

*(The translation may not be completely consistent with the original, as it is based on online translation programs.)*

*I am looking for a publishing house that will publish my book "Krzysztof Kuszej. Sunyata and new ontology. Philosophical conclusions" in English! Contact: poczta@kuszej.pl*

## Sunyata and new ontology. Philosophical conclusions.

This book is not another interpretation of Śūnyatā, nor an external philosophical reconstruction of the concept. It is a detailed compendium of knowledge of Śūnyatā developed from the perspective of a mind that has realized it and that subjects this realization to systematic philosophical analysis. Its fundamental premise is that Śūnyatā is neither a merely religious notion, nor a mystical metaphor, nor a tool for deconstructing metaphysics, but rather discloses a real, ontologically distinct reality – one that is inaccessible to consciousness-based cognition and absent from the dominant systems of Western philosophy. The book proceeds from the conviction that any ontology which ignores this dimension of reality remains incomplete, regardless of its degree of formal sophistication.

This publication arises from direct experience of Śūnyatā rather than from the interpretation of texts devoted to it. This fact gives it a character fundamentally different from that of most contemporary philosophical works, in which Śūnyatā appears as an object of commentary rather than as a reality actually experienced. Descriptions of the state of realization and of the path leading to it do not serve here a narrative or autobiographical function; instead, they constitute ontological material from which new philosophical concepts and theses are formulated. The conclusions presented in the book are based on investigations of a mind immersed in deep meditation, functioning beyond the structures of selfhood, form, and time, and thus beyond the horizon within which classical epistemology operates.

From this perspective, the book offers a new approach to key problems of contemporary philosophy, particularly ontology. It introduces a distinction between existence as a single, non-differentiated whole and being as a mode of its manifestation within specific realities. It demonstrates the reality of the ontic reality constituted by the ontic mind, while simultaneously indicating the existence of another, equally real reality that reveals itself in the experience of Śūnyatā but remains

inaccessible to consciousness-based cognitive apparatuses. It is this second reality – rather than merely conceptual crises or the limits of language – that constitutes the source of the tensions and paradoxes present in modern and contemporary philosophy.

Given the scope and consequences of the distinctions introduced, the author deliberately employs the term “new ontology.” This does not designate a system competing with classical, phenomenological, or realist ontologies, but rather a new way of understanding them in the light of Śūnyatā. The new ontology does not negate existing systems; instead, it reveals their confinement to a single order of reality and a single mode of the manifestation of existence. In this sense, it breaks through the traditional frameworks of ontological thought not by negation, but by ontological transcendence.

Of particular significance in this context are the theses concerning existential externalization and the introduction of the concept of subconscious existential judgments. These undermine the axioms on which both substance ontology and language-based ontology rest, demonstrating that the most fundamental determinations of being occur prior to reflection, prior to logical judgment, and prior to discourse. Ontology thus ceases to be a theory of entities or an analysis of concepts and becomes instead an account of the structures through which existence manifests itself across different realities.

The genesis of the book is unconventional and remains visible in its structure. The text emerged from notes accompanying paintings created under the influence of experiences of Śūnyatā, which has shaped its form as a series of loosely connected statements rather than a linear systematic exposition. Only a complete reading and the synthesis of these statements allow a relatively coherent image of Śūnyatā and the new ontology to emerge. This form is not a deficiency but a consequence of the subject matter itself, which resists classical philosophical modes of discourse without thereby losing its ontological reality.

Throughout the text, Buddhist terms such as Śūnyatā and Emptiness are deliberately capitalized. This choice does not result from a disregard for convention, but from an ontological conviction that the reality to which these terms refer is not an abstraction or a concept, but an experience of monumental and enduring impact on the structure of the mind. Śūnyatā is not treated here as an object of description, but as a living reality that radically transforms thinking, perception, and the understanding of existence. This book stands as a testimony to that transformation and as an attempt to give it rigorous philosophical form.

Excerpt from the book:

(...)

(839) Lack of awareness of the existence of a really existing thing, located outside the field of vision, in the reality of Sunyata. In the commonly experienced conventional reality, in a situation when a thing is outside the field of vision, for the subject it does not really exist – it is a thing in itself. The subject does not experience the real existence of the thing at a given moment, but has knowledge of the presence of the thing outside the field of vision and knowledge of the potentiality of its existence (at any moment it can become visible and exist). This knowledge creates a kind of continuum, an illusion – awareness of the continued existence of a thing that has moved outside the field of vision. The thing does not cease to be present in consciousness – its image continues to “exist” in memory. In the reality of Śūnyata, a thing that is not visible also does not really exist. However, due to the inactivity of the processes of awareness, the subject does not have knowledge of the possible presence and supposed existence of a thing outside the field of vision. The mind cannot therefore create this continuum of existence, awareness of the existence of a thing that has currently moved outside the field of vision. Therefore, a thing that has moved beyond the field of vision ceases to exist in reality and is no longer “existing” in memory - it ceases to exist in an absolute way.

(838) Informen – does it exist at all, can it be observed? Informen is a concept created in conventional reality and only in this reality does it exist as a concept. Informen describes a single thing visible in the reality of Sunyata, manifesting itself without Buddhist form, i.e., without properties and time, among other things. Can it be observed in Sunyata? Yes and no. On the one hand, a single thing is visible in the reality of Sunyata, but on the other hand, this thing is not differentiated and constitutes, as it were, one whole with other things. We can assume that informen is the physical appearance of a thing – this is how it is visible, because things in Sunyata are physically separated. However, it is not a separate, differentiated thing with properties (it is not an entity in itself), which would be visible as a separate whole. Informen is the physical appearance of a single thing, visible, however, only in the whole, which whole is created by all other undifferentiated things. Informen exists only because things in Śūnyata are not visible as one material mass, but are visible as

single, physically separated material objects. It would be more appropriate to speak of informen as a set of things unified in terms of the way of manifesting existence, rather than of a single element that has no ontic value (the single does not exist, it exists only in the whole of undifferentiated elements). A single informen cannot be distinguished in any other way than through its visible physical separateness. It is visible as one, but it exists as one of many. Therefore, it does not have a separate existence. It would seem that only informen have a separate existence. But they are not distinguished in any special way either. They are part of the whole. And this whole is the whole. That is, reality in which nothing is distinguished. Thus, the concept of informen in the singular and informeny is admissible in considerations, although it cannot be claimed that their referents exist independently - the whole exists. And what is visible is the universal existence of the universal whole.

(837) The independent existence of a thing? One can say that a thing exists only because it is in a certain reality that enables this thing to exist. This reality is constitutive of the existence of a thing. Things do not exist by themselves. They do not have such a possibility. A thing is really existing only when it is in a reality in which existence is possible. A thing is not really existing when it is not in any reality. This does not mean that it undergoes annihilation - it is not only a really existing thing, it is a thing in itself. It is not existing in itself, it is only a thing in itself. And further, following Immanuel Kant - we do not know the whole thing in itself, we only know the existence of the thing in itself. And this existence manifests itself in two ways - as a conventional being (in the commonly experienced conventional reality) or as the being of Sunyata (in the reality of Sunyata). The element with which existence is visible is a really existing thing, which in the process of realization (making real) came into being from the thing itself. This is significant because one cannot speak of the independent existence of the thing to which this separate existence is attributed, but of an existence caused by the reality in which the thing appears. Therefore, no object in conventional reality has an independent existence. Similarly, in the reality of Śūnyata - here too, existence is caused by the reality in which the thing is located and it (the thing) does not have an independent existence.

(836) Can the reality of Sunyata be the basis of the commonly experienced conventional reality? The mutual dependence (being the basis) of really existing things is a mental episode occurring on a common level for these things (in one conventional reality). On the other hand, the hypothetical dependence of two essences (being the basis), containing ontic transcendence, is also a mental event, but occurring on

different levels (in different states of mind), in different realities. The ontic difference between these two, so ontologically different elements, hypothetically dependent, would make it impossible to define any dependence at all, because there is no way to compare elements from two different realities. There is no plane on which such a comparison could take place. It could not be a comparison on the plane of one of these realities, because then it would not include an element from the other reality. Also, a comparison made from the perspective of the third reality would not be a solution, because then this procedure would not include any element from the two realities. As we can see, the procedure of comparing elements from two different realities is ontically impossible. And the postulate that the reality of Sunyata should be treated as the basis of the commonly experienced conventional reality is wrong. Moreover, it is incompatible with experience. In Sunyata it is clearly seen that the reality of Sunyata is a finite, absolutely finite reality. There is no room in it for anything more than what is visible in it. It is absolutely perfect and internally coherent. The idea of making it a basis for something else is abstract. Something that is finite in itself cannot be a basis. Completely finite and closed. The idea of a basis is an idea from another reality, which has nothing to do with the reality of Sunyata.

(835) The constitutive role of the disappearance of the conscious self in the emergence of the reality of Sunyata. Or is it perhaps the other way around and it is Sunyata, by creating reality, that causes the absence of the conscious self and, more broadly, of all the processes of awareness? There is no doubt here about the order of things and every meditator striving to know the non-dual and formless world will know this. It is the long-term meditation sessions aimed at gaining control over the emerging thoughts and, further, over the conscious self that are the key to the gates of Sunyata. For some time it seemed to me that it was the general inactivity of the processes of awareness that caused Sunyata and, further, the absence of the conscious self. Ultimately, however, it is the absence of the conscious self that is the causative element, causing the experience of Sunyata, including the inactivity of the processes of awareness. I have no doubts about this, because this is how entering Sunyata takes place. I see it clearly - the disappearance of the conscious self, its complete disappearance, is a breakthrough moment. It is its atrophy that causes Sunyata. The connection between the moment of entering Sunyata and the moment when the conscious self disappears is unambiguous to me. Sunyata appears when the conscious self disappears completely. Why does this happen? The structure of every reality that really exists is based on things that really exist. The way we perceive the existence of a thing that really exists is responsible for the type of reality within which it happens. The view of

existence in connection with the conscious self creates the commonly experienced conventional reality. Visible existence without the presence of the conscious self manifests itself in the environment of the reality of Sunyata. How does the presence of the conscious self or its absence determine the type of perceived reality? It is hard to believe that such enormous changes that the transition from one reality to another causes can be caused by the mere deprivation of the mind of the conscious self. These changes are the complete inactivity of all processes of awareness, conception, reasoning, as well as the complete lack of time. What is the mechanism of the change in reality caused by the disappearance of the conscious self? The absence of the conscious self causes the inactivity of all processes of awareness - because there is no one who could be conscious at that time. Similarly, one can explain: lack of reasoning – there is no one who could reflect, and lack of conception and related lack of property of objects – there is no one who could be aware of it. It seems that conception and property of objects are present (in the subconscious) but are not conscious – there is no one who could be aware of them. Is it similar with time – there is no one who could be aware of it?

(834) Every element of reality to which it is ontically transcendent ceases to exist in it. For example, a tree that transcends conventional reality and manifests in the reality of Śūnyata ceases to exist in the reality from which it transcends (ceases to exist as a tree). On the other hand, it appears as the informen of the tree in the reality to which transcendence has occurred, i.e. in the reality of Śūnyata. The tree has ceased to exist in conventional reality. Every thing that really exists after ontic transcendence continues to be a thing that really exists. Transcendence concerns only being in this reality, and existence itself does not change. Every being in the reality to which it becomes ontically transcendent ceases to exist in it.

(833) In the reality of Sunyata, in relation to the commonly experienced conventional reality, everything is different except for the physical appearance of things. But why does the physical appearance of things not change in the reality of Sunyata? Why is it that the physical appearance of things is an unchanging element of both realities? Sunyata is based on sensory stimuli and they are its basis, just as they are in conventional reality. A state of mind in which the process of awareness is inactive and the conscious self is absent does not affect the sensory stimuli in any way. Even the way these stimuli are processed in the subconscious does not change. The decisive factor creating a different reality is the absence of the conscious self and the inactivity of the processes of awareness – this creates a new reality and a new way of existence,

leaving the physical appearance of a really existing thing unchanged. The ontic essence only changes the way a thing exists, not its physical appearance.

