CLASS ONE

JULY 5, 2013

Melting Disagreements Away

Part 7 of *The Devil Debates an Angel*,

A Book of Wisdom written by

His Holiness the First Panchen Lama,

Four Centuries Ago
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This is an argument, which occurred one time between Wisdom and her opponent, whose name was The Tendency to Think that Things are Real. It all started when Wisdom was identifying what the word “Mahamudra” meant, at three different stages in a person’s life: in the way things normally are for them; in the way they are as this person practices the spiritual path; and as they are when the person reaches the fruit of their practice.

*Explained emptiness as emptiness of partner who is criticizing you. Then the devil is telling you that the partner is always criticizing you and that's their fault, not yours. But those two forms of misunderstanding and understanding can't exist at the same time in one mind. So you need to make the angel strong enough to keep the devil out.*

*We're going to do some review and then get to an ancient view of emptiness.*

*Mahamudra is a practice of watching your mind and catching the way you think. There are also asanas that will facilitate that practice, and the inner and outer practices go together.*
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I bow down to my Lama, Angel of Angels.

*There's an ancient practice of honoring the one who who taught you that.*

\* \* \* \* \*

*Up to this point in this series of talks, we have yet to cover verses 106-107; and after that we pick up at verse 114.*
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Those who do possess some training

Say they’re meditating on you,

But spend their time trying to prove

One thing or another.

They analyze, and then they examine,

Looking again and again

For some problem in the way that others

Try to meditate.

*He's talking about ideas that people who are well trained might have. They say they are going to meditate on "you", ie the angel's viewpoint, but they spend all their time trying to prove things. They check everything too much and look for problems in other peoples meditations. (this is also a problem in yoga—you might be watching how other people are doing, and not working on your own.*
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They try to find some problem

In the conclusions others make;

Then they analyze, and analyze,

The meditations they used to get there;

And then they start to analyze

The one who’s doing the analysis,

And then move on to the one

Who’s analyzing that.

*This is talking about people who will examine someone else's practice and not focusing on our own. If you're into deeper meditation you'll start to examine your own state of mind which is watching the other person, and then watching that state of mind, etc. And so you get into overanalyzing.*
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The antidotes of analysis come then

To an infinite regression—

You can analyze on to infinity.

But all you’ve done is entangle yourself

In a net of long-winded ideas

That will leave you completely exhausted—

There is nothing there to meditate on.

*If you get into the practice of watching your own mind, you can go overboard and get lost in watching watchers. It's not helpful. Watching your thoughts is a good practice because most of us aren't aware of our own mind—usually we're inside our thoughts and not even aware of where they are going. Very few people get to the point where they can listen to what their mind is saying all day. But there's a point where you should stop checking and just let it flow.*

It feels with this kind of analysis

That the next thing must be something,

But whatever you bring to mind then isn’t

The next thing any more.
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*Some people are lost in thoughts of "me" (meaning the devil—so they're meditating on why their boss is stupid, etc.).*
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*Some people think that it's proper to meditate on nothing, which leads to being absent minded etc.*
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*those people are making a mistake.*
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*If you're going to meditate like that, don't think you're going to kick me out of your mind. Thinking about nothing doesn't hurt me at all.*
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And so sometimes people are meditating

On nothing more than me;

And sometimes they are meditating

On nothing more than nothing;

And sometimes they are meditating

On trying to think of nothing.

A person who is meditating

On the way that all things really are—

Who enters a meditation upon

The object which is absolute,

And thus attains a state of mind

Incompatible with how I see things—

Is as common as a star that shines

In the middle of the day.

*Someone who can meditate in a way which is incompatible with the way the devil thinks is rare. How does the devil think about the partner who is criticizing you? He thinks it's not my fault. The angel understands that it's coming from me. If the angel gets strong enough the devil must go. But those moments of understanding are as common as a star in daylight.*
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Until we come to a day when you

Can change this situation,

I would ask you never to speak again

Of trying to drive me from the mind.

You are an udumbara flower—

(*this flower opens only every 10,000 years when a Buddha is born.)*

One of those blooms that only appears

Once in several thousand years.

*Ie. you have a clear thought very seldom.*

In the very best of circumstances

You might come, but only once;

And even that requires that one

Spend an inconceivable number

Of eons amassing an unsurpassed

Power of virtuous deeds.

*Why does the udumbara open? The coming of an enlightened being. And that is only when you have inconceivable good karma.*

And that can only come by pleasing

The one who is your Lama.

*And that good karma only comes from pleasing your lama. The highest offering that would please a teacher is to offer your practice of doing what they ask you to do. In this case, the udumbara is wisdom coming in your mind for even 5 minutes. To grow up hearing the words that Jesus said about turning your cheek to someone who hit you is an amazing karma, extremely rare in this world.*
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Now for me that’s all unnecessary;

I am this mansion’s resident lord.

*Devil: I'm not like you—I live here (in your mind).*

*Every time you get upset ever, this devil is in your mind. He can't be in your mind for the length of time that you are considering that it might be your doing.*

And sending me from this mind requires

The wisdom that acts against me,

In an unmistaken form:

A way of looking at things

Which is incompatible

With how I see them myself—

There is no other way.

*The only way he's going to get rid of me is if he starts thinking about wisdom.*

k#({,-.}-#6,-+#-9}+->v:-<$-k

k\o,->m=-9m+-&{=-1m-A{+-.=k

k"}-0}8m-E}#=-=v->v:-.-9m,k

kE}#=-=v->v:-;-\*:-.-1{+k

110

And even if there were

Some other, different ways,

Nobody would accept them—

They would come and take me as their friend,

And for those who take me as their friend

Freedom will never be.

