

Part 1

Changkya Rolpai Dorje · Tsong Khapa

source: https://web.archive.org/web/20060308195802/http://gileht.tripod.com/Jang-gya_Harmony_Part_1.txt

TO READ THIS FILE SAVE IT TO DISK FIRST;
AND READ IT USING NOTEPAD OR ANY OTHER TEXT EDITOR.

Part 1 of
The Harmony of Emptiness and Dependent-Arising
in the Middle Way Consequence School
(From: Presentation of Tenets)
Jang-gya (1717-1786)

Gelukpa School

[see the other file for the commentary to this text]

In-depth exposition of the methods for realizing the highest view of emptiness from the Prasangika Madhyamika school based on Jang-gya's renowned exposition of the major Buddhist tenets. The author takes pains to make the presentation approachable and experiential throughout.

Sub-section titles are in the form: L#: [...].

These can be used to regenerate the structure using a Word Processor.

L1: [CONTENTS] :L1

L1: [CONTENTS] :L1

L1: [The Harmony of Emptiness and Dependent-Arising in the Middle Way Consequence School – Jang-gya] :L1

L2: [Definition of a Consequentialist] :L2

L4: [I. Definition of a consequentialist] :L4

L2: [Self] :L2

L4: [II. Assertions of tenets] :L4

L5: [II.A. How to Settle the View of the Bases] :L5

L6: [II.A.1. What is negated in relation to what [THE OBJECT OF NEGATION] :L6

L2: [Purpose of Reasoning] :L2

L6: [II.A.2. Settling the selflessness that is the negative of the object of negation [THE EMPTINESS OF INHERENT EXISTENCE OF THE OBJECT OF NEGATION] :L6

L7: [II.A.2.a. An identification of the main reasonings refuting the object of negation] :L7

L8: [II.A.2.a.1) PURPOSE of refuting the object of negation [through reasonings] :L8

L8: [II.A.2.a.2) Identification of THE [FIVE] MAIN REASONINGS] :L8

L2: [Refuting a Self of Phenomena] :L2

L7: [II.A.2.b. How those reasonings refute the object of negation, the two selves] :L7

L8: [II.A.2.b.1) REASONINGS REFUTING A SELF OF PHENOMENA] :L8

L9: [a] Explaining the reasoning of THE DIAMOND FRAGMENTS (#1) refuting production of the four extreme types 225] :L9

L10: [1' Refutation of Production from SELF] :L10

L10: [2' Refutation of Production from OTHER] :L10

L10: [3' Refutation of Production From BOTH SELF AND OTHER] :L10

L10: [4' Refutation of CAUSELESS Production – NEITHER SELF OR OTHER] :L10

L9: [b) REFUTATION OF PRODUCTION OF THE FOUR ALTERNATIVES [about cause(s) and effect(s)

(#5)] :L9

L9: [c) REASONING REFUTING PRODUCTION OF THE EXISTENT AND NON-EXISTENT [Is the effect

existent, non-existent, both, neither? (#4)] :L9

L9: [d) REASONING REFUTING BEING ONE OR MANY ()] :L9

L2: [Refuting a Self of Persons] :L2

L8: [II.A.2.b.2) REASONING REFUTING A SELF OF PERSONS] :L8

L9: [a] Ascertaining the self as not inherently existent] :L9

L10: [1' Stating the Example [ANALYZING CHARIOT IN THE SEVEN WAYS (#2)] :L10

L10: [2' Applying the Example to the Meaning [is the self the same or different than the five aggregates] :L10

L11: [a' Refutation of Oneness / THE SAME] :L11

L11: [b' Refutation of the Position That the Self and the Aggregates are DIFFERENT] :L11

L11: [c' How THE REMAINING [OF THE SEVEN] POSITIONS are Refuted by These Reasonings] :L11

L9: [b) Showing that this [ascertainment of persons as not inherently existent] also establishes the mine as not inherently existent] :L9

L9: [c) How this reasoning is applied to other phenomena] :L9

L2: [Dependent-Arising] :L2

L8: [3) KING OF REASONINGS, THE REASON OF DEPENDENT-ARISING (#3), REFUTING A SELF OF BOTH

PERSONS AND PHENOMENA] :L8

L9: [a] Actual explanation of dependent-arising] :L9

L9: [b) How the other reasonings derive from dependent-arising] :L9

L1: [Commentary] :L1

[see other file for the commentary]

L1: [Outline of Jang-gya's Text] :L1

L1: [Notes] :L1

L1: [The Harmony of Emptiness and Dependent-Arising in the Middle Way Consequence School – Jang-gya] :L1

L2: [Definition of a Consequentialist] :L2

Brief expression of the system of the glorious middle way consequence school, supreme summit of all schools of tenets, bearing the subduer's own system

[The explanation of the Consequence School] is in two parts:

-- definition and

-- assertions of tenets.

¢(i.e. Note: Santaraksita's syllogism about the true nature of phenomena is accepted by Prasangika and Svatantrika alike; it is the nature of the reflection that they dispute.)

L4: [I. Definition of a consequentialist] :L4

The means of positing, or definition of, A CONSEQUENTIALIST IS:

~ a Proponent of the Middle Way School who asserts that it is not necessary to establish the modes of a reason from the viewpoint of the common appearance of the subject [of a debate] to non-mistaken valid cognitions of both disputants through the force of an objective mode of subsistence of things, but rather that an inferential consciousness cognizing selflessness is generated by a reason which has the three modes and which, leading only from the other party's assertions, is approved by that very other party.