(832) The description of Sunyata was a great challenge for the realized (realized – one who has come to know the reality that really exists, that is, Sunyata). Some of them did not attempt to describe it at all, claiming that this reality cannot be described because it is non-conceptual. Being so different from everything that is commonly known, it is non-verbal. Buddhist teachers warn students not to even imagine what the Void might look like, because it will be different from their mental constructions anyway. And they are right. The appearance of Sunyata, as emphasized by all who have come to know it, is dramatically different from all concepts and messages. This is because our knowledge is limited. We are given only one commonly experienced conventional reality, in which and thanks to which the world is perceived in a strictly defined way, developed in the course of evolution, allowing for optimal interaction of the mind with the external environment. Conventional reality is commonly known. The reality of Sunyata looks completely different. The only common element for both of these realities is the thing, and we can say that apart from the physical appearance of the thing, everything is different. (For Śunyata experienced through hearing, apart from the sound presentation of the thing, everything is different). Everything that is different is immanent to this reality and distinguishes it from conventional reality. For example, the meaning of the existence of the thing is different, not because the thing has a different meaning, but because a different essence creates this thing. And it is the essence characteristic of this reality that does not allow a category alien to it to exist. The meaning of time is different, but not because the lack of time automatically creates ontic eternity, but because it (ontic eternity) is created by a different essence for which it is an immanent category, and time is transcendent into nothingness. The very concept of meaning is subject to the same mechanism, as is the category of concepts. Essence, being itself extra-verbal, determines the remaining elements of reality, which also remain non-verbal (e.g. timelessness, formlessness, etc.). Essence is responsible for the fact that apart from the physical appearance of things, everything is different, and it is different because it exists in a different way.

(831) The view that Sunyata is the basis of conventional reality is often repeated. This reasoning is based on the assumption that conventional reality is a development of Sunyata reality – since things in conventional reality are the same things as in Sunyata reality, and only the “superstructure” added by consciousness and the conscious self differ, then it can be assumed that things in conventional reality are the same things as

in Sunyata reality enriched with Buddhist form (i.e. properties and time). Even some Buddhist schools often repeat such views. And it might seem that this is exactly the case, everything falls into place nicely – the realized person has deep insight into the absolute reality that is the basis of conventional reality, and sees another reality – the absolute reality – existing all the time – beneath the conventional reality. At the beginning of my path, I myself succumbed to such an illusion, saying then: Sunyata is present here all the time, it is everywhere, all you have to do is learn to see it. Well, it turns out that it is not present and never was. The reality of Śūnyata does not exist parallel to conventional reality and is not its basis, and things without properties visible in Śūnyata reality cannot be considered the basis of differentiated objects in conventional reality. First of all, no aspect of one reality can be the basis of another. Every reality is a closed system, all of whose elements are interconnected by the same principle (essence) that creates them and creates reality itself. Each element of this reality has meaning only in its environment; taken out of it, it ceases to be an element belonging to it. Elements can be interconnected only within one reality. Any case of transcendence beyond this reality will create elements alien to it. Interconnections of elements of reality, including hierarchy and order, can only take place within one reality. Therefore, one element can be the basis of another only in one reality. It cannot be said that an element alien to this reality is the basis of some of its elements – an element from one reality cannot be the basis of an element from another. Moreover, things in different realities have different essences, so for things to be interconnected, the essences would also have to be interconnected. The essence of one reality would have to be the basis of the essence of another reality, which is simply ontically wrong. I find it hard to even imagine this, not to mention that it is empirically impossible. Every reality is ontically closed and limited to itself. Every element ontically transcendent in relation to it ceases to exist in it. Unlike, for example, within one and the same reality, in which transcendent elements, but transcendent within this one reality, e.g. functionally transcendent, still remain in mutual connections, e.g. the form of a mature butterfly is transcendent to its larval form, but still remains connected to it. This does not happen in ontic space, where the act of transcendence is the severance of all connections. Being is a finite being within a given reality, it is ultimately shaped and created from scratch by this reality. Being is a being because it is unique, completely dependent and embedded in this one, specific reality. No entity can have anything in common with any aspect of another reality, because it would no longer be coherent with its reality. An entity can have no ontologically transcendent ground. Every entity is its own ground. So not only is Sunyata not the ground of the commonly experienced conventional reality, but also, theoretically speaking, no



reality can be the ground of another.

(830) Buddha emphasized that existence as a concept cannot be and is not present in the reality of Sunyata. The position that is the negation of existence is ultimately the negation of the presence of the concept of existence in the reality of Sunyata and is not equivalent to nihilism, which Buddha emphasized many times. In the reality of Sunyata there is no existence as a concept, but there is existence appearing through intuition. This is an existence that really exists but without the visibility of its conceptual shape. This is an existence emphasized by reality, identically as in the commonly experienced conventional reality. For Buddhists, only the reality of Sunyata is really existing. Existence is present in it in a non-conceptual form. I have seen this exactly many times - existence appearing in non-conceptual intuition. However, despite the conceptual limitation, this existence is the same existence outlined by reality as in conventional reality. No ontologically significant difference between them can be indicated. Well, maybe apart from a small exception, namely the reality of existence in the reality of Sunyata is significantly greater than in conventional reality. It can only be described very imprecisely as greater purity, greater crystallinity, greater clarity or greater transparency. However, this does not translate into a difference in existence, which is always the same. In Buddhism, the only really existing reality is the reality of Sunyata, and the existence present in it is the only one that really manifests itself. In the ontological approach, both existences are really existing.

(829) It is not possible to know a thing in its entirety, as it is in itself, as Immanuel Kant has already shown. However, it is possible, in a certain sense, to come close to knowing a thing as it is in itself. This possibility is given to us by intuition in the reality of Sunyata. In it we see things existing in timelessness, deprived of their properties and everything that could be connected with them. This is a very strange sight. The sight of things to which no human interpretation and human meanings are attached. Things visible *sauté* – this is extraordinary. The sight of things deprived of human meaning is inhuman. And yet, in its ontological transcendence, human through the possibilities of the transcendence of the human mind.

(828) Ontic difference – two realities – two truths. Buddha in his teaching indicated the existence of two truths – conventional and ultimate, absolute. These truths are based on two realities – conventional or commonly experienced and ultimate or the reality of Sunyata. Of these two realities, only the reality of Sunyata is considered by Buddhists to be really existing, in contrast to

conventional reality, which they define as an illusion. However, from an ontological point of view, both of these realities are really existing. Both contain existence and in both reality is a category that sanctions this existence as really existing. In both of these realities, existence manifests itself in a way characteristic of them in the form of a really existing being, differentiated for each of them separately. The differences between these two really existing beings create an ontic difference. Apart from possible descriptions of the characteristic features of these beings and further, descriptions of the difference between them, the most important for the definition of ontic difference is the difference between the essences of these realities. The difference between two realities can be described by pointing to their different properties, but this will not be a complete description, because it will omit what is most important, because the ontic difference is not a difference between concepts, it is not a concept, it is not a difference that can be presented verbally. The rudimentary category that creates the meaning of the ontic difference is the essence assigned to two different entities. And it is the difference between essences that creates the ontic difference. Essence is what is hidden behind the statement about the difference between two ways of experiencing existence, which create the ontic difference. Two different ways of experiencing existence, two different entities contain two different essences. The difference between two essences is the essence of the ontic difference. The ontic difference can only be grasped on the basis of one's own experience of it, and ultimately on the basis of comparing one's own experience of two different essences. The ontic difference is a difference that is only empirically perceptible and its verbal equivalent is not possible. Similarly, it is impossible to describe the nature of a sweet taste to someone who has never experienced it. If someone has not personally experienced two different essences of real beings, they will never really know what an ontic difference is. It can be imagined based on a description, but its actual form, its ontic specificity, what distinguishes it from other differences, will never be available. An ontic difference is an atypical difference. It is difficult to even imagine it, because it requires knowledge from two different realities. An analogy to the difference between two objects is far from sufficient - here we have a difference between the properties of two different objects, which is perceptible within the framework of one experienced reality and one act of intuition. An ontic difference is a difference between the essences of being in two different realities. It is impossible to see this difference within the framework of one reality. Its existence can only be confirmed by comparing memory traces - it is not a difference available in one view. It is a difference between two different experiences. However, it is not a conceptual difference. Because this difference between experiences cannot be verbalized. When I address a person who is

already realized (has already experienced the reality of Śūnyata) and tell him that the ontological difference is the difference in the essentiality of these two realities, he will answer: yes, I know what you are talking about, I have also seen two different essentialities, which are ultimately the most important elements differentiating these two realities. A person who is not realized will answer: I don't know what these essences are about - he has not seen the essence of Śūnyata reality, and the essence of the commonly experienced conventional reality, in which this person is de facto immersed, is invisible to him, because it is transparent to him - experienced from birth, it is an element of "normality" and an obviousness of the commonly experienced conventional reality. It is true that one can say that these two realities are differentiated by a different set of features, for example, the fact that time is visible in only one of them. And this is true, except that the difference shown in this way has no ontological value. The lack of time is one of the features that ultimately influence or even co-create ontic value, but in this approach it is only a difference of properties. Ontic difference is a difference of ways of existence, it is a difference transcendent to the difference based on properties. It is a peculiarity, it is an abnormal difference, it is a difference legible to those who have known more than one way of existence.

(827) The place of comparison as a determinant. How does reality influence the description of the existence of a thing existing in another reality, in the context of the possibility of comparing the existence of things in different realities? It looks like this: being in conventional reality, we try to compare the existence of a thing from this reality to the existence of a thing from the reality of Śūnyata. Using the conceptual apparatus that we use in conventional reality, we try to describe the existence of a thing in another reality, which would require a different conceptual apparatus, characteristic of this reality. Ultimately, it is not just about the conceptual apparatus. This second reality is built on different principles and on different foundations. This second reality has different designations of concepts such as sense, cause and effect, etc. Applying, let's call it, a descriptive apparatus characteristic of conventional reality (created in this reality) to another reality is inadequate - let's call it an ontological error - an attempt to describe the way of existence in one reality with tools used to describe the way of existence in another reality. Ultimately, a description marked by an ontological error is, in the context of empirical knowledge, a distant approximation, it is only an attempt at a description.

(826) Therefore, it is not possible to compare things from conventional reality to things from Śūnyata reality, because the essential element of such a comparison is not

the differential properties, but something else. This something else is an ontic substance associated with the mode of existence characteristic of each of these realities. Metaphorically speaking, this something else is the sauce in which all things are immersed. A sauce with a different taste and consistency assigned to each reality.

(825) Ontic quality - a new type of quality. In the context of utility, an airplane is transcendent to a car, because its properties (possibilities) go beyond the properties of a car, offering a new quality, which is flight in the air. Similarly, we can point to the reality of Śūnyata as transcendent to the commonly experienced conventional reality, because it offers a new quality – it is ontic quality. Ontic quality is, however, a different type of quality than the quality resulting from properties. Ontic quality is related to such a rudimentary aspect as the way things manifest and is not a simple translation of the definition of conventional quality into ontic quality. Conventional quality, perceived in the context of the difference between the properties of objects, occurs within the same reality, while ontic quality can only be grasped in the context of comparing two realities. Quality is not defined by the properties of objects but by the way things manifest. Ontic quality is a specific type of quality. One may wonder whether ontic quality is a type of quality at all, due to the ontic distance, which does not allow for any comparison (of properties). From the level of reflection, comparison is of course possible, but it can take place in one reality (comparison). However, what the referent of the concept of ontic quality is, i.e. the experience itself contains such a rudimentary difference that it does not allow for comparison (and thus for defining quality). It is a bit like trying to compare a sweet taste to a bicycle - the distance of the properties of objects is so great that it prevents a meaningful comparison. In my opinion, however, for descriptive purposes, using the concept of quality in relation to ontic states is permissible and, with certain reservations, allows for the presentation of specific, transcendent (non-verbal) aspects in an accessible form.

