

## Chapter 18 Analysis of the Self

At this point someone asks: Since mental afflictions, actions, and the bodies, agents, and results are all not real, does that mean they are not real like the city of gandharva and so on are not real?<sup>1</sup> If they appear to childish beings as real, then what is this reality? Besides, how does one enter reality?

To answer: reality is the exhaustion of all aspects of the conceptions with respect to inner and outer of I and mine, due to the non observation of external and internal things.

Seeing with his intelligence that all mental afflictions  
and faults  
Without exception, arise from the view of transitory  
collection,  
And after realizing that the self is its object,  
the yogi rejects the self.<sup>2</sup>

For an extensive explanation of this passage and so forth, see *Entering the Middle Way*. I will explain a bit about this point: a yogi who wishes to completely abandon mental afflictions and all defects must enter into reality. Wondering what the root of this samsara is, he proceeds to closely investigate. Upon this analysis, he sees that the root of samsara is the view of the transitory collection and sees that the view of transitory collection obscures the self. By not observing the self, he abandons the view of transitory collection. Because he sees that by abandoning this, all the mental afflictions and faults are also stopped, initially, since it is the object of the conception of the self, asking himself seriously what this self is, he proceeds to inquire solely into the self.

---

<sup>1</sup> This question paraphrases the final verse (17.33) of Nagarjuna's preceding chapter on actions and their results, which says, "Mental afflictions, actions, and the body, agent, and results are like the city of gandharvas; they are all like a mirage, a dream."

<sup>2</sup> Chandrakirti, *Entering the Middle Way (Madhyamakavatara)*, 6.120.

Also, when analyzing the object of the conception of the self, it must be either of the nature of aggregates or different from the aggregates. The remaining possibilities—that of being the supported or the support and that of possessing them—are encompassed in the possibilities of being either one or different. In short, one can say that if it is rejected in both possibilities of being either one or different, then the self is rejected.

In the explanation:

*1. If the self were the aggregates,  
it would be characterized by birth and destruction.  
If it were different from the aggregates,  
it would not have the characteristics of aggregates.*

The other analyses—that of the Tathagata [in chapter 22] and that of fire and fuel [in chapter 10]—are organized into five possibilities, so why here there are only two? Since those five possibilities are explained elsewhere, they are not explained here. In order to be brief, two possibilities are considered: if you think that the aggregates, which are subject to birth and destruction, are the self, then since the aggregates are characterized by birth and destruction, the self should also have birth and destruction. I do not accept this because it leads to many errors.

It does not arise from what has not arisen,  
it would mistakenly follow  
that the self is created,  
also that it arises without cause (cap 27/12)

Besides:

The self is not the appropriated [aggregates],  
which are produced and disintegrate,

for that would imply that the appropriator [the self] would do likewise, just like the appropriated.<sup>3</sup>

That will be explained. Again, on the line of this position:

If the aggregates were the self, then since they are multiple, the self should also be multiple.<sup>4</sup>The self would be substantially existent, and seeing it as substantially existent would not be wrong. At the moment of nirvana, the self would certainly cease, while in the moments prior to nirvana, it would arise and disintegrate. Having no agent, it would have no karmic results, and karma accumulated by one would be experienced by another.

This and other explanations should be understood from the extensive analysis found in *Entering the Middle Way*. That is why I will not elaborate further in this context.

In brief, just as the self is not the aggregates, it also cannot be different from the aggregates. If it were different from the aggregates, it would not have the characteristics of aggregates, just as a horse, being different from a cow, does not have the characteristics of the cow. If you think that the self is different from the aggregates, it would not have the characteristics of the aggregates. Since the aggregates are compounded phenomena, they have the characteristics of production, duration, and disintegration. If the self does not have the characteristics of the aggregates, it cannot possess production, duration, and disintegration. Therefore, either the self does not exist, or else it is an uncompounded phenomenon, like a flower in the sky or like nirvana. Such a self of which we speak is not suitable even to be the object of the conception of the self. Therefore a self distinct from the

---

<sup>3</sup> Nagarjuna, *Root Verses on the Middle Way*, 27.6.

<sup>4</sup> Chandrakirti, *Entering the Middle Way*, 6.127ab.

aggregates is also impossible. In other words, it is not a separate phenomenon.

Moreover, if the self were totally different from the aggregates, its characteristics would not be those of the aggregates. These are characteristics of the five aggregates: fit to be form, experiencing, discriminating characteristics, formative, and cognitive. Considering the self as different from the aggregates, it would have characteristics distinct from those of [the five aggregates, from] form to consciousness. If it had distinct characteristics, it would have to be apprehended distinctly, just as the mind is apprehended [differently] from the body. Therefore the self does not exist even as different from the aggregates.

Non-Buddhists, believing in a different self from the aggregates, shouldn't they also assert that it is of different characteristics, since this way would not be faulty. This is how non-Buddhists propound a self of different characteristics, as explained in the Entering:

Non-Buddhists designate a self that is the one who experiences, permanent, not an agent, **equal attributes**. The system of non Buddhists is differentiated on the basis of various small subdivisions.