*And even if you came up with a good way of getting rid of me, people don't want to do it. People are more interested in TV and Facebook—nobody really cares about this stuff.*

*For people I get along with, there will be no moksha. (the devil makes you blame other people for your problems.)*
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There is another thing that people do

That they think is a meditation

Upon the way things really are:

Rather than hammering me on the head,

They try to reach a state of mind

Free of any conceptions—

A state of mind which never says

Something is either this or that.

And it makes me break out in laughter

From the bottom of the heart.

*If you don't get past this problem, and you don't lay a toreg (Thor's hammer—like the idea that you shouldn't have any opinion and just go with the flow) on me, when I hear people talk like that, I have to laugh.*
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The appearance of things around us

Some count as being the mind,

Deciding the mind must be empty.

Then they decide that being empty

Must mean the mind’s an illusion.

Meditating on this illusion

Is then what it means to say the mind

Possesses no nature of its own;

This then they hold to be meditation

On the way things really are.

*Some people say everything's an illusion so you don't have to be moral and you're free from all responsibility. (He's criticizing that view.)*

But the object here is nothing more

Than the deceptive nature of things;

At best they are only meditating

On what it means to be an illusion.

*The Angel says, it's a good thing to meditate on illusion, and you're doing good. (He means meditating that the partner who criticizes you who isn't your fault.*

*If I think that it's true that my partner is coming from something I did last week, I'm not perceiving emptiness but dependent origination, ie. this stuff is coming from what I did last week.*
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*at the best, this person is only meditating on illusion.*
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*if you meditate on the idea that "I" is not there, then you can damage "I"*

*if you meditate on the idea that "me" is not there, then you can damage "me"*

*gnod means to want to hurt someone or in debate, to damage the other position.*

*Buddhism is saying there is no "self". But I am here and I'm validly here. But there's one person who comes from themselves, like the angry partner who isn't my fault, doesn't exist, and the one who came from what I did does exist.*
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If one were to find in a meditation

That I was something that didn’t exist,

Then that would damage me, because

I can’t not be here and be here too.

But until such time as a person reaches

A meditation where they conclude

That I’m not here, then their view of things

And mine are not in contradiction,

And they could never hurt me at all.

*If you realize they're coming from you, then your viewpoint is opposed to that of the devil and anger can't remain in the mind.*

*—BREAK—*

*(change to a different book) (He searched the ACIP database for chik du drel and came up with an autocommentary on Master Atisha's Light on the Path.)*

*[from ACIP S5941M.ACT, verse 41B, line 6:*

*Author: PAn CHEN BLO BZANG CHOS KYI RGYAL MTSAN*

*Year: 1565-1662*

*Title: BYANG CHUB LAM GYI SGRON MA'I RNAM BSHAD PHUL BYUNG BZHAD PA'I DGA' STON*

*Pages: 1A-54A*

*Tertiary Title: "A Party to Open Up Excellent Things," being an Explanation of "The Lamp for the Path to Enlightenment"*

*Type of Work: M*

*Custom 1: S5941*

*Label: T*

*Abstract: A commentary on Lord Atisha's classic text on the steps to enlightenment at TD3947]*

…,DE BZHIN DU 'DIR YANG LHAG MTHONG GI TSOGS BSTEN PA LA GNYIS,

*He starts about hlaktong—vipashyana. "Vi" means" very much" and "pashya" means "to see". It means "special insight," or meditating on emptiness. The goal of Buddhism is to reach samadhi on emptiness. The first Panchen Lama is going to teach us how to meditate on emptiness.*

TSOGS BSTEN PA *means "I'm going to tell you what you need to get there," if you wanted to see emptiness in a deep state of meditation, which is different from understanding it intellectually.*

*Here's how to get there—there are two ways:*

*1)* RIG PA LA BRTEN PA BSAM BYUNG GI SHES RAB DANG, *logic, reasoning: (you need to understand what it is before you can meditate on it), and*

*2)* LUNG LA BRTEN PA THOS BYUNG GI SHES RAB BO, *scripture. When you're in a debate you can use logic or scripture to prove something. These two lead to meditation, but when you get there, you let them go like a boat after you've crossed the river.*

,DANG PO LA GSUM,

*The first (proof of emptiness) has 3 categories:*

'BRAS BU LA DPYOD PA YOD MED SKYE 'GOG GI GTAN TSIGS,

*"Let us examine results (of the world)"*

*1) products or results, how things are made (we deny that things (that exist or don't exist) could ever start). Example: the process by which an iPhone or a child or a watermelon is made.*

RGYU LA DPYOD PA RDO RJE GZEGS MA'I GTAN TSIGS,

*"Let us examine the causes of things" (and come to emptiness)*

*2) causes of things (dorje sekma, slivers of diamond)*

NGO BO LA DPYOD PA GCIG DU BRAL GYI GTAN TSIGS SO,

*"Let us examine the very nature of things."*

*3) nature of things (chik du drel, one or many)*

*Each of those has a corresponding traditional proof in ancient India. The first is* YOD MED SKYE 'GOG GI GTAN TSIGS, *meaning "we deny that things ever start." Here it means that we deny that something that already existed could ever start, and we also deny that something that didn't ever exist could start.*

*The second proof is called* RDO RJE GZEGS MA*.* Dorje *is "diamond" and* sekma *means "sliver of diamond".*

*The third one is* GCIG DU BRAL*, which is why we're in this text. It is the best presentation of* chik du drel*.* Chik *means "one",* du *is short for* duma*, which means "many", and* drel *means "not there."*