(824) Before the mind experiences Śūnyata, it passes through many mental states (levels). These states can be distinguished, because they differ significantly (qualitatively). In the initial phase of meditation, two states can be indicated that show the first noticeable change in the functioning of the mind - the conventional state, in which the conscious self is subject to emerging thoughts, and the second - the observer state, when the conscious self merely observes the emergence of thoughts. The first is as if from the inside with the conscious self identifying with the emerging thoughts, the second is as if from the outside with the conscious self being an observer of mental contents (thoughts), which until now were wrongly considered to be the

conscious self. It is worth noting during meditation that this is not one state during which the mind began to observe itself, but these are two different mental states - they differ in the mental perspective that generates the emergence of a new quality - a new state.

(823) There is no possibility of comparing and contrasting two different entities at the same time. In the commonly experienced conventional reality, it is possible to place two different objects next to each other and compare them at the same time, in one act of cognition. Given that the mind can only be in one reality at the same time, it is not possible to grasp the ontic difference between two entities in one act of cognition. Grasping the ontic difference is possible only through reflection by comparing memory traces – images of remembered entities.

822) Is an entity characteristic of a given reality a descriptive value of a thing? While an entity is a descriptive value that can be used to characterize existence, existence itself is a quantitative value – there is one existence or there is none at all. In order to indicate an ontic difference, two values must exist. The ontic value of existence can take only two states – something exists or it does not exist. And in fact, then the ontic difference is existence itself. And can we talk about an ontic difference in the case of a difference between entities? Is the ontic difference created by the difference in the ways of manifesting existence, just as the qualitative difference (in the commonly experienced conventional reality) is created by the difference in the objects themselves and their properties? Can the ontic difference result from the difference between entities in these realities? And what value would it have then? A thing exists in both one and the other reality. This is the existence of a really existing thing. The ontic value of these two things is the same – both exist. However, their existence does not manifest itself in different ways. So what is the difference between these ways of manifesting the existence of a thing? Both are really existent, but they manifest themselves in different ways. One manifests itself to the conscious self along with the properties of things embedded in time, the other manifests itself as an intuition without the presence of the conscious self and without the properties of things that are devoid of time. We have already established that this is not a qualitative difference. It is therefore an ontic difference understood as describing the difference in manifestation in two different realities.

(821) Can we say that ontic difference is a kind of qualitative difference? In the commonly experienced conventional reality, things are differentiated by the properties

attributed to them. A bicycle differs from a table in terms of workmanship, construction and utility – there is a qualitative difference between these things. It is obvious that things differ from each other. And can we also speak of a qualitative difference in the case of ontic difference? A thing existing in conventional reality differs from a thing in the reality of Śūnyata in its way of existence – this is an ontic difference. In conventional reality, a thing manifests itself with properties and in time, while in the reality of Śūnyata, the same thing manifests itself without properties and without time – it would seem that there is a qualitative difference between them. Since descriptions are possible, of an object in conventional reality and of a thing in the reality of Śūnyata, it is also possible to indicate a difference between them. However, this is not the case. The fact that things appear differently, that we can grasp the differences between them, is not caused by qualitative differentiation but by ontic differentiation. And although the difference is tangible and possible to describe, it is not a qualitative difference. Since things existing in different realities have different ontic value, it cannot be said that they are qualitatively different. And although I have used the concept of "qualitative difference" in my earlier texts, in relation to things in two different realities it can only have a metaphorical meaning, allowing us to show in a figurative way the rudimentary differences between realities. Ultimately, ontic differentiation is not qualitative differentiation. It is a unique differentiation that cannot be presented in any way by a description of the difference in quality.

(820) John R. Searle's thesis, according to which there is only consciousness and neurophysiological processes, is untenable. Although it cannot be denied its charm - neurophysiological processes are not mental states, so they cannot be conscious. According to Searle, everything that already has the form of mental states is conscious. Thus, Searle places recognition, assigning meanings, assigning properties, recognition and all other mental processes taking place in the subconscious in the area of physiological processes - according to him, these are neurons, not specialized areas of the mind. Comparing this to a computer - are electrons performing computational operations, not applications? John R. Searle's thesis about the lack of unconscious mental states, and consequently the entire subconscious, is catchy, appealing to the imagination and brilliantly solves the problem of a hidden and inaccessible subconscious. However, it is in contradiction with experimental data. In meditation, one can clearly see how fully developed mental contents – thoughts – appear and disappear in a purified, unthinking mind. They appear there finally formed, and there is no possibility of their being produced only through consciousness. They arise in the subconscious and as finally formed mental contents

await awareness (similarly to S. Freud). John R. Searle rejects this approach, but does not refer to any experimental data.

(819) The distinction between consciousness and self-awareness. Up to now I have used the term “consciousness” in order to be consistent with the descriptions in the sutras, which speak of the absence of consciousness in Sunyata (while, for example, there is an awareness present). However, this is somewhat confusing. In the sutras, Sunyata is often described as a state of non-consciousness. However, in order to be consistent with experience, Sunyata should be defined as a state of non-self-awareness (no conscious self). Sometimes in Buddhist texts, one encounters the description of Sunyata as a state of higher consciousness, which should be understood as a state of consciousness (i.e., one that registers the presence of sound, touch, or taste), while at the same time lacking self-awareness (the presence of a conscious self). Finally, one must always remember that the experience of Sunyata is not an experience of emptiness or nothingness, and therefore not a subconscious state. Sunyata is a state of consciousness, while not being a state of self-awareness.

(818) Nonduality is a rather distant property in Sunyata. A closer, or even directly observable, quality is nothingness. Only after that can one derive nonduality as a consequence of nothingness.

(817) Once again – showing the difference between consciousness and subconsciousness. Why is it so important? Because until now consciousness has always been defined in the context of the presence of a subject (for example John R. Searle in the book “The Mind Rediscovered” – *“No one can simply be conscious; in any case there must be an answer to the question: “What are we conscious of?”*). The definition of consciousness should not be connected with the observing subject (the conscious self) but rather with the subconscious – consciousness is the complete and exact opposite of the subconscious. If the subconscious is all mental states that are completely covered and completely inaccessible, then conscious are all mental states that have revealed themselves in any, even the simplest form. In this approach, the mere act of intuition (in Sunyata) is already a state of consciousness (but not self-consciousness). Similarly, the mere act of hearing (in Sunyata) is a state of consciousness. These are states of consciousness without the presence of the conscious self. I know that it is difficult to imagine an intuition that we are not aware of. Similarly, it is difficult to imagine a sound that reaches our ears and of which we are not aware. However, this is completely natural and possible to observe and experience

(Shunyata). (Someone could say that this happens every day, or even all the time, when we are not aware of many stimuli that reach the mind. However, it is not quite the same process, because then the lack of awareness of the stimulus takes place in the presence of the conscious self - unlike in Shunyata.) The experience of a sound, sight or smell that the mind is not aware of is possible in Shunyata during meditation - it is an experience of awareness without self-awareness. I know that it is difficult to imagine a sound that the mind is not aware of (self-aware - I hear the sound). You have to see it for yourself. In Shunyata I saw clearly things that I was not aware of - I heard sounds that I was not aware of. Things and sounds that meant nothing, did not carry the information that would be attached to them. They had no label - they were nothing more - they were themselves (in the absence of a conscious self). But they were there - they were not a vacuum or nothingness (they were not hidden in the subconscious).

(816) Unconscious existence is existence present in the reality of Śūnyata. It should be clarified, however, that the concept of "unconscious existence" that I use is related to non-subjective consciousness. It is not existence present in the subconscious, although it is formed in the subconscious and takes its full and final shape in the subconscious. Existence present in the subconscious is completely hidden and is in no way accessible. Only the processes of becoming conscious cause the appearance of existence, in non-subjective consciousness or in subjective consciousness. Existence in both of these consciousnesses is no different, it is always the same existence. Unconscious existence could also be called non-subjective existence to emphasize the context in which it manifests itself - without the participation of the conscious self.

(815) If we assume that what is conscious is present (exists), and what is subconscious is covered (does not exist), then we can assume that the subconscious existential judgment arises from nothingness. And more generally, that existential judgments arise from nothingness. It is impossible not to notice a very distant similarity with the phenomenon described by quantum physics, where in experiments particles are observed, disappearing and appearing from nothingness (vacuum). (Appearing and disappearing in consciousness?)

(814) What is consciousness? The contemporary definition of consciousness: "Consciousness - a basic and fundamental mental state in which an individual is aware of internal phenomena, such as their own thought processes and phenomena occurring in the external environment, and is able to respond to them (somatically or



autonomously)." In other words, in this approach, consciousness is associated with the conscious self, with the subject who is the active recipient of internal and external stimuli and processes. And is their final addressee. In other words, in the approach of contemporary science and knowledge, the necessary condition for the presence of consciousness is the existence of the subject. And what happens when the subject is absent, as is the case in Śūnyata? It would then be appropriate to say that consciousness is absent. And this is true – there is then no conscious self and no consciousness associated with it. However, it is not the case that then there is nothing, because there is intuition, and with it reality. It is a presence that does not have any of the characteristics of conscious presence. There is no one who is aware of intuition and reality. It is not conscious, since there is no subject that is aware of it. If it is not conscious, what is it? We cannot say that this state is subconscious since it is present. Subconscious is everything that is hidden – both from the subject and in general. The subconscious is completely covered. In such a case, we should say that what is not postconscious is conscious. Consciousness is everything that is not subconscious, that is, everything that is not covered, that is not nothingness. We can simplify this and say – consciousness is everything that is not nothingness. In order not to use the concept of consciousness for two different referents, we should distinguish between the state of consciousness of the subject and consciousness without a subject. I am aware that using the term consciousness without a subject may seem to contradict the descriptions of the sutras, which unequivocally define the state of Śūnyata as completely devoid of consciousness. However, on the other hand, the sutras describe the existence of intuition in Śūnyata. So this inconsistency is only apparent, it is a semantic inconsistency. The sutras describe the lack of awareness of the subject during intuition. In other words, de facto the lack of awareness at a moment that cannot be called a vacuum cannot be called nothingness (since intuition is present). Subjectless awareness could also be called subjectless intuition, subjectless presence, and that would be fine too. In order to maintain consistency with the clear division between what is conscious (exists) and what is subconscious (does not exist), I will stick to the concept of "subjectless awareness". What is awareness then? It is everything that is not nothingness.

(813) Observation of existence is a derivative of the activity (skill) of the human mind. And outside of it it is not present. This is very important - outside of the human mind, existence is not present. Existence, as well as the concept of existence, is a product of the mind. And when you know this, try to imagine a Universe in which there is no existence. Is it difficult? That's right, our mind is so conditioned, or even identical with

its products.

(812) Enlightenment is a term that encompasses the entire richness of Eastern culture. An enlightened person is one who has been recognized by a given society as enlightened. In this context, I do not consider myself enlightened, I consider myself realized – one who has come to know the reality that really exists – the reality of Sunyata.

(811) If someone thinks that after realization he will be able to understand koans, he is mistaken. Ultimately, he will be able to understand the meaning of using koans, but he will still not understand their content. And this is for the simple reason that koans have nothing to do with the reality of Sunyata. Koans belong to the commonly experienced conventional reality and they only make sense in this reality. There is no translation of the content and meaning of the koan into the reality of Sunyata or its nature. Koans are tools in conventional reality and their usefulness ends there. As tools, they do not have the nature of the reality for which they are supposed to prepare. They have the nature of conventional reality. They are the key to the door, but they are not the room behind the door. For example, the well-known koan "What is the sound of one hand clapping?" It has no translation into the reality of Sunyata, and this is because in Sunyata there is no such thing as a hand, nor anything that could be described as clapping. The sound of clapping hands could indeed be heard, but it would not be the sound of clapping hands, but the sound itself, unrelated to any source of sound. Besides, in Sunyata, no such miracles occur that one hand could clap. In Sunyata, we will not find any aspect of the koan of "one hand clapping". We will not find a real phenomenon, not even its substitute or even a metaphor, nor anything that would in any way refer to the "sound of one hand clapping". The message of koans and what they carry has nothing to do with the nature of Sunyata. They are a tool belonging entirely to conventional reality and only in this reality manifesting and useful.

