

#### 4 tenet schools

Tenet is a conclusion reached by eliminating other possibilities. Established conclusion.

#### Buddhist tenet schools

Tenet schools	Sub schools	
1. Middle Way School (MWS)	Consequence MWS (CMWS)	
	Autonomy MWS	Sutric Autonomy MWS (SAMWS)
		Yogic Autonomy MWS (YAMWS)
2. Mind Only School (MOS)	MOS follow reasoning	
	MOS follow scriptures	
3. Sutra School (SS)	Sutra school follow reasoning	
	Sutra school follow scriptures	
4. Great Exposition School (GES: divided into 18 sub schools)	PROPONENTS FROM KASHMIRI	
	PROPONENTS FROM THE WESTERN REGION (Aparantaka)	
	PROPONENTS FROM THE CENTRAL REGION (Magadha)	

#### Turning of the wheel: Lesson 2

Turning of the wheel		Tenet	Schools	Assertions
2 <sup>nd</sup> turning	Perfection Wisdom Sutras	Mahayana	1. Madhyamika (Prasangika and Svatantrika)	All phenomena are not truly established.
3 <sup>rd</sup> turning	Sutra unraveling the thought	Mahayana	2. Cittamatra	<u>Imputational nature</u> not truly established. <u>Thoroughly established nature</u> (ultimate truth) and <u>other powered nature</u> are truly established.
1 <sup>st</sup> turning	4 noble truths	Hinayana	3. Sautrantika 4. Vaibhasika	All phenomena are truly established

True existence vs. non true existence

Proponent of non true existence (Proponent of non nature, Proponent of non entityness) i.e. Madhyamika School	Consequence MWS	No truly existent external object
	Sutric Autonomy MWS	No truly existent external object
	Yogic Autonomy MWS	No external object (Pg. 283 Cutting through appearances)
Proponent of true existence (Proponents of realism) i.e. non-Madhyamika Schools	Mind Only School	No external object
	Sutra school follow reasoning	Truly existent external object (Pg 221 Cutting through appearances)
	Sutra school follow scriptures and Great exposition school	Truly established external object (pg 179 Cutting through appearances)

Yogic Autonomy MWS (assert 1 final vehicle) can be sub divided into:

False Aspectarians	Non tainted false Aspectarians
	Tainted false Aspectarians
True Aspectarians	

MOS can also be sub divided into:

False Aspectarians (assert 1 final vehicle)	Non tainted false Aspectarians
	Tainted false Aspectarians
True Aspectarians (assert 3 final vehicles)	Proponents of equal subjects and objects
	Half eggists
	Non pluralists

Pg. 194 note 1, Buddhist philosophy: The tainted false Aspectarians hold the unique position that the nature of the mind itself can be tainted by ignorance. All other Buddhists contend that all the latencies established by ignorance and the afflictions motivated by ignorance are adventitious and removable.

Comparison of someone who is a proponent of tenet and has entered a vehicle:

a) Hinayanist by tenet, Hinayanist by path.
b) Hinayanist by tenet, Mahayanist by path.
c) Mahayanist by tenet, Hinayanist by path.
d) Mahayanist by tenet, Mahayanist by path.

Theravada historically was just one of many Hinayana schools.

Mahayanist by tenet asserts a selflessness of phenomena, Hinayanist by tenet do not.

Non Buddhists tenets schools

Proponent of view of permanence e.g. Vaisheshika, Samkhya
Proponent of view of annihilation e.g. Lokayata (or Charvaka)

Samkhya's position is that self is awareness.

Vaisheshika's position is that self is matter.

GES BP2 (source BP2 Tenets lesson 3 and 4)

In the traditional studies of the Buddhist philosophies, the study of Lorig is usually done before the studies of Tenets.

The four seals are the four things that attest the particular teaching or doctrine to be Buddhist.

In general, existent and established mean the same.

However in GES, truly established is not the same as truly existent.

All things are necessarily truly established.

Conventional truth is not truly existent but it is truly established.

For this school, if it is an established base, it is necessarily truly established but whatever is truly established is not necessarily ultimately established. Because if something is ultimately established, it is substantially existent; which is ultimate truth.

E.g. A cup do not truly exist but a cup is truly established.

A cup is not truly exist because a cup is not an ultimate truth.

In GES, substantially established is not the same as substantially existent.

All things are necessary substantially established, but they are not necessarily substantially existent.

E.g. A cup is not substantially existent but a cup is substantially established.