*Is this [cell phone] a thing?*

*You're wrong.*

*Is it one thing or more than one thing?*

*You're wrong.*

*Did this come from some place?*

*You're wrong.*

*Can it do anything?*

*You're wrong.*

*Those are very fundamental wrongs. If you understand them your life will change radically—you can change reality.*

,YOD PA SKYE BAR RIGS MIN TE,

,MED PA'ANG NAM MKHA'I ME TOG BZHIN,

,NYES PA GNYIS KAR THAL 'GYUR PHYIR,

,GNYIS KA DAG KYANG 'BYUNG BA MIN,

ZHES SO,

*1. Discussion on the proof that things don't start. This thing never started; nothing caused it. You could say that it was made in a factory, but did it exist a second before it was manufactured?*

*No.*

*Did it not exist a second before it was made?*

 *No. I didn't say that.*

*Did it both exist and not exist a moment before its manufacture?*

*No. I didn't say that.*

*Did it neither exist nor not exist?*

*No. I didn't say that either.*

*This iPhone couldn't have existed before it was made but it couldn't have not existed either—we have to struggle through this. In there somewhere is the answer to your whole life.*

,GONG DU RANG BZHIN GYIS SKYE BA MED PAR RTOGS PA'I BLO SHES RAB TU BSTAN PA LA, DE MI 'THAD DE,

*Previously we tried to understand that if nothing was itself, that was wisdom. For example the partner who is criticizing you isn't the partner who is criticizing you. Is there any way you can make sense out of that? The partner you thought was there, who isn't your fault, isn't there. The partner who is your fault is there. So you can say the partner isn't your partner.*

DNGOS SMRA BA RNAMS NA RE,— *this refers to a whole group of Buddhist schools who believe that things work.*

*Example: Does aspirin always work? Not all the time. If something doesn't work all the time, it doesn't work. You wouldn't buy a car that only worked sometimes.*

*When aspirin works, why does it work? Not because of something in the aspirin—the "active ingredient" isn't active. When it does work, why does it work? It can't be the 81 mg of aspirin because if it were, then it would work all the time. The power for the aspirin to work isn't* in *the aspirin, it comes from me, from my karmic seeds.*

DNGOS PO RNAMS RANG BZHIN GYIS SKYE BA DANG 'JIG PA; MNGON SUM DU GRUB PA'I PHYIR *(because you can see it with your own eyes),* ZHE NA,

*Objection: But you might say that of course something starts. In the factory, at the moment the last piece went on the product, it started—it was a cell phone. And then if you drop it, at some point it stops working, and it would seem that it's stopping from its own side.*

'O NA, MYU GU RANG BZHIN GYIS SKYE NA, RGYU'I DUS NA YOD PA'AM, MED

PA'AM, GNYIS KA'AM, GNYIS KA MA YIN PA ZHIG RANG BZHIN GYIS SKYE BAR BRTAG GRANG,

*Us: If things* really *started at some point, did it exist the moment before it started or not? In the moment before it was a cellphone, there are four logical permutations about whether it existed or not and we have to prove those four things about the phone. If none of them is true, we can say the phone never started. (If you understand this, you can make anything happen in your life.)*

DANG PO LTAR NA, MYU GU CHOS CAN, RGYU'I DUS SU YOD PA SKYE BA RIGS PA MA YIN TE, YOD PA GRUB ZIN PAS SKYE BA DGOS PA MED PA'I PHYIR DANG,

*1) (It was there the moment before it was completed). If it had been there, then did it start or not? It couldn't have started then, because it was already there. There's no point.*

GRUB ZIN SLAR YANG SKYE NA SKYE BA THUG MED DU 'GYUR BA'I PHYIR,

*If things which already started had to start again how many starts does this thing have to have?*

GNYIS PA LTAR NA, RGYU'I DUS SU MED PA'ANG RANG BZHIN GYIS SKYE BA RIGS

PA MA YIN TE,

*2) (It was not there the moment before it was made—this is the one we believe). You can say it wasn't there in the moment before it was made, but can you say that that was coming from its own side? The thing that wasn't quite a phone yet a moment before its manufacture—is it coming from you or from itself? It's coming from me. The fact that it wasn't a thing yet before it was finished is also coming from me.*

*You could ask if there could be a phone that wasn't quite finished yet, which is not coming from me. And can you say that that phone ever starts? 帀Ɋ*

*Or to put it in terms of a relationship: in the example where your husband was complaining about you, did he start at some time? Yes.*

*Did both the husband that came from you and the husband who wasn't your fault both start complaining? No. There are two husbands in the kitchen—one who started complaining and one who didn't.*

*The one who did start complaining wasn't complaining before you came into the kitchen, but was complaining after you came in. That's the one who is coming from you.*

*Is there a husband who isn't coming from you? He's the one you're upset at, and he doesn't exist, so he can't complain to you. You can say you thought he was but he wasn't because he's not there.*

*Was he complaining a moment before you came into the kitchen? This is the punch line. Was there a phone that wasn't there, an uncompleted phone, a moment before they finished it? Generally you would say yes, the one that is coming from you.*

*3) It was both there and not there before it started.*

*4) It was neither there nor not there before it started.*

*The point of this exercise is to think deeply about how things start. Your husband is complaining—what is the moment when it started? Whatever you find, it must have started before that. Any given moment of tension with your partner, examine what was there before it started.*

*It's like the creation of the universe—big bang. What was there before the big bang? What made it blow up? It's the same with your partner in the kitchen. A seed went off in your mind. There are no external causes.*

BYE BA BRGYA PHRAG RGYU YIS KYANG, ,DNGOS PO MED PA SGYUR DU MED,

*"10 billion causes can't affect a result which is not itself." (Master Shantideva). Can you calm down the husband who isn't your fault? No, because he doesn't exist—nothing can touch him. Change your seeds and he will change—everything else is useless.*

