

A SURVEY OF THE MADHYAMIKA SYSTEM

Contents

1. An Outline of the Madhyamika System
2. How Ignorance Results in the Svabhava Fallacy
3. Attachment to Distinctions Reflects the Svabhava Fallacy
4. The Unfindability and Indeterminacy of All Dharmas
5. Dogma Is Rooted in Attachment to Distinctions
6. Mind as the Source of Distinctions, Dualisms, and Dogmas
7. How the Wisdom of Interdependency Affects Our Relationships
8. The Middle Path as the Means to Empty Our Preconceptions
9. References

1. AN OUTLINE OF THE MADHYAMIKA SYSTEM

Commentary: Nagarjuna equates the two truths, the conventional (= interdependency of daily life) and the supreme (= emptiness of self-nature), with the middle way (= madhyama pratipad) between extremes of IS and IS NOT: **"In the instructions to Katyayana, both 'it is' and 'it is not' were demonstrated by the Buddha as causing the appearance of being [= existence] and nonbeing [= nonexistence]."** (MK 15:7 in McCagney 1997 172) Views of existence and nonexistence of a dharma or its characteristics lead to attachment and conflict. Thus, the name of his middle way school: Madhyamika, which promotes a noncommittal attitude towards either dual extreme.

"When one affirms 'being' there is a seizing of awful and vicious dogmas which arise from desire and hatred, and from that contentions arise. That is the cause of all dogmas, without it the passions do not arise. So when this is thoroughly understood, dogmas and passions disappear." --Nagarjuna, YS 46-47 (in Lindtner 1982 115)

When practiced in our daily lives, the middle way gradually invokes the two truths as our awareness deepens. **"What is interdependent origination, that is called openness by us. It [openness] makes use of convention and is the practice of the middle way."** (MK 24:18 in McCagney 1997 202). Then, we become aware that our preconceptions are **relative** to us and NOT **inherent** to the perceived dharma (= factors of experience--people, objects, events, ideas). The emphasis that perceptions are "relative" to the perceiver reflects interdependency whereby things are defined IN RELATIONSHIP; the emphasis on no "inherent" self-nature (svabhava) reflects dharmic emptiness. Thus, aware of these two truths, we are no longer attached to the results of our actions but, instead, we are infused with energy and commitment to helping others through creative nonviolence based on wisdom and compassion.

While easy to grasp, simplistic theories about human nature are also distortive and misleading. Buddhism is not intentionally designed to be hard to understand. It examines the depths of our humanity to aid us in becoming the best human beings that we can be. Humans are by definition complex and so discussing human nature will be unavoidably difficult at times. Human nature

includes self-consciousness or self-reference which requires feedback between self and others and can be extremely complex. This complexity, which involves how we see the world and our place in it, requires that we consider two important aspects of the act of conceptualization in human consciousness which influence our views of the world, our interpretation of experiences, and our responses to others.

THE WHAT

The first aspect of conceptualization deals with WHAT we perceive: the characteristics or attributes by which we define the existence of phenomena (= dharmas: factors of experience). The technical term for this aspect involving "the study of being" is **ontology**. Buddhist ontology rejects the existence of a permanent, independent self-nature (= svabhava) of any phenomena. For example, someone who sees abuse as a justifiable means to achieve one's goals obviously sees the world in terms of svabhava (self-nature). In other words, WHAT characteristics s/he perceives in the other (dharma) is reified (= to make real) and seen as **inherent** to that dharma and NOT **relative** to the perceiver. This ascribing svabhava to a perceived dharma differs from the view that abuse is NOT a relational option simply because, by rejecting abusive acts, we reveal the wisdom that what we see is relative to us. Yet, to change our views that WHAT we see is based on svabhava, we must first change HOW we see the world.

THE HOW

The second aspect of conceptualization deals with HOW we know what we know. The technical term for this aspect involving "the study of knowledge" is **epistemology**. Buddhist epistemology asserts that we can only know something by our relational interdependency with it. This invokes a self-reflexive awareness that requires us to examine why we see things the way we do. For example, if a particular psychological, behavioral, or ethical theory appeals to us, epistemology reveals what is behind our attraction to that particular theory. What is it in our own life experiences that makes that theory seem correct as opposed to a different theory? We usually like a particular theory because it makes sense to us. But if our belief system reflects a distortion of "WHAT we see" (= ontology) based on the existence of svabhava then our resulting views are due to a bad "HOW we know" (= epistemology). In other words, what we think we know is based on faulty premises. Again, HOW we know what we know is due to errors of WHAT we see IF we see the world in terms of svabhava. And, since the WHAT and HOW of our perceptions are mutually reinforcing, Buddhism offers the Middle Way between dual extremes (such as is/is not) to break that vicious circle of misconceptions that is rooted in our inherited and unexamined belief system.