Non Buddhists propose a self with true characteristics that is different from the aggregates, but they do not profess these characteristics by observing the nature of this self. In what way then?

Frightened, they do not realize in accordance with the meaning of dependent designation, and by not realizing that the self is a mere name, they also misconceive conventional truth. Therefore, driven only by misconceptions, they are deceived with faulty inferences that have wrong reasons, imagining a self and expounding its characteristics. In the analysis of actions, of the agent and others, it is taught that the self and the

appropriated are established in mutual dependence and the aforesaid (views of the non buddhist) are also refuted conventionally.

Therefore,

"As the reflection (of a face) appears depending on a mirror , it doesn't really exist at all,

In the same way, depending on the aggregates, the conception of the self is observed like the nature of the reflection of the face, it doesn't really exist at all.

Just as without depending on the mirror, the reflection of the face does not appear, without depending on the aggregates, it is the same also for the conception of the self".

Since this has been taught (elsewhere), I will not elaborate on that. (295)

The self that is designated in dependence to its basis and those who possess the distortion of ignorance grasp it completely; those who wish to achieve liberation should investigate whether what appears as the appropriator of the five aggregates is of their characteristics or whether it is devoid of the characteristics of the aggregates. After having analyzed in every way, those who seek liberation remain without an object of observation.

Therefore, in this passage:

*2. If the self does not exist,  
how can exist what belongs to it (mine).*

Since a self is not observed, even the five aggregates that are the cause (basis) of designating a self are not exaggeratedly seen as mine (possessed). Just as when a chariot burns, its parts also burn and are no more observable, in the same way

when yogis realize that this self is devoid of self at that moment they also realize with certainty that the thing of mine, the aggregates, are also devoid of self.

"Aggregates arise from the conception of I, and because this conception of I is a falsehood, how can what has arisen from a false seed be true? Seeing then that these aggregates are not true, one abandons the conception of I. Abandoning the conception of I, later the aggregates will not arise".

It is like when the powerful light of the sun in a cloudless sky at the end of spring pervades all directions. Like the glow of fire in a great furnace, increasing the heat of the earth surface. Because of that, to those who are looking from far a mirage like water is observed, appearing like it was water, but this doesn't happen to those who are near by. In the same way, ordinary beings affected by the delusion of ignorance view the reality of nature of self and mine from far, superimposing a false reality to self and aggregates that appears to them as truly existing. Such entity doesn't appear to those close by.

"A form seen from afar, is seen clearly by those close by.

If the mirage was water, why can't those near see it?

Those who are far away see the world as real.

Those who are near do not see it so, for them, like a mirage, it is devoid of features.

In the manner of a mirage looking like water but is not and does not exist as such, so the aggregates appear like the self, but they are not the self and do not exist as such".

Because he doesn't observe a self and mine, he doesn't see them as ultimate, the yogi who is near definitely

*pacifying the self and mine*

*the conceptions of the self and mine cease*

The meaning of *mine* is the five aggregates, that mine is what benefit the self . By pacifying the object of the conception of i, the self, and the object of the conception of mine, the five aggregates, by not observing will not arise, and the yogi becomes devoid of the conception of self and mine.

Someone wonders: “since the conceptions of i and mine cease, would the yogi also ceases to exist temporarily? If he exists, would also self and the aggregates exist?”

Is not like that. How so?

*3. He who does not have the conception of i and mine doesn't exist either, so*

*The one who see who doesn't have the concept i and mine Doesn't see.*

The conceptions of self and mine cease to exist when all aspects of intrinsically existing self and aggregates are not observed. How can anything other than these exist? Those who see those who do not exist intrinsically and who are without the conception of the self and mine, do not see reality.

Baghawan said:

"Look at the inner self as empty,  
and look how empty the outside is too.  
Even those who meditate on emptiness  
don't exist.

Moreover:

That mind of pacified and totally pacified phenomena  
Childish beings enter wrong paths  
Phenomena are empty, without letters  
and that without letters is shown with letters.

That mind of pacified and totally pacified phenomena  
even that mind, never arose.

All the elaborations are the conceptual mind

Therefore, you should know that all phenomena are  
inconceivable.

And, in the same way

“The aggregates are devoid of intrinsic nature, emptiness...

enlightenment is devoid of intrinsic nature, emptiness.

whatever is experienced is also empty of intrinsic existence

The knowledge of transcendental wisdom is not for childish  
beings”.

Thus is taught.

Therefore:

*4. If the thoughts of i and mine,  
Inside and outside, cease,  
Appropriation is stopped  
And by extinguishing it, birth will also cease.*

All mental afflictions are rooted in the view of transitory  
collection. The view of transitory collection is the origin.

Because the view of transitory collection, as taught in the  
sutras, is the root, abandoning I and mine, his objects of  
observations, one also abandons the view of transitory  
collection and with that one abandons the four appropriations:  
desire, views, moralities and activities, and positing a self. *By  
extinguishing actions and afflictions, one is liberated* explains  
these stages of stopping rebirth.