Furthermore, in that way Chandrakirti's Clear Words¹⁰⁶ gives, together with [showing its] correctness, the reason why a thesis is proven by a reason approved by the other party and why autonomous [syllogisms] should not be asserted:

~ With regard to an inference for one's own purpose, [even you say that] just what is established for oneself is weightier at all [times], not what is established for both [oneself and an opponent, for in an inference for one's own purpose there is no opponent]. Therefore, expression of the definitions of logic [as they are renowned in the systems of the Autonomists and below]¹⁰⁷ is not needed because the Buddhas help beings — trainees who do not know suchness — with reasoning as it is renowned to those [beings].

Chandrakirti also indicates this with a worldly example; his Clear Words says:¹⁰⁹

~ It is just by a reason established for oneself, not by one established for the other [disputant], since such is seen in the world. In the world, sometimes [one party] prevails and [the other] is defeated by the word of a judge whom both take to be valid and sometimes by just one's own word, but victory or defeat is not by the other's word. Just as it is in the world, so it is also in logic because only the conventions of the world are appropriate in treatises of logic.

Positing the import of [being] a Consequentialist in that way is the flawless thought of [Chandrakirti's] text.

Tsong Khapa's Great Exposition of the Stages of the Path to Enlightenment (Lam-Rim-Chen-Mo) says:

~ Proving a thesis with a reason that is established for both parties with valid cognitions such as were explained previously is called an autonomous reason.

~ One who proves a thesis not that way, but through the three aspects [of a reason] approved by the other party is posited as a Consequentialist. It is very clear that this [explanation of the meaning of being a Consequentialist] is the thought of the master [Chandrakirti].

In that case, a Consequentialist may also be defined as a Proponent of the Middle Way School who, without accepting autonomy, asserts that an inferring consciousness cognizing an absence of true existence is generated merely through what is approved by the other [party]. Moreover, it is suitable to give THE DEFINITION OF A CONSEQUENTIALIST AS: A PROPONENT OF THE MIDDLE WAY SCHOOL WHO DOES NOT ACCEPT, EVEN CONVENTIONALLY, PHENOMENA

THAT ARE ESTABLISHED
BY WAY OF THEIR OWN CHARACTER.

Furthermore, the final root of the Consequentialists' many uncommon ways of positing the two truths is this non-assertion of establishment of objects by way of their own character even conventionally.

Chandrakirti's Auto-commentary on the "Supplement to (Nagarjuna's) 'Treatise on the Middle Way' "110 says:123

~ May scholars ascertain that, in terms of the doctrine of emptiness, the system which appears in this [treatise] — set out together with objections and answers to any [other] system — does not exist in other treatises.

He is saying that his own [Consequence School] system is not shared with commentaries by other Proponents of the Middle Way School [such as those by Autonomists, including Bhavaviveka].

In explaining the meaning of that passage, the Foremost Great Being [Tsong Khapa] says in his Essence of the Good Explanations (Essence of True Eloquence):124

~ In the [Consequentialists'] own system, phenomena that are established by way of their own character are not asserted even conventionally, whereas those [Proponents of True Existence] only posit [all phenomena] in the context of that [establishment of objects by way of their own character].

Earlier Tibetan scholars also used the term "Thoroughly Non-Abiding Proponents of the Middle Way School" [for the Consequentialists]. This appears to be based on a statement in the master Shura's [i.e., Ashvaghosha's] Essay on the Stages of Cultivating the Ultimate Mind of Enlightenment:126

~ Through synonyms such as emptiness, [suchness, final reality] and so forth,
~ Limitless examples such as likeness with a magician's illusions, [dreams, mirages] and so forth
~ And the skillful means of a variety of vehicles,
~ [Buddha] characterized the meaning of the middle way not abiding [in any gross or subtle extremes].

Moreover, in reports of statements by the Foremost Elder [Atisha] this convention [of calling Consequentialists "Thoroughly Non-Abiding Proponents of the Middle Way School"] occurs, and it also does not appear that the Foremost Father [Tsong Khapa] and his spiritual sons [Gyel-tsap and Kay-drup]127 refuted it. Although there are a couple [of scholars] who say that Shura's text was not written by the master Shura, such is exhausted as a mere thesis without proof. It appears that all the great chariots [i.e., path-blazing leaders] of the snowy land [Tibet] as well as all of our own [Gelugpa] scholars and adepts who appeared over the years accepted it as valid.

A description of different internal divisions in the Middle Way Consequence School, like those in the Autonomy School, does not appear in other texts, and neither is there seen an explanation of divisions of the Consequence School by the Foremost Father and his spiritual sons. [Hence, there are no significant subschools within the Consequence School.]

L2: [Self] :L2

L4: [II. Assertions of tenets] :L4

This section has four parts:

- how to settle the view of the bases,
- the features of how, in dependence on that, a presentation of the two truths is made, [non-available]
- how to progress on the path, [non-available]
- and the fruits [of the paths]. [non-available]

[i.e. Note: Only the first item is translated here.]

L5: [II.A. How to Settle the View of the Bases] :L5

This section has two parts:

- explaining what is negated in relation to what bases
- and settling the selflessness that is the negative of the object negated.

L6: [II.A.1. What is negated in relation to what [THE OBJECT OF NEGATION] :L6

Proponents of Mind Only and of Autonomy system (i.e. Madhyamika Svatantrika school) assert that the two selves — through the negation of which in persons and phenomena the [two] selflessnesses are posited — are different and that the modes of conception of them also differ. Therefore, although one realized the subtle selflessness of persons [as presented by the Proponents of Mind Only and of Autonomy], it is not necessarily the case that one would also have cognized the subtle selflessness of phenomena. This being so, [the Proponents of Mind Only and of Autonomy] assert that it is not necessary to realize the subtle selflessness of phenomena in order merely to attain liberation.