(810) If you still want to free all beings from suffering, it means that you are not enlightened. An enlightened person no longer wants anything. Then the all-encompassing certainty is that everything is in its place and as it should be. Suffering is where it should be. The attempt to influence suffering is a manifestation of the ever-regenerating ego and the realized self. Without the realized self, there is no suffering, no arising of suffering, no cessation of suffering, and no way to avoid suffering. The realized one is free from the need to influence anything, including suffering. The

realized one accepts everything, because everything that comes is a consequence of karma. The realized one does not struggle with karma, either his own or another's. The realized one sees karma as an organizing principle. Seeing no value in good or evil, he does not see suffering as evil and sees no reason to seek paths to the cessation of suffering. Suffering has the same value as happiness - or rather, suffering has no value just as happiness has no value. For the realized one, dealing with suffering is beneath him. In fact, it is even acting against his own realization, as acting within the realm of Buddhist form. The form that is suffering belongs to the commonly experienced conventional reality. For the realized one, form is a conventional structure (illusion) that is not within the scope of the realized one's interest. If the realized one examines form, it is always through the prism of the formless reality of Sunyata. The enlightened one accepts the suffering of another and does not even notice it. The enlightened one sees no need and does not want to free anyone from anything, not even from suffering.

(809) "Soul" and "reincarnation" are all concepts. In Sunyata, which is fundamental to Buddhism, there is nothing about "soul" or "reincarnation". These are myths and legends that have overgrown pure Knowledge. These are concepts. Those who propagate them have no arguments to prove their existence. All they cling to is faith. Blind faith and nothing more. If they experienced Sunyata, they would see that they are wandering. But the early stages of the path to realization are full of false beliefs and views. Myths and legends are still propagated by those who have not experienced Sunyata and believed too early that they could teach.

(808) In order for one category to be the basis of another, it must have the same ontic value - it must exist in the same ontic space. For example, in the claim that the basis of life on Earth are biological processes. Both biological processes and life are categories from the same ontic space, which means that they exist in the same reality. However, categories existing in different realities cannot be mutually dependent because they have different ontic value - they exist in different ontic spaces. This means that they have no points of contact. Categories from different ontic spaces cannot exist together at the same time. They may occur alternately, but never at the same time. Why? Well, the mind cannot exist in two different realities at the same time. It cannot simultaneously perceive things with and without properties, create reality simultaneously with time and without time. The decisive issue here is the capabilities of the human mind, for which something cannot be two different objects at the same time, for example, it cannot be an apple and a bicycle at the same time. The mind can

only create and reside in one reality at a time. So to say that the basis of objects in conventional reality are things in Sunyata's reality is wrong. However, it is permissible to say that the thing itself is the basis of both the thing in Sunyata reality (without properties) and the object (with properties) in conventional reality. This is because the ontic value of the thing in itself (the whole thing) is "0" (zero). The whole thing in itself, as unknowable, has no ontic value. Only the part of it that is subject to cognition acquires a specific ontic value, different for each reality in which it manifests itself. Thus, for conventional reality, the ontic value of the thing in itself (its knowable part) has the form of being in this reality (being as a way of manifesting existence), and in the reality of Sunyata it is a non-conceptual being in this reality. Both entities, having the same basis, which is the thing in itself, are independent of each other. They do not have any common parts, although they have the same base (!). This is because their ontic value is completely different, and the ontic value of their common basis, i.e. the thing in itself, is "0" (zero). It is the different ontic value that causes the differentiation of entities. This differentiation is so complete and complete that it leaves no common parts or any possibility of interaction with another being. Ontic differentiation is different from the differentiation commonly known to us, for example from differentiation according to properties - in conventional reality, a metal fork differs from a metal bowl in its functional properties. You can't pour soup into a metal fork. However, it can be said that both a metal fork and a metal bowl are made of the same material, metal. An observer in conventional reality can confirm that at a given moment a spoon and a plate are made of the same material and have the same feature. The situation is slightly different with ontic differentiation. In this case, there is no possibility of an observer who could compare two ontic values with each other at the same moment, compare two different entities. This is because it is impossible for such an observer to be in two different realities at the same time. This type of differentiation is only possible from the perspective of conventional reality, and then it takes the form of reflection, not observation. There is no way to compare two entities at a given moment, and therefore there is no way to grasp their common basis. This is only possible a priori, through post factum reflection. Ontic differentiation, due to its specificity, is not a typical differentiation, because it concerns categories existing in different realities.

(807) In the Sunyata there is not even the slightest indication of the existence of reincarnation. For Buddhists, what is not in the Sunyata is an illusion, an illusion, and ultimately does not exist in reality. In the Sunyata there is no indication of the existence of reincarnation, on the contrary. There is no need for reincarnation to exist

at all. Reincarnation is completely unnecessary. In Sunyata there is everything that is needed and actually exists, and there is no reincarnation. Reincarnation is part of Hindu mythology. The only and ultimate truth is the truth of Sunyata. Truth of the Emptiness. And in the Emptiness, not only is there no reincarnation, but it is not needed for anything there. I do not deny Buddha's attachment to the idea of reincarnation. What I am saying is that there is nothing like that in Sunyata. Sunyata, through the absolute perfection of its structure, creates a somewhat closed reality. There is no room for anything else. Even more so for reincarnation. There is no duality in Sunyata. And reincarnation through its existence (or any premise) would create a dualism of reincarnation and its opposite or the opposite of its existence. There is also no reference to reincarnation in the Sunyata, nothing that would refer to it in any way. The existence of reincarnation would be to extract something concrete from the great insignificance of Shunyata. And that's not there. What is not in Sunyata does not exist in reality. Reincarnation does not really exist. It is only a concept.

(806) In modern ontology, existence and being are consciousness categories - I am aware that this object exists and the being I am observing is a conventional being. Awareness is the sine qua non condition for establishing existence and confirming existence. A subject who was not aware of the presence of an object could not observe its existence. My philosophy goes beyond this dogma of modern ontology and goes a step further. Well, awareness of existence is not necessary for its experience. Existence is already present when it is only visible, without awareness. As is the case in Sunyata. Eyesight in Sunyata is a full-fledged confirmation of existence, because it is allowed by the existential judgment that constantly formulates judgments in the subconscious.

(805) Subjective awareness processes and non-subjective awareness processes. The so-called consciousness can be divided into subjective and subjectless consciousness. In Sunyata, awareness processes are inactive, but there is visuality and (visible) reality. Should two categories of awareness be distinguished? One is awareness specific to the subject - I am aware of existence. And the second is intuition itself with its visible reality - as it goes beyond subconscious activity, which is by definition inaccessible. If we assume that all subconscious content is inaccessible to us, then intuition and visible reality exist beyond the subconscious, because they are visible, and after leaving Sunyata they can be recalled from memory. Since these contents exist outside the subconscious, they have been made conscious. There's no other way. In Sunyata there is no subjective consciousness (I exist, it exists), but the mind is not unconscious. Some content is made conscious by the mere fact of its presence beyond the

subconscious. This content is not readable by the entity. The subject is not aware of them (the subject is absent), although the mind participates in them - these are subjectless awareness processes.

(804) What causes the exit from Sunyata? Since the conscious self is inactive, it would seem that there is no one who could make such a decision. The mind in Sunyata is completely non-decisional. It is as if the mind comes out of Sunyata on its own - there is no visible impulse, no tangible mental content that could cause it. It's just that at some point, Sunyata ends by itself. This sign of a certain form of decision-making, which is the concrete beginning of the process of leaving Sunyata, can be interpreted as confirming the existence of Brahman, i.e. someone who is above it all. However, there is no need to look for a transcendent solution, because the solution already exists in the mind. It's the unconscious self. It is the actual decision-maker and is responsible for starting the process of leaving Sunyata and activating awareness processes, including self-awareness. But why does the duration of Sunyata vary? It seems that it depends on the potential that the mind has at a given moment. A mind with greater potential, better prepared to experience Sunyata, can stay there longer.

(804) Preparing to experience Sunyata is very complex and time-consuming. It requires methodical work with the mind on non-verbal and non-conceptual levels. Work consisting in non-intuitive, skillful directing the mind to appropriate paths. And ultimately, on the skillful creation of mental circumstances conducive to the appearance of Sunyata. Sunyata is not experienced upon will, by becoming aware of the desire to experience it. It is experienced by creating appropriate conditions that are favorable and necessary (non-thinking).

(803) **Separating ontic properties.** The commonly experienced conventional reality and the non-conceptual reality of Sunyata are different realities. They are separated by an ontological difference. That's everything. Therefore, attempts to identify common categories make no sense. The similarities are only apparent and can only be indicated conceptually. For the experiencer, these realities are homogeneous, complete and closed. It cannot be said that an apple in conventional reality is an apple in Sunyata reality. Although it's about the same physical thing. The basis is, of course, the thing, but the realities that are based on it are completely different. The difference is qualitative. This qualitative differentiation of reality does not allow for a simple comparison of categories. Similarly - but only similarly - you cannot compare the color red with the taste of sweet. Things existing in different realities are incomparable

due to the ontic properties that separate them. The conventional being is something separate and completely different from the being of Sunyata. Ontic difference is experienced difference. If in the "red" reality the color red is constitutive of this reality, and for the "sweet" reality the constitutive taste is sweet, then these realities will have nothing in common even if their basis is the same red and sweet apple. Let us now turn to the well-known fragment of the *Heart Sutra*: "Form is emptiness, and emptiness is form." Form exists only in conventional reality, and emptiness only in the reality of Sunyata. Form and emptiness are two different ontic categories that cannot exist together. Unless it is assumed (for didactic purposes) that they refer to the same referent. The color red, which constitutes the "red" reality, and the sweet taste, which constitutes the "sweet" reality, are based on the same apple, refer to the same apple, i.e., hmm! – they are the same.

(802) Conventional being in the commonly experienced conventional reality is the subject of intellectual cognition. However, it is not an abstraction and concerns a concrete designator. It is a mode of manifestation of existence in conventional reality. Similarly, the extra-conceptual entity of Śūnya is not an abstraction and is concerned with a concrete designator, that is, with the manner of manifestation of existence in the extra-conceptual reality of Sunyata. The only difference is that Śūnjata's being present visually in Sunjata's extra-perceptual reality, as an object of intellectual cognition, is only formed in commonly experienced conventional reality.

(801) **Suspension of humanity.** Existence is independent of the activity of awareness processes. Existence is also present when the mind becomes unconscious. The conventional (conscious) being then passes into the unconscious being of Sunyata, and objects with properties change into propertyless informens. Immaterial phenomena such as time, judgments, concepts, relationships, feelings, knowledge, views, etc. disappear. Speech shrinks to meaningless sounds, and all people become the same. The unconscious being of Sunyata is a unifying, undifferentiating and undifferentiating being. In this being, all persons lose their individuality and become whole with others. Being in Sunyata's being is devoid of meaning and meaning. Devoid of "before" and "after", it is ontic eternity. An existence without meaning and without a future is hopeless - there is nowhere to go, because there is no "go" and no "where". There is no space-time that contains "where to go." The only possible and available existence is the present moment. It is as if the momentum of the world has stopped. It is true that there are moving people, the sun is shining and the wind is blowing, but it is as if in another world, where rules and meanings are illegible,

causality is absent, meaning and future are missing. What remains is persistence. Persistence without meaning and future, without past and consciousness. A state of suspended humanity in which others are indistinguishable and misunderstood, as if seen for the first time. And the last one.

(800) **Reality without an observer.** Commonly experienced conventional reality is perceived through processes of awareness and identification in the presence of the conscious self. The conscious self is the reference point. Both cognition and reflection concern the same reality. In the case of the non-conceptual reality of Sunyata, cognition and reflection take place in two different realities - cognition takes place in the reality of Sunyata, and reflection takes place in the conventional reality. The conceptual apparatus and language of conventional reality are used to describe the reality of Sunyata. This has far-reaching consequences. Many categories are difficult to describe, and some are even impossible. The latter include: the nature of non-conceptual reality, lack of time, the appearance of things without properties, ontic eternity, etc. The lack of a conscious self does not allow for directing cognition, it is not possible to concentrate attention on a selected fragment of reality. Everything is known in its entirety. On the other hand, the lack of an observer allows for pure knowledge, knowledge of the world in its final shape. This is not absolute knowledge, because it is still based on sensory stimuli, but it is final because it shows the world without filters and masks - without the entire superstructure created by the mind. The lack of an active observer shows the world as it is when the mind does not interfere with its image.