*5. By extinguishing actions and afflictions one is liberated*



In this way, by extinguishing appropriation, existence with that as a condition will not arise. By stopping appropriation and existence, how can birth, aging and death happen? This establishes that liberation occurs by extinguishing actions and mental afflictions.

Someone may say that, at this point, it is necessary to explain how actions and mental afflictions are extinguished:

*Actions and mental afflictions arise from conceptualizations,  
And these from elaborations. Elaborations  
Are stopped by emptiness.*

Ordinary childish beings have unreal distorted concepts about form and so on, and that is how attachment and other mental afflictions arise.

"It is taught that attachment, aversion, and ignorance  
Arise from distorted conceptualization  
Of pleasant and unpleasant.  
They all arise depending on these."

So it has been explained. Even in the Sutra:

"Attachment, I understand that the root that produces you is conceptualizations.  
Since I do not follow your conceptualizations, you do not rise in me."(300)

In this way, actions and mental afflictions arise from conceptualisations and these, in turn arise from the multiple elaborations of characteristics to which we have been accustomed since beginningless time in samsara: knowledge, object of knowledge, expressed object and espression, vase, cloth, chariot, shape, feelings, birth, woman, gain and not gain,

happiness and suffering, fame and not fame, praise and offense. By means of emptiness, within the view of that all phenomena are emptiness, all these elaborations cease.

How? In whoever observe an external thing, there are the aforementioned elaborations. Without observing the child of a barren woman, the mind of those who have attachment don't engage into elaborations (with regard to the son of a barren woman). Without engaging with elaborations that mind doesn't initiate unreal conceptualizations. Moreover, without the involvement of conceptualizations, mental afflictions arising from intensely conceiving I and mine, whose root is the view of transitory collection, do not arise.

Since the mental afflictions that are rooted in the view of transitory collection do not arise, actions do not take place and without the activity of actions no samsaric birth, aging and death are experienced. That is why, depending on emptiness whose characteristic is to pacify all elaborations, one is separated from elaborations. Moreover, by separating from elaborations, conceptualizations come to an end. Stopping conceptualizations stops mental afflictions and actions and stopping them stops birth. Therefore, since it has the characteristic of stopping all elaborations, only emptiness is known as the state beyond suffering (nirvana).

This is taught in the 400 stanzas:

“In short, the Dharma that taught the Thatagata is just these two: non-violence and that emptiness is nirvana”.

Master Bavaviveka does not understand that the hearers and the solitary realizers possess the realization of emptiness which is explained here.

It is taught that:

"Even superior hearers definitely observe the multitude of formative phenomena as devoid of I and mine. This and that, they have the nature of momentary production and disintegration. Therefore, since the phenomenon called self does not exist, they generate the vision that those who are subjected to production and disintegration are mere phenomena and nothing more. Thus, since the self that is the object of the conception of the I does not exist, it also does not arise. Since it does not exist at all, it does not even exist as an internal or external phenomenon, even the conception of my own is not acceptable.

Apart from the conventional labelling, there is no self to be grasped as self and therefore not even a graspable self exists. If the ascertainment of an intrinsic production does not take place, what need is there to affirm that even the great bodhisattvas dwell in the object of engagement of non-conceptual wisdom that observes the non-existence of production of formative phenomena?

For this, it is taught that:

“Even he who does not conceive I and mine doesn’t exist”.

These words express this concept.

The way of thinking of this master is not in line with the system of master (Nagarjuna). Therefore, in Madhyamika's Supplement "...he who has gone far is superior even in intelligence". This is already explained and I don't need to keep rejecting it.

‘Bro For this is the truth that Baghawan has taught very extensively: "Subhuti, even those who wish to obtain the enlightenment of the Hearers must train in the same perfection of wisdom. Subhuti, even those who wish to attain the

enlightenment of the solitary realizers must train in the same perfection of wisdom. Subhūti, even those who wish to attain the unsurpassable perfect enlightenment must train in the same perfection of wisdom”.

It is also taught that:

"Those who want to become Tathagata Hearers, and equally those who want to become Solitary Realizers and Dharma Sovereigns, without depending on this fortitude, cannot do so. **For example, do not see the landing on this or that shore.**

So, by not observing internal and external things, the conceptions of I and mine think of internal and external things will not arise. It is asserted that this is the reality.

Then isn't it perhaps in contradiction with these passages taught extensively by Baghawan?

"You are your own savior, how can anyone else be your protector?

By perfectly pacifying themselves, the wise beings obtain the higher states”.

"Black and white deeds do not fade away.

What one does one will experience, actions and their results are also not transferable nor arise without causes and conditions."

The answer is as follows:

"Such a self does not exist in beings, these phenomena have causes..."

Also:

"The self is not form, self doesn't possess form, form doesn't have self, self doesn't have form.

In the same way, self is not the consciousness, self does not possess consciousness and consciousness doesn't have self and in the self doesn't have consciousness. Likewise, all phenomena are without self".

What is it that has not been taught by Baghawan? So the previous and subsequent quotations are not contradictory. Since this is what Baghawan taught, one must seek his intention.