A cup is not substantially existent because a cup is not an ultimate truth.

If we go by the definition of this school, the essential difference between a conventional truth and an ultimate truth lies in whether the mind apprehending the phenomena in question can be cancelled or not.

Conventional truth, conventionally existent, conventionally established and imputedly existent are mutually inclusive.

The vase is an imputed existent. If the vase is destroyed, smashed or broken, then the valid cognizer apprehending that vase ceases to exist.

Truly existent, ultimate truth, ultimately existence, ultimately established and substantially existent are mutually inclusive i.e. they mean the same thing.

The directionally partless particle is always there. Since it cannot be destroyed and the mind apprehending it cannot be cancelled. Therefore, going by the definition, that makes the directionally partless particle an ultimate truth.

Meditation on emptiness pg 338: They are called ultimate truths because they definitely have ultimate existence.

For something to be true, the mind apprehending it can never be cancelled; which makes only ultimate truth is true and conventional truth is false.

We have to say that directionally partless particle is true and vase is false.

## BP2 Tenets Charts Pg 4

True existent is not mutually inclusive as inherent existent, existing from its own side, establishment by way of its own character.

True established is mutually inclusive as inherent existent, existing from its own side, establishment by way of its own character.

We usually hear the word truly existent being mentioned. Even during the teaching, the lama or the translator always say "truly existent" but "den par grub" in Tibetan mean truly established; but it is translated as truly existent.

Cutting pg 179: A proponent of GES is a person propounding Lesser Vehicle tenets who does not assert self-cognizers but does assert truly established external objects.

According to GES, all phenomena are substantially established/ truly established, because this school has the world view that in order for anything to exist, it is not sufficient merely to have a consciousness imputing that object. There must also be something right there in that object, a substance. So, there is something substantial about the object in question. If there is no substantiality in the object, then just having a mind imputing on something cannot cause that object to exist. So the world view of this school is that they don't know how to posit things and events exist as merely imputed by consciousness. There has to be something from the side of the object; there is substance. Therefore their world view is that anything that exists, it is necessarily truly established/ substantially established.

(Therefore substantially established and truly established is mutually inclusive in GES)

Meditation on emptiness pg 338: GES is the only school to differentiate "substantially established" and "substantially existent", the intention being provide a status of "substantially" for conventional truths.

Lesson 7: For GES, everything that exists (i.e. permanent or impermanent phenomenon) must necessarily perform a function.

### Lesson 7:

Person (in general) is an ultimate truth which is a substantially existent. In this school, substantial existent is mutually inclusive with ultimate truth. If the mind apprehending the phenomena cannot be cancelled despite trying to or mentally separating it into its parts then that makes the object in questions an ultimate truth. That is the meaning of substantial existent. That means the mind apprehends the object cannot be cancelled.

But for the case of the person that is self-sufficient substantially existent then that is a different story.

Person(in general) is substantial existent because it is ultimate truth but the self-sufficient substantially existent person does not exist because it is not inherent one with nor inherently different from the aggregates.

## SS BP2

Cutting pg 229: This way of presenting the 2 truths is the system of the sutra school following reasoning.

Conventional truth: a phenomenon that is not ultimately able to perform a function.

Conventional truth, falsely existent, permanent phenomenon, and generally characterized phenomenon are equivalent.

(Lorig text: Generally characterized phenomenon - A phenomena which is merely imputed by a term or thought consciousness and is not established as a specifically characterized phenomenon).

E.g. True cessation is posited to be permanent, therefore it is conventional truth.

Ultimate truth: a phenomenon that is ultimately able to perform a function.

Cutting pg 224: Functioning thing, ultimate truth, specially characterised phenomenon, impermanent thing, compounded phenomenon and truly existent phenomenon are mutually inclusive.

(Lorig text: Specifically characterized phenomenon - A phenomena which is established by way of its own character without being merely imputed by a term or thought consciousness)

Cutting pg 229: The sutra school follows scripture asserts a presentation of the 2 truths that accords with that of Great Exposition School.

Cutting pg 237:

GES and SS follow scripture assert directionally partless particles and temporally partless moments of consciousness as ultimate truth because they are irreducible.

SS follow reason asserts directionally partless particles and temporally partless moments of consciousness as ultimate truth because they are ultimately capable of performing the functions of creating effects.

Lesson 10: Both (directionally partless particles and temporally partless moments of consciousness) are necessarily compounded phenomena, and impermanent phenomena which make them ultimate truth.

