

Radical Rejection The Adornment of the Middle Way Outline & Verses for Class Seven

Previous Classes: The Commentary, pp. 151-165

5. A demonstration that no entities exist on the ultimate level 151
6. The main argument of the *Madhyamakalankara* (**stanza 1**) 151

The entities that our and other schools affirm,
Since they exist inherently in neither singular nor plural,
In ultimate reality are without intrinsic being;
They are like reflections. 1

7. An investigation of the subject of the probative argument 152
7. An investigation of the argument 153
8. A Prasangika or a Svatantrika argument? 153
8. Does the "neither one nor many" argument serve to establish the predicated property in itself, or does it simply establish the term predicated? 155
8. Are the object of refutation and the sign nonimplicative negatives or implicative negatives? 156
7. The nature of the analogy 157
6. A demonstration of the validity of the argument 160
7. A demonstration that the sign fulfills the condition of being the property of the logical subject 160
8. Establishing that there is no such thing as a truly existent entity that is one 161
9. A refutation of a single, truly existent, pervasive entity 161
10. A refutation of a single, truly existent, particular pervasive entity 161
11. A refutation of a single, truly existent, permanent pervasive entity 161
12. A refutation of a truly existent, permanent entity as presented by non-Buddhist schools (**stanza 2**) 161

Producing their effects sequentially,
Eternal entities cannot be "one."
If each of their effects is different from the others,
These entities can have no permanence. 2

Class VII: The Commentary, pp. 165-180

12. A refutation of a truly existent, permanent entity as posited by Buddhist schools 165
13. A brief presentation of the refuting argument (**stanza 3**) 165

And also in the schools that say the uncompounded
Is cognized by wisdom that results from meditation,
This self same object is not one,
For it is linked with knowing instants that arise in sequence. 3

13. A detailed explanation of the argument 167

14. The assertion that the object of a past moment of consciousness is also the object of a subsequent moment of consciousness is untenable (**stanza 4**) 167

If, already known to earlier consciousness,
It continues to be present to a later consciousness,
The earlier consciousness becomes the later;
The later too becomes the earlier. 4

14. To deny that the object continues coexisting with consciousness is also untenable 175

15. For if it does not coexist, it follows that the uncompounded object is momentary (**stanza 5**) 175

And if the uncompounded is not present
In conscious moments earlier and later,
This very uncompounded, you should know,
Is momentary, like consciousness itself. 5

15. What is wrong with the assertion that the object does not continue to coexist with different moments of consciousness? 175

16. If the uncompounded is dependent on conditions, it is compounded (**stanza 6**) 175

Should it arise by force of moments
That occur in sequence one by one,
It is not uncompounded.
It is like the mind and mental factors. 6

16. If the uncompounded does not depend on conditions, it must be either forever existent or forever nonexistent (**stanza 7**) 176

If you consider that in all these moments
The uncompounded, wholly on its own, occurs,
It must forever be or never be,
For there is no dependence upon something else. 7

12. A summary of the refutation of permanent, truly existent entities (**stanza 8**) 177

What purpose does it serve to pin your fond beliefs
On what is destitute of causal potency?
What use for lustful girls to estimate
The charms or defects of a neutered male? 8