In the scriptures, in general, regarding the Baghawan:

*6. They have taught a self,  
And they also taught non-self.  
The Buddhas also taught that the self  
And non-self don't exist at all.*

The intention of this passage is as follows: those who have the eyes of intelligence completely covered by the thick layer of the cataract of distorted views, do not see, and do not go beyond the object of conventional correct view. Thus, relating exclusively in the conventional truth they just believe in a reality that unfolds only from what is called earth, water, fire, and wind. They assert that the awareness of the fetus arises as a fruition of the great elements, just as beer alcoholic potential to intoxicate and make one unconscious is seen arising only due to the ripening of their particular substance's potential as condition, such as roots and seeds, dough, water, heat and so on.

They don't accept past and future lives, negating also the existence of this world, and the fruitions of positive and negative actions. Because for them there is not miraculous birth in sentient beings, they refute future lives and the self. Due to this denial, they turn their back to the aspiration of achieving high rebirths, purification and liberation, and engage

solely in non virtuous formative actions, eventually falling in the great precipices of hells and so forth. In order to stop the distorted views of these beings, they take care of inferior, middling and superior disciples. For the inferior disciples engaging in negative actions they teach in order to stop those non virtuous actions. The Buddha Baghawan with 84000 different types of activities act in accordance with the physical and mental make up of sentient beings. These unmatched friends of sentient beings engage and act with effort to liberate sentient beings from all existences, with method, wisdom and great compassion. Thus, curing all the diseases of mental afflictions like a great king physicians, it is said that *they have taught a self*.

Logically refuting proponents of no cause.

The analysis of agent and action and also (production) without causes should be known in detail in the Supplement of the Middle Way . Since i have already refuted those in that context, i will not elaborate in here.

Those with a strong view of a real self who engage in virtuous action and turn away from non virtue, just like a bird tied up with a very long tread, although they can go very far will not be able to go beyond the three realms to the peaceful city of Nirvana. In order to help the middling capacities disciples to loose the grasping grip of the view of transitory collection and generate the intention to achieve the state beyond sorrow the Buddha Baghawan also taught non-self.

Those who, have a special inclination for the profound Dharma and are close to the achievement of nirvana due to having the characteristic of past acquaintance, since the seed for that is about to ripen, are separated from attachment to self and have the capacity to fathom the depth of the most profound supreme meaning of reality explained in the scriptures of Buddha Baghawan. For these supreme capacities disciples, by

seizing on the characteristic of their exceptional inclination the Buddhas taught that self and even non-self don't exist. Just like the view of the self is not real, in the same way also his antidote, the view of selfless is not real. Therefore they taught that *the self and non-self don't exist at all*.

The Sutra says:

“Kashapa, what is called self is an extreme and what is called selflessness is the other extreme. Because being in the middle of those two extremes, is without form, undefinable, without support, without appearance, uncognizable, baseless. Kashapa, this is called the middle path of perfect detailed investigation of phenomena”.

Also in the Precious Garland it is taught:

“Thus neither self or no self  
Are to be apprehended as real.  
Therefore the great Subduer rejected  
Views of self and non self.

Sights, sounds and so forth were said by the Subduer  
Not to be true and not to be false.  
If from one position its opposite arises  
Both in fact do not exist”.

In order for the beings disciples of different capacities, inferior, middling and great, to enter the Dharma, Buddha Baghawan taught self, non self and refuted both. Therefore, Madiamakas are not damaged by scriptures. For this reason, master Aryadeva said:

“Initially stop the non virtuous, then in the middle stop the self and in the end stop all the views. Who understands this is a sage”. (305)

The master also taught:

“Just like the manner in which one is introduced to reading in order to become literate,

In the same way, Buddha teaches the Dharma to disciples according to their capacity.

To some he teaches Dharma to stop them from non virtue,

To some to accumulate merits, and to some he relies on duality.

To others he doesn't rely on duality. To those who doubt and fear the profound

With the essence of emptiness and compassion, he teaches them the path to achieve the state of Buddha”.

This can be understood also in another way. Because, compounded phenomena are subject to momentary destruction and therefore Samkyas and so forth view actions and results as without connection, it is feasible that to them *they have taught a self*.

Charvakas, who don't see a self revolving in samsara:

A being is solely what is perceived by senses as an object. Studying and propounding the profound is like following a jackal.

In this way and so on, they also taught non-self. In the same way in which those without cataract see the shaved hair seeing by those affected by cataract, the Baghawan doesn't see in anyways self, selflessness and so forth, the things as imputed by childish beings, as with intrinsic nature. For this is taught:

*The Buddhas also taught the self and the non-self, don't exist at all.*



Well then, the Buddha Baghawan have taught that both self and no self don't exist . Since neither of this two were taught, so what did they teach?