(Cambridge dictionary: Etymology is the study of the origin and history of words, or a study of this type relating to one particular word)

Lesson 10: Etymology of Conventional truth and ultimate truth.

We are trying to make connection with ultimate truth and ultimate awareness.

The word "ultimate" in the ultimate truth refers to the ultimate awareness.

We are trying to make connection with conventional truth and conventional awareness.

Conventional truth	Ultimate truth
E.g. Uncompounded space	E.g. blue
Essentially conventional awareness refers to a facsimile of a direct perceiver. Mistaken consciousness is a conventional awareness. In this context, it is conceptual mistaken consciousness. E.g. Conceptual consciousness apprehends uncompounded space.	In the context here, an ultimate awareness refers to a direct perceiver. In this context, it has to be a direct valid cognizer. Direct valid cognizer is non mistaken, therefore it is an ultimate awareness. E.g. Eye consciousness apprehending blue.
Uncompounded space is <u>truth</u> to the perspective of <u>conventional awareness</u> , which is a conceptual consciousness. Uncompounded space cannot appear to a direct perceiver. It exist merely through appearing (via a mental image) to a conventional awareness. Conceptual consciousness obscures the direct seeing of the object.	Blue is <u>truth</u> to the perspective of a <u>ultimate awareness</u> . Blue exist the way it appear to the eye consciousness apprehending blue.

Lesson 9

For the GES and SS, when you look at the vase, they have to say that the vase lack a self, the vase is empty of self. Don't think English, self not necessarily the person.

Cutting pg 288

The coarse selflessness of persons is also applied to phenomena in the sense that all phenomena are empty of being objects of use if a permanent, unitary and independent user.

The subtle selflessness of person similarly applies to phenomena in that all phenomena are empty of beings objects that are used by a substantially existent or self sufficient user.

Thereby, it seems that, according to the AMWS, the base of emptiness of persons is not just the person but all phenomena.

Then if we extend this line of reasoning to the GES and SS, the base of emptiness of persons is not just the person but all phenomena. This fits with Khen Rinpoche's explanation above (lesson 9)

MOS BP2 (lesson 11 to 17)

According to the MOS, everything arises from the awakening of the latencies or imprints.

Mind is truly existent, therefore self knower is truly existent.

MOS is not solipsistic, it accepts that there are other beings different entities from oneself. Cutting pg 250

MOS accept form, but not external form. External form is something outside the mind.

Form is non other than the factor of appearance to the consciousness.

MOS says appearance of external object is due to the mind polluted by the latencies of ignorance.

Definitions of the 2 truths.

Conventional truth: That which is realized through dualistic appearance by a valid direct perceiver that directly realizes it e.g. cup
Ultimate truth: That which is realized through <u>the subsidence of</u> dualistic appearance by a valid direct perceiver that directly realizes it e.g. emptiness of eye consciousnesses apprehending cup and cup as different entities

2 truths and the 3 natures

The phenomena that are subsumed by the two truths have to be existence.

Conventional truth (falsity)		Ultimate truth (truth)
Other powered nature. (compounded phenomena, composed phenomena)	Imputational nature which is existence	Thoroughly established nature.
All impermanent phenomena. (Cutting pg 261)	All permanent phenomena except for emptiness.	All emptiness. Thoroughly established nature, ultimate truth and emptiness are synonymous.
e.g. object Tashi (i.e. person Tashi) e.g. our contaminated appropriated aggregates	e.g. term "Tashi" (i.e. label or name "Tashi") e.g. uncomposed space	e.g. emptiness of object Tashi, established by way of its own character, as the basis for applying the term "Tashi"

Imputational nature which is non existence

e.g. subject and object as different entities e.g. object Tashi, established by way of its own character, as the basis for applying the term "Tashi" e.g. self sufficient person. e.g. external object e.g. sky flower
--

Note: Tashi is a Tibetan name.

3 natures (from ABC charts)

Other powered nature	Imputational nature	Thoroughly established nature
Exists from its own side. Exists inherently. Truly established. Established by way of its own character.	Exists from its own side. Exists inherently. Not truly established. Not established by way of its own character.	Exists from its own side. Exists inherently. Truly established. Established by way of its own character.

Meaning of term according to MOS.

Exists from its own side. Exists inherently.	The imputed object when sought is findable.
Truly established. Established by way of its own character.	Not merely imputed by thought but exist from its own side.

MOS assert 2 subtle selflessness of phenomena:

According to MOS, object and subject are empty of different entities i.e. object and subject are produced simultaneously. They are both produced from a single predisposition.