This [Consequentialist] system (i.e. Madhyamika Prasangika school) asserts that it is necessary to cognize the subtle selflessness in order to achieve any of the three enlightenments [of a Hearer, Solitary Realizer, or Buddha]. For it is said in the Perfection of Wisdom Sutras¹³⁷ that those who discriminate true existence¹³⁸ are not liberated. Shantideva says,¹³⁹

~ "Scripture says that without this path there is no enlightenment."

\ ###

\ [40]

\ [Hinayanist:] Liberation comes from understanding the [Four Noble] Truths,
\ so what is the point of perceiving emptiness?
\ [Madhyamika:] Because a (Mahayana) scripture states that
\ there is no Awakening without this path (the realization of emptiness).

Therefore, the two selflessnesses are differentiated by way of the bases that have the attribute [of selflessness], persons and [other] phenomena such as the [mental and physical] aggregates. It is not asserted that they are differentiated from the viewpoint of two different non-existent selves. Just as an emptiness of true existence of a phenomenon such as a [mental or physical] aggregate is posited as a selflessness of a phenomenon, so also must an emptiness of true existence of a person be posited as a selflessness of a person. For the reason [to do so in both instances] is the same. That is the thought [of the Consequence School].

Therefore, Chandrakirti's Supplement to (Nagarjuna's) "Treatise on the Middle Way" says:¹⁴³

~ In order to release transmigrators [from the afflictive obstructions and the obstructions to omniscience], this selflessness was set forth in two aspects by way of a division into phenomena and persons.

\ ###

\ [VI.179]

\ 222.

\ To liberate living beings, the Blessed One said

\ That this selflessness has two types when divided by way of persons and phenomena;

\ And then again, according to disciples,

\ He explained many divisions of these.

What is the self to be negated in terms of persons and [other] phenomena?

Chandrakirti's Commentary on (Aryadeva's) "Four Hundred" says:

~ Here, 'self' is an inherent nature¹⁴⁶ of phenomena, that is, a non-dependence on another. The non-existence of this is selflessness. Selflessness is realized as twofold through a division into phenomena and persons — a selflessness of phenomena and a selflessness of persons.

Thus, whether the base is a person or a phenomenon, the innate mode of conception of self is to conceive that it exists objectively through its own entity and is not posited through the force of conceptuality. The conceived object of that conception is the self to be negated on this occasion and is the hypothetical measure of true existence.

The Proponents of the Middle Way Autonomy School make the distinction of refuting the three — true existence, ultimate existence, and existing as its own reality¹⁵⁰ — but not refuting the three — inherent existent, existence by way of its own character, or existence by way of its own entity.¹⁵¹

However, in this [Consequence] system, true existence, etc., and existence by way of its own character, etc., are asserted as having the same meaning.

Therefore, Tsong Khapa's Differentiation of the Interpretable and the Definitive [also called the Essence of the Good Explanations (Essence of True Eloquence)] says,

~ "The existence of an objective mode of subsistence [means] a self-powered entity."

Since it is asserted that autonomous¹⁵³ and self-powered¹⁵⁴ are synonyms, when the Middle Way Autonomists maintain that the three modes [of a reason]¹⁵⁵ are established from their own side, this has the full meaning of true existence in this system [of the Consequence School].

Aryadeva's Four Hundred says,¹⁵⁶

\ ###

\ "All these are not self-powered; hence, there is no self [inherent existence]."

\ ###

\ 348.

\ Anything that has dependent arising

\ Is not independent.
\ All these are not independent,
\ Therefore there is no self.

¢(i.e. In résumé: everything is empty of inherent existence because everything is dependently arisen. Everything is empty of inherent existence but still dependently arisen and functional. There is no exception. And this doesn't mean complete non-existence or nihilism. Dependent origination and emptiness are not in opposition; one implies the other. They are two complementary antidotes pointing toward transcendence, toward the Union of The Two Truths, toward non-duality.)

Also, Chandrakirti's Commentary on (Aryadeva's) "Four Hundred" states these as having the same meaning:

~ "own entity, inherent existence, self-powered, and non-reliance on another".157

Question: Since the self refuted on this occasion is [a thing's] existing by way of a mode of subsistence that is not posited through the force of conceptuality, in "posited through the force of conceptuality" to what does "conceptuality" refer? How are things posited through its force? What is the difference between this and the Autonomy School's assertion that a mode of subsistence not posited through the force of an awareness does not exist?

Answer: With regard to the way in which things are posited through the force of conceptuality, Aryadeva's Four Hundred says:160

~ Without [imputation by] conceptuality [like the imputation of a snake to a rope], there is no [finding of] the existence of desire and so forth. If so, who with intelligence would maintain that a real object is produced [dependent on] conceptuality? [For, being imputed by conceptuality and existing as its own reality are contradictory.]

\ ###
\ 178.
\ Apart from conceptuality,
\ Desire and so forth have no existence.
\ Who with intelligence would hold [that there are]
\ Real things [imputed by] conceptuality?

¢(i.e. What this real nature is: The root cause of any disturbing emotions and its consequences – suffering – is this belief in the inherent existence of the objects of these disturbing emotions. But they are dependent on the mind; all merely imputed by the mind, conceptuality. Once we understand and directly see that everything is like that then we automatically drop all karma formation, all production of more causes for suffering. That is how it is done. Nothing to do, or not do.)

Chandrakirti's commentary on this passage says:161

~ There is no question that what exists merely due to the existence of conceptuality and does not exist without the existence of conceptuality is, like a snake imputed to a coiled rope, to be ascertained as not established by way of its own entity.

Therefore, conceptuality [here refers to] this ordinary, innate awareness which makes designations of forms and so forth through having become accustomed again and again since beginningless time to thinking, "This is a form," "This is a feeling," and so forth.