*7. Verbal expressions are refuted because*

*The object engaged by the mind is refuted*

*Unproduced, unceased*

*Reality is like Nirvana.*

If they were some verbal expressions, that could be explained. When the verbal expression is refuted, the object of those words do not exist, that's why the Buddhas haven't explained it at all. Why the object of verbal expression doesn't exist? The object of engagement of the mind is refuted; the object of engagement of the mind is the object engaged by the mind. Object of engagement is an object, and that is called with the term referent. If some of the object of engagement of the mind exist, due to this one could attach verbal expressions to it. Whenever the object engaged by the mind is unfeasible, projecting reasons one could verbally express it. Yet, why the object of engagement of the mind doesn't exists? To teach this, it is taught that:

*Unproduced, unceased*

*Reality is like Nirvana.*

The reality that is unproduced and unceased is the nature of phenomena. Positing the nature of phenomena as similar to Nirvana is the meaning of not engaged by the mind. If is not engaged by the mind, how can there be projections? And because this is not, how can it be engaged with words. This is why the Buddhas haven't explained it at all. Therefore:

“Having pacified all referents

Elaborations are pacified.

Never the Buddhas

Have taught phenomena to anyone”.

This is either not in this way or is different from the previous one. Having said that elaborations are stopped by emptiness, in what manner elaborations are stopped by emptiness?

*Verbal expression are refuted because*

*The object engaged by the mind is refuted*

This passage and so forth should be understood as the one before<sup>5</sup>. What they express in the same way as that before, by not observing phenomena internally and externally, the conception of I and mine with respect to the inner and the outer, are extinguished. This is what is explained as reality. And how is it? Is it possible to explained it in order to understand it?

*Verbal expressions are refuted because*

*The object engaged by the mind is refuted.*

In the remaining verse is the explanation of what is called reality. Moreover, if one asks what is the cause for saying that verbal expression are refuted because *the object engaged by the mind is refuted*:

*unproduced, unceased,  
reality is equivalent to Nirvana.*

For this reason, in the Sutra is taught:

“Shantimati, from the day in which the Tathagata achieves the unsurpassable perfect and complete enlightenment till the day in which, without appropriation enters the complete state

---

<sup>5</sup> see pg 13 So, by not observing internal and external things, the conceptions that I and mine think of internal and external things will not arise. It is asserted that this is the reality.

beyond sorrow, the Tathagata doesn't speak even a single syllable. There is no speech happening" .

“Just like there is sound out of a of cimbal music machine and the stirring of wind, although no one is there playing yet sounds arise. In the same way, for those sentient beings who have previously practice well and possess the intention, the speech of the Buddha arises but there is no thought behind it. Just like an eco is not within nor abiding outside, likewise the speech of the Buddha abides within and outside.”

In this respect, someone says that there is no difference between madhyamikas and those who profess utter non existence. Why? With respect to those who profess that virtuous and non virtuous actions, the agent, results and all the worlds are empty of intrinsic existence, those who profess utter non existence say that these don't exist. Therefore, they argue that there is no difference between madhyamikas and utter non existence. This is not the case because the madhyamikas assert arising by dependent relation, and because the world and the world beyond arise by dependent relation they profess that they are not intrinsically existent. Those who assert utter non existence dont think that this and the world beyond dont exist because they arise by dependent relation are not intrinsically existent. Then what they think? They view the appearance of this life as intrinsically existent thing, and don't see this life coming from the past or going to the future. In this way, they deny the existence of other phenomena in the way they do with this life. Someone could say that despite this view, they think of non existence because things are not intrinsically existent, therefore the view is similar from this point of view. This is not the case because the madhyamikas do accept conventional existence whereas they don't, therefore they bear no similarity.

In case someone says that it would be like things are not established. Even if (for him) it were like not being established,

for a different cognizer would not be like that. It is like this, for example with respect to a thief, one person sees this man as honest, he befriends this person and therefore is inclined to consider who accuses him of being a thief to be wrong. Someone else, having seen it directly (that he is a thief), contradicts the first person. In this case the thing is not different, but there are two different cognizers, one saying that is a lie (that he is a thief) and the other saying it is true.

One designates as true, but that becomes faulty and without consensus, but not the other. In the same way, also in the case of different entity of thing, Madyamikas explain and understand in accordance with the nature of a thing, while the nihilists don't cognise accordingly the entity of the thing. Therefore their understanding and their explanations do not accord with what exists.

The masters of the past did not consider the non individual investigation of ordinary beings with the individual investigation of Arya being, them alike. Like, although from the objective point of view a blind person and someone with side are alike, there is a great difference, in the same way there is difference between nihilists and madyamikas.

Therefore, what is not produced, not ceased, reality is similar to nirvana, if it was that this can not be engaged by speech and mind, without explanation those sentient beings who are the intended disciples would not be able to understand it. In order to make sentient beings who are intended disciples to engage in that, one should definitely rely on conventional truth. Because it is necessary to show it in a gradual order, it should be expressible .

The expression: in order to show the gradual order of engagement with the nectar of reality of the Buddha Baghawans, this should be understood:

*8. All is real and not real,  
this real and unreal  
it is not real and not unreal  
this are the teachings of the Buddha*

“Beforehand, it should be explained what the person likes.  
Those who are corrupted are not vessels of the pure Dharma.”

And

“Just like a barbarian cannot be  
guided using a different language,  
worldly people cannot be guided  
except by worldly ways”.

Likewise, also the Baghawan:

“The world is in disaccord with me, i am not in disaccord with  
the world. What is well known in the world to exist i also day it  
exists. What is not well known to exists in the world, i also day  
it doesnt exists.