1) Emptiness of object and subject as different entities. (deals with sense consciousness)
---

Form does not exist from its own side as natural basis for the term form.  
Rather form exists as natural basis for the term form, is merely imputed.

2) Emptiness of phenomena as naturally bases of engagement /referent of names. (deals with conceptual consciousness)
---

SS vs. MOS

SS	MOS
Both schools assert that blue established by way of its own character.	
Both schools assert that there is a blue that exist as the basis for applying the term 'blue' to the conceptual consciousness apprehending blue.	
Blue also, established by way of its own character, as the basis for applying the term blue.	But blue, does not established by way of its own character, as the basis for applying the term blue. It exists as merely imputed by conceptuality.

MOS: If phenomena exist as naturally bases of engagement /referent of names, then these faults arises:

If a flat base bulbous thing (definition of vase) is naturally base of engagement as term "vase", a small child would know "vase" innately, without instruction.
If a person has 3 different names e.g. Mr Tan, John, Tashi, then it follows that there are 3 different individuals.
If two different people having the same name e.g. person A is John, person B is also John. Then it follows these two individuals will become one person.

MOS: In the case of a vase, we see a flat-base bulbous thing. Then conceptuality gets involved that labelled it as vase.



### AMWS BP2 lesson 19 to 21

It is not sufficient just to have the MOS world view that external objects do not exist, we need a method to deal with the apprehension of true existence (true established). MOS assert true existence. MWS refute true existence.

MOS	MWS
Mind is truly established.	Mind is not truly established. Anger is not truly established. Attachment is not truly established.
E.g. truly established anger. Truly established attachment	If we focus on the mind itself, it is possible to feel pain, hurt, happiness, pleasure and so forth. Based on those feeling of pain or pleasure that is derived from focusing on the mind itself then there can be anger or attachment that arises due to these emotions or feelings. The MWS explanation of how phenomena do not exist truly is a method to eradicate the destructive emotions and to destroy them.

### Lesson 19

The AMWS cannot accept that phenomena exist merely by being imputed by mind, as there must be something that exists from the side of the object. For them, if a phenomenon exists as merely imputed by mind, then one can just make up anything with one's mind.

The AMWS say: "If you assert phenomena exist as merely imputed by mind then it is tantamount to say that things do not exist".

Lesson 20: According to the AMWS, if a phenomenon is established by way of its own uncommon mode of existence without being posited through the force of appearing to a non-defective awareness, that phenomenon exists ultimately. According to AMWS this is the meaning of true existent. (Mind is non-defective i.e. there is nothing wrong with that particular mind existing by way of its own character).

### Lesson 20

There is a quotation from "The Descent into Lanka Sutra": "All phenomena exist through appearing to the consciousness, all phenomena exist conventionally and all phenomena do not exist ultimately."

Why is it that all phenomena exist conventionally?

All phenomena exist conventionally because phenomena exist through the force of appearing to a consciousness.

For, if a phenomenon can exist without being posited through the force of appearing to a consciousness, then that phenomenon would be ultimately existent.

If it is posited through the force of appearing to a mind that means it exists conventionally. It does not exist ultimately.

Lesson 21: AMWS states that something is an existence because it appears to the mind/ awareness.

The opposite of that would be if there is something that can exist without appearing, that would make the object truly existent.

The definition of an Autonomist is: a proponent of non-entityness (i.e. no true existence) who assert that phenomena exist by their own character conventionally (although not ultimately). Cutting pg. 282, 281.

#### Lesson 20. AMWS

For anything to exist:  
It must appear to a mind  
There is also existence from the side of the object.  
When these two come together then there is how thing exists.

Root text: The definition of an Autonomist is: a Proponent of the Middle Way who, by way of accepting autonomous reasons, does not assert true existence even conventionally.

#### Conventional Truth and Ultimate Truth

(Cutting pg. 286) CT: An object that is realised in a dualistic manner by a direct prime cognition that directly realises it.

(Cutting pg. 286) UT: An object that is realised in a non dualistic manner by a direct prime cognition that directly realises it

#### (Cutting pg. 297) Sutric AMWS vs. Yogic AMWS:

Except that Sutric AMWS assert external objects and does not assert self knower, their presentation of the basis mostly resembles that of Yogic AMWS.

Yogic AMWS assert that there are no external objects i.e. the object and the subject are not different substantial entities. They assert that a belief in external object is a coarse obstructions to omniscience and that is abandoned by solitary realizer.