The Following Excerpt Is from Huntington (1989 36-37)

"The Middle Way represents first of all a characteristic attitude, rooted in a certain set of individual and social concerns, which shapes the motivation for one's actions in the world. Secondly, it is indicative of a particular sort of deconstructive philosophy which endows the Madhyamika with its paradoxical 'non-position.' This notion of a Middle Way is fundamental to all Buddhist teachings--it is in no sense the exclusive property of the Madhyamika--yet it was given priority by Nagarjuna and his followers, who applied it in a singularly relentless fashion to all problems of ontology [= the study of being], epistemology [= the study of knowledge], and soteriology [= theology of salvation: Buddhist liberation]....

Perhaps one of the best-known references to a Middle Way is found in the record of the buddha's first sermon at the Deer Park outside Varanasi, in the plains of northern India.... The Middle Way is very clearly defined here as a practical approach to the religious life, a prescription for the sort of behavior that will eventually lead to release from fear and suffering. Elsewhere we find evidence of a different conception of the Middle Way, a much more abstract application of the concept to ontological [= the study of being] categories.... The avoidance of reified [= to make real] concepts of being and nonbeing, that is, the Middle Way, is directly equated with the eightfold noble path, and with the last of the four noble truths, the 'path leading to the cessation of all suffering.'

One of the most crucial doctrinal issues for all Buddhists is, of course, the concept of selflessness (nairatmya), and here as elsewhere we encounter the all-pervasive influence of the Middle Way, this time interpreted by Nagarjuna as the absence of any philosophical view--the 'view' which is really no view at all: 'The buddhas have indicated that there is a self, they taught that there is no self, and they also taught that there is neither any self nor any no-self.' [Nagarjuna, MK 18:6]"

Commentary: This apparently self-contradictory quote above on self and no self (MK 18:6) simply reflects the fact that the Buddha accommodated his teaching to meet the needs and capabilities of his audience. Actually, there is no contradiction at all because each assertion (is/is not) is correct depending on which of the two truths (interdependency or emptiness) is emphasized.

2. HOW IGNORANCE RESULTS IN THE SVABHAVA FALLACY

"Since the Buddhas have stated that the world is conditioned by ignorance, how is it not reasonable therefore that this world is a [result of] discrimination? When ignorance is stopped why is it not clear that [what also] stops was imagined by it?" --Nagarjuna, YS 37-38 (in Lindtner 1982 113)

Commentary: The unwisdom or ignorance (avidya) of NOT knowing our interdependency is at the core of all human conflict and suffering historically and worldwide. We see avidya at work in the inherited and unexamined belief in svabhava: the existence of a permanent (= fixed, unchangeable) and independent self-nature. Through avidya, we attach to our preconceptions of others (dharmas: factors of experience--people, objects, events, ideas) as reflecting their **inherent** self-nature; so our views are no longer **relative** to us but "real" to the perceived dharmas and therefore independent of us. This error allows us to ignore the responsibility for our own actions and perceptions. Through the svabhava fallacy a causal-agent self is separate from and acts upon its other (parabhava: other-nature) to achieve a desired result--even if only for self-validation. Thus, the svabhava fallacy promotes the self/other split and the conflicts that emerge from it.

"If you believe the world is comprised of independent dharmas with real properties [= svabhava], then you will see them existing without causes and conditions." --Nagarjuna, MK

24:16

"In the absence of self-nature (svabhava), whence can there be other-nature (parabhava)? For, self-nature of other-nature is called other-nature. Without self-nature and other-nature, whence can there be an existent? For, the existent is established only when there is self-nature or other-nature. Those who perceive self-nature as well as other-nature, existence as well as non-existence, they do not perceive the truth embodied in the Buddha's message." --Nagarjuna, MK 15:3-4, 6 (compare Kalupahana 1986)

"Since all things altogether lack substance (svabhava) either in causes or conditions [or their] totality or separately, therefore they are empty (sunya). Inasmuch as all things are empty of own-being (svabhava) the incomparable Tathagata [= Buddha] has taught this [interdependency] about things." --Nagarjuna, SS 3, 68 (in Lindtner 1982: 35, 65)