This is from scriptural citations.

Initially, exclusively for the time being, thinking in accord with  
the mode of worldly environment and sentient beings,  
beginning with formation, abiding and disintegration, from the  
wind mandala up to the pick of samsara throughout the infinite  
space element along with all the various unmistakable categories  
of causes, effects, tastes, shortcomings, explanations,  
because the Baghawan is omniscient he sees them all.  
Thinking “I totally know the mode of arising of the world” “for  
the world to develop respect in me i rely on that view. The  
categories of things are in accordance with what is known by  
the persons who are the intended disciples. By hearing about  
the categories of things and the distinctions of entities, their

interest is awoken To those who are affected by the cataract of ignorance I teach that the reality they designate as truly existent is real. Because of this, the persons who are the intended disciples will come to think that the Baghawan is omniscient. Later, i will teach them that all this is not real”.

Now, regarding the meaning of “real”, it is whatever doesn't change into something else. Since they disintegrate momentarily, compounded phenomena change into something else. Therefore, since they change into something else they are not real. The word “and” is a connecting particle, so the passage “all is real and not real” should be regarded as a summary explanation.

Someone says the all these explain that “this real and unreal” because for the childish beings all this is real, or the transcendental wisdom of an Arya all this is false.

For those with a long familiarity with the view of reality and are only slightly obscured and not liberated, the explanation “it is not real and not unreal” in order to abandon even that little obscuration, like in the case of the child of a barren woman the fact his face, even a part of it is of clear or dark complexion is rejected, and both are rejected. This is explained by the Buddha Baghawan in order to stop corrupted path and establish them on a virtuous path. Like that, he teaches in a gradual way. Or he teaches in accordance with the capacities of the intended person disciples. All the teachings given by the the Buddha Baghawns are within the method to enter the nectar of reality. Nothing said by the Tathagatas is anything other than teaching the method to enter the nectar of reality. Just like in case of dispensing a medicine or the specific ailment, teachings are carried out in accordance with the capacities in order to take care o those beings to be pacified.

From 400 stanzas:

It was taught that exist, doesn't exist,  
non existing and also neither.

What is called medicine is in relation to the ailment  
not for everything.

What are the characteristics of the reality taught in the  
teachings given in order to enter that?

*Verbal expression are refuted because*

*The object engaged by the mind is refuted*

I have explained this before.

What else can be asked at this point, since this is it? Even  
thought it is like this, one could say that for those who believe  
in the conventional, there is the need of expressing the  
characteristics of the projections in the perception of  
conventional truth. For this, the expression

*9. Not knowledge from others, peaceful  
and not constructed by elaborations  
non concettuale, nota different object  
these are the characteristics of reality.*

In this, the meaning of *not knowledge from others* is that it is  
not understood from others, not realized in dependence on  
others, it has to be realized by oneself.

Just as those with cataract mistakingly see shredded hairs and  
so forth, even if they rely on those who are not affected by  
cataract they are not able to realize in the way those without  
cataract don't see shredded hairs and so forth. How then? By  
relying on those without cataract they will realize only the  
words saying that is a mistaken perception. Once the medicine  
to cure the cataract is applied to the eyes, being without  
cataract, they will realize by means of not apprehending the  
entity of shredded hairs and so forth. Those who are not Aryas,

even if they wish to have reality explained by Aryas by means of superimpositions, with nearly this they won't be able to realize reality. But when the medicine for the cataract of ignorance, the unmistakable view of emptiness, is applied to the eyes of intellect, it will produce the transcendental wisdom of reality, in that very moment one will realize that reality in the manner of not apprehending. Therefore, that reality is the very entity of things not understood from others.

It is *peaceful* in nature: the meaning is that, as without cataract one does not see shredded hairs, it is devoid of nature. Because of being like this, is *not elaborated by elaborations*. Elaborations are words, because they elaborate appearances of phenomena. *Not elaborated by elaborations* is a terminology indicating that is not expressible, and that is also without conceptualizations. Conceptualizations make the mind stirring, and since it is separated from these that reality is *without concepts*.

The Sutra says: What is ultimate truth? That where the mind doesn't stir, even if one wishes to see letters, what is the use of it? Therefore, is without concepts. If this was of different meaning, a different phenomena would be an individual phenomena. Not being a direct phenomena, is not different, whose meaning is that is not an individual phenomena.

In the Sutra of the two truths of Aryas it is said:

The divine child said:

“Mañjuśrī, what is the application of the excellent phenomenon (ultimate reality)?”

Mañjuśrī said:

“Divine son, the excellent phenomenon is whatever is the same as reality itself, the sphere of phenomena, and the utterly unborn, on



the excellent phenomenon is also the same as the (five) uninterrupted (actions).

“Whatever is the same as the uninterrupted in the excellent phenomenon, is also the same as views.

“Whatever is the same as the views in the excellent phenomenon, is also the same as the phenomena of ordinary beings.

“Whatever is the same in the excellent phenomenon of ordinary beings phenomena, is also the same as the phenomena of those who are training.