CLASS TWO

JULY 6, 2013

*(Continued from the first Panchen Lama's commentary on Master Atisha's Light on the Path.)*

*The purpose of philosophy is to be happy, and understanding emptiness should provide that for you. Everyone wants wealth, health, love, inner peace, and peace in your community and your world.*

*The first (proof of emptiness) has 3 categories:*

*1) products or results, how things are made (we deny that things (that exist or don't exist) could ever start)*

*2) causes of things (dorje sekma, slivers of diamond)—whether things come from themselves or from other things. Does inner peace come from itself or from something else?*

*3) nature of things (chik du drel, one or many). Is a thing one thing or more than one thing?*

*By discussing these three we can go back to the devil and the angel.*

*Last night we were talking about an iPhone as an example. At what point in production does it become an iPhone—before it was finished, after it was finished, both, or neither? You have to go through all four possibilities.*

*Modern physicists are also struggling with this problem. Do things come from something or from nothing or neither?*

*1. If it came about from a time when it was already there, it wouldn't have to start. And if it had to start once, it would have to keep on starting over and over. So it didn't start from a place where there was already an iPhone.*

*2. If it started from before it was already there, a force would have had to act on it to start it. This is what we usually think—it wasn't there and then a force acted upon it, and then it was there. If it were there before, the force wouldn't have to start it, and if it weren't, there would be nothing for it to act on. Can a force act upon an object which is not there? It's not possible. That's why theoretical physicists in the world are struggling with this.*

*3. Both — impossible—you can't say that something starts from something and nothing.*

*4. Neither — impossible—you can't say that something starts from neither something nor nothing.*

*Third possibility—it doesn't start from something or from nothing, but your mind creates a picture of something starting and you take that to be reality. The cause and effect are created by your mind. Without your mind tying those two events together, there is no cause and effect relationship between the two. If your headache goes away after you take the aspirin, there's no connection, apart from your mind. Your mind draws a false conclusion, because it doesn't always work, and that makes you suffer, because you don't know where the things in your life come from.*

*It's impossible for a thing that is unrelated to another thing in content to be the cause of that thing. You don't get bananas from watermelon seeds. Gasoline and getting to where you want to go are fundamentally dissimilar. Gas doesn't make a car go unless you have given people rides in the past.* ***It doesn't matter how powerful a cause is, if it's unrelated to the result, it didn't cause it.***

*(This part was skipped:* CES GSUNGS PA LTAR RGYU NUS PA JI LTAR CHE YANG, RANG BZHIN GYIS GRUB PA'I MY GU BSKYED MI NUS PA'I PHYIR, DPER NA NAM MKHA'I ME TOG BZHIN NO,)

,RGYU'I DUS SU MED NA, SPYIR MED MI DGOS KYANG,

*In general, if I gave you the four choices mentioned before, you would normally say it wasn't there and then the put the last part together and then it was there. So it came from a place where it didn't exist before. Lord Atish agrees here. We have to say that you are right. This particular iPhone comes from a place where there wasn't an iPhone before. But he says it in a negative way: Just because it wasn't there at the time of its cause, ie. when they put the last screw in the iPhone, doesn't mean it couldn't exist. In the final moment of its cause there was no finished iPhone, but after that moment there was a finished iPhone—we can say that's true.*

RANG BZHIN GYIS GRUB PA ZHIG RGYU'I DUS SU MED NA RNAM PA THAMS CAD DU MED DGOS TE,

*But if there were an iPhone that didn't exist the moment before they put in the last screw, which came from its own side, that could never exist anyway. But if you're saying that the iPhone which was there after they put in the last screw, that's an iPhone that could never exist. And if the absence of an iPhone before you put in the last screw wasn't coming from me, there will never be an iPhone, because it can't exist.*

*Last night we said there were two criticizing partners in the kitchen—the one that came from me and the one that wasn't my fault (which one never existed), and that's the one you get upset with. The one you get upset with is always the one who was never there. So if you know who they really are, you would never get upset with them.*

*Arya Nagarjuna, who was called the second Buddha, wrote a book called Root Wisdom that is the basis of all study of emptiness. All the books we study go back to him. If you believe that this iPhone exists, you must think it will never break.*

[quote from Arya Nagarjuna's: Root Text On Wisdom]

,YOD CES BYA BA RTAG PAR 'DZIN, *If you say the thing exists, you must think it can never break.*

,MED CES BYA BA CHAD PAR LTA, *if you say it doesn't exist, then you must be saying it's impossible.*

,DE PHYIR YOD DANG MED PA LA; ,MKHAS PAS GNAS PAR MI BYA'O, *therefore wise people don't say either that it exists or that it doesn't exist.*

 *If you say it doesn't exist, you are saying it's impossible. Does your partner exist who is criticizing you in the kitchen? There is someone criticizing you but they don't exist the way you thought they did. They really exist as an emanation from your mind.*

*If I break my phone does it stop existing? No, not because I broke it, but because my seeds wore out and it broke. What will happen if you believe this? You will help other people to communicate so iPhone 6 will be better than iPhone 5.*

*(back to the first Panchen Lama's commentary:* RANG BZHIN GYIS GRUB PA'I MY GU BSKYED MI NUS PA'I PHYIR, DPER NA NAM MKHA'I ME TOG BZHIN NO,

*Formal reasoning for the first proof of emptiness:*

*Imagine a tiny sprout just coming out of the seed. It doesn't start by itself. Because it couldn't start from having been there before, or from not being there before, or both or neither.*

