eye consciousness of a snake? Snakes don't have ears. Some people say snakes have holes where the ear would be, but they don't actually have ears. Again one would have to say that there is no pervasion. Just because sound is held by the eye consciousness of a snake it doesn't become that which is held by eye consciousness.

3.2.5. Correct Assumption With Reason which is Not Understood

The fifth of the correct assumptions is the correct assumption which has a reason, but the reason is not understood. The correct assumption is that sound is impermanent, which is generated in dependence upon the valid reason of sound being a product. However the person doesn't understand that sound is a product, or doesn't understand the pervasion that if it is a product, it has to be impermanent.

There is a reason, but the reason is not understood. This means that in dependence upon hearing that sound is impermanent, one generates the correct assumption that sound is impermanent, without having understood how being produced can prove that something is impermanent. So we accept that proof statement, 'sound is impermanent because it is produced', but we don't really understand the pervasion that if something is produced then it has to be impermanent. If that is the case, then the correct assumption is a correct assumption where there is a reason, but the reason is not understood.

© Tara Institute

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

Mind and Awareness

Commentary by the Venerable Geshe Doga

Translated by the Venerable Tenzin Dongak

7 September 2001

As usual please try to generate the virtuous motivation of bodhicitta for listening to the teaching. If we listen to the teachings without having the proper motivation then it will not be beneficial. Just knowing the Dharma alone is not enough; one needs to have a proper motivation.

There are examples mentioned in the Lam Rim explaining the various wrong motivations for listening to the teachings. One is 'dirty vessel'. If we listen to the teachings with a motivation for this life, with the purpose of attaining fame, or becoming a great renowned scholar and so forth, we will be just like a dirty vessel. Even very fine food when poured into a dirty vessel will be inedible.

There are three examples explaining the wrong ways of listening to the teachings. The first is listening to the teachings like a dirty pot. The second is listening to the teachings like a pot with a hole in it. Regardless of how much is poured in at the top, it will all flow out of the bottom. We may listen to the teaching with a good motivation. However if we are not mindful of what is being said - keeping it in mind, and concentrating on what is being said - we will be just like a leaking pot. No matter how much is explained it will all go straight in one end and out the other. The third example is, not to be like an upside-down pot. No matter how much water we pour on an upside-down pot nothing will go inside.

When we listen to the teachings we should try to be free of these three faults, which are explained in the Lam Rim. We should keep these explanations from the Lam Rim in mind wherever we go, and apply them in the appropriate situations.

Not only should we be free from these three faults, but also one should have 'the mind which listens to everything'. This means not just listening to certain sections or parts of the teaching, and switching off during other parts of the teaching. We should not listen like that, but listen to all parts of the teaching.

Another explanation of this mind listening to everything, or listening with everything (it depends on how you say it in Tibetan), is that we should concentrate one hundred percent on what is explained. We should not concentrate with only one part of our mind, while the other part of our mind has already gone home.

Last time we went through the definition of awarenesses that are non-valid cognisers, and we finished the first two divisions.

3.3. Awarenesses to which the object appears but isn't ascertained

Definition: A knower to which its engaged object, a self-characterised meaning, appears clearly but can't induce ascertainment of its engaged object, a self-characterised meaning.

In the Sutrists school functioning phenomena, self-characterised phenomena and ultimate phenomena, ultimate truth are all synonymous.

This kind of awareness has a self-characterised phenomenon that is its engaged object. This object appears clearly to that mind, but that mind cannot induce an ascertaining awareness¹.

The first part of the definition is 'a knower to which its engaged object, a self-characterised meaning, appears clearly'. There is debate with regards to the significance of positing

'engaged object instead of just object. If one would not specify engaged object then the eye-consciousness to which a blue snow mountain appears would become an awareness to which the object appears but is not ascertained. The appearance of the white colour of the snow-mountain as blue is a self-characterised object appearing clearly to this eye-consciousness.

Here again we have two points of view, that the appearance of the white colour of the snow-mountain as blue is the self-characterised object appearing clearly to that eye-consciousness or that the white colour of the snow-mountain is the self-characterised object that appears clearly to that eye-consciousness. I think it is the first. If we say: "Take the subject white colour of the snow-mountain - it follows it is the self-characterised object which appears clearly to the eye-consciousness to which a blue snow mountain appears - because it appears to that eye-consciousness as blue", then various logical faults would arise.

The correct situation is that the colour of the snow-mountain appears to that eye-consciousness as blue.

One example for this type of consciousness is the eye consciousness that induces the doubt: 'Oh, maybe I have seen a blue snow-mountain, but maybe not'.

Also the five mental direct perceptions apprehending form etc. in the continuum of an ordinary being are examples for awarenesses to which the object appears but isn't ascertained.