[The example of a rope-snake illustrates] how things are posited through the force of [ordinary innate conceptuality]. When darkness has fallen on a rope, it is thought to be a snake since the variegated colors of the rope and the way in which it is coiled are like a snake and it is seen in a dim place. At that time, neither the color of the rope, its shape, its other parts, nor the collection of those parts may be posited as something that is a snake.¹⁶⁷ The snake of this occasion is only a mere designation by conceptuality in dependence upon the rope.

Similarly, when the thought "I" arises in terms of the five [mental and physical] aggregates that are its bases of designation, neither the individual aggregates, the collection, their continuum, nor their parts can be posited as something that is I.¹⁶⁸ Furthermore, there is not in the least any phenomenon that is a separate entity from those [mental and physical aggregates] and can be apprehended as something that is I. The I is merely posited by conceptuality in dependence upon the aggregates.

Although the way in which all phenomena are imputed by conceptuality is, in this way, like the imputing of a snake to a rope, a rope-snake and phenomena such as forms are not the same with respect to whether or not they conventionally exist. For they are dissimilar in terms of whether or not conventional valid cognition damages an assertion [made] in accordance with what is being imputed.

Furthermore, with respect to how [phenomena] are mere nominal imputations, one engages in adopting [virtues] and discarding [non-virtues] in dependence on mere nominalities which are conventions designated to these phenomena such as forms, "This is a form," "This is a feeling," and so forth, and through this, desired aims are accomplished. Also, within the context of mere nominality, all affirmations and negations of correctness and incorrectness, etc., as well as all agents, actions, and objects are possible. However, if one is not satisfied with mere nominalities and enters into searching to find the object imputed in the expression "form", [trying to discover] whether it can be taken as color, shape, some other factor, or the collection of all these, and so forth, one will not find anything, and all presentations [of phenomena] will become impossible.

Making presentations of what is and is not correct in the context of mere nominalities is most feasible. For example, there were two villagers who went to a city to see the sights. They went into a temple and began to look at the paintings, whereupon one of them said, "That one holding a trident in his hand is Narayana; the other holding a wheel in his hand is Maheshvara." The other villager said, "You are mistaken; the one holding a trident is Maheshvara, and the one holding a wheel is Narayana." And thus they disputed.

A wandering holy man was nearby. They went up to him, and each spoke his thought. The wanderer thought, "Being murals on a wall, these are neither Maheshvara nor Narayana." Although he knew that, still he did not say, "These are not gods, but paintings." Instead, in conformity with the conventions of the world, he told the two villagers that one of them was right and the other wrong. Through his speaking thus, the wishes of the two villagers were fulfilled, and the wanderer also did not incur the fault of telling a lie.

Likewise, although all phenomena do not have objective establishment, presentations such as, "This is correct, and that is incorrect," are feasible within the context of mere nominalities. Although the Supramundane Victor [Buddha] sees that all phenomena do not truly exist, even he teaches the adopting [of virtues] and discarding [of non-virtues] using terminology as the world does, thereby bringing about the welfare of transmigrators.

This way [of presenting nominalities] was taught by Buddhapalita, a great master who had attained yogic feats, in his commentary on the eighteenth chapter of Nagarjuna's Treatise on the Middle Way. The honorable Chandrakirti and the revered Shantideva also, through many examples and reasonings, explain still other ways in which agent, object, and action are feasible within the context of mere nominalities. I will not elaborate more on the topic here.

This presentation of conventions is the uncommon way in which the three masters [Buddhapalita, Chandrakirti, and Shantideva] comment on the thought of the Superior [Nagarjuna]. The Foremost Omniscient Father [Tsong Khapa] and his spiritual sons [Gyel-tsap and Kay-drup] frequently advised that just this is the final difficult point of the Middle Way School view.

About this way [of presenting conventionalities], the Questions of Upali Sutra says:¹⁷⁰

- ~ These alluring blossoming flowers of various colors
- ~ And these fascinating brilliant mansions of gold
- ~ Are without any [inherently existent] maker here.
- ~ They are posited through the power of conceptuality,
- ~ The world is imputed through the power of conceptuality.

And the King of Meditative Stabilizations Sutra says:¹⁷¹

- ~ Nirvana is not found
- ~ In the way nirvana is taught
- ~ By words to be profound.
- ~ The words also are not found ...

And a Perfection of Wisdom Sutra says:

- ~ It is this way: this "Bodhisattva" is only a name.
- ~ It is this way: this "enlightenment" is only a name.
- ~ It is this way: this "perfection of wisdom" is only a name ...

And the Superior Nagarjuna's Precious Garland says that name-only does not exist ultimately:¹⁷²

- ~ Because the phenomena of forms are
- ~ Only names, space too is only a name.
- ~ Without the elements, how could forms [inherently] exist?
- ~ Therefore even "name-only" does not [inherently] exist.

- \ ###
- \ 99. Because the phenomena of forms
- \ Are only names, a space too is only a name.
- \ Without the elements how could forms exist?
- \ Therefore even name-only does not exist.

And Nagarjuna's Precious Garland of Advice¹⁷³ also says that, except for what is merely posited by the power of nominal designations, nothing at all exists:

- ~ Other than as a convention
- ~ What world is there in fact
- ~ Which would be "[inherently] existent" or "[inherently] not existent"?

\ ###
 \ 114. Thus it has a nature beyond the three times.
 \ Other than as the imputation of a convention
 \ What world is there in fact
 \ Which would exist or not?

Based on not understanding those reasons, Middle Way Autonomists and below [i.e., Proponents of Mind Only, Proponents of Sutra, and Proponents of the Great Exposition] maintain that when the expression, "This person did this deed," is imputed, an accumulator of deeds¹⁷⁴ and so forth can be posited [only] if there comes to be something that is posited as the person upon finding it — for instance, a part, the collection [of parts], or the continuum from among the bases of designation [of that person]. If nothing is found, [an accumulator of deeds] cannot be posited. It is the same also for the Sutra School's positing as space the non-affirming negative that is a mere elimination of any obstructive tangibility and is the same also for [the presentations in] higher [systems but not the Consequence School].