"When this is, that arises, like short when there is tall. When this is produced, so is that, like light from a flame. When there is tall, there must be short; they exist not through their own nature [= svabhava], just as without a flame light too does not arise." --Nagarjuna, RA 48-49 (in Hopkins 1975 24)

"Those who speak of the reality of entities and who assign them distinct existences do not know the [Buddha's] teaching." --Nagarjuna, MK 10:16

3. ATTACHMENT TO DISTINCTIONS REFLECTS THE SVABHAVA FALLACY

"Whatever is seen, heard, sensed or clung to, is esteemed as truth by other folk. Amidst those who are entrenched in their own views,... I hold none as true or false. This barb I beheld well in advance, whereon mankind is hooked, impaled: 'I know, I see, tis verily so'-- no such clinging for the Tathagatas [= Buddhas]." --Buddha, *Anguttara Nikaya* II.24 (in Macy 1991 130)

Commentary: The unwisdom (avidya) of the svabhava (self-nature) fallacy results in the dualistic distinctions we create regarding the other-nature (parabhava) of dharmas (= factors of experience--people, objects, events, ideas). These distinctions define the "is/is not" dualisms by which we view and respond to our world and others in it.

"By expressing himself clearly through analogies such as illusions [and so on] the Supreme Physician [Buddha] has [taught] the Good Law which cures [us] from all dogmas. The ultimate truth is that things are without svabhava. This is the unsurpassed medicine for those obsessed by the fever of [grasping after things]." --Nagarjuna, CS III:51-52 (in Lindtner 1982 157)

"If something is [considered] different because it exists apart from [something else], then it will also exist without [that other thing]. But without a second thing to define the first thing, that first thing cannot possibly exist [as a different thing]." --Nagarjuna, MK 14:6

"Just as the person is not an ultimate but a composite of six constituents, so too each of them in turn is a composite and not an ultimate. The aggregates [= skandhas*] are not the self, they are not in it, it is not in them, without them it is not, it is not mixed with the aggregates like fire and fuel, therefore how can the self exist?" --Nagarjuna, RA 81-82 (in Hopkins 1975 28).

*[*Note: The Sanskrit term skandhas has no precise English equivalent. As the "basic functions" or "factors of personal existence," the five skandhas perpetuate the illusion of an independent psycho-physical self: physical form, sensations, perceptions, tendencies, and consciousness.]*

"Just as a teacher, by his psychic powers, creates an imaginary form, and this illusion makes another form. In the same way are the agent and his action (karma): the doer is like the imaginary form and his deed is like an illusion made by another illusion. Desires, actions, bodily forms (deha), doers and deeds are all like a fairy castle in the sky, a mirage or a dream." --Nagarjuna, MK 17:31-33

"Those who see self-nature [= svabhava] and other-nature [= parabhava], being and nonbeing, do not see the truth in the Buddha's teaching. In the instructions to Katyayana, both 'it is' and 'it is not' were demonstrated by the Buddha as causing the appearance of being and nonbeing." --Nagarjuna, MK 15:6-7 (in McCagney 1997 171-172)

4. THE UNFINDABILITY AND INDETERMINACY OF ALL DHARMAS

"When characteristics do not appear, the character [= object] does not occur. Likewise, when the character [= object] is not established, then characteristics do not arise. Ceasing to accept our conceptions as real, in a world devoid of characteristics, brings the end of illusions. No other truth was taught at all, nowhere and none, by the Buddha." --Nagarjuna, MK 5:4; MK 25:24

Commentary: When we reify (= to make real) our perceived distinctions we fuel the "fires" of the self/other split as well as the illusory dualisms by which we map our world. Interdependency reveals to us that **attachment** to our perceived distinctions which we impose on others are NOT **inherent** to them but **relative** to the perceiving self: in other words, our perceptions arise IN RELATIONSHIP with the perceived. All dharmas (= factors of experience: people, objects, events, ideas) are unfindable and indeterminate in any final or absolute sense. This is true of any dualism: self/other, samsara/nirvana, is/is not, and so on. (See Dalai Lama 1995 49-54).