#### Examples of UT and CT

Lesson 20: Ultimate truth, suchness, and the subtle selflessness of phenomena are mutually inclusive.

E.g. emptiness of truly existent vase

E.g. emptiness of truly existent person

E.g. Coarse selflessness of person,  
subtle selflessness of person and

non existence of object and subject as different entities are conventional truths.

E.g. Uncompounded space, true cessations, vase, flower, biscuit are conventional truth

Lesson 20: its own uncommon mode of existence = existing from its own side.

CMWS BP2 (lesson 24 - 26)

Lesson 21: Both AMWS and CMWS are the proponents of the Middle Way, which means both refute true existence even conventionally.

Lesson 24: For the ease of understanding:

A conventional truth is the final object or main object of a valid cognizer distinguishing a conventionality.

An ultimate truth is the final object or main object of the valid cognizer distinguishing an ultimate.

2 truths

CT: An object that is found by a valid cognizer distinguishing a conventionality and with respect to which a valid cognizer distinguishing a conventionality becomes a valid cognizer distinguishing a conventionality.

UT: An object that is found by a valid cognizer distinguishing a final nature and with respect to which a valid cognizer distinguishing a final nature becomes a valid cognizer distinguishing a final nature.

(Lesson 24: The words underline is to deal with the problem when "the subject is the Buddha's omniscient mind which realizes emptiness").

Lesson 24: The Buddha's omniscient mind directly perceives the two truths simultaneously. That would make the omniscient mind both a valid cognizer distinguishing a conventionality and at the same time a valid cognizer distinguishing an ultimate.

Lesson 24: In the context of CMWS, sometime obscurational truth is more accurate (translation) than conventional truth.

Lesson 24: Great master Chandrakirti stated very clearly that the Prasangika's position is a correct one, whereas the assertion of the autonomous is incorrect

AMWS use autonomous syllogism.

Example: A person is not truly existent because it is a dependent arising.

CMWS use (absurd) consequence of opponent's position.

Example: It follows that the subject, a sprout, is not produced in dependence upon its own cause, because it is inherently existent.

CMWS: What exactly is an ultimate truth? It is the emptiness of truly existent.

Anything other than this is a CT.

CT: cup, vase, biscuit, true suffering, true origin, true path

Subtle selflessness of person, true cessation are UT.

Example of UT: person empty of inherently existent, cup empty of inherently existent.

Lesson 25: According to the Prasangika, all phenomena are merely imputed by thought. The word "merely" negates or eliminate "establishment by way of its own character" or "existence from its own side."

Lesson 25: There is a common locus between a mistaken consciousness and a valid cognizer. Example: yogic direct perceiver realise coarse selflessness of person is mistaken consciousness.

According to Prasangika, with the exception of the wisdom directly realise emptiness, every other consciousness is mistaken

Lesson 25: The Prasangika always use the classic example of mistakenly a coil of rope to be a snake.

Under a certain conditions such as the weather or when it is not bright enough and yet not completely dark, when you come across a coil of rope at a certain distance between yourself and a coil of rope on a road, what you see is a snake.

Using this as an example the Prasangika explain how the 'I' exist, the 'I' is that which is merely imputed in dependence upon the aggregates which is the basis of designation.

Like the 'I', the person, the aggregates are also merely imputed. According to the Prasangika, everything that exists is merely imputed by thought.

Lesson 25: Anything that is said to exist and yet is not merely imputed by thought, that become the object of refutation or object of negation, according to the Prasangika. This is what is meant by self, according to the Prasangika.

Terms use in the 2 truths definition

MOS and AMWS use direct valid cognizer	From Lorig: A direct valid cognizer is a <u>new</u> incontrovertible knower that is <u>free of conceptuality</u> .
CMWS use valid cognizer	Lesson 25: According to the Prasangika, the <u>valid cognizer</u> is a knower that is infallible with respect to its main object. A valid cognizer need not to be newly incontrovertible. It also can be either non conceptual or conceptual.

Lesson 26: To us, inherently existent "I" and conventionally existent "I" is mix up. It is difficult to differentiate inherent existence and existence. Obviously there is an "I" that exist and do not want to suffer. When we look for the inherent existent "I", it cannot be found. But this does not mean that "I" is not existent. All phenomena are empty of inherent existence because they are dependent arising.

Lesson 26 CMWS - The main reason why we can become Buddha because our mind is not truly existence.