In this system [of the Consequence School], it is admissible, without having in that way to search for and find the object designated, to posit all agents and actions, as in the case of a person as an accumulator of deeds (karma). This is a marvelous distinctive feature [of the Consequence School].

The Autonomists maintain that in [the phrase] "a mode of subsistence not posited through the force of an awareness is to be taken as the object negated [in the view of selflessness]", the word "awareness" refers to an unmistakable non-defective consciousness. However, in the Consequentialists' [assertion of phenomena] as being posited through the force of conceptuality, conceptuality is asserted to be a mistaken consciousness. Hence, they differ.

Therefore, the Consequentialists even posit the mere I or mere person as the object of observation of the innate [false] view of the transitory collection¹⁷⁵ [as an inherently existent self]; they do not posit the [mental and physical] aggregates, etc., [as its object of observation]. The object of observation of an innate [false] view of the transitory collection that [misconceives mine is mine itself. A consciousness conceiving persons of other continuums to be established by way of their own character is not an innate [false] view of the transitory collection but is an innate conception of a self of persons.

The objects of the innate conception of a self of phenomena are the aggregates of forms and so forth, either those included in [your own] continuum or not. Although in that way the objects of observation of a consciousness conceiving a self of persons and of a consciousness conceiving a self of phenomena are different, their subjective aspects are the same in that they [both] conceive that the object is established by way of its own character. Hence, there is no fallacy of its [absurdly] following that there are two discordant modes of conception that are roots of cyclic existence.

The way in which an innate consciousness conceiving true existence conceives an inherently existent person in the context of the aggregates of form and so forth is not to conceive such upon having analyzed [whether the person and the mental and physical aggregates] are one or different. Rather, it conceives such through the force of ordinary familiarity, without any reasons at all. [This] innate consciousness has no mode in which it conceives of oneness, difference, and so forth [of the person and the mental and physical aggregates]. Therefore, the Foremost Omniscient [Tsong Khapa] spoke even of the non-analytical innate conception of true existence.

Although even a consciousness conceiving true existence is posited as an object to be refuted through reasoning, the main [object to be refuted through reasoning] is the conceived object itself [inherent existence].

In order to distinguish the fine points of these presentations, it is necessary to rely on many causal collections — training in detail in the great texts as well as relying for a long time on a wise spiritual guide who has thoroughly penetrated the instructions in the teaching of the Foremost Father [Tsong Khapa] and his spiritual sons [Gyel-tsap and Kay-drup], and so forth. These topics are not in the province of either those professors of vanity who are biased toward foolish meditations or of those professors of public speaking who meditate on wasting their human life with criticism directed outside as if such were the supreme state.

L2: [Purpose of Reasoning] :L2

L6: [II.A.2. Settling the selflessness that is the negative of the object of negation [THE EMPTINESS OF INHERENT EXISTENCE OF THE OBJECT OF NEGATION] :L6

This section has two parts:

- an identification of the main reasonings refuting the object of negation
- and how those reasonings refute the object of negation, the two selves.

L7: [II.A.2.a. An identification of the main reasonings refuting the object of negation] :L7

This section has two parts:

- the purpose of refuting the object of negation through reasoning
- and an identification of the main reasonings.

L8: [II.A.2.a.1) PURPOSE of refuting the object of negation [through reasonings] :L8

Concerning that, the honorable Superior Nagarjuna made commentary on the thought of the definitive sutras, and two who made clear commentary on those in exact accordance with [his] meaning are Buddhapalita and Chandrakirti. Also, the great master Shantideva expounded in agreement with these two. According to the assertions of these three great chariots [i.e., great leaders], it is the thought of the sutras of the perfection of wisdom class that, without even considering omniscience, in order merely to attain¹⁸² release from cyclic existence, one must necessarily realize the suchness of persons and phenomena. For, passages in Perfection of Wisdom Sutras say

- that those who have discrimination of true existence¹⁸³ are not liberated,
- that the completely perfect Buddhas of the past, present, and future as well as even all from Stream Enterers through to Solitary Realizers attain [their respective levels] in dependence upon this perfection of wisdom, and
- that "even those who wish to train in the grounds of the Hearers should train in this perfection of wisdom," etc.

This is also the thought of the Superior Nagarjuna, for his Sixty Stanzas of Reasoning¹⁸⁴ teaches that there is no release for those who have fallen to the extremes of [inherent] existence or [utter] non-existence:

\ ###
\ Through [the view of inherent] existence one is not released;

\ Through [the view of] no [nominal] existence there is nothing but cyclic existence.

And then, [Nagarjuna's Sixty Stanzas of Reasoning] says that Superiors are liberated from cyclic existence through unerring knowledge of the suchness of things and non-things:

\ ###
\ Through thorough knowledge of things and non-things,
\ A great being is liberated.

\ ###
\ 4.
\ One is not liberated by being;
\ one does not transcend present existence by non-being.

\ ###
\ But by thorough knowledge of
\ being and non-being
\ the magnanimous are liberated.

¢(i.e. The Middle Way: Liberation is not gained by accepting things as inherently existing or absolute, and continuing this samsaric life; nor by rejecting everything or opting for the complete non-existence of everything. Liberation is gained by realizing the real non-dual nature of our own self and or everything.)

And also Nagarjuna's Precious Garland of Advice for the King establishes that the means for achieving high status¹⁸⁵ [as a human or god] is the faith of conviction, and that with such faith as a precursor one becomes a vessel for wisdom, which is the means for achieving the definite goodness¹⁸⁶ [of liberation and omniscience].

\ ###
\ 3. In one who first practices high status
\ Definite goodness arises later,
\ For having attained high status,
\ One comes gradually to definite goodness.

