

**Chapter Two of Dharmakirti's Pramanavarttika
Advanced Buddhist Philosophy Course – Term 5**

Class 8 - 2016 October 10 – Wednesday¹
Institute for Buddhist Dialectics, McLeod Ganj, India

20161010Co8T1.mp3, 20161010Co8T2.mp3 & 20161010Co8T3.mp3

Teacher - **GESHE KELSANG WANGMO**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

REVIEW	1
HOW CONSCIOUSNESS IS GENERATED	5
ASSERTION RE THREE CONDITIONS NECESSARY FOR ANY SENSE CONSCIOUSNESS TO ARISE....	9



**Chapter Two of Dharmakirti's Pramanavarttika
Advanced Buddhist Philosophy Course – Term 5**

Class 8 - 2016 October 10 –*day² - 2016*.mp3
Institute for Buddhist Dialectics, McLeod Ganj, India
Teacher - **GESHE KELSANG WANGMO**

REVIEW

Track 2 - 20161010C08T2.mp3

Reasoning for -- in context of Ishvara is permanent and simultaneously a cause. Permanent, i.e., changing each moment. This is difficult to understand; we're comfortable with coarse change. My hair is turning grey, I'm not as strong. But the very subtle change is said to be very difficult to understand.. . .

. . . if I'm angry with John who did something to me seven days ago . . . even if I feel, I'm angry at John's continuum, that would make more sense; but I don't feel that. I'm still angry at John; holding a grudge because I feel he's the one who harmed me.

As Geshe Thupten Palsang says, to think about this once or twice isn't sufficient; one must familiarize repeatedly, over and over until you have a strong conviction that allows you to make a change. So the next time you see the person, you think, is that the same person.

If John is the cause of my problems, he is the same John. What is the absurdity.

STUDENT: He would be the cause and the non-cause of my problems because six days ago, he didn't cause me problems.

GESHE WANGMO: The definition of a cause is that which produces. If something produces my problems, so I will call him the cause of my problems. If the next day, he doesn't cause my problems, he is qualified to be called the *non-cause* of my problems. So is he both? That seems contradictory - it is absurd and doesn't make sense, but it would follow that John would have to be both the cause and the non-cause of my problems?

STUDENT: Because he is permanent.

GESHE WANGMO: He doesn't change from being sometimes the cause of my problems and sometimes, he changes into a person who is not harming me; that is correct. But if I assume he's permanent, he would have to be both.

This is not to say he didn't harm me. In Buddhism, it is not like saying it is either that or not; i.e., we're not saying he didn't do anything to harm me; but my reactions are usual too extreme to be in accord with reality. If someone does something to me, it seems too difficult to bear; but if the same thing happens to



another person, and they react strongly, that seems inappropriate. The extreme reaction comes from is perception.

Six days ago, I'm debating - we should have this internal debate running in my head. There's a text that His Holiness has taught, the *Debate between the Self-Grasping Mind and the mind* . . . and it's a beautiful debate between the mind that understands reality and the emotions.

So without any judgment, remember a time when I was angry with someone, allow that anger to arise - but without getting sucked into it, but watch it like with curiosity to learn about my own mind. Consciousness seems to be one solid lump until we begin looking closer. Its like when you first look at a picture, it's one thing, you don't see details until you examine it.

Our consciousness is like that. When you gradually examine it, you see and more details, oh, in that moment I had attachment, in that moment resentment. Then where was I wrong in my perception. If I'm still angry at John, that's because I not only have angry which totally exaggeration, that sees that action of John and John as identical, John is identified by the action. John is the person who harmed me. First mistake. All I can see is that negativity, so it is totally exaggerated because I don't perceive any good qualities. Activity - agent as one; exaggerate negative and negate positive qualities. He's intrinsically bad and I'm good. 6th, he's permanent.

Here we can't deal with all of them, so we're looking at the 6th, he's permanent.

Especially when you hold a grudge; it's terrible. If we retaliate, it's even worse. It's painful to be angry; but for a week. It's painful. Everything is going well, and then you think of the person you hold a grudge against, it ruins your present contentment. It's like holding a ball of fire. You put it down for awhile, and then the resentment picks it up and burns you; and you can't even do anything with the burning anger.

This needs to be practical; we need to apply. Without applying it, it's a waste of time; we need to make changes to the negative experiences that we have; if we don't have introspection/attention all of the time, they come back. It's like weeds in the flower plot; without attention, new weeds.

It is like weeds in our mind that grows so quickly.