(799) **Reality as a manifestation of existence.** The existence in the non-conceptual reality of Sunyata is the existence of a real thing. They consist of intuition and reality. Visibility is not extended to properties, relationships, or time. Reality is not a property of this thing, although it belongs to intuition. However, while not being its property, it is a form of manifestation of existence. Reality is not a property of things because it is not a differentiating category - it is visible to all things. For the same reason, it is not a property of intuition - it is not experienced at any level of visibility (of a really existing thing) without reality. Reality is a form of manifestation of existence. Mere intuition, without visible reality, would be a mere image of things consisting of bits of information. What creates existence from the image on the retina is reality. Existence manifests itself through reality. If we could attach reality to the image on the computer screen, then the computer processor would experience existence. It might seem that reality is a form of emotion. After all, we feel it strongly,



it is something that exists alongside the rational view of the world. However, this is not the case. First, reality is in no way related to thoughts or emotions. How we think or what we think about does not cause any changes in visible reality. Similarly, emotions do not interact with reality. Secondly, reality is visible in the reality devoid of thoughts and emotions, i.e. in the non-conceptual reality of Sunyata. It is a reality of the same nature as the reality in conventional reality, only with greater intensity. Is existence already present in the visual experience itself (the image created on the retina, which has already been processed in the subconscious)? It seems so. It manifests itself in the form of reality. In meditation, there is never visual observation without reality. And if this happens, these are pathologies or aberrations that no longer have anything to do with something that actually exists. Reality in the non-conceptual reality of Sunyata is related to the manifestation of things, and not to the thing itself, although it belongs to this thing. Reality is a manifestation of existence, or is it identical with existence? It seems to be just a manifestation after all. Existence in its fullness, in the form of a constituted ontic category, is present in the **s u b c o n s c i o u s** in which it was created. Reality is the **manifestation** of existence present in the subconscious.

(798) **The persistence of being without time.** Time is a category relating to the duration of being - it is impossible to be without being embedded in time - time is the basis of being - being is not an episodic category, it is extended in time - being is duration in time. In short, this is all about being and time in contemporary ontology. But is time the necessary basis of being? Well, it isn't. It is possible to be without time. Of course, then existence has a different ontic value than existence in time - it is duration without time. Enduring without time is not a constant transformation of the future into the past - it is remaining in the "now", in ontic eternity. Being is not the events associated with existence at time  $t_1$  to  $t_2$ . Being is an event in a constantly repeating  $t_1$ . Let us assume that an entity without time is a car moving from point A to point D. An entity without time does not contain the sum of events between points A and D. An entity without time is not a **s e t** of events between A and D - it is **s e p a r a t e** events between A and D. A moving car at point B is an entity in B, and a moving car at point C is an entity at C. Since these entities do not differ in any way, they are the same entity. In conventional reality, being in time is a **set** of ontic events (existence) in time - it is a sequence of events. In Sunyata's reality, being without time is a separate single event in the now. This single event continues to recur in the now, but does not create any **c h a i n** of events. This lack of a set of events, this lack of sequence, is duration without time. The existence of a car at point B is in no way

related to the existence of a car at point A, nor at points C and D. The existence of a car at point C is neither an existence preceding its existence at point D nor subsequent to its existence at point B. They are these are separate existences. Although all these existences between A and D are the same existence of the car - these existences are not related to each other. A being without time is always the same being in all positions of the car, because its ontic value does not change. Existence in every position of the car manifests itself in the same way - it is the persistence of being in the ever-renewing now. It is the duration of being without time.

(797) Informenas exist in the reality of Sunyata without time. However, it would be more appropriate to omit the complement "without time" and say that they simply exist. The existence of informen is the purest and, above all, the most universal existence. Rather, objects in conventional reality should be said to exist, adding "in time" - to emphasize that this is a v e r y s p e c i a l way of existence.

(796) **The whole in the act of creation.** In the non-conceptual reality of Sunyata, the chair, table and wardrobe have the same nature, are the same nature, are immersed in the same nature. They are no different, but this does not mean that a chair is a table and a table is a wardrobe - despite the lack of ownership, they retain their visual distinctiveness. So these things are the same, but they are not the same. What they are missing is "the same." However, we can only claim that they lack something from the perspective of conventional reality, when we compare the ways in which things appear in different realities. In the non-conceptual reality of Sunyata, things lack nothing. They are full, complete elements of reality. Because it is the way they manifest themselves that is fundamental to this reality. If we take the reality of Sunyata as the basis and point of reference, where things manifest themselves without properties, then we can assume that objects in conventional reality are exactly the same things, additionally labeled with categories - properties, time, dependencies, etc., i.e. everything that came into being or has been implemented into the mind. Objects then begin to mean something, they cease to be anonymous and, above all, they become separate, differentiated objects. From this moment on, what is visible is not the whole, but individual elements - "bricks" of reality. In Sunyata, the entire "building" is visible, but the "bricks" are invisible. In conventional reality, the "bricks" are visible, but the entire "building" is invisible. Being plastered with properties narrows the perspective of cognition, distracting the mind on details. When details are visible, the whole is not visible (in conventional reality). When the whole is visible - the details are not visible (in reality of Sunyata). The

whole does not manifest itself as something specific. The whole is not composed of parts because the parts do not exist. The whole is homogeneity. A uniformity that spreads over things, permeates them and gives them new life, a new existence. It cannot be said that in this approach, comprehensive means the same as holistic, i.e. encompassing everything. Comprehensive means created anew as homogeneous. The chair, table and wardrobe were not merged in the process of deprivation of property. These objects were created anew as things, in the act of creating a new reality (the reality of Sunyata) - as a whole. Where properties are a destructive category for this whole.

(795) Being and existence from the perspective of **conventional reality** and Buddhist philosophy. In the Buddhist perspective, one cannot talk about being, because in the Sunyata being as a form does not exist. The situation is slightly different with existence, which as a concept, or form, is also not present in the Sunyata. However, in Buddhist philosophy there is an argument corresponding to the accusation of nihilism, according to which Sunyata is neither vacuum nor nothingness, i.e., it is indirectly admitted to be existence (in the Buddhist perspective, it is neither existence nor non-existence). Ultimately, even if it is accepted that Sunyata is not a vacuum, it cannot be established that it exists. Because to confirm existence, concepts would have to be used, and as we know, Sunyata is non-conceptual.

(794) Being and existence from the perspective of **Sunyata reality** and Buddhist philosophy. The presence of being and existence cannot be ascertained due to the absence of forms in the Sunyata. Being and existence are form. And also because of the lack of a conscious self - there is no one who can observe and confirm the presence of being and existence. Both categories, being and existence known from conventional reality, are an illusion. The only reality that exists is the reality of Sunyata. What is not present in Sunyata is not really existing. Being and existence are not visible in Sunyata.

(793) Sunyata can be presented in four perspectives:

- conventional reality and Western philosophy (Western approach),
- conventional reality and Buddhist philosophy (Buddhist approach),
- the reality of Sunyata and Western philosophy (Western approach),
- the reality of Sunyata and Buddhist philosophy (Buddhist approach).

Each of these descriptions will differ significantly, they will exclude each other and contradict each other. Each of them is true and false at the same time. It all depends

on the perspective adopted and the assumptions associated with it. Ultimately, each of them is true.

(792) The difficulty in describing a thing (informen) in the reality of Sunyata lies in the impossibility of separating it from other objects. The image in the field of vision is selective only visually, remaining undefined in the layer of meaning. It is as if, looking at all objects at once, we had trouble focusing our eyes on one selected one - we know it is there, but we cannot say anything about it because it is e l u s i v e . It cannot even be said that it is part of the whole, because this would result in isolating it from the rest as a part - it is a whole together with other things, a universal whole. "No eyes, no ears, no nose, no tongue, no body, no mind." (Heart Sutra).

(791) In conventional reality, an object is experienced as a separate object, differentiated from other objects by the properties assigned to it. However, a thing in the non-conceptual reality of Sunyata is experienced as a whole with other things. Due to the lack of properties belonging to this thing and the lack of properties belonging to other things, the thing is experienced as integrated with others. So, the being of one thing is the being of all things. In fact, we should not speak of the being of one thing, since such is not observed, but of the one being of all things. Similarly, we are not talking about one thing but about t h i n g s . In the reality of Sunyata, it is not a single thing that is experienced, but a multi-thing, or all-inclusiveness.

(790) We can only talk about things and things from the perspective of conventional reality. For the mind in Sunyata there is nothing that is a thing. No labels are given to objects in the field of view - including the concept of "things". Objects are u n d e f i n e d . Their existence is also undefined, although visible. Being manifests itself as a visible, non-conceptual way of manifesting existence.

(789) Why is Sunyata a tool of knowledge in **science**? Because you enter Sunyata as if you were entering a laboratory. First: Sunyata is a state of mind experienced on demand - one who knows the way to Sunyata experiences it when he so desires. Secondly, Sunyata is unchanging - the nature of Sunyata is the same during each successive experience. Third: the nature of Sunyata is the same for every experiencer - everyone who knows Sunyata will experience the same nature of it. Fourth: Śunyata is verifiable - everyone can check the correctness of conclusions regarding Śunyata through personal experience.

(788) After many experiences and attempts to find the element directly responsible for opening the path to Sunyata, I can say that it is the removal of the **conscious self**. It is not a turning off of awareness, it is not a turning off of time or concepts. These processes (switching off) occur at the same time, which is why it is so difficult to determine which of them is decisive. The exclusion of the conscious self is responsible for the emergence of the reality of Sunyata. Everything else is secondary to this act of exclusion. Removing the conscious self causes the disappearance of time, ownership, dependencies, judgments, and consciousness. What direct relationships exist between these categories - why does the deprivation of the mind of the conscious self cause time to disappear?

(787) **Confusion and lack of correct view of the Emptiness.** The Emptiness is only one and indivisible. However, not everyone knows about this. W. Kurpiewski, in the book "Filozofia prajnaparamita", page 360, describes the direct knowledge of Emptiness, quoting the words of J. Hopkins: *"Having gained knowledge of the emptiness of one object, the bodhisattva extends this understanding to all objects. Such extension is possible thanks to an extraordinary way of direct cognition in which emptiness and the object - wisdom-consciousness - are indistinguishable. This does not mean, however, that the emptiness of one thing is the emptiness of everything. Although the emptiness of one thing is not the emptiness of another, they are similar in type. Therefore, knowing the emptiness of one thing is sufficient preparation for knowing the emptiness of anything else to which the mind, still remembering the first cognition, will turn (Hopkins 1983, 183).* Well, both W. Kurpiewski and J. Hopkins are very wrong. They describe what they have heard about the Emptiness - based on this, they describe their own ideas about the process of learning about the Emptiness. These ideas do not correspond to what cognition looks like and are wrong. For two reasons: First, even if we accept for a moment the authors' view that "The Emptiness of one thing is not the Emptiness of another" thing, it should be noted that there would be two different Emptinesses at any given time. This means that there would be a differentiation between two different Emptinesses. It is clear that if there is any differentiation between two objects, or two different emptinesses, it certainly cannot take place in the reality of Sunyata - it is not Emptiness. For there to be differentiation, there must be properties. The existence of any properties of anything, even the imaginary hypothetical two Emptiness, cannot take place in the Emptiness (Shunyata). Similarly, it is not possible to know the Emptiness of one thing as a preliminary to knowing the Emptiness of everything. There is no such thing as the Emptiness of One Thing. The emptiness is all-encompassing and encompasses everything at **once**. There is no way to selectively