This mental consciousnesses last only for one instant, and because it is so short ordinary beings cannot realise the object apprehended by that consciousness. Therefore these very short mental consciousnesses following the five sense consciousnesses are also inattentive awarenesses.

Yogic direct perceptions don't have a common base with inattentive awarenesses. Yogic direct perceptions are never inattentive awarenesses. With regard to yogic direct perceptions there are valid cognisers and subsequent cognisers, but there are no inattentive awarenesses that are yogic direct perceptions. With regard to omniscient minds there are no inattentive awarenesses, and there are no subsequent cognisers. All instances of omniscient mind are valid cognisers.

Another example for inattentive awarenesses is the ear consciousness apprehending sound, at the time when the mental consciousness is distracted by some beautiful form. At the time when our mental consciousness is distracted by some beautiful form, it is possible that the ear consciousness apprehends sound, but because the mental consciousness is distracted, the sound will only be apprehended, and not ascertained.

We can relate this to meditation because this example shows that the mental consciousness is more powerful than the sense consciousness. When the mental consciousness is engaged the sense consciousnesses are less engaged. Sometimes people say meditating with open eyes is distracting and prevents them from concentrating, but if our mental consciousness is properly engaged, having the eyes open will not distract us. This is because the more the mental consciousness is engaged, the less the eye consciousness will be engaged.

Even though it is recommended to keep our eyes open during meditation, one should just gaze over the tip of one's nose. Staring off into space is not recommended. The two extremes to avoid are staring off into space and closing the eyes completely. Just gazing over the tip of one's nose is said to be the best position for the eyes during meditation. There is a special reason why this is recommended.

We have finished with subsequent cognisers, correct assumptions, and inattentive awareness and now we come to doubt.

3.4. Doubt

¹ Ascertaining awarenesses are conceptual realisers.

A knower which has, through its own power, qualms in two directions, is the definition of doubt.

Although already mentioned before, there is a reason why the definition includes the phrase, 'through its own power'. The reason is that we have the concomitant mental factors with doubt, and the main consciousness concomitant with doubt. They also have qualms in two directions and they are also knowers, but this doesn't happen through their own power. The main consciousness concomitant with doubt has qualms in two directions, but through the force of doubt and not through its own power. In order to make this distinction clear 'through its own power' is included in the definition.

There are three kinds of doubt: doubts tending towards the truth, tending away from the truth and equal doubt. Of the various divisions of doubt, the most important is the doubt included in the six root delusions, which is afflicted doubt. This is the kind of doubt that prevents us from entering and progressing along the path. As long as we have qualms about the path, are undecided and don't make up our mind, we don't start our practice.

There are three doubts: equal doubt, doubt tending towards the truth and away from the truth. An example for **doubt tending towards the truth** is the doubt thinking that, 'Most likely sound is impermanent'. Having first asserted impermanent sound, then having thought about it and analysed it, the practitioner gains the doubt, 'Maybe I was wrong. Maybe sound is not permanent after all, but impermanent'. This is the generation of doubt tending towards the truth.

Doubt is a very powerful mental factor, which has the power to turn us in a negative direction. For example if there is a person who has faith in the law of cause and effect and karma, but then starts to doubt whether karma really exists or not, he starts to waver in his conviction, and then slowly starts to generate the doubt tending away from the truth. There is a very fine line where his mind changes over to 'Most likely karma does not exist'. From that moment onwards it becomes very easy for more delusions, and more negative actions and karma to arise. One the other hand, through the doubt tending towards the truth one can change from a negative point of view into a positive direction. It is important to know the importance of doubt and how it can affect us.

3.5. Wrong Awareness

Fifth is wrong awareness. The definition of *wrong awareness is a knower that mistakenly engages its object*. There are conceptual wrong consciousnesses and non-conceptual wrong consciousnesses.

It is very important to know what a wrong mind is. Many times we believe mental states and awarenesses that are wrong minds to be valid minds. Then we follow them and end up in all kinds of confusing situations.

Since the grasping at the self of a person is also a wrong mind, and is the mind that we have to oppose with the wisdom realising selflessness, it is important to know how it comes about that the grasping at the self of a person is a wrong mind. Because it is a wrong mind we can oppose it with the wisdom realising selflessness. It is important to be able to identify our wrong minds and then to know how we can oppose them with wisdom.

There are two divisions, conceptual wrong minds and non-conceptual wrong minds.

3.5.1. Conceptual Wrong Awareness

3.5.2. An example of conceptual wrong mind is the grasping at permanent sound. It is very important to be able to identify grasping at permanence as a wrong mind. When we meditate, our understanding of why grasping at permanence is a wrong mind will not be definite at the beginning. It will be what we

call a correct assumption. However through continuing familiarity, that correct assumption will become an actual realisation that grasping at permanence is a wrong mind. If we don't understand that grasping at permanence is a wrong mind, we will not be able to understand impermanence.