He says that wisdom is the knowledge that the two — I and mine — do not ultimately exist. And, based on this [reason], he says that when one knows that the [mental and physical] aggregates do not truly exist, the conception of [a truly existent] I is extinguished.

Also, he says that until the conception of the aggregates as truly existent is extinguished, cyclic existence is not overcome and that when [this conception] is extinguished, cyclic existence is overcome. Also, he says that through the view of [utter] non-existence, one cycles in bad transmigrations and that through the view of [inherent] existence, one cycles in happy transmigrations and, therefore, in order to be free from these two [types of transmigrations], one must understand the reality that is not based on the two extremes of [inherent] existence and no [nominal] existence.

Nagarjuna's Precious Garland says:¹⁸⁷

~ As long as a [misconception of the aggregates exists, So long, therefore, does a [mis]conception of I exist. Further, when the [misconception of I exists, There is action, and from that there is birth.

\ ###
\ 35. As long as the aggregates are conceived,
\ So long thereby does the conception of I exist.
\ Further, when the conception of I exists,
\ There is action, and from it there also is birth.

And Nagarjuna's Praise of the Supramundane (Lokatitastava) says:

~ You [Buddha] taught that without realizing

Signlessness there is no liberation.

\ ###
\ Lokatitastava 27.
\ You have proclaimed that there is no liberation unless one resorts to the
signless. Therefore You have demonstrated it comprehensively in the Mahayana.

And so on. [These passages from] the Precious Garland and the Sixty Stanzas mainly prove that realization of the subtle emptiness is definitely necessary for a path releasing one from cyclic existence.

For, Tsong Khapa's Ocean of Reasoning, Explanation of (Nagarjuna's) "Treatise on the Middle Way" says:

~ In this [Praise of the Supramundane] and also in the former two [the Sixty Stanzas on Reasoning and Precious Garland of Advice for the King] there are indeed many teachings on the suchness of dependent-arising, which is the negation of inherent existence in persons and phenomena. However, they appear as branches proving the chief [assertion] — that understanding the meaning of the reality that is not based on the two extremes is definitely necessary for a path releasing one from cyclic existence.

Moreover, it is necessary to realize suchness with [a mind] that eradicates the mode of apprehension of an innate consciousness conceiving self. Through merely not engaging the mind in the two selves [i.e., the inherent existence of persons and the inherent existence of other phenomena] or merely stopping the mind from moving to other objects, it cannot be posited that one has realized emptiness. For, otherwise, it would [absurdly] follow that even [such minds as] sleep and fainting, etc., would realize suchness.

All the chariots [i.e., great leaders] of the Great Vehicle speak — with one voice and one thought — of [the necessity for analytically refuting inherent existence].

Aryadeva says:

~ When selflessness is seen in objects
~ The seeds of cyclic existence are destroyed.

And the honorable Chandrakirti says:¹⁹⁶

~ [Extreme] conceptions arise with [a consciousness conceiving inherently existent] things. It has been thoroughly analyzed how phenomena do not [inherently] exist.

And the master Bhavaviveka says:

~ With the mind in meditative equipoise
~ Wisdom analyzes in this way

- ~ The entities of these phenomena
- ~ That are apprehended conventionally.

And the venerable Shantideva also says:

- ~ When [these things] are sought as realities
- ~ Who is attached and to what is there attachment?

\ ###

\ [97 ?]

\ Thus, when there is no (truly existing) contact, how can (resulting) feeling arise? What is the reason for this exertion? Who could be harmed by what?

Etc. And the glorious Dharmakirti also says:

- ~ Without disbelieving the object of this [misconception]
- ~ It is impossible to abandon [misconceiving it].

Etc.

Therefore, one must analyze well what that which is conceived by consciousnesses erroneously conceiving [persons and phenomena] as the two selves is. After analyzing that, it is necessary to bring about the collapse of the false edifice of mistake by way of inducing conviction through pure scripture and reasoning that [things] do not exist as they are conceived by this [erroneous consciousness]. That this is needed is an indispensable excellent essential [of the path]. Hence, it is important to analyze again and again with the wisdom of individual investigation.

In that way the Superior Sutra of the Sport of Manjushri also says:198

- ~ "O daughter, how is a Bodhisattva victorious in battle?"
- ~ "Manjushri, when analyzed, all phenomena are unobservable."

And the Superior Sutra of the King of Meditative Stabilizations says: 199

- ~ If the selflessness of phenomena is analyzed
- ~ And if this analysis is cultivated in meditation, It causes the effect of attaining nirvana.
- ~ Through no other cause does one come to peace.

And the Superior Sutra of the Cloud of Jewels says,200

- ~ "To analyze with special insight and thereupon realize the lack of inherent entityness is to enter into signlessness."

And the Questions of Brahma Sutra says,201

- ~ "Those who properly investigate phenomena individually are the intelligent."

Therefore, in general, the great chariots have set forth — through refutations and proofs — many paths of reasoning that differentiate, among the word of the Conqueror, what is definitive and what requires interpretation. In particular, the statements of many forms of reasonings for delineating suchness were made only for the sake of illuminating for the fortunate the path to liberation. They were not made for the sake of becoming intent on debate.

The Buddhapalita Commentary on (Nagarjuna's) "Treatise on the Middle Way" says:²⁰²

~ What purpose is there in teaching dependent-arising? The master [Nagarjuna], whose nature is compassion, saw that sentient beings are oppressed by various sufferings; in order to release them, he assumed the task of teaching the reality of things, just as it is; hence, he began the teaching of dependent-arising.

And Chandrakirti's Supplement says:²⁰³

~ The analyses done in [Nagarjuna's] Treatise are not for attachment
~ To disputation but for liberation; they teach suchness.