treat items in the Emptiness. The mind in the Emptiness sees everything at **once**, and all objects in the field of vision are treated the same, all are seen as having no property or time. And what is important - they are all seen at once, in - let's call it wide-angle vision. It is impossible to distinguish the emptiness of one thing, because the mind does not distinguish any one thing and cannot focus on any one thing or in any other way distinguish it from the rest. In the reality of Sunyata, everything is Emptiness - one great Emptiness, pervading everything. In a total and unambiguous way. Everything is Emptiness, and trying to isolate one thing and claiming that it is Emptiness is only possible if it is only a conventional procedure. We can talk about the Emptiness of one thing when we are talking about this one thing, but this does not mean that this thing has its own Emptiness belonging to it. This only means that this thing is also Empty. But it is the Empty Emptiness of the whole. Her Emptiness is not part of the Emptiness - it is all Emptiness. There is only one Emptiness. Any attempt to conceptually fragment the Emptiness is de facto its annihilation. The second reason why W. Kurpiewski and J. Hopkins are untrue is the inconsistency of their descriptions with experience. Anyone who has experienced Emptiness in the non-conceptual reality of Sunyata, who has acquired Knowledge, has no doubt. When one experiences the Emptiness for the first time, one experiences the entire Emptiness, all at once, in one act of knowing. It is the Emptiness that encompasses everything. It is uniform. It is a **monolith**. Things are then visible as united by one Emptiness. It is not possible, at the same time, to see one thing as Empty, without properties and time, and other things with properties and time. It is not possible, at the same time, to see one thing that is in the non-conceptual reality of Sunyata and at the same time other things that are in the commonly experienced conventional reality. The mind can only produce one reality at a time. He cannot perceive in the field of vision, in one act of cognition, both things with and without properties. There is no overlap of two realities in Sunyata - their separation is complete. In the non-conceptual reality of Sunyata, one all-encompassing Emptiness is visible to everything in the field of vision.

(786) The world looks different in the commonly experienced conventional reality (with concepts and time) and differently in the non-conceptual reality of Sunyata (without concepts and time). Both realities make up the full picture of the world's manifestations.

(785) **I. Kant's cognitive limitations.** Claiming that the world is as it presents itself to us, I. Kant located our cognitive capabilities, smaller or larger, but always in one commonly experienced conventional reality. The noumenon, as well as the thing itself,

is analyzed from the perspective of conventional reality. The postulated inability to know the noumenon and the whole of the thing in itself is caused by the limitations of the cognitive senses. In the "Critique of Pure Reason", page 265, he presents it as follows: *"For the word noumenon to denote a true object, distinguishable from all phenomena, it is not enough for me to liberate my thought from all conditions of sensual intuition; I must also have a basis for assuming a type of intuition other than sensual intuition in which such an object could be given; otherwise my thought is empty, although free from contradiction."* and further on page 262, *"The intellect can never transcend the limits of sensuality, within which alone objects are given to us, for what is not a phenomenon cannot be an object of experience."* The world is as it appears to us - it depends on the capabilities of the senses. Cognition of the noumenon and the whole of the thing in itself is possible only through **extrasensory** intuition (a type of intuition other than sensory intuition). Extrasensory, or what? Would a new type of intuition, extrasensory, generate a new type of reality? Let's ignore the technical issues of extra-sensory for a moment and assume that information arises by itself and reaches the mind as not being produced by the senses, but in some other, extra-sensory way. It doesn't matter to the mind how the information is obtained. The information is zero-one. The mind will process it in the same way as information coming from the senses, that is, it will recognize the thing and assign concepts to it. Often the mind itself creates new information, which it then further processes. This is information resulting from logical operations that do not always have any connection with the senses (mathematics, particle physics). Kant, by postulating a different type of intuition, extrasensory intuition, clearly suggests an extrasensory apparatus that receives information in an extrasensory way. Information obtained through this extrasensory receptive apparatus would lead to the formation of an object in the mind: *"But in order for the word noumenon to mean a real object, distinguishable from all phenomena..."* "True object" means a category distinguishable from a phenomenon. It seems that extrasensory reception, from the mind's perspective, would still be just another sensory input. I. Kant's extra-sensory apparatus, by sending data to the mind, would allow for the creation of the same commonly experienced conventional reality, but with an expanded spectrum of manifestations of things. However, it would not create a new reality. Getting to know the noumenon and the whole of the thing in itself is possible by expanding perception with extrasensory receptivity. It is cognition within the same reality, with all its conditions (limitations) - it is an extension of cognition, not a deepening. Cognition in which the noumenon has a chance to become a phenomenon when extrasensory receptivity becomes available. This is possible within the same reality. Today we can say that "the world is as it appears to us"

because of the way it manifests itself. Not because of the cognitive arsenal, but because of the course of cognition - eliminating cognitive limitations. The world "presents itself" differently in the commonly experienced conventional reality (with concepts and time), and differently in the non-conceptual reality of Sunyata (non-conceptually and timelessly). The limitations of cognition, in the philosophy of the author of the "Critique of Pure Reason", are the limitations of the senses and limit the knowledge of conventional reality. I. Kant does not reach further than conventional reality, because he simply did not know any other reality. He does not claim that the limitations of cognition are the way of knowing, the way existence appears (consciousness, concepts and time). Today we can digest his idea and declare that "the world is as it appears to us.

(784) Concepts are an element modeling the final appearance of objects in commonly experienced conventional reality, **co-creating their nature**. The nature of objects in conventional reality does not allow them to be separated from concepts at any level of experience (within this reality). Therefore, an existential judgment cannot be a judgment without predicate. If it were a judgment without predicate, then it would have to take place within a different reality - one in which the manifestation of objects is without predicate. (The statement "an object is" always has a complement - an object is always some.) A non-conceptual existential judgment is not possible in conceptual reality. Because it is not possible to be deprived of concepts within nature, in which concepts are constitutive of it. If, despite this, the deprivation of concepts occurred, it would result in the emergence of a different reality, of a different nature - one that is constituted by the absence of concepts. Existential judgments are predicate-free only apparently. In commonly experienced conventional reality, objects do not manifest in a non-conceptual way, because this is impossible due to the nature of this reality - otherwise it would be logically contradictory. An existential judgment in commonly experienced conventional reality cannot be non-conceptual - and ultimately predicate-less.

(783) All contemporary ontic theorems are conscious theorems. In commonly experienced conventional reality it is not possible, at any level of experience, to separate the thing from the concept - the object always has a form shaped by the nature of conventional reality. Every statement of modern ontology contains this condition. The existential judgments of modern ontology are conscious judgments because they are judgments regarding the commonly experienced conventional reality, based on its **nature**, i.e. the



c o n s c i o u s manifestation of things with concepts (it is not possible to separate existence from a concept). (Incorrect postulate of the general thesis of E. Husserl's natural attitude as a "rational but unconscious belief".)

(782) **The ripple of Sunyata - the ripple of time.** During Sunyata there is no thought about time, there is no sense of time passing, all events are timeless, and after leaving Sunyata, information about its duration is available. Sunyata is not a black hole of time. Time is measured in the subconscious and after leaving Sunyata, a retroactive sense of the passage of time is available. Does the time present in the subconscious in Sunyata leak into the consciousness? This is manifested in the fact that the person experiencing Sunyata seems to have a belief about the duration of Sunyata. It is difficult to say whether this belief is available immediately after leaving Sunyata or also during it. However, it seems to arise at the moment of leaving Sunyata. It is possible that the nonverbal message "lasted a short time" or "lasted a long time" occurs at a moment of transition. S u n y a t a d o e s n o t e n d s u d d e n l y . Coming out of Sunyata is a process and takes time. Characteristic of the process of leaving Sunyata is the phenomenon of multiple waves, when Sunyata weakens and strengthens again, goes away and comes again. This undulation may last for up to half a minute until Sunyata ends definitively. It seems that it is during this period that the belief in the duration of the Sunyata is available, which in periods of waving may give the impression that the sense of the passage of time is also available in the Sunyata.

(781) **Preconscious?** The division of the mind into subconsciousness and consciousness (conscious content) is graphic, unambiguous and formally clear - whatever is revealed in any form, even the subtlest, is already conscious. However, there are n o s h a r p b o u n d a r i e s in the mind, rather great fluidity and vagueness are observed. Is it possible for conscious and subconscious areas to overlap and interpenetrate? Are there mental contents that are partially conscious? Conscious with half intensity. Is there a slight, faint realization. Is it possible to be barely aware of something (it barely registers to me)? Is it possible to indicate an area between subconsciousness and consciousness - p r e - c o n s c i o u s n e s s (with extremely subtle content)? In this area, mental content would not be conscious, but would already be present?

(780) The statement – there is no time in Sunyata – means that time is not conscious. Upon deeper observation, it should be concluded that time e x i s t s i n t h e s u b c o n s c i o u s and is not subject to conscious processes.

(779) **Being as existence in time** - only for conventional being in the commonly experienced conventional reality - conventional being as existence in time. **Being as existence without time** - only for non-conceptual being in the reality of Sunyata. Non-conceptual being as a timeless existence.

(778) **There are no reasons to make time the basis of existence.** This attitude is dominant when the only existence available to knowledge is existence in time, and the only known reality is the commonly experienced conventional reality. However, this is a cognitive error caused by individual limitations. The illusion of being related to time occurs only in commonly experienced conventional reality, where the only thing observed is existence in time. In the non-conceptual reality of Sunyata, existence without the presence of time is observed. A non-conceptual being is a timeless being. In the Sunyata it is clearly seen that time is not necessary at all for the manifestation of existence and the formation of being. Indeed, a timeless being, compared to a conventional being, seems to be a more perfect, ideal being, because its component is not the limiting time, but the lack of time - eternity.

(777) **Ultimately, time affects the type of being, but has no effect on existence.** Its presence differentiates being depending on the reality in which it is shaped. In conventional reality, existence creates a conventional being whose nature is created by, among other things, time. In the non-conceptual being of Sunyata, existence creates a non-conceptual being whose nature is created by the lack of time. Time, however, has no influence on existence, because it is always the same, regardless of the presence or absence of time. Existence is binary - either something exists or it does not exist. There are no intermediate states, values or differentiations of existence - something cannot exist only a little. Being is differentiated, but not existence.

(776) **Subconscious existential judgments and hallucinations.** It seems that it is possible to easily distinguish things that actually exist from illusions that appear in the field of vision, for example during hallucinations. While during the hallucination the impression of reality is complete and it is impossible to identify any element that allows it to be distinguished from the reality that actually exists, after the hallucination stops it is known that it was not a really existing event, that it was an aberration, a fixation of the mind. Despite the misleading of subconscious existential judgments, whose judgments create the reality of the objects of hallucinations, subconscious existential judgments, after the end of the hallucination, easily verify previous,

erroneous judgments, pointing to the unreal existence of things during the hallucination. Despite the fact that subconscious existential judgments give reality to the objects of hallucinations, it is possible to maintain the belief in the illusion of the observed images - when seeing the object of hallucination in front of it, the mind does not succumb to the illusion and retains the belief in its unreality. Which element of the hallucinatory representation allows the mind to maintain a sober view of the situation while the image is fully realistic? People who have experienced it know that the image in the hallucination is no different from the real image, the illusion is complete and the reality is complete. Yet the mind is not always deceived. It seems that for a subconscious existential judgment, not only the events during hallucinations are important, but also the context that sets the final judgment - as a derivative of the probability of the actual occurrence of the event. Hallucination is not an isolated state in the mind and is also influenced by many other factors - if a hallucination is experienced by a deeply rational mind, it will probably be able to control the illusion, unlike a deeply religious mind, which will probably succumb to it.

(775) Both during and after the hallucination, subconscious existential judgments confirm the lack of real existence of the object of the hallucination. Both during and after emerging from Sunyata, subconscious existential judgments confirm the real existence of things in the reality of Sunyata.