*Therefore an iPhone can't start from a situation where there was one before or from a situation where there wasn't one before. What you believe is happening in a factory is wrong and you are suffering because of that. It goes against 50,000 years of human thinking. What produces a result must be similar to it—what produces an iPhone is helping other people communicate.*

*Did these proofs come from Lord Buddha? The first Panchen Lama looked it up and found where they did come from. Langkar Shekpa / Langka Avatara* (ACIP KL00107E\_'PHAGS PA LANGKAR GSHEGS PA'I THEG PA CHEN PO'I MDO\_An Exalted Sutra of the Greater way entitled "A Journey to Langka" (Arya Langka Avatara Mahayana Sutra). *In there, Lord Buddha said,*

BLO GROS CHEN PO, RANG GI SEMS SNANG BA'I DNGOS PO MED PA DANG, YOD PA DANG, MED PA LAS SKYE BA MED PA'I PHYIR DNGOS PO THAMS CAD NI MA SKYES PA STE, *(this version from the ACIP input is a little different from what GM is reading)*

*"O bodhisattva of great intelligence, objects as they appear in your own mind never begin because they don't begin from something that was there or from something that wasn't there." This is the source of the first proof of emptiness.*

BLO GROS CHEN PO; DE'I PHYIR SKYES BU BLUN PO DE DAG THEG PA GSUM DU SMRA BA YIN TE,

*"O wise one, that's why foolish people have to talk about three different tracks" (of Buddhism).*

SEMS TZAM DU RTOG PA SNANG BA MED PAR NI MI SMRA'O,

*"They don't know enough to say things are only images in your own mind."*

*,*BLO GROS CHEN PO, DE LTAR DE DAG 'DAS PA DANG, MA 'ONGS PA DANG, DA LTAR BYUNG BA'I DE BZHIN GSHEGS PA RNAMS KYI RANG GI SEMS SNANG BA'I SPYOD YUL MNGON PAR MI SHES PA STE,

*"O wise one, therefore they don't grasp what the buddhas already know that products of their mind aren't real outer things." (That the beginning of an iPhone is coming from a seed in your mind from when you helped other people communicate.)*

*It doesn't mean that people don't exist outside of you. They still exist in the same way they always have, and you can have meaningful conversations, etc, with them.*

BLO GROS CHEN PO, PHYI ROL GYI SNANG BA SEMS KYI SPYOD YUL DU MNGON PAR ZHEN PA DE DAG 'KHOR BA'I 'GRO BA'I 'KHOR LOR RAB TU 'KHOR RO, ,

*"O bodhisattva, those who don't understand those things will continue to suffer in the cycle of suffering."*

*You will yell back at your partner when they yell at you, because you don't understand that they were coming from you when you yelled at them last week. Those who don't understand that the partner who criticized them in the kitchen is coming from their own mind, will respond to that partner with the same kind of criticism, and they will continue to live in this self-perpetuated cycle of partners who yell at them, because every time you yell back, you create another one.*

*So Lord Buddha is saying here that those who don't understand that the partner is coming from them will yell back, and they will continue to circle in the circle of pain.*

 ,BLO GROS CHEN PO, GZHAN YANG 'DAS PA DANG, MA 'ONGS PA DANG, DA LTAR 'BYUNG BA'I DE BZHIN GSHEGS PA RNAMS CHOS THAMS CAD MA SKYES PA STON TO,

*Therefore o bodhisattva of great wisdom, we can say that every Buddha who ever lived in the universe, lives now, or ever will live (which is everyone, because every living creature will eventually become a Buddha) are all unanimous in declaring that nothing ever begins."*

,DE CI'I PHYIR ZHE NA, 'DI LTA STE, BLO GROS CHEN PO, RANG GI SEMS SNANG BA'I DNGOS PO MED PA DANG, YOD PA DANG, MED PA LAS SKYE BA MED PA'I PHYIR DNGOS PO THAMS CAD NI MA SKYES PA STE,

*"Why? O great one, because things don't start from having been there, from not having been there, from both having been there and from not having been there, or from neither having been there and from not having been there." This reasoning came from Lord Buddha in Langkavatara.*

BLO GROS CHEN PO, CHOS THAMS CAD NI RI BONG DANG, RTA DANG, BONG BU DANG, RNGA MO'I RVA DANG MTSUNGS PA'O,

*"O great one, everything in the world has equal ontological status to the horns of a rabbit, a horse, a donkey or a camel, you choose." You can do camel bullfighting and get gored… It's a joke in Tibet. This phone's reality is equal to the reality of the horns on a rabbit's head.*

,BLO GROS CHEN PO BYIS PA SO SO'I SKYE BO RNAMS KYIS YANG DAG PA MA YIN PAR YONGS SU BRTAGS PA'I RANG BZHIN DU RNAM PAR BRTAGS PA'I PHYIR DNGOS PO THAMS CAD NI MA SKYES PA STE,

*"O great bodhisattva, infants (ie non-aryas, or people who haven't studied these teachings) don't understand these things." It takes lots of training to learn how these teachings can be applied. And then one day suddenly you realize that you can get an iPhone if you help others to communicate or you can get peace if you are more thoughtful of others.*

*Then he quotes a lot of other sources to further prove this.*

*—BREAK—*

*He is going to quote two other texts. This is a tradition in Buddhism—first you prove something logically and then you quote authoritative sources.*

*From the STONG NYID BDUN CU PA (Seventy Verses on Emptiness, ACIP Catalog #TD3867M) by Arya Nagarjuna:*

YOD PA YOD PHYIR SKYE BA MIN,

*"Things that are there already are already there" (so there's no point for them to start).*

,MED PA MED PHYIR MI SKYE LA [or SKYE MA YIN],

*"Stuff that wasn't already there isn't already there," so there's no point for that to start. Or you can also translate it as, "Stuff that wasn't there doesn't exist anyway, so how could it start?"*