“Whatever is the same of ordinary beings phenomena, is also the same as the phenomena of those who are no longer training.

“Whatever is the same as the phenomena of those who are no longer training is also the same as the phenomena of the completely perfect Buddha.

“Whatever is the same as the phenomena of the completely perfect Buddha is also the same as nirvāṇa.

“Whatever is the same as nirvāṇa is also the same as saṃsāra.

“Whatever is the same in the excellent phenomenon as saṃsāra is also the same as the totally afflicted.

“Whatever is the same in the excellent phenomenon as the totally afflicted on the ultimate level is also ultimately the same as purification.

“Whatever is the same as the excellent phenomenon of purification is also the same as all phenomena.

“A monk who genuinely engages in the equality of all phenomena on the ultimate level in this way, divine son, is called one with *the application of the excellent phenomenon*. Yet, it is not like the way it is expressed.”

The divine child said:

“Mañjuśrī, what is the equality within the excellent phenomenon up to purification is said to be the equality of all phenomena within the excellent phenomenon?”

Mañjuśrī said, “The excellent phenomenon is that all phenomena are equally unborn. The excellent phenomenon is that all phenomena are equally unarisen. The excellent phenomenon is that all phenomena are utterly unborn. The excellent phenomenon is that all phenomena are equally non thing. Divine son, all phenomena are equal within the perfect phenomenon.

How so? Having apprehended the utter unbornness within the perfect phenomenon, all phenomena are not different.

“Divine son, it is like this analogy. The space within a clay vessel and the space within a precious vessel are both the element of space; ultimately, not the slightest distinction can be made between them. Divine son, in the same way, within the perfect phenomenon the totally afflicted are utterly unborn. Purification is also utterly unborn within the perfect phenomenon. Also saṃsāra, within the perfect phenomenon is utterly unborn. Within the perfect phenomenon, up to nirvāṇa, are utterly unborn.” (Quote arranged from Teaching the Relative and Ultimate Truths translation of 84000)

That’s why it is thought that, within the perfect phenomenon all phenomena are utterly unborn. Therefore, one should know that the characteristic of reality is that of not being a different phenomena, because being of the same taste in emptiness. These should be understood consecutively.

In this context this is the characteristic of Superior’s reality.

In order to express the reality in the context of ordinary beings:

*10. Whatever arises in dependence on something  
is not the same as that  
and yet is not different either.  
Therefore is not nihility nor permanent.*

Just like the rise sprout arises depending on the rise seed, an effect arises depending on its cause. Yet you can’t say that is the same as that. Whatever is the seed is not the sprout because there would be the consequence that what arises and what makes that arising are the same, father and son although are two would become one, and because being one, at the time of the sprout one would also apprehend the seed, or one would not apprehend the sprout just like (one doesn’t apprehend) the seed. In this way the seed would be permanent because having accepted that it doesn’t disintegrate. Therefore one would incur in a great mistake due to having asserted permanence, with the consequence of negating the existence of actions and results. This means that is not feasible to state that the seed itself is the sprout, nor that is different from it.

Also, the sprout itself is not different from the seed, or it would allow that a sprout would grow even without a seed, it would come to this monad so on:

If other is other than other,  
in that moment it would be other without other.

At the moment of the sprout the continuity of the seed would not have ceased. Such are the confusing mistakes. Therefore, because a result arises from a cause, that cause is not the result, and that result is not something different from that cause. This is why it is possible to assert what is stated that the cause is not nihility, nor permanent.

Also Aryadeva in the 400 stanzas<sup>6</sup>:  
Since things function  
it follows that they are not nihility.  
Since things come to end,  
it follows they are not permanent.

Also the Sutra teaches:

If there is a seed, likewise the sprout  
the seed is not the sprout itself  
is not other than that nor that either,  
therefore that phenomena is not nihility nor permanent.

Therefore, in the manner of these explanations:

*11. The nectar of the teachings  
of the Buddhas, Saviors of the world:  
not the same, nor different,  
not nihility nor permanent.*

The perfect completely enlightened Buddhas by amassing the great clouds of their great Naga great compassion, covering the entire

---

<sup>6</sup> chapter 10 last stanza.

expanse of the sky act to pacify the torment of the intense heat of the sun of the manifest cause of the masses of afflictions, attachment and so forth, of migratory beings, constantly without interruption in accordance with their actions, let descend the flow of the nectar of their teachings, that being the antidote, benefitting the growth of the sprout of the harvest of the root of virtues in the intended disciples, in order to take care of them. Constantly letting the rain of Dharma nectar, protecting those worldly beings without protection, and saving those without savior. One should know that the nectar of the pure dharma of the saviors of the world, cutting aging and death, has the modality of teaching separated from being one or different, devoid of from propounding nihilism, and permanence.

Hearers enter the nectar of the dharma of reality, by gradually approaching with listening, reflecting and meditating. By engaging only the nectar of the three trainings, morality, concentration and wisdom, with certainty they realize the state beyond sorrow whose entity is the exhaustion of aging and death. However, in case in that very life, although having heard the nectar of the pure dharma the root of virtues do not ripen and they don't achieve nirvana, in a future life, due to the strength of the previous causes, without doubt they will ripen.