\ ###
\ 161.
\ The analyzes in the treatises were not composed out of attachment to debate;
\ Rather thatness is revealed for the sake of liberation.
\ If in correctly explaining thatness, the works of others are discredited,
\ There is no fault.

And the Foremost Great Being [Tsong Khapa] says:

~ All of the various, reasoned analyses set forth in Nagarjuna's Treatise on the Middle Way are only for the sake of sentient beings' attaining release.

One must understand well what is excluded by the words "not for attachment to disputation" in the former quote and by the word "only" in the latter quote.

In general, analysis of individual investigation that takes valid scripture and reasoning as the means of attestation²⁰⁴ is important whether you are hearing, thinking, or meditating. Moreover, if [your practice] is conjoined with the special causal and continual motivations that involve directing these analyses as means of yourself and others attaining liberation and omniscience, you come into accord with the meaning of what both the unsurpassed Teacher [Buddha] himself and the great chariots taught with such striving. Therefore, it is right for those who want goodness to strive in this way.

Most of the hearing,²⁰⁷ thinking, and meditating as well as explaining, debating, and writing done by those who boast of practicing religion and boast of helping [Buddha's] teaching is not only not helpful to themselves and others, but also pollutes their mental continuums with many ill deeds related with the doctrine. It should be understood that in the end those who think that they are maintaining the teaching through fighting, quarrelling, heaving [stones, etc.]²⁰⁸ and [wielding] weaponry and clubs are, due to impure motivation, only [like] medicine that has become poison and deities who have become demons.

Therefore Aryadeva says that one makes the suffering of cyclic existence more distant even through having doubt tending to the fact with regard to the profound nature of phenomena:²⁰⁹

~ Those whose merit is small
~ Have no doubts about this doctrine.
~ Even through merely having doubt
~ Cyclic existence is torn to tatters.

And in particular, the glorious Chandrakirti says²¹¹ that at this time of the end of [Buddha's] teaching, it is very good fortune merely to take interest — for even a moment — in this very profound topic.

He says:

~ In this tumultuous age when Buddhism is deprived of the essential meanings taught by the Omniscient One, anyone who can clear away two-mindedness for even a moment and cognize emptiness is fortunate.

And the Taming Demons Chapter²¹² and the Ajatashatru Sutra²¹³ say that since taking an interest in this profound nature of phenomena purifies even the karmic obstructions that lead to immediate rebirth in a hell,²¹⁴ what need is there to mention [its purifying] minor [infractions of] rites and ethics?

Having gained conviction well in such, you should strive at means to expand [in your own continuum] the potential of this type of doctrine.

For, the Foremost Great Being [Tsong Khapa] says:

~ Therefore, you should plant wishes for hearing the texts, memorizing them, and thinking and meditating on their meaning, as well as having faithful interest [in the profound emptiness] in all lives within not damaging conviction in the dependent-arising of causes and effects.

L8: [II.A.2.a.2) Identification of THE [FIVE] MAIN REASONINGS] :L8

In general, the countless forms of reasonings for ascertaining selflessness that are set forth in the texts of the Middle Way are included within two types,

- reasonings for ascertaining the selflessness of persons
- and reasonings for ascertaining the selflessness of phenomena.

This is because the bases of adherence to the two selves — which are the chief of those things that bind one in cyclic existence — are persons and phenomena and, therefore, the main bases with respect to which selflessness is ascertained must also be persons and phenomena.

In that way Tsong Khapa's Differentiation of the Interpretable and the Definitive says:²¹⁵

~ The principal fetters [that bind one in cyclic existence] are adherence to the two selves (1) with regard to the person, which is the object of observation that generates the thought "I", and (2) with regard to the phenomena of that person's continuum. Therefore, these two are also the principal bases with respect to which the conception of self is refuted through reasoning. Consequently, the reasonings also are included in the refutations of the two selves.

[THE SELFLESSNESS OF PHENOMENA:]

Furthermore, among them, the main reasoning for settling the selflessness of phenomena is just THE REASONING REFUTING PRODUCTION FROM THE FOUR EXTREMES (#1). For, when the Superior

Nagarjuna explained the thought of the statement in the Sutra on the Ten Grounds²¹⁶ where it says that a Bodhisattva enters onto the sixth ground through the ten samenesses, he considered that through only demonstrating with reasoning that all phenomena are the same in being without [inherently existent] production, the other samenesses would be easily demonstrated.

And thus, at the beginning of the Treatise on the Middle Way Nagarjuna says:²¹⁷

\ ###
\ There is never production
\ Anywhere, of any thing
\ From itself, from others,
\ From both, or causelessly.

\ ###
\ 1:1.
\ Never are any existing things found to originate
\ From themselves, from something else, from both, or from no cause.

And in the glorious Chandrakirti's Supplement to (Nagarjuna's) "Treatise on the Middle Way" the demonstration of the reasoning for settling the selflessness of phenomena is seen to be only the reasoning refuting production of the four extreme types —

\ ###
\ "It does not arise from itself; how could it arise from others? ...
\ Those who analyze will quickly be released."218

\ ###
\ [VI.8.ab]
\ 51ab.
\ It does not arise from itself;
\ how can it come from other?
\ Also it is not from both;
\ how can it be without a cause?

\ ###
\ 162.
\ Attachment to one's own view,
\ And likewise anger at the views of others, are mere conceptions.
\ Therefore those who eliminate attachment and anger and analyze correctly
\ Swiftly attain liberation.

Therefore, Tsong Khapa's Differentiation of the Interpretable and the Definitive says,219

~ "The principal reasoning proving the selflessness of phenomena is the reasoning refuting production from the four extremes."