(774) **Sunyata is not a hallucination.** Both during hallucinations and in Sunyata, subconscious existential judgments confirm the reality of the image of the visible thing. However, in the case of hallucinations, they do not confirm the real existence of things. However, the real existence of things and subconscious existential judgments are confirmed in the case of Sunyata. Both images have the same reality, but only in Sunyata is the real existence of things visible. What premise for the subconscious existential judgment allows for such differentiation? Probably the subconscious existential judgment has access to information about the image in Sunyata, that it is the same one that appears on the retina, that it is an unprocessed image. Unlike the hallucination image, which has been modified by the mind and is not an unprocessed image, the same image that was created on the retina. The subconscious existential judgment creates the reality of the image in the hallucination, while having knowledge of its own interference in this image. The judgments of subconscious existential judgments in Sunyata contain knowledge about the truthfulness of the image and the reality of the existence of things. I have experienced both Sunyata and hallucinations, and I can clearly state that these are two

extremely different mental states, both in terms of the image (the presence of the observer in the hallucination) and the mechanisms that trigger them.

(773) In Sunyata, unlike hallucinations, no additional elements appear in the image. The only thing that occurs is a change in the way of seeing.

(772) **Being and existence in the reality of Sunyata experienced through hearing.**

Let us consider the pure situation when Sunyata is experienced only through hearing. In commonly experienced conventional reality, sound carries information about the sound source. In the non-conceptual reality of Sunyata, sound is devoid of this information - all properties remain hidden. As we have already noted, a sound is recognized subconsciously, but its properties, including information about the sound source, remain unconscious. The relationships between different sounds are also not subject to the awareness process. Existence is **aural** existence. Just as in intuition, something that is visible cannot not exist - if something is heard, it also cannot not exist. The confirmation of existence is a subconscious existential judgment for which sound is sufficient proof of existence. This ruling is not realized - the ear is the only revealed sign of existence. Being in the non-conceptual reality of Shunyata experienced by hearing and being in the non-conceptual reality of Shunyata experienced by sight are the same entity. In the case of hearing, it is the existence of a thing that actually exists, heard in a way that makes it impossible to determine its properties and the properties of sound. The aural entity is a manifestation of only those things that actually exist and emit sounds. A really existing thing that does not emit sound has no existence on the ear - ultimately, its existence is also elusive, because being unheard it remains inaccessible. In this approach, the aural entity is limited in scope compared to the visual entity - although they are the same, their scope differs. However, the opposite is also true, when the visual being is limited in relation to the aural being. This happens when the real thing emitting the sound is outside the field of view. Then the only entity indicating the existence of a really existing thing is the sound emitted by this thing. It should be emphasized once again that both the visual being and the aural being are the same entity, realized only through different sense organs. Both entities point to the same existence. Existence for every really existing thing is always the same existence. Within one reality, all sound-emitting things, undifferentiated in their properties, have the same entity. In conventional reality, assigning their signatures to sounds is done by imagining their sound source. This image is a mental image to which properties have been assigned. In the Sunyata reality, a mental image of the sound source is also

created, but no properties are assigned to it. The on-ear entity is associated with the image of a thing through its mental image - the sound of an ambulance passing outside the window evokes a mental image of an ambulance, but this image is devoid of signature and properties, so the source of the sound remains undefined. All things that actually exist and are the source of sound have the same existence, regardless of whether they are in the field of vision or outside it.

(771) The visual being in the non-conceptual reality of Śūnyata, like the aural being, is based on the mental image of a really existing thing, which has already been developed by the subject's cognitive powers. Both entities refer to a really existing thing, to which properties and time have already been assigned in the subconscious, but have not yet been made conscious.

(770) The non-conceptual reality of Sunyata arises on the basis of sensory stimuli. In an environment of sensory deprivation, experiencing Sunyata is impossible.

(769) Sunyata experienced through sight occurs when one meditates with open eyes in a soundless, quiet room. Sunyata experienced through hearing takes place when one meditates with closed eyes, surrounded by sounds. When meditating in a park or on the street, when both visual and auditory stimuli are present, one experiences Sunyata simultaneously through sight and hearing. In each of these cases, the same non-conceptual reality of Sunyata, along with its non-conceptual nature, arises in the mind. It seems that it is easiest to experience Sunyata in a place where there are visual and auditory stimuli. And especially when visual stimuli are diverse and change over time, for example in the presence of traffic (on the street) - although this may depend on individual preferences. Sunyata, without movement present in the field of view, is equally powerful and monumental.

(768) **What does Sunyata look like through smell?** Experienced through hearing, Sunyata creates the same reality as experienced visually. The nature of reality does not depend on the type of senses - the same reality arises in Sunyata through sight and hearing. Reality is a superstructure over perceptions, and in Sunyata it is always the same. From experience I know only Sunyata evoked through sight and hearing. But I am certain that it is also possible through touch, taste or smell. Knowing Śūnyata through sight and hearing, I cannot even imagine what Śūnyata experienced through other senses might look like - what the translation of a

sensory stimulus into reality looks like - what the stimulus looks like in the context of a new reality. What smell "looks like" in the non-conceptual reality of Sunyata. By analogy with Sunyata experienced through sight and hearing - the nature of reality will be the same. But what this might look like as a whole is a mystery to me.

(767) **Sunyata through hearing.** While meditating by the open window, I hear someone in the yard loudly closing the car door and the trunk lid, and in the distance the sound of an ambulance buzzing. And it's like there's no one in me to hear it. There are sounds that reach the mind where there is no one. The reality I hear is a reality without me - I hear a reality that is for itself. Maybe it's still for those people, but definitely not for me. Because there is no "for me", because there is no "me". There is a spectacle taking place outside the window that I can hear, but in which I do not participate. The sounds reach no one. The sounds come from a distant world whose principles are inaccessible to me. What is heard happens without any specific meaning or purpose. Like observing an ant mound, where a lot is happening, but the rules remain hidden, the motivations remain unclear, the goals remain unknown. The essence of Sunyata is the absence of a conscious self. Properties, time, relationships, awareness, and understanding are absent, but it is the lack of a conscious self that seems to be the *d o m i n a n t* category. Sounds reach the mind, which is not an active participant in the reality in which it exists. Not only is he not an active participant, but he is not a participant at all. The sounds of the outside world echo in the mind without engaging the mind in any way - the mind does not respond to sounds. The sounds reach him and that's it. The mind is not aware of the information that sounds carry. Deprived of a subject, a conscious self, he is passive and does not interact with the outside world. He is not even an observer because he has no conscious self to observe. This is a very specific state in which the possibility of interaction is completely suspended. The external world exists for *i t s e l f*. The mind, although it hears it, is completely eliminated from it. He can only perceive sounds that mean nothing to him anyway. Not only do they mean nothing, but they are also not for him. The world is a closed and inaccessible reality. It is impossible to interfere with it at any level, the world can only be reflected in the mind as in a mirror or like an echo in a forest whose meaning is lost among the trees. Sounds reach the mind without causing any emotions. The mind remains completely calm, or it would be more accurate to say that it remains completely *i n d i f f e r e n t*. There is complete indifference to the incoming sounds. No sound concerns the mind, although it reaches it. Indifference of mind consists in the *l a c k* of an addressee. The mind does not feel itself the recipient of any sound. It's a bit as if he wasn't there at all. The sounds reach a mind that is not there,

that is absent, and instead of it there is a large mirror. The spectacle of sounds does not create a performance - there is no spectator in the audience. The perspective of the mind in which sounds only bounce is the perspective of god. The world reaches the mind in its fullness without being divided by properties, concepts, and time. The world is heard in a holistic perspective - one, great, comprehensive, final view. God's perspective is not absolute, it is ultimate. Sounds are completely objectified. This is divine objectivity, complete objectivity, perfect objectivity. If I had just had a heart attack, an ambulance arriving with its siren would definitely not be for me.

(766) **Micro-entems.** It seems that in Sunyata the mind is completely empty. Generally speaking, you could say that. Thoughts, emotions, conscious self, properties of objects, concepts and time are absent. The external world is reflected in it, which manifests itself as intuition. Nothing else seems to appear, that there is complete emptiness within him. And this is indeed the case. However, after a closer (and longer, and deeper, and more thorough) look, you may notice something else. These are extremely small and discreet mental forms. They are so small that you may not notice them. One may question whether they are anything at all. They are not only microscopic, but also extremely distant. The micro-entems appearing in the Sunyata are not massive blocks, but single, extremely subtle fragments of mental content - on the verge of being perceptible. While the appearance of conscious mental content activates the process of leaving Sunyata, the appearance of micro-entemes does not significantly affect it. It seems that their structure does not differ from the full entems visible in the conscious mind, but their intensity of appearance is very low.

(765) **Entema are present in the Sunyata.** However, their intensity is much lower than when the mind has active awareness processes. When the mind creates conventional reality, some of the entemes become aware and identified. In the Sunyata, entemas are not identified and realized. They appear as very strange mental contents, some great distance from consciousness. As light and weak as one thousandth of a feather's brush. So maybe there are additional, deeper levels of consciousness? Maybe there is some pre-consciousness? Or maybe the division into conscious and subconscious content is conventional, and the content simply occurs at different degrees of awareness? It should probably be stated clearly - if they appear, it means that they have been made aware of them. Their existence is so subtle that until now I did not pay attention to them, I did not see them - they were unnoticeable. But still, they were actually there, they were there all the time, but... they were so faint, so insignificant, they weren't even something, they were a ripple, a thousandth of a

whisper in the depths of the universe. Now I know they are there – micro-entities. Perhaps they are responsible for starting the process of leaving Sunyata? The deeper, the more question marks.

(764) **Lack of identification.** The mind in Sunyata reality is devoid of identification. Although I should rather say that I have not observed any involuntary movement in Sunyata that could possibly trigger the process of identification. Sunyata is experienced in a state of stillness. Any *i n t e n t i o n a l* movement would result in the initiation of the process of exiting Sunyata, as it would be preceded by the activation of conscious processes (a conscious decision to move the hand).

(763) However, movement is possible in Sunyata. It is blinking of the eyes, and it is possible to move the head "sweeping the panorama" horizontally (caused by **entemes**). I can't explain it at the moment. This indirectly shows that the boundaries between states of mind are not sharp. And certain behaviors attributed to conscious behaviors in a *s p e c i f i c* form may also occur in Sunyata.

(762) **The conscious self is not a decision-making structure.** At first it may seem that conscious self and identification are part of the same process. However, this is not the case. They are two separate categories. This is clearly visible when observing the time delay between the moment of starting the activity and the appearance of the identification impulse. Moving the hand in a state of mindfulness shows that the moment of identification of the conscious self with the hand movement that has already started is delayed by a fraction of a second. This can be observed in *u n f o r c e d* movements, such as involuntary scratching, changing one leg to another, etc. In the case of intentional activities, when moving the hand is caused by an order to make a movement, the time shift will not be visible. This split second between starting a movement and identifying it with the conscious self shows how the subconscious mind controls the body. The command to move the hand from the subconscious, without being a conscious command yet, causes the hand to move. The identification impulse then identifies this movement with the conscious self. At the moment of identification, awareness of the movement occurs - the conscious self identifies with the movement (I am making the movement) and identifies with the decision (I was the one who wanted to make this movement). It is noticeable that the decision to move the hand is made in the subconscious, and then through identification, it is integrated with the conscious self. It is important to emphasize that the conscious self is not a decision-making structure. All decisions are made in the



subconscious, and the conscious self is only a passive **supporting structure**. The same applies to verbal and non-verbal thought content. Thoughts come and go with the conscious self still present. The identification of the conscious self with thoughts is a primary illusion, eliminated at the beginning of meditation practice. The conscious activity of the subject is an illusion and has no empirical confirmation. The so-called consciousness is a passive supporting structure, not a decision-making one. The idea that the mind does anything consciously should be put aside. Everything happens in the subconscious, and only a small part is subject to the conscious process in the form of messages (identification message: I am making the move, message of mental verbal content).