"Those who do not see reality believe in samsara and nirvana [but] those who see reality believe neither in samsara nor nirvana. Existence and nirvana--these two are not to be found [since] nirvana [is] the thorough knowledge of [samsaric] existence. When that which arises conditioned by [ignorance (avidya) is seen] with a correct knowledge, no [dharmaic] origination or destruction whatsoever is perceived." --Nagarjuna, YS 5-6, 10 (in Lindtner 1982 105)

"There is no distinction whatever between samsara and nirvana. There is no distinction whatever between nirvana and samsara. The limit of nirvana is that of samsara. The subtlest

difference is not found between the two." --Nagarjuna, MK 25:19-20 (in McCagney 1997 209)

"If there is own-being there would be other-being. In case of other-being own-being [can be] maintained: Establishment of those two has been stated by You (Buddha) to be correlative like the further and nearer shore. When it is not related to anything, how can [something] exist? When it is not related to long how can [something] short exist? When there is existence there is non-existence, as there is short when there is long. And since there is existence when there is non-existence, therefore each of the two do not exist [separately or independently]. Unity and multiplicity, past and future, defilement and purification, true and false--how [can they exist] by themselves? Of course, when a thing does not exist quite by itself how then can it exist as a [separate, independent] whole? That [thing] which is called 'other' does not exist without its own-being. When there is no other-being [= parabhava] things have no own-being [= svabhava]." --Nagarjuna, CS III:11-16 (in Lindtner 1982 145)

"Thus neither self nor non-self are understood as real, therefore the Great Subduer [= Buddha] rejected the views of self and non-self. Sights, sounds and so forth were said by the Subduer neither to be true nor false; if from one position its opposite arises, both in fact do not exist." --Nagarjuna, RA 103-104 (in Hopkins 1975 32)

5. DOGMA IS ROOTED IN ATTACHMENT TO DISTINCTIONS

"For those who, suppressed by false knowledge, take the untrue for true, a series of seizing and contention [and so on] will arise. The magnanimous [= Buddhas] have neither thesis nor contention. How can there be an opposing thesis to those who have no thesis?"
--Nagarjuna, YS 49-50 (in Lindtner 1982 115)

Commentary: We reify (= to make real) our perceptions of dharmas (= factors of experience) by ascribing them with a self-nature (svabhava) which makes them independent of our perception of them and which also defines them as permanent and independent of our relationship with them. This act of reification negates our own responsibility for our perceptions since what we see is in them and does not originate with the perceiver. By realizing the dharmic lack or emptiness (sunyata) of svabhava, however, we realize that our perceptions are relative to us and are NOT inherent to the perceived dharma--and we can no longer avoid our responsibility for our views of others. Then, both the perceiving self and perceived other are OPEN to their mutual relationship devoid of our preconceptions that previously fixed them as permanent and unchangeable, and thereby limited us.

"'Exists' is the dogma of Eternalism. 'Exists not' is the dogma of Annihilation. [In order to avoid the two extremes] You [Buddha] have therefore shown this principle (dharma) [of interdependency] which is free from the two extremes." --Nagarjuna, CS III:22 (in Lindtner 1982 147)

"The conqueror [= Buddha] taught openness [= sunyata] as the refutation of all views. But those who hold openness as a view are called irremediable." --Nagarjuna, MK 13:8 (in McCagney

1997 169)

"If you perceive the existence of all things in terms of svabhava, then you will see them existing without causes and conditions [of interdependency]." --Nagarjuna, MK 24:16

"If there were a beginning there would certainly also be clinging in the form of dogmas. How can that which is dependently co-arisen have a first and a last? One who, with his intelligence (buddhi), comes to see that existence (bhava) is like a mirage [and] illusion, is not corrupted by dogmas [based on] a previous limit or a final limit. Those who have come to understand that [interdependency] (pratityasamutpada) is devoid of origination and destruction have crossed the ocean of existence consisting of dogmas. By taking any standpoint whatsoever one is attacked by the twisting snakes of the passions. But those whose mind has no standpoint are not caught." --Nagarjuna, YS 14, 16, 23, 51 (in Lindtner 1982 107, 109, 117)

6. MIND AS THE SOURCE OF DISTINCTIONS, DUALISMS, AND DOGMAS

"To [students] enthusiastic about Mahayana [= universal teaching] the preaching of the Buddhas is in brief: the selflessness and equality (samata) of [all] phenomena [and the doctrine] that mind is originally unborn [= empty of svabhava]. A 'thing' (bhava) is construction (vikalpa). Emptiness is the absence of construction. Where constructions have appeared how can there be emptiness (sunyata)?" --Nagarjuna, BV 29, 44 (in Lindtner 1982 195, 199)

Commentary: Following the implications of the causal law of Interdependency, these quotes emphasize that our perceptions of dharmas (= factors of experience) are **relative** to us and are NOT the **inherent** self-nature (svabhava) of the perceived dharma. Our conceptualizations are MAPS to help us negotiate our world. When we attach to and reify (= to make real) our views, the map is imposed onto the territory and relational errors emerge as rigid dogmas. Thus, the teaching that dharmas are unfindable and indeterminate in any final or absolute sense reflects the fact that the map is NOT the territory. Our complacency and nonaction in the face of abuse, exploitation, and worldwide turmoil and misery also reflect attachment to a self fearful of loss.