We need to think about these things; not just move on to new information; if we are not to waste this precious life that we are not certain of attaining again.

So if that's true, he's a non-cause, what is the absurdity?

STUDENT: How can it produce something.

GESHE WANGMO: So if John is both the cause of troubles and non-cause, then you could say, this table is responsible - say Aidan is hit with a stick by someone, a nurse comes along and gives him some medicine. So the cause for his wound is the stick; and the medicine and nurse are cause for healing the wound.

But if a non-cause could be the cause of my problem, then this table which has never moved is the cause of Aidan's wound and the healing of Aidan's wound, because anything is possible.

Then, also he argues, what is the next argument?

NHAN VO: Multiple . .

GESHE WANGMO: First, if something is a cause and a non-cause it is a quality of that object, it is of one nature of that object. If there's something we don't do, it becomes a part of my nature. If John is a non-cause of my harm, that's his quality, then how can I say he is a cause of my problems.

If Ishvara on the one hand is the cause of my problems, or lets say of everything good that happens to me; and also a non-cause of the good things because good things don't happen to me all of the time, and God is the cause of the non-good. If I believe god is responsible for the rice growing in the field, then when the rice paddy is empty, dormant, at that time, he is the non-cause of rice; then we have to say, since God is permanent, he is both the cause and the non-cause of the rice in the paddy.

We say something is a cause in relation to a particular object, so if something . . . it may be the cause of the fruit or table but in respect to the non-cause . . . the table can be long and short, both: in relation to a shorter table, it's long; and relation to longer one, its short. But it can not be both, long and short, in relation to X, in relation to just one object; that doesn't work.

In relation to one object, this table can not be both a cause and an effect. So God cannot be both the cause and non-cause of rice. But at some points he time he can be one or the other if he is impermanent. But not if he is permanent.

What is the relationship between a cause and a result?

What is the connection between the two? Think of coming into existence. From a positive perspective, what is the relationship between a cause and a result? If you have a result you know for sure there must have been a cause. If you have a cause, with all requisite causes/conditions, and nothing preventing the arisal, at some point you will have a result.

If you have a positive relationship, you must have a non-affirming relationship. What is the negative.

STUDENT: If there is no result, there's no cause.

GESHE WANGMO: Right, just that. If there's no result, the cause must not be present; so this is very important for Karma. If I want to be happy, I need to create the causes. If I want to win the lottery, if I don't play the lottery, I can't win it.

Just prayer can serve as some kind of condition, but the requisite cause is to buy a lottery ticket.

If I want something so badly, I may blame everything and everyone else, but those are just conditions; I didn't create the cause.

If I didn't buy the lottery, it's easy to let go a feeling of confusion about why I didn't win. If I do something negative, if I beat someone else, let go of the expectation that they'll be your best friend tomorrow.

Our whole life is one long cause/effect, in each moment, everything we do is the cause of the later effects. Fast food, deserts, there's going to be a result no matter how delicious.

One negative thought or word, very important to be mindful.

If the result ceases, previously the result was present, then it means the cause ceased.

. . . would have nothing to do with God. If God were also the non-cause of rice, then that relationship wouldn't make sense. Since God is permanent, unchanging, he couldn't change from being the cause of rice . . . so important as Asanga says in his *Compendium* . . . citation of the *Rice Seedling Sutra*, you need to have three factors:

A cause for a result to arise, it must be impermanent and it must have the capacity to bring forth that result. If you have a result whatever precedes it must be the cause and the cause changes in the process of bringing forth the result. So a creator god that is unchanging cannot be a cause because nothing that is creating cause doesn't change in the course of creating something. That is impossible.

The seed changes into the sprout, the water that assists also changes in the process of giving rise to the sprout.

Last time we talked about someone who says there's actually no difference between a seed that exists in a store room and a seed in the soil; it's the same seed. Page 142.

. . . It feels like the seed in the storeroom and the seed in the ground, they seem to be the same in terms of being a seed.

I'm going to be okay; I'll attain enlightenment because I'm a nun. If I just keep my vows, even if I keep them purely, I won't become enlightened. I need Bodhicitta. But I think, I'm getting closer. It's like I'm a seed in a storeroom.

Why is the soil - it needs proximity to the seed. We have the sense it has nothing to do with the soil. But without the soil doing anything, the seed is suddenly close to it, then the soil becomes a cause. It's almost like you put a Bodhisattva next to me; and that's enough. My roommate is another nun who is a Bodhisattva, so I'm on the road to enlightenment.

It feels that way about soil with the seed. How does the soil change. It feels that the soil itself changes.