In the 400:

Through knowing reality, even if now  
one doesn't achieve nirvana  
one will certainly gain it effortlessly  
in a later life, as it is with actions.

In a seldom case:

*12. If the perfect buddhas have not arisen  
and also the hearers are exhausted*

(...and also the hearers are exhausted...) In such circumstances, because the conditions for being led to the Arya path are not complete one can not achieve the nectar of reality, depending solely on the strength of the cause of having listened in regard to reality in previous lives, even

if in this very life one is without the possibility of relying on the teachings, one will achieve it merely on the basis of absence of conditions. The self arisen:

*The transcendental wisdom of Self Buddhas arises without support.*

(...arises without support...) Now regarding being without support, whether in relation to body and mind isolation or not searching for a virtuous teacher, these are the causes of being without support. This is because during a time when the Buddhas do not arise, Self Buddhas realize the reality. Therefore, one should understand that, the king of physicians, the perfectly enlightened Buddhas teach the pure Dharma, the nectar of reality, as it was quoted before, they achieve the fruition of that. Since this is what happens, for those who are endowed with wisdom is appropriate to pursue reality at the cost of their lives just as the ever crying Bodhisattva pursued the Baghawati.

The following passage is mentioned in the Perfection of Wisdom in 8000 verse. It was asked: Baghawan, how did the Bodhisattva Mahasattva Saraparudita pursue the Perfection of Wisdom? The Baghawan replied to Subuti endowed with life: Subhuti, in the past the Bodhisattva Mahasattva Saraparudita pursued the Perfection of Wisdom without the slightest regard for his body, for his life, for fame and gain and words related to these. While pursuing the Perfection of Wisdom in this way, he went to a remote area and he heard a sound in the space.

Go East, son of good family! There you shall hear the perfection of wisdom! And on your way you must not pay attention to the weariness of your body, you must not give in to sleep and drowsiness, you must pay no attention to food, up to not paying attention to other or inner things. You must not look to the left or right, to the South, East, West or North, upwards or downwards, or in any of the intermediate directions. Do not be distracted by the self or the transitory collection. Do not be distracted by form, likewise by feelings, discriminations, by compositional factors, and

do not be distracted even by mind consciousness. When you are distracted by these, you will degenerate. From what one degenerates? One degenerates from the Dharma of the Buddhas. Whoever is degenerated from the Buddhadharma acts in samsara. Whoever acts in Samsara doesn't act with the Perfection of Wisdom and will not achieve the Perfection of Wisdom (...up to...) There was no water in sight and no matter how much he searched for water couldn't find any. Then, the Bodhisattva Mahasattva Sadaparudita thought: I shall cut my body and use the blood to moisten the ground. Why? The ground here in this place is very dusty, and it wouldn't be suitable for the Bodhisattva Mahasattva Dharmodgata to physically come to such a dusty place. Certainly my body will disintegrate, what is the use of it? It is better for me to destroy my body in this way rather than with an inferior action. While in samsara, I wasted meaninglessly hundreds and thousands of bodies after samsaric pleasure. Then the Bodhisattva Mahasattva Sadaparudita, took a sharp knife and pierced his body in many places and sprinkled all over the ground with his blood.

Then as soon as the Bodhisattva Mahasattva Sadaparudita saw the Bodhisattva Mahasattva Dharmodgata, he felt the bliss that a fully ordained monk feels when in single pointed absorption in the first concentration level. Then the Bodhisattva Mahasattva Dharmodgata taught the Perfection of Wisdom in this way: because all phenomena are equal, so the Perfection of Wisdom is equal. Because all phenomena are isolated, so the perfection of wisdom is isolated. Because all phenomena imperturbable, so the Perfection of Wisdom is imperturbable. Because all phenomena are without conceited mind, the Perfection of Wisdom is without conceited mind. Because all phenomena are without arrogance, the Perfection of Wisdom is without arrogance. Because all phenomena are of the same taste, the Perfection of Wisdom is of the same taste. Because all phenomena are limitless, the Perfection of Wisdom is itself limitless. Because all phenomena are unproduced, the Perfection of Wisdom is unproduced. Because all phenomena are unimpeded, the Perfection of Wisdom is itself unimpeded. (Until...) Because space is limitless, the Perfection of Wisdom is itself limitless. Because all phenomena are unmixed, the Perfection of Wisdom is itself unmixed. Because all phenomena are

unobservable, the Perfection of Wisdom itself is unobservable. Because all phenomena are equal to disintegration itself, the Perfection of Wisdom is equal to disintegration itself. Because all phenomena are without activity itself, the Perfection of Wisdom is without activity itself. (Until one should know that ...)Because all phenomena are unconceivable, the Perfection of Wisdom is unconceivable.<sup>7</sup>

From the Clear Words, as spoken by the master Chandrakirti, the commentary to 18 chapter “The Analysis of Self”.

---

<sup>7</sup> From the Perfection of Wisdom Sutra in 8000 verses, the chapter on Sadaparudita.