"When neither an entity nor a non-entity remains before the mind, then since there is no other possibility, having no objects, it becomes calm." --Santideva, BC 9:34 (in Wallace 1997 120)

"Consciousness occurs dependent upon the internal and external sense-fields. [So,] consciousness is empty (sunya), like mirages and illusions. Since consciousness arises dependent on a discernible object, the discernible [object] does not exist [in itself]. Since [the conscious subject] does not exist without the discernible [object] and consciousness, therefore the conscious subject does not exist [by himself]." --Nagarjuna, SS 56-57 (in Lindtner 1982 59-61)

"Concerning one single exterior object, divergent judgements may prevail. That form (rupa) which is pleasant [to one person], precisely that [form] may appear different to others. In

respect to the same female body, [for example,] an ascetic, a lover, and a dog entertain three different notions: 'A corpse', 'A mistress', 'A titbit'." --Nagarjuna, BV 19-20 (in Lindtner 1982 191)

"As far as I am concerned, those who say that the self (atman) and entities (bhava) have distinct existences do not know the [Buddha's] true meaning." --Nagarjuna, MK 10:16

"Thus, [at the supreme (paramartha) level,] neither self [atman] or non-self [anatman] are understood as real. Therefore, the Great Subduer [= Buddha] rejected the views of self and non-self. Sights, sounds and so forth were said by the Subduer neither to be true nor false; if from one position its opposite arises, both in fact do not exist." --Nagarjuna, RA 103-104 (in Hopkins 1975 32)

7. HOW THE WISDOM OF INTERDEPENDENCY AFFECTS OUR RELATIONSHIPS

"Since [perfection of wisdom] is the mother of bodhisattavas [= students] it is also the mother of Buddhas. Perfection of wisdom (prajnaparamita) is the foremost collection [= equipment] for enlightenment. Great compassion penetrates into the marrow of the bone. It is the support of all living beings. Like [the love of a] father for his only son the tenderness [of a Buddha] pervades everything." --Nagarjuna, BS 5, 8 (in Lindtner 1982 228-229)

Commentary: The "perfection of wisdom (prajna-paramita)" is "the mother of Buddhas." As one of the six perfected virtues (= paramitas*), it nourishes our compassion (karuna) and, as a result of our knowledge of interdependency, it empowers us. Yet, using our knowledge to harm others violates every principle and precept of the Dharma, including the precept of noninjury (ahimsa). Empowered by the wisdom of interdependency, harming self or other ceases to be an option.

*[*Note: The six paramitas (virtues) are: generosity, morality, tolerance, courage, contemplation, and wisdom. On the necessity for the paramitas today, see **Whitehill 1994**.]*

"If nirvana is not a non-thing [= abhava: nonexistent], just how could it have thingness [= bhavata: existence]? The extinction of the misconception of things and non-things is called nirvana. Because 'is' and 'is not' are destroyed by wisdom, there is a passage beyond merit and sin. This, say the excellent [= Buddhas], is liberation from both bad and happy migrations." --Nagarjuna, RA 42, 45, 79 (in Hopkins 1975 23, 26)

"Roots [of the highest enlightenment] are [1] the altruistic aspiration to enlightenment firm like Meru, the king of mountains, [2] the compassion which reaches to all quarters, [3] the wisdom which relies not on duality." --Nagarjuna, RA 175 (in Hopkins 1975)

"[Practicing] self-restraint, kindness toward others, and friendliness is the teaching. It is that seed of the fruit [= karma] now and after death." --Nagarjuna, MK 17:1 (in McCagney 1997 175)

"A man is not a great man because he is a warrior and kills other men; but because he hurts not any living being he in truth is called a great man. A wise man calmly considers what is right and what is wrong, and faces different opinions with truth, non-violence and peace. This man is guarded by truth and is a guardian of truth." --Buddha, *The Dhammapada* 270, 257 (in Mascaro 1973 74, 73)