Even in the moment before the seed is absorbing nutrition, it is the cause of the smoke. Like if you have a lump of clay and a potter, then you have a potential for a pot.

Why do you feel that is weird? Because we have a feeling there's something from the side of the object; we don't see that phenomena are merely imputed, but we

feel there's something naturally coming from the side of the object. We're hitting our head against the invisible wall of grasping at true existence.

So the text continues with how a Consciousness is generated.

HOW CONSCIOUSNESS IS GENERATED

Track 2 - 20161010C08T2.mp3

[Dharmakirti says in the *Pramanavarttika*:]

*If someone says: just as an object and a sense power
Are the causes of a [sense] awareness [although] there is no difference
Between them having come together [and not], so too is Ishvara.*

If someone says: Just as an object and a sense power are the causes of a sense awareness, although there is no difference between them having come together and not having come together, so too is Ishvara [the cause of all results].

p. 143

... where causes come together and there's a result, those are similar.

Another opponent supports the idea that irrespective of whether a phenomenon has met the other causes necessary for a result to arise or not, it is the cause of and thus generates the result.³

STUDENT: There's the potential.

GESHE WANGMO: Monday is the empty soil when you haven't added the seed yet. Tuesday is the soil with the seed planted. Wednesday the seed sprouts. So the soil on Tuesday is that the cause of the sprout on Wednesday.

RENY: No.

GESHE WANGMO: If it is not, when is the cause.

RENY: It's a condition.

GESHE WANGMO: A condition is a cause; we use it when it is not the main cause but a secondary cause. So it is still a cause. So is the soil on Tuesday a cause of the sprout on Monday?

Yes. What about the soil on Monday? No. But the soil on Monday is the cause of the soil on Tuesday and that soil is the cause of the soil on Wednesday . . . we can argue that way but it doesn't necessarily follow. It doesn't mean that the soil on Monday is the cause of the sprout on Wednesday. Because soil is a cooperative condition and the seed is the main cause.

So isn't the potential in the seed already present whether or not you add the cooperative condition. Aidan says no, thank you for allowing debate.

³ As an example he cites an observed object and a sense power. He says both are the causes of a sense consciousness – whether the two have come together or not.

Regarding the subject, the beggar on the street, assuming he is not a Dharma practitioner, does the potential to become enlightened.

We say, once you have Bodhicitta, you are moving towards enlightenment even though the potential was present beforehand.

So are you going to say they don't have the Buddha Nature?

So doesn't the sprout have the sprout nature?

They're a bit different. We have Buddha Nature because of the clear nature of the mind. But anyway, you can debate it.

Some say, we don't have the potential yet - there's a difference between being suitable or possible to become enlightened, but the capacity or potential is not present until there is Bodhicitta. So there are different arguments; it doesn't matter. It causes us to think.

But for as seed, doesn't it have the potential in itself.

It's even more complicated: when you have the soil and warmth, it doesn't mean that a moment later the sprout arises; so it means that something is missing; so it doesn't grow right away. Well, in the cupboard something is missing. It may be moisture in the air and warm, but it doesn't grow. But if the soil was a sufficient growth, it should start growing immediately.

What exact causes and conditions do you need for a sprout, how much nitrogen, oxygen, who knows. Don't even think about the complications of the law of Karma, the law of cause and effect is very complicated.

So you can't firmly establish when exactly it is or is not a cause of something, but generally, we understand that you need certain causes and conditions.

So here, the arguments is if you want to have a Sense Consciousness -- how many do you have.

STUDENT: Relative to the lack of enough water, the soil, or seed in itself is not sufficient relative to the lack of something though it has the potential.

GESHE WANGMO: To be a cause, does it have to be a direct cause. There are direct and indirect causes. A direct cause is the moment immediately preceding the sprout; and the indirect cause is two moments before the sprout. The one moment before sprout is direct cause; whatever precedes that direct cause is an indirect cause. During the indirect cause, something is lacking, so then you would have to say that an indirect causes is not a cause, because something is lacking. All of the causes and conditions come tighter, nothing prevents the seed from sprouting.

So the indirect cause would not be a cause because something is lacking.

On the debate ground, you say, the main causes and conditions are there, some minor ones are missing.

AIDAN: For a sprout to grow, you need to grow. . . .

GESHE WANGMO: I agree, what is the question.

AIDAN: The seed is the main cause of the sprout. But they're saying the soil

GESHE WANGMO: It's a secondary cause. The main cause is definitely the seed and the rest are secondary; secondary cause are nonetheless a cause. What are you saying?