It is also very important to understand awarenesses to which the object appears but is not ascertained, because in our life we should learn not to trust all our awarenesses. We should be able to see that what appears to us at certain times is not necessarily definite. Just as at certain times a snow-mountain can appear as blue, not everything that appears to us in our daily life is necessarily definite. Not everything that appears to us can be ascertained. Therefore those various types of consciousness, like wrong consciousness, and awarenesses to which the object appears but is not ascertained, are important to know.

Grasping at permanent sound is an example for a conceptual wrong mind. Grasping at sound as being impermanent, such as the correct assumption apprehending impermanent sound, is a correct mind, and it is a mind concordant with reality. Grasping at permanent sound apprehends sound in a way sound that doesn't exist, so therefore it is an awareness that mistakenly engages its object. The correct assumption apprehending impermanent sound apprehends sound in exactly the same way as it exists - as being impermanent. Therefore it doesn't engage its object mistakenly.

3.5.2. Non-Conceptual Wrong Awareness

Non-conceptual wrong minds have a two-fold division into sense consciousness and mental consciousness.

1. An example for a **mental non-conceptual wrong consciousness** would be apprehending the blue that appears to us in dreams, as blue. That dream awareness apprehending the blue of the dream as actual blue is an example for mental non-conceptual wrong consciousness. First of all it is a **mental consciousness** because it is a dream. All dreams are mental consciousnesses. It is **non-conceptual** because it is free from grasping at the meaning and sound generality as being suitable to be mixed. It is a **wrong consciousness** because it apprehends the blue of the dream as being an actual blue.

The dream apprehending the dreamt blue as being actual blue is a wrong consciousness. Why? Because the blue that appears to us in the dream is not actually blue. If we apprehend something that is not actually blue as being blue, then it becomes a wrong consciousness. The blue appearing to us in the dream is not any of the five sources. The sixth source that we call the dharma or phenomenon source² refers to phenomena that are objects only of mental consciousness.

Objects or phenomena, which are objects only of mental consciousness but not of any of the five sense consciousnesses, are referred to as the source of dharma or phenomena. The blue in the dream is such a phenomenon. It is not an object of any of the five sense consciousnesses. It is only the object of mental consciousness, and as such it is a phenomenon source. These kinds of phenomena, even though they are not what we normally refer to as form, are some other kind of subtle form.

2. Examples for **sense non-conceptual wrong consciousnesses** are the eye consciousness apprehending a snow-mountain as blue, or the eye consciousness apprehending a conch shell as yellow. Through the condition of having certain sicknesses such as hepatitis it is possible that one can apprehend something, which is white, as being yellow. Our whole body becomes yellow, the eyes become yellow and everything one sees has a yellow tinge. So you could apprehend the conch shell as yellow. Also the eye consciousnesses generated when wearing sunglasses of various coloured

² Lit. Dharma source. In this context dharma is synonymous with phenomenon.

shadings would also be wrong consciousnesses. If we wear sunglasses with blue shading, then the snow-mountain will appear as blue. That eye consciousness is a wrong consciousness. If we have sunglasses with a yellow colouring then the snow-mountain will appear yellow. That will also be a wrong consciousness. These examples are very easy to understand.

We have been through the five types of awarenesses that are non-valid cognisers: subsequent cognisers, correct assumption, doubt, awarenesses to which the object appears but is not ascertained and wrong consciousnesses. If we add direct valid cognisers and inferential valid cognisers to that list we have the seven-fold division of awareness.

4. Other Divisions of awareness

After the seven-fold division a further three-fold division of awareness is mentioned. The first is conceptual awareness which has a meaning generality as its held object³, the second is a non-mistaken, non-conceptual awareness which takes self-characterised as it's held object, the third is mistaken non-conceptual awareness which takes a clearly appearing non-existent as it's held object.

4.1. Conceptual awareness that has a meaning generality as its held object.

The definition of a *conceptual awareness is a determinative knower that grasps at meaning and sound as suitable to be mixed*. The definition includes, 'grasping at sound and meaning as suitable to be mixed'. Sound refers to the sound generality, and meaning refers to the meaning generality. A conceptual thought is a type of awareness that grasps at those two as suitable to be mixed.

The definition says, 'grasps at sound and meaning as suitable to be mixed'. When we analyse the definition of conceptual awareness we can understand how it comes that all conceptual awarenesses are mistaken awarenesses. For example the conceptual thought apprehending a yellow vase apprehends a yellow vase. Yellow vase appears to the conception apprehending yellow vase, but the appearance of yellow vase is mixed with the appearance of the reversal of non-yellow vase.

So we have the meaning generality and the sound generality that are mixed with the appearance of the object to the conceptual thought. Because they are mixed, the conceptual thought becomes a mistaken awareness. The conceptual thought apprehending a vase doesn't apprehend the meaning generality and sound generality as being mixed with the appearance of the object. In the appearance to that conceptual thought, it doesn't apprehend them as being mixed, but they appear as mixed. Because they appear as mixed the conceptual thought is a mistaken awareness.