*For there to be a relationship between two objects they both have to exist. You can't say that a rabbit horn struck a drum and caused a sound—they both have to exist.*

*There are only two kinds of relationships in the world: either one has to cause the other or one is kind of a subset of the other, so that to be one is to be the other, for example to be a Toyota is to be a car. But if Toyotas don't exist, there can't be a relationship between Toyotas and cars. For there to be a relationship, they both have to exist.*

*So some impetus must strike the object which is to be created, cause must act on the effect. But the effect doesn't exist until the cause stops.*

,CHOS MI MTHUN PHYIR YOD MED MIN [or NYID PHYIR MIN],

*"And because it would be contradictory, we can't say that something starts from nothing and also starts from something." That one is easy.*

,SKYE BA MED PAS GNAS 'GAG MED,

*"Because there's no beginning there's therefore no staying or ending." IPhones don't start, and so we can't talk about them staying or ending.*

*And then he's quoting from DBU MA LA 'JUG PA, or Madhyamakavatara, "Entering the Middle Way" by Master Chandrakirti (ACIP Catalog #TD3861):*

,YOD NA SKYED BYED CI DGOS

*"If something already existed at the time it was going to be starting, there would be no point for it to start."*

MED LA'ANG DES NI CI ZHIG BYA,

*"If a thing didn't exist, there would be nothing for the cause to act upon."*

,GNYIS NYID LA DES CI BYA GNYIS DANG BRAL LA'ANG DES CI BYA,

*"What's the point of both of those situations and what's the point of neither of those situations?"*

*(back to the first Panchen Lama's commentary:* ZHES 'BYUNG BA LTAR MDO DANG

BSTAN BCOS RNAMS NA RIGS PA 'DI SHIN TU MANG NGO,

*"You could take all the sutras written by Lord Buddha and shastras written by ancient Indians and they say the same thing." There's no point in saying more.*

,DNGOS PO RANG LAS MI SKYE ZHING,

,GZHAN DANG GNYIS KA LAS KYANG MIN,

,RGYU MED LAS MIN DE YI PHYIR,

,NGO BO NYID KYIS RANG BZHIN MED,

*Second reasoning:*

*"Things don't start from themselves*

*"Things don't start from something else*

*"Things don't start from both,*

*"And things don't start from neither."*

*Did the iPhone start from the iPhone? Did the iPhone start from something other than the iPhone? (This is the one we think is real). Did the iPhone start from both? ). Did the iPhone start from neither?*

*If none of the above, we can conclude that the thing didn't start. Things don't start. There's no process in the outside world by which one thing makes another thing start. What we've always thought is mistaken.*

*Do things start? No. Did this iPhone start? Yes. This iPhone started because I helped other people to communicate with each other and that act created a seed in my mind. Out of your mind, a seed broke open and images came of a company in Cupertino and a factory in Shanghai and FedEx to deliver it to the store and a store in Phoenix for me to buy it. Those are the means by which your karma brought the phone to you but they didn't make the phone. Your karma made the phone and your karma produced all the things that brought it to you. You help two other people to communicate, you hear yourself do that, and that creates an imprint in your mind. And that creates a seed that creates all of this. This is a process that you can explain but we're not going to do it now.*

*Arya Nagarjuna: says the same thing (from the verse above).* ,GZHAN DANG GNYIS KA LAS KYANG MIN, *This is the one that's even remotely possible—things came from something else: the phone came from a factory, the baby came from its parents. That's how we normally think.*

*If a verse in the text I'm working on now suddenly pops up, who wrote it? We're in a book by the first Panchen Lama based on a book by Lord Atisha. So he's quoting Atisha, and he only wrote one book, Bodhipada Pradipika, or Lamp on the Path to Enlightenment.*

*Then he's back to Arya Nagarjuna, following the verse quoted before:*

,BDAG LAS MA YIN GZHAN LAS MIN,

,GNYIS LAS MA YIN RGYU MED MIN,

,DNGOS PO GANG DANG GANG NA YANG,

,SKYE BA NAM YANG YOD MA YIN,

*"Things don't come from themselves,*

*"Things don't come from something else,*

*"Things don't come from both,*

*"And things don't come without any cause at all."*

[,DNGOS PO GANG DANG GANG NA YANG,

,SKYE BA NAM YANG YOD MA YIN,]

*"And therefore nothing ever starts."*

*Seeds are opening in your mind, a stream of karmic seeds opening that create the illusion of time moving. The video is very high quality, your mind is running about three times the speed of a normal video.*

*Now the first Panchen Lama is quoting Chandrakirti:*

ZLA BA'I ZHABS KYIS, DE NYID DE LAS 'BYUNG MIN GZHAN DAG LAS LTA GA

LA ZHIG

*"If something can't start from itself how can it ever start from something else?"*

,ZHES SOGS RTZA 'GREL GYIS BSTAN PA'I DON SNYING POR DRIL BA YIN NO,

*These are all summaries of other root texts.*

,'ON KYANG 'DI DAG GI DON 'CHAD PA NA, 'JUG PA'I RANG 'GREL DU, 'DIR

MA YIN ZHES BYA BA NI YOD PA NYID KYI SGRUB BYED RANG LAS SKYE BA DANG SBREL GYI YOD PA DANG NI MA YIN TE,…

*We're going to skip to the end, and just have a taste of the 3rd reason, called chik du drel in Tibetan.*

*Is this iPhone one thing or is it more than one thing? Wrong.*

*Is it one thing? No.*

*Is it more than one thing? No, if it's not one thing, how can it be more than one thing, because more than one thing is made of separate things.*