AIDAN: A main cause.

GESHE WANGMO: My debate is the seed in a cover that doesn't have warmth, soil, does that hold the potential for the sprout to grow.

AIDAN: No, because you need all to have a sprout.

GESHE WANGMO: Let's say the cupboard is moist, etc., but that's not enough. The seed is going to grow on Thursday. You plant it on Tuesday; but it doesn't grow on Wednesday, it grows on Thursday. So is the seed the cause of the sprout on Thursday? It's an indirect cause.

But why doesn't the sprout grow Wednesday? Because something is still missing? But we call the seed a cause. So why don't we call the seed in the cupboard a cause.

On Tuesday, we can say it is the cause. What is the difference. On the debate, we say, the difference is that most the important causes are there.

Or is the cause all along? Since it is the substantial cause. The seed is the substantial cause, it is the main cause and the rest is just added to assist the seed. So the seed in the cupboard is the substantial cause - we could say that also.

So is the seed always the cause of the sprout. So at one exact moment is it a cause or not.

Similarly, the Bodhisattva who preceded the Buddha is the cause of the Buddha. What about the cow that preceded the Bodhisattva, is the cow the cause of the Buddha? . . . many, many, many lifetimes before, a chicken. So is that a cause of the Buddha.

VEN. KHUNPHEN: It is the same continuum, so it must be.

GESHE WANGMO: That's the argument. Then the soil without the seed would also be a cause.

VEN. KHUNPHEN: But not a substantial cause.

GESHE WANGMO: A cause is that which assist the production. Is my negative mind right now, its continuum continues to Buddhahood; then my anger right now is a cause of a future Buddha. Regarding the subject, my anger, it follows that it is a cause of enlightenment? No, because it has no potential to create it. Otherwise, let's just be angry.

My anger . . .

Some meditations seem easy, like generating understanding that our happiness comes from others. If it is too easy, we don't really reflect on it; so we don't get the conviction that causes us to do something about the realization.

. . . Forget about enlightenment, just being kind; to care for one person, to have sincere care for all people in McLeod; how difficult is that. To be realistic, and to work hard because we require so many causes and conditions, it makes us work. We only have one life time.

TODD:

GESHE WANGMO: We say phenomena depend on three aspects, let me try to rephrase question.

- The relationship between the result and cause is obvious, because the cause of this cup gives rise to this cup, so it is a **causal relationship**.
- From the point of view of dependence on parts, the parts of the cup and the cup; they're of one nature. So the first is a causal relationship, the second **being of one nature**.

The awareness that imputes this object is not the cause of the phenomena. Remember the debate you had with Aidan last time? Why is the mind that imputes this cup not the cause of this cup? What does it mean to be the cause of this cup?

The cause of the cup has to exist one moment before the cup. Todd said, when you have an object that is merely imputed by mind, it doesn't have to precede the object. The first Dalai Lama, Gyalwa Gendun Drup. He is the first Dalai Lama. The mind that designated the First Dalai Lama, was that the cause of the first Dalai Lama? No, because it came later. So imputing mind can come at same time, before and after. So it is not one of the causes

There's a sense that the causes of this cup are the maker of this cup, the paper, tree, etc., the maker, and the mind that imputed it. But that imputing mind is not a cause, because it can come later.

Geshe-la says, the mind that imputes this cup has . . . we still have not understood inherent existence.

It is not its cause because it doesn't have to precede it. So when we say the mind creates everything, not necessarily, because a creator is a cause. The moment you think, mind creates everything, it doesn't because it doesn't have to precede it.

TODD: In *Liberation in the Palm of the Hand*, Ananda couldn't see any potential for Little Path to be ordained, but Buddha said that he had created the causes to be ordained with he was a fly. . . .

GESHE WANGMO: The anger that inspires you to think, I want to become a Buddha.

TODD: But the fly had no intention.

GESHE WANGMO: And the anger had no intention, so I'm saying the fly, in and of itself, is not a cause; but some flies could be. If something is the cause of something else, then it must always precede that result.

That's why we say, in and of itself, it is not a cause. Someone might see a cup and say, oh, I need to make a table for this good cup. So it may be a cause of a table,

but not every table is preceded or caused by a cup. So there may be some cases in which a chicken is a cause of enlightenment, but it may be. But if you argue as Kunphen, everyone was a chicken, so it is a cause; but then you could say, everyone gets angry, so anger is a cause.