(761) What does the timeobject look like in the reality of Sunyata? Deprived of time and distinctive properties, it is seen not as a thing that is part of a whole, but as a whole that constitutes all other things. This whole, like all things, is devoid of property and time. The appearance of things without property is very specific, different from the appearance of objects in the commonly experienced conventional reality - the lack of property is part of their visual experience. Things, not being mentally separated, do not have values. All of them are seen as equally important, although it would be more accurate to describe them as equally *u n i m p o r t a n t* . Unity in the mental image of things combined with the visible physical distinctiveness of things create a new quality. We can only talk about the distinctiveness of things in the context of the distinctiveness of their physical appearance. Informen exists only as a physical image of things, because in the mental image all things are one whole. **Worthless and undifferentiated**. None of the things is isolated, defined and named. They are one big nothing and one big nothingness.

(760) **Timeobject**. It will be visible, it will be obvious - the lack of time is so acutely visible that it cannot be ignored. Being born in a commonly experienced conventional reality, we are not aware of how time affects the *a p p e a r a n c e* of objects. The physical appearance of things combined with time creates a physical and mental conglomerate. Each object is visible in the context of time: when it was created, when it will cease to exist, since when it has been in the field of view, when it is removed from this field, what is its duration, etc. This context makes us talk about a **timeobject** as a coherent combination of two different categories. This combination creates a new quality, a new look, objects are visible in a different way, they are different objects, they are of a different quality. Time and the object, integrating with each other, create a new, physical and mental emergent object - a new quality resulting from this

connection. Simply put, an object visible in time is dramatically different from the same object visible without time. However, in the non-conceptual reality of Sunyata, in which time is not present, visible things are *sauté*. These are completely timeless things. If we are talking about two realities, the time that appears is an additional property of objects. Things visible without time seem to be in their natural state, or rather, as they are - in their actually existing state. One experiencing the reality of Sunyata for the first time may not be afraid, it cannot be missed. Lack of time changes the appearance of things in a fundamental and spectacular way. Nothing has ever looked so impressive before.

(759) **The nature of ontic difference.** Ontic difference has a different nature than objective difference. This difference is not due to different sets of properties. The ontic difference cannot be compared with anything known from conventional reality. The comparison to the difference between a car and sadness will be too weak. The comparison to the difference between two parallel universes will be too strong. Ontic difference is ultimately the difference between two realities. It is a *r u d i m e n t a r y* difference. The nature of ontic difference is created by: unchanging existence, unchanging reality (although of varying intensity), and changeability of beings.

(758) The non-conceptual being of Sunyata is characterized by the absence of properties. And even more – no **space** for property. This is the ontological lack of need for property. It is not a state of deficiency that creates a new quality. It is a state that is a new quality, one whose properties would violate its structure. For whom properties would be a barbaric interference with the fullness of his being - without being necessary for anything. It is not an impoverished version of a conventional being. Rather, a conventional being could be a Sunyata being plastered with properties. This is very important - in Sunyata being is not the one that is *m a r k e d* by the absence of anything. It is fullness in its finitude. It is the last resort. It is a completely new quality, established on completely new foundations.

(757) Existence is abstract (immaterial), and being is concrete (immaterial)?

(756) Existence is the *p o s s i b i l i t y* (space) in which being appears. If entities are two chickens of different species, then existence is a chicken coop.

(755) **Is being existence?** So far, it is believed that existence is a state of manifestation in real reality, and existence is assigned to everything that is intelligible. However, this

distinction is weak and most often equates being with existence. Which, on the one hand, is impractical, is an unnecessary duplication of concepts, and on the other hand, is an a b u s e . There is only one existence. And it is absolutely clear - something exists or does not exist. Existence always has the same nature, structure and essence. It is always the same - in all realities. It is the basis and cause of manifestation. Being, on the other hand, is the d e v e l o p m e n t of existence. Being is a super-given in relation to existence, because it already takes into account the conditions in which existence occurs. As a result, it allows itself to be differentiated, depending on the nature of the reality in which it manifests itself. The differentiation of existence and being, in the conditions of commonly experienced conventional reality, and only in this reality, may seem permissible. It is assumed that being is identical with existence, because it is not possible to compare a conventional being with another being. It is not possible to observe one existence and two different, differentiated entities in two realities. **This is a cognitive error** - caused by o n t i c limitations. From the perspective of the non-conceptual reality of Sunyata, the difference between existence and being is clearly visible. Existence is one and beings are two.

(754) **Ontic difference.** The difference between conventional being and Sunyata being is not only the lack of property and time. Sunyata's being is not a conventional being, impoverished by properties and time. The matter is much more complicated than the differences between objects. In the case of items, to simplify slightly, a car that we add wings to will become an airplane and will be able to fly - items are differentiated by a set of features. However, there is no simple translation into ontic differentiation here. An ontic car to which we add wings will not become an ontic plane and will not be able to fly. The ontic difference between entities is not a simple subtraction or addition of features. It is something more. In the case of ontic difference, subtracting or adding features introduces a new quality. It is a difference of natures, or more precisely, of the e s s e n c e s of two realities in which entities manifest themselves. The essence is non-conceptual and cannot be described, it can only be known through one's own experience (just as a sweet taste cannot be described). Anyone who has not experienced Sunyata knows only the essence of the commonly experienced conventional reality, which, however, he most likely cannot grasp because it seems obvious to him and, as seen from birth, it is the only one he has known. It is the difference between the essences of two realities that distinguishes the ontic difference from the difference between objects. To complicate matters further, I will add that this is a visual difference. The being of Sunyata looks different from the conventional being. And again - it is impossible to describe the appearance of Sunyata's being, it can

only be known through personal experience. The difference between beings is the difference of two worlds, two realities. It is the ontic distance between them.

(753) There must be an **ontic difference** between different entities. There is no need to duplicate concepts in the description of reality. If things are differentiated by properties it means that they are differentiated objects. And it makes no sense to create another category for their differentiation, which is to be the different entities of these objects.

(752) In Sunyata, we can point to only one entity for all things. In commonly experienced conventional reality, too, we can point to only one entity for all things, and a multiplicity of differentiated objects and phenomena. It cannot be argued that in commonly experienced conventional reality there is a multiplicity of entities, that each object is a separate entity. Every thing is a separate object because what differentiates it from others are its properties. The properties of objects are not an ontically differentiating category. For example, the being of a car and a driver are one and the same. Their properties do not differentiate their mode of existence. They exist in the same way. They have the same being, they are the same being. We can only speak of an ontically significant difference when these things differ in their mode of existence. Thus, a car and a driver will not be ontically different from each other as long as they exist in the same reality - they will be the same thing (not the same). The differentiation of entities will occur only when the car exists in a different reality from the driver. The same car, too, will have a different entity depending on the reality in which it will exist. The ontic difference arises due to the different way in which existence is manifested. In the case of commonly experienced conventional reality, it is a manifestation with properties and time. In the non-conceptual reality of Sunyata, it is a manifestation that is conceptless and timeless. **Sunyata being and conventional being are separated by an ontic difference.** The ontic difference is a qualitative difference. In conventional reality there is one entity of ontically undifferentiated things and a multiplicity of objects and phenomena, differentiated by properties. In the non-conventional reality of the Sunyata, there is one entity of ontically undifferentiated things and nothing else - there is no differentiation of objects, since the properties of objects are absent in the Sunyata reality. The two entities are strongly marked, well-formed, definitively formed and uniquely differentiated. They are completely separate from each other. There is no possibility of the entities interacting with each other, interpenetrating, overlapping or any other interaction. The entities are immanent to their own reality and transcendent

to another. They are not some intangible form, they are the unequivocally visible structure of the manifestation of existence. The Śunjaty being is visible differently from conventional being. The entities in both realities share the same existence.

(751) **Qualitative difference of entities.** The basis of the ontic difference of entities is their qualitative difference. The difference in the modes of manifestation of existence is a qualitative difference.

(750) **The image seen in the Sunyata is a theater scene.** It is not a pure neurophysiological signal, an image collected from the retina. It is already an appropriately prepared frame, a prepared theatrical scene of the mind's interaction with the external environment. The p r o p s a n d d e c o r a t i o n s of this show are visible things, space, movement, distances, eternity, reality, existence.

(749) The mind a d a p t s to the external world by creating a reality with which it can interact.

(748) **Eyewitnessing is not the precursor of existence.** It is sensory stimuli, in the subconscious analysed and compared with the pattern of existence. Subsequently, a commentary is created on the eyewitness - it is the label of existence attached to it.

(747) **Eternity is a kind of existence.** Existence appearing in commonly experienced conventional reality is existence in time, is temporal existence. Existence in the non-conventional reality of Sunyata, devoid of the sense of the passage of time, is eternal existence, eternity. It can be assumed that both eternity and temporality, are the shape that existence can take, they are a k i n d of existence.

(746) When we say that eternity, reality, existence are present in Sunjata, it does not mean that something concrete appears. Eternity is nothing but the absence of time. It is associated with the eye and through this eye it manifests. Reality and existence are rudimentary components of reality, and through this nousness they also manifest themselves (possibly through hearing, touch, smell, taste, etc.). On the one hand, it can be said that they are isolated, well-differentiated elements of reality, but on the other hand, it can be pointed out that they are its **properties**. As a certain form of mental content, they take a form depending on the needs of the subject. Is the presence of the properties of mental content (the elements that differentiate, for example, eternity from existence) in the non-conceptual reality of Sunyata their

realisation? Is existence present together with the realised properties of tangibility, objectivity, truthfulness, physicality, etc.? Or does existence simply 'is' and the properties attributed to it are realised in the course of reflection? Similarly, eternity, simply 'is', reality simply 'is'?

(745) My statements about the reality of Sunyata, are usually dry descriptions of facts. However, Sunyata, beyond all that, is a magnificent, miraculous, arch-beautiful experience, incomparable to anything else, but also charismatic, perfect, in what it brings with it epic, fascinating in its reality, ideal in its completeness, majestic in its vastness, monumental in its uncompromisingness, superhuman in its transcendence, surreal and dazzling in its crystalline purity, extraordinary, incomparable in its uniqueness, perfect and satisfying in its finitude, spectacular and captivating, yet exclusive and refined in its simplicity.

(744) The state of **realisation** is a state of interaction of the mind with the external world. It is not a vision, an illusion or an imagination. It is realisation - making real, stripping away illusions. It is the purest, most complete interaction of the mind with the outside world.

(743) The mind produces a new, specific reality, the non-conceptual reality of Sunyata, in order to remain in interaction with it on new principles (no conceptualisation, time, dependence, etc.) in order to remain in contact with the external world.

(742) There seems to be no such thing as **pure eyewitness**. Visibility never occurs as an independent, isolated property of visibility. Eyewitness is only possible when there is a receiving system. In this case it is the subconscious. The concept of intuition goes beyond the neurophysiological approach, beyond pure visibility. Before they become visual stimuli, they are processed by many processes in the subconscious. Eyewitness in the reality of Sunyata is an already specifically formed process of the mind's interaction with the outside world. The mind remains in interaction with the outside world, although the lack of activity of the conscious processes does not allow it to be fully conscious.

(741) Is consciousness, as it were, an antonym of subconsciousness? Then, it would be identical with consciousness. The conscious mind can be unconscious, for example in Sunyata. However, if we assume that the unconscious mind is

unconscious, then pure intuition will be a conscious form.

(740) **Subconscious – hidden consciousness?** Is the subconscious mind a hidden consciousness? All conscious content already exists in the subconscious (before awareness), in its full form.

(739) **The problem of interpreting the state of mind in Sunyata.** Generally, in Sunyata the processes of realisation are inactive. Dependencies, properties or time are not present. Also absent is the conscious self - the entity that would be subject to the process of identification with the current state of mind. However, despite this, categories such as reality, eternity, existence, or the eye itself are visible. Thus, it cannot be said that nothing is present. The very visibility of certain states indicates that they are not subconscious. If they were subconscious, then they would not be present. The fact is that the realisation of these states (with naming them, defining what they were), and the identification with the conscious self (the I experienced eternity), occurs after the exit from Sunyata. Nevertheless, since they are visible, they cannot be subconscious. However, they are not conscious because there is no one who can be conscious of experiencing them. Is the presence of the subconsciousness a realisation? After leaving Sunyata, it cannot be said that non-existence was experienced. What was experienced was existence, through the very presence of the eyefulness.

(...)