YANG NA PHYI NANG GI DNGOS PO RNAMS THAMS CAD DAG NI CHOS CAN,

*Full classical traditional form of the proof called, "things are not one and things are not more than one," (starting on page 44A line 4). This is one of the most important proofs of emptiness and the one that the devil and the angel are going to fight about. This is the most complete and exquisite form of this syllogism that I have ever seen.*

PHYI NANG GI DNGOS PO RNAMS THAMS CAD DAG NI CHOS CAN,

*"Consider all things in the universe, both outer and inner."*

RANG BZHIN GYIS MED PA NYID DU NGES TE,

*"They are unequivocally things which cannot come from themselves."*

RANG BZHIN GYIS GRUB PA'I GCIG DANG, DE LTAR GRUB PA'I DU MA GANG DU GRUB CES RNAM PAR DPYAD NA,

*"Because if we explore them to see if they are a single thing which has come from itself or more than one thing that have come from themselves…*

YUL STENG NAS GRUB PA'I NGO BO NYID NI RDUL TZAM YANG MI DMIGS PAS TE MI DMIGS PA'I PHYIR,

*"we draw a blank, because there's not an atom of any object that could come from itself." There is not a single quality of anything in the universe which could come from its own side. Stated positively, you could say that everything about everything you ever experience is coming from you, from seeds in your mind that were planted there by kindnesses to other people. And again if you search to find if there is anything about them that is coming from their side, you come up with nothing.*

*Therefore is it possible for there to be one thing or more than one thing which is not coming from how you treat other people? Then we can say there is nothing that is one or more than one. Is there anything which is one thing? No. Is there anything which is more than one thing? No. Once you cover one and more than one, you've covered everything.*

*A classical Buddhist syllogism has four parts:*

*1. State the thing you're talking about. (All existing things)*

*2. Tell us what you propose. (None of them, inside or outside of you exist from their own side.)*

*3. Tell us why. (Because none of them can be one from its own side or more than one from its own side.)*

*4. Give us an example which proves your statement.*

DPER NA ME LONG NANG GI GZUGS BRNYAN BZHIN NO,

*"For example everything is like a reflection in a mirror."*

*This has a lot of connotations; here are a few:*

*1. There's an unreality, an illusion going on—you see things in the mirror but they aren't real. A baby in front of a mirror will think it's another baby, and interact with them. But we are just like that when we get angry at someone else.*

*2. There is a justice to it, to the karma that ripens. The baby in the mirror will do exactly what the baby outside does and the husband who gets angry at you is doing exactly what you have done, just like a baby looking in a mirror.*
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Some other people reflect upon how

There are no edges or middle

To the emptiness of space;

And then they meditate on this,

Mixed with the mind itself.

And they think this is the view

Where things are just like space;

They think that this is the meditation

Where things are just like space.
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I can’t imagine why anyone

Would think that thinking that space

Has no edges and no middle

Would somehow be incompatible

With my continued presence.

As far as the fact that the mind

Has no edges and no middle,

The reason we see no edges there

Is simply because the mind

Is not a physical thing!
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And so I continue

My delightful dance,

Here within the mind.

If you think that something can stop me

When it cannot even touch me,

Then quite mistaken you are.
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Some people believe in yet another version

Of what it means to meditate

Upon the way things really are.

They say that when a thought pops up

You should simply focus upon it:

Watch as it makes its arrival,

Stare at how it looks.
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And when this thought then slips away,

All of its own accord,

Understand that this is nothing less

Than a Buddha’s body of reality.

The more random thoughts you have then,

The more reality bodies you have—

So why make effort to try to stop

Random thoughts in your meditation!

This they claim is the practice

Of transforming things into

The body of reality.
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Seeing that your random thoughts

Are not a physical thing,

Understanding that our mind

Is not a physical thing,

Is not a point of view that stands

In any way opposed

To the way that I consider things.

To claim then that you could use this

To drive me from the mind

Is nothing but a joke,

Much less saying that it’s a way

To see the reality body.
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Some do a perfect analysis

On the fact that things

Are neither one nor many;

They use it to seek a thing

And find that it’s not there—

Then meditate on that.

But this is just a meditation

Upon the major premise,

And not upon the proposal

That there is no I that exists.

It does not contradict

The way in which I see things,

And it isn’t a meditation

On why there is no me.
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Some do an analysis

On the fact that things

Are neither one nor many,

And again find nothing’s there.

But what they think

To themselves then

Is that there is no I,

Because it is nothing more

Than something labeled with a name;

And then they meditate on that.

This though is a meditation

On what a thing is not;

It is not a meditation

Upon its very absence—

And it’s not therefore a thing

Which directly contradicts

The way that I see things.
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How on earth can you imagine

That you could expel me from this mind

Unless you found a viewpoint

Which stands in direct opposition

To the way that I see things?

How could you ever meditate

Upon wisdom so long as you

Had yet to inflict any damage on me?
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Some again do an analysis

On the fact that things

Are neither one nor many,

And find that nothing’s there.

They say that then they’re meditating

On the fact that the me

Is simply gone;

But even in that moment,

They are living in this me.
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People like this are wandering

Further and further from emptiness;

They fail to grasp that emptiness

Is the fact that they themselves

Have no nature of their own.

Emptiness is standing there

Right in front of their eyes,

But they can’t comprehend

Why it is it’s empty;

And in that very moment

The wisdom which could serve

As my antidote slips from sight.

If the antidote is missing,

How could I ever be hurt?

The only choice I’d have then

Would be to remain right here!
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Some others do a much more careful

Analysis of the fact that things

Are neither one nor many.