There are three types of conceptual awareness: conceptual awareness grasping only at sound generality, grasping only at meaning generality and grasping both. The definition of a vase is a flat-bottomed bulbous container that can fulfil the function of carrying water. We can have a conception that only grasps at that phenomenon that can fulfil the function of carrying water, is flat bottomed and bulbous and so forth, without actually grasping at that as being a vase. Normally, in order to understand a phenomenon such as vase we first have to understand the definition of that phenomenon, and then apply the name of that phenomenon to the definition.

The first kind of conception grasps only at the meaning generality. That conception doesn't understand vase, it only understands the meaning of vase, but not vase itself.

The second kind of conception grasps only at the sound generality that comes about, for example, through hearing the

sound 'vase'. Having heard the sound 'vase', some kind of idea will form in our mind about what a vase is. However it is not necessarily the correct one, so it will not necessarily be mixed with the actual definition of vase.

The third kind of conception mixes both the meaning and the name.

With all the definiendums⁴ we have to first understand the definition and then afterwards we apply the name to the definition. For example with valid cogniser, first we have to understand the definition of a valid cogniser, which is a newly incontrovertible knower. Then having understood the definition, 'a newly incontrovertible knower', we can apply the name 'valid cogniser' to the definition, and then understand exactly what a valid cogniser is.

It is the same with all phenomena that are definiendums. With the example of vase, the thought apprehending a vase can be generated just through hearing the sound 'vase'. The concept apprehending a vase that is generated only from the sound of the word 'vase' is a conception grasping only at the sound generality, and the meaning of vase does not appear to that conception. So the definition of a vase - flat bottom, bulbous, phenomenon that fills the function of carrying water - does not appear to that conception, because it is a conception that grasps only at the sound generality.

Maybe we can leave it here.

Tea Offering

Even though I have mentioned this before, when we recite the OM AH HUM there is a certain meditation we have to do in relation to each of these three syllables. There are two ways of reciting the three syllables: either separately or, as we do sometimes do, reciting them three times as one word, OM AH HUM, OM AH HUM, OM AH HUM. Regardless of how we do it, there are three steps of purifying the impurities of taste, smell, colour and so forth, then transforming it into nectar, and making the nectar inexhaustible. These three steps are related to either the three separate syllables of OM AH HUM, or to the first recitation of OM AH HUM. The second recitation of OM AH HUM. and the third recitation of OM AH HUM.

The HUM is the seed syllable of the enlightened mind or the omniscient consciousness of the Buddha that blesses the nectar and makes it inexhaustible. We talk about the three steps of purifying, realising and increasing.

In the *Lama Chopa* it talks about the ocean of wisdom nectar that has been purified, realised and increased. The impurities of colour, smell, taste and so forth are purified, realised as wisdom nectar and then increased.

The three syllables are related to the vajra body, speech and mind of the Buddha. There is the blue HUM, the red AH and the white OM.

The letter HUM is what we would call the interpretive vajra mind. The definitive meaning of the letter HUM is the enlightened vajra mind of the Buddha. HUM is the seed syllable of Akshobhya.

The definitive meaning of the letter AH is the vajra speech of the Buddha and AH is the seed syllable of Buddha Amitabha.

The definitive meaning of the white OM is the vajra body of the Buddha and the white OM is the seed syllable of Vairochana.

Vairochana is white and therefore the OM that is the syllable of Vairochana is also white. Amitabha is red and therefore his syllable AH is also red, and Akshobhya is blue so therefore his syllable HUM is also blue. So the OM AH HUM symbolises the vajra body, speech and mind of the Buddha.

When we bless our tea and recite OM AH HUM three times we

³ Synonymous with appearing object.

⁴ The *Macquarie Dictionary* defines a definiendum as the thing which is to be defined, especially a word or phrase in a dictionary entry.

have to meditate on how these three syllables do perform the three steps of purifying, realising and increasing. One can visualise that the whole sky is filled with the various offerings, so that at the end one no longer has just an ordinary cup of tea.

The word offering, which in Tibetan is *cho-pa* and in Sanskrit is *puja*, actually has the connotation of pleasing or making happy. The meaning of making an offering to the Buddhas is making the mind of the Buddhas happy. If the Buddhas or the teachers are pleased, it becomes an offering. If they are not pleased it won't be an offering - then you have to try something else.

There is the offering of practice or accomplishment. All practices we do during the day can be offered to the Buddhas. This becomes the offering of practice. Milarepa said, 'I don't have any kind of material offerings. I only have the offering of practice. So that is what I am going to offer to my teacher'.

© *Tara Institute*

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

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 5th 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