TODD: Even with Bodhicitta, on the small ground of the Path of Accumulation, one can lose one's Bodhicitta, so that means it is not always a cause for Buddhahood.

GESHE WANGMO: So then the soil in which the seed is planted is not a cause for . . . to say every Bodhicitta is not the cause of enlightenment; but Buddhahood is always preceded by spirit of enlightenment.

These are good debates and I don't have definitive opinion, even with the anger, it's debatable.

It's not so much about getting an answer but getting a better understanding.

NHAN VO: It's how you look at the problem. . . . it's not the cause.

GESHE WANGMO: I said that, but am not sure.

NHAN VO: Take a look at the whole, when do we call something a cause? When all of the causes are present.

GESHE WANGMO: Then the indirect cause is not a cause. Because on Tuesday, when everything has come together, if it doesn't sprout on Wednesday, then it's not a cause for Thursday's sprout.

. . . . whose Bodhicitta can no longer degenerate; you can't call it a cause because the Path of Preparation, Path of Seeing and Path of Meditation aren't present.

STUDENT: I have a question that says something must change to be a genuine cause of something else. Does that imply that are times when things don't change. Everything changes moment to moment; then how does something endure.

GESHE WANGMO: We talk about permanent abstractions. Lack of Obama . . . but impermanent phenomena are constantly changing, and in order to produce something else as a cause, it must change in that process.

STUDENT: In that case the soil is also changing.

GESHE WANGMO: You're right. I made it sound as though it looks the same and is; but it is changing. It doesn't seem to be anything coming from the soil that the soil did to make it the cause of the seed. It didn't . . .

I'm saying in the moment that the seed is added to the soil before any nutrition has been taken.

ASSERTION RE THREE CONDITIONS NECESSARY FOR ANY SENSE CONSCIOUSNESS TO ARISE

Track 3 - 20161010C08T3.mp3

Anyway. Let's now look at this one here. I'll read through it. Those of you who studied Lorig, you'll remember and for the rest of you, this may be something new.

This assertion relates in particular to two of the three conditions (Tib: *rkyen gsum*) that are necessary for any of the five sense consciousnesses to arise. The five sense consciousnesses are: eye consciousness, ear consciousness, nose consciousness, tongue consciousness, and body consciousness.

Each of these sense awarenesses must be preceded by the three conditions:

- (1) The observed object condition
- (2) The empowering condition
- (3) The immediately preceding condition

The observed object condition (Tib: *dmigs rkyen*) refers to the principal object of perception of a sense consciousness. In the case of an eye consciousness apprehending a table, for instance, the table is the principal object of perception of the consciousness. The table is also the direct cause of the eye consciousness and thus exists a moment before that awareness, for it is in dependence on the table that the eye consciousness takes on the aspect of the table, *i.e.*, that the table appears to the consciousness.

Therefore, an eye consciousness comes into existence in dependence on shape and color, an ear consciousness in dependence on sound, a nose consciousness in dependence on smell, a tongue consciousness in dependence on taste, and a body consciousness in dependence on tangible objects.

[LISTEN TO TAPE . . .]

. . . . you can't have a mind without an object; and you can't . . . so to have an eye consciousness perceiving table, you need a table. And you need shape and color for an eye consciousness to perceive table. So it exists the moment before, the table, so it is not the table two or three seconds or minutes ago, but the moment before the eye consciousness, that's the number one cause of the eye consciousness.

What does it mean that the *Venerable* . . . ?

STUDENT: . . .

GESHE WANGMO: It's not that the table enters our eye; no. there's an appearance. Unlike heat and cold has to touch our body. It is not that my mind enters the object; an appearance of the object appears to mind; and my mind is like a mirror of the object. It is only possible because of the object.

STUDENT: Imputing of table comes after the arising of the awareness.

GESHE WANGMO: That is a whole different question. We're not mentioning imputing, but since you mention it: could I impute table before seeing it. If I were planning to make a table tomorrow. Let's say I've never seen one, if I know what a surface and legs are. Say, I'm the first person to make a table, so the take the elements together to make a table. The first rocket to go to the moon, you need a

plan. Before you perceived it directly, you've already imputed it. Usually, we name children after conception, but it is possible to have the name beforehand.

Usually, we learn language by seeing objects and our parents tell us the name. But it's not necessary/

Next there's the empowering condition. I once spoke to Geshe Dorje Damdul about my difficulties with this, and he said, there's discussion of the empowering conditions having shapes, like a triangle, so it's difficult to equate it with subtle parts of -- it is distinguished in text from the sense organs. An eyeball is not sufficient, it needs to be properly hooked up to the neural systems. That's my concept.