First you analyze, they say,

And then you meditate, they say,

In a way where you simply suspend

Your mind from any opinion of things:

Focus your thoughts on nothing at all;

And then, they claim,

You have reached some deep meditation.
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What a strange idea it is

To think that if you managed

To think of nothing at all,

It could somehow contradict the way

That I conceive of things.

If a meditation can’t be considered

The kind where you discover

That there’s no I at all,

Then sure then you can give it

Some deep and fancy name,

But the fact’s that it doesn’t even

Approach a view that could hurt me;

This thing that you believe

To be a meditation on wisdom

Is nothing more than a joke!
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Still others do an analysis

Of the fact that things

Are neither one nor many,

And manage to come up

With nothing at all.

They thus conclude that the I

Is nothing that is real,

And then they stay in meditation

As long as they possibly can

On the flow of the logical

State of mind

They used to make this conclusion.
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And this, they claim,

Is what it is

To do a meditation

On the way things really are.

Now everbody knows

That the mind is something that belongs

To the deceptive side of reality;

So what they’re really saying

Is that meditating on the deceptive side

Is meditating on the absolute side.

Ho ho! It’s a weird sort of wisdom

When you’re meditating on me,

And making me your best friend!
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Others do an analysis

Of the fact that things

Are neither one nor many,

And based on this reasoning

Come to an understanding

That the I is nothing real.

They believe that staying in meditation

On the flow of these kinds of thoughts

Is a meditation upon

The way things really are.
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But there isn’t any difference

Between this and the position

We just described above;

And it really is absurd

To say that it contradicts

The way that I see things.

In fact it’s really nothing else

Than a meditation on me;

How on earth could you ever call it

A meditation on wisdom?

k;-;=-#%m#-+$-`o-K;->m=k

k+?+-.8m-K#=-;=-$-(m+-,mk

k0+{,-.:-1{+-.:-${=-.8m-3|k

k"}-:$-1{+-.:-+#-.-+{k

k1-<{=-0"}1-Wv8m-%}$-(m+-+{k

k7v:-`o-02;-,=-"}1-.:-A{+k

131

Now others do an analysis

Of the fact that things

Are neither one nor many,

And based on this reasoning

Perceive that the I

Is nothing that is real.

They fail to understand

The simple absence of things

Where they themselves are gone,

And for their meditation

They seek some other emptiness

That they can focus on.

k#%m#-\_p-%}$-(m+-W$-&+-9m,k

k%}$-.-0+{,-84n,-R}-9}+-.=k

k$-:$-0"}1-.:->v:-.-+$-k

k$-+$-84n,-%$=-8#;-0-9mk

k#({,-.}-9}+-1{+-=}+-:$-=}1=k

132

People like this are uniquely

Far from emptiness;

They possess a state of mind

Which holds emptiness itself

To be a thing that’s real.

Thus their meditation is

In fact meditating on me.

Now perhaps you can give it some thought

And decide whether or not this practice

Is an antidote which contradicts

The way that I see things!

k+{-9m-Wv-13,-%m-%{-,k

k=}+-:$-1{+-.-1-#}-0:k

k%}$-(m+-7v:-`o-02;-0=-=}k

k"-.}-=v-,m-&{-9$-:v$-k

k+},-;-$-1{+-0"}1-.-^p$-k
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The reason why this is the case

Is that they fail to understand,

And are seeking some kind of emptiness

Which exists in some other place

Than the fact that they don’t exist.

There may be lots of people around

Talking all kinds of big talk,

But the fact is that they are very few

Who know how to meditate

On the fact that the I’s not there.

k;-;=-#%m#-+$-`o-K;->m=k

k+?+-.8m-K#=-;=-$-(m+-,mk

k0+{,-0:-1{+-.:-${=-.-9mk

k${=-<{=-+{-9m-84n,-%$=-<mk

kWv,-;-%m-\*v0-1(1-.:-8'}#

k+{-;-#,=-;v#=-0"}1-.:-8+}+k
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And there are others

Who do an analysis

On the fact that things

Are neither one nor many,

And based on this reasoning

Come to an understanding

That the I is nothing real.

Then they meditate

For as long as they possibly can

On the flow of how these thoughts

Consider things to be.

This they claim is to meditate

On the way things really are.

k#6,-+{-+#-;=-%t$-;{#=-<m$-k

k$-;8$-%t$-7+-#,}+-1}+-<$-k

kQ}#=-.:-#,}+-.:-#-;-8>v:k
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These folks are a little bit better

Than all those other ones.

They do, I admit, manage to inflict

Some little damage on me,

But how in the world could they ever

Smash me totally?

k+{-9m-Wv-13,-%m-%{-,k

k/v$-.}-3~#=-21-;-0K{,-,=k

k$8}-$1-.8m-R}-[{-6m$-k

k$8}-$1-.8m-R}-+{=-,mk

k+1m#=-.-$-;-+1m#=-,=-,mk

kM1-.-0+{,-.:-Es0-.:-84n,k
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And why is that the case?

The state of mind that thinks

“That’s me” comes up in us

Based on nothing more

Than the collection of our parts.

And when it looks at this “me,”

It believes it exists in truth.

k+{-W:-0+{,-.-0+{,-84n,-9m,k

k+{-W:-6{,-.-0+{,-6{,-9m,k

k+{-W:-'$-0-0+{,-'$-9m,k

k@m-1-=-0%t-0:-`o-8K$-k

k<{=-am0-7{:-08m-1m$-9$-0)#=k
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This kind of real

Is to believe things are real

This kind of grasping

Is to grasp things as real

This way of appearing

Is to appear as though real—

And it follows us all the way on up

To the tenth bodhisattva level.

It goes as well by the name

Of “an obstacle to omniscience.”