"From morality comes wisdom and from wisdom morality....Like washing one hand with the other...so is morality washed round with wisdom and wisdom with morality." --Buddha, *Digha Nikaya* I.124 (in Macy 1991 211)

8. THE MIDDLE PATH AS THE MEANS TO EMPTY OUR PRECONCEPTIONS

"When one does not swerve from the Middle View (madhyama-darsana) with regard to any phenomena (dharma) whatsoever, there is acceptance [of the fact that things are unborn] [= do not arise in the mind], because all ideas are eliminated." --Nagarjuna, BS 29 (in Lindtner 1982 231)

Commentary: Our preconceptions about things fix them with the self-nature (svabhava) we project onto them. When our preconceptions are emptied, the perceiver and the perceived dharmas are OPEN to mutual relationship between them. The dharmaic emptiness (sunyata) of svabhava is gradually realized when we follow the middle path between "is" (= existence) and "is not" (= nonexistence) regarding any dharma or the characteristics we ascribe to them. Interdependency emphasizes that our perceptions are **relative** to us as maps that guide us through our daily lives. If we mistake the map for the territory, the relative for the inherent, relational errors occur. Since all dharmas are empty (sunya) of an **inherent** self-nature, they are unfindable and indeterminate in any final or absolute sense. Therefore, eliminating (emptying) our preconceptions about others (dharmas) OPENS both self and other to mutual relationship.

"The Tathagatas [= Buddhas] did not proclaim this teaching [of selflessness] for the sake of argumentation. Nevertheless, it destroys other theses, just as fire destroys fuel. In brief, the Tathagatas explain non-violence as virtuous behavior and nirvana as, in fact, emptiness [= sunyata: openness]. Here [in our system] there are only these two. All people love their own thesis, just as they love their own birthplace. Yet why should a reason that defeats it distress you? An intelligent person who desires good fortune accepts things that are appropriate, even from opponents. Isn't the sun common to everyone on earth who has eyes?" --Aryadeva, CS 12: 15, 23-25 (in Lang 1986 115-117)

"This [is] a matter hard to perceive, this conditionality, this [interdependency]...against the stream of common thought, deep, subtle, difficult, delicate...." --Buddha, *Digha Nikaya* II.36 (in Macy 1991 45)

"What is interdependent origination, that is called openness [= sunyata: emptiness] by us. It [openness] makes use of convention and is the practice of the middle way." --Nagarjuna, MK 24:18 (in McCagney 1997 202)

"Thus the doctrine of definite goodness was taught by the perfect Buddhas, the seers of reality, as profound, unapprehensible and baseless [= not providing a base for the conception that things inherently exist]. Frightened by this baseless doctrine, delighting in a base, not passing beyond [ideas about] existence and non-existence, unintelligent beings ruin themselves. Afraid of the fearless abode, ruined, they ruin others. O King, act in such a way that the ruined do not ruin you." --Nagarjuna, RA 75-77 (in Hopkins 1975 27-28)

9. REFERENCES

Dalai Lama. 1995. *The World of Tibetan Buddhism: An Overview of Its Philosophy and Practice*. Boston: Wisdom Publications.

Hopkins, Jeffrey, et al, trans. and eds. 1975. *The Precious Garland and The Song of the Four Mindfulnesses*. New York: Harper and Row.

Kalupahana, David J. 1986. *Nagarjuna: The Philosophy of the Middle Way*. State U of NY P.

Lang, Karen. 1986. *Aryadeva's Catuhsataka: On the Bodhisattva's Cultivation of Merit and Knowledge*. Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag.

Lindtner, Chr. 1982. *Nagarjuniana: Studies in the Writings and Philosophy of Nagarjuna*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Macy, Joanna. 1991. *Mutual Causality in Buddhism and General Systems Theory: The Dharma of Natural Systems*. Albany: State U of NY P.

Mascaro, Juan, trans. 1973. *The Dhammapada: The Path of Perfection*. New York: Penguin Books.

McCagney, Nancy. 1997. *Nagarjuna and the Philosophy of Openness*. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Wallace, Vesna A. and Wallace, B. Alan, trans. 1997. *A Guide to the Bodhisattava Way of Life (Bodhicaryavatara) by Santideva*. Ithaca, NY: Snow Lion Publications.

Whitehill, James. 1994. "Buddhist Ethics in Western Context: The 'Virtues' Approach." *Journal of Buddhist Ethics* 1:1-15. (Website: <http://www.gold.ac.uk/jbe/1/whitabs1.html>)