TODD: Don't they all say that the sense power goes from life to life.

GESHE WANGMO: In a potential form, as a potential. In the formless realm, it takes on the form of a potential. I don't know; it does go on from life time to lifetime; they become dormant at the time of death and arise in the next life. Similarly, my anger is too coarse, so temporarily I don't have anger. As you die, coarse consciousness becomes very subtle.

Anyway, the potential we carry with us to be angry, the potential with the sense powers we carry with us. Todd made a good point, what is important, whether it is in potential form or not, if it goes from life to life, my optical nerve, visual cortex do not, so maybe the potential is part of the sense power from having a consciousness. I don't know. I find it very difficult; and that's why they say it is very subtle. It is interesting. Maybe also this life that it goes from life to life needs to be investigated.

The empowering condition (Tib: *bdag rkyen*) refers to the *sense power* that is the direct cause of a sense consciousness. It is traditionally described as a subtle physical form that is associated with the sense organs and in dependence on which the sense consciousness is able to perceive its object. The sense power and the observed object condition have to come together or *meet* in order for any of the sense consciousnesses to manifest.

Here the cup and my eye sense power are not touching, so meet doesn't mean "touch". . . .

In the case of an eye consciousness apprehending a table, a subtle physical form associated with the eye organ, the 'eye sense power', is the *empowering condition* or the empowering cause that meets with the observed object condition, the table, and is responsible for the eye consciousness' ability to perceive the table. The eye sense power and the table meet in the sense that the table is reflected in the eye sense power (*i.e.*, light waves bounce off the surface of the table and lead to the formation of an image of the table on the eye's retina).

In case of the remaining sense consciousnesses, sound waves meet with the ear sense power located in the ear; odor molecules meet with the nose sense power located in the back of the nose, taste particles meet with the tongue sense power in the tongue (and other parts of the

mouth), and texture, temperature, etc. meet with the body sense power that is spread throughout the entire body.

Do you remember from H.H. Dalai Lama's teachings that the body sense power pervades the entire body.

KIKO: The tactile power pervades the remaining sense powers as the tactile power pervades those, likewise or so too ignorance pervades the other afflictions. If you poke a needle in your eye, you see and feel it; if you put something in your nose you feel and see it; etc.

Aryadeva in order to describe our misperceptions of reality with the afflictions, any type of misperception is a type of ignorance; and any emotionally distorted mind is affected by its perception.

Texture, temperature meet the skin's receptors, those are the two conditions that give rise to the experience of heat or cold. The skin doesn't experience anything; it can't; it's an inanimate object. It's a consciousness that perceives. But something more is needed.

The immediately preceding condition (*de ma thag rkyen*) . . .

Actually they are all immediately preceding conditions, so I don't know why it gets that name.

The immediately preceding condition (*de ma thag rkyen*) is another direct cause of a sense consciousness and refers to the awareness that must precede a sense consciousness.

This is one of the proof of previous life; every moment of consciousness must be preceded by a moment of awareness; you can't go from nothing to a perception.

Anything physical must be preceded by something physical; similarly, any consciousness must be preceded by . . . so if a person has died, there's no consciousness. If you are asleep, when the consciousness is too subtle, it cannot serve as an immediately preceding condition. Say, it gets very cold while you're sleeping deeply. From a tantric perspective, there's consciousness, but for the Middle Way Consequentialists, unless you dream, while you're asleep, you don't need consciousness. Why does Middle Way Autonomy school need to say that wherever state you're in you have to have consciousness? Because the 'I' is the mental consciousness. For the Prasangika, the person is not the mental consciousness. The person is imputed on four or five aggregates. In the tantric system, they say, there are subtler consciousness even in subtle states. But when we sleep the consciousness is too subtle to serve as the temperature and body consciousness coming together.

Let me guess? How do you wake up? By the ringing of an alarm clock, a bucket of water, the sunshine in the AM. Those are different. Either the consciousness in itself -- the strong sensation becomes a cause for coarser sensations to arise. It is interesting that you can hear alarm clock in your dreams, when you don't wake up but you dream about it. He suggested that you briefly wake up, and you immediately fall back asleep, but you did actually hear enough sound to make it

part of your dream. So sometimes, we think we've been awake but realize we actually fell asleep; and otherwise, we can wake up briefly, and think we're sleeping.

STUDENT:

GESHE WANGMO: the mere fact we remember, there may be moments to which an object appears but is not ascertained.

We will complete it next time.