[THE SELFLESSNESS OF PERSONS:]

The main reasoning for settling the selflessness of persons is THE SEVENFOLD REASONING (#2)

-- (1) because Chandrakirti's Supplement to (Nagarjuna's) "Treatise on the Middle Way" says that just as a chariot is not found through searching in the seven ways but is posited as imputedly existent — imputed in dependence upon its own branches [i.e., parts] — so a person also is to be posited that way, and it says that just this is a method for easily finding the profound view:220

\ ###
\ How could what does not exist in these seven ways be said to exist [inherently] ?
\ Yogis do not find the [inherent] existence of this [chariot].
\ Since through that [way yogis] easily enter also into suchness,
\ The establishment of [a chariot] also should be accepted in that way.

\ ###
 \ [VI.160]
 \ 203.
 \ How can it be said that that which is non-existent in the seven ways exists
 \ When its existence is not found by Yogis?
 \ Since they realize thatness easily,
 \ Its existence should be asserted in the same way here.

-- (2) And because in that treatise [i.e., Chandrakirti's Supplement] ascertainment of the selflessness of persons is done only through the sevenfold reasoning,

-- (3) and because this reasoning is said also in Tsong Khapa's Differentiation of the Interpretable and the Definitive to be the principal one.²²¹

[See also: Candrakirti's Sevenfold Reasoning, Meditation On The Selflessness Of Persons, by Joe Wilson

Here, in brief, are the seven aspects of the Sevenfold Analysis:

- There is no chariot which is other than its parts,
- There is no chariot which is the same as its parts,
- There is no chariot which inherently possesses its parts,
- There is no chariot which inherently depends on its parts,
- There is no chariot upon which its parts are inherently dependent,
- There is no chariot which is the mere collection of its parts,
- There is no chariot which is the shape of its parts.]

[THE KING OF ALL REASONINGS:]

THE REASON OF DEPENDENT-ARISING (#3) IS THE MAIN OF ALL REASONINGS in this system.
 All these
 former reasonings derive from just that of dependent-arising.

In this way, moreover, the honorable Chandrakirti says:²²²

\ ###
 \ Since things are dependently arisen,
 \ They cannot sustain these conceptions [of being produced from self, other, and so forth].
 \ Therefore, this reasoning of dependent-arising
 \ Cuts through all the nets of bad views.

\ ###
 \ 158.
 \ Because things arise completely dependently,
 \ These conceptions [or views] cannot be sustained.
 \ Therefore this reasoning of dependent arising
 \ Cuts all nets of bad views.

It is very difficult to realize how all the other reasonings must derive from this [reasoning of dependent-arising] and do not have such an exceptional ability to cut through the nets of bad views as this does. Therefore, the Foremost Father [Tsong Khapa] and his spiritual sons [Gyel-tsap and Kay-drup] praise it, saying that the reason of dependent-arising is the king of reasonings.

THE REFUTATION OF PRODUCTION OF THE EXISTENT AND NON-EXISTENT (#4)

And

THE REFUTATION OF PRODUCTION OF THE FOUR ALTERNATIVES (#5) are reasonings for settling the selflessness of phenomena.

THE LACK OF BEING ONE OR MANY [OR SAME OR DIFFERENT -- PART OF #2] is applied to both selflessnesses. The extensive teaching of the reasoning that is the lack of being one or many by way of an analysis of four essentials set forth in Tsong Khapa's Small Exposition of the Stages of the Path 223 is based on the eighteenth chapter of Nagarjuna's Treatise on the Middle Way.

\ ###

\ [18:1

\ If the individual self (atma) were [identical to] the "groups" (skandha), then it would partake of origination and destruction.

\ If [the individual self] were different from the "groups," then it would be without the characteristics of the "groups."]

It is said that this chapter teaches the meanings of all the other twenty-six chapters of Nagarjuna's Treatise on the Middle Way, arranged in stages of practice; hence, [Tsong Khapa's teaching of the four essentials] in this way is very important. There are many reasons for this, but I will leave them for the time being.

L2: [Refuting a Self of Phenomena] :L2

L7: [II.A.2.b. How those reasonings refute the object of negation, the two selves] :L7

The presentation of how those reasonings refute the objects of negation, the two selves, has three parts:

- (1) reasonings refuting a self of phenomena,
- (2) reasoning refuting a self of persons, and
- (3) the king of reasonings, the reason of dependent-arising, refuting self with respect to both persons and phenomena.224

L8: [II.A.2.b.1) REASONINGS REFUTING A SELF OF PHENOMENA] :L8

L9: [a) Explaining the reasoning of THE DIAMOND FRAGMENTS (#1) refuting production of the four extreme types 225] :L9

Nagarjuna's Treatise on the Middle Way presents four theses of non-production from the four extremes:226

\ ###

\ There is never production

\ Anywhere of any thing

\ From itself, from others,

\ From both, or causelessly.

\ ###

\ 1:1.

- \ Never are any existing things found to originate
- \ From themselves, from something else, from both, or from no cause.

Furthermore, these theses are merely non-affirming negatives, not implying any other positive phenomenon.

Question: Why are only four theses stated?

Answer: If things were inherently produced, then [this production] would necessarily be one of the four extreme types of production. Due to that, if these four theses are established, it is easily established that there is no inherently existent production. Therefore, the reasoning refuting the four extremes is a decisive reasoning.

Objection: If, when production of the four extreme types is refuted, a negation of inherent production is implicitly established, then it follows that these theses are not non-affirming negatives.

Answer: There is no such fallacy. For something to be an affirming negative it must prove or imply another positive phenomenon.

The reason why, if there were inherently existent production, it would necessarily be one of the four extreme types of production, is that it is certain that production is either caused or causeless, and if it is caused, it is limited to three types — production of an effect (1) that is the same entity as the causes, (2) that is a different entity from the causes, and (3) that is a composite of being the same entity as and a different entity from the causes. The Foremost Omniscient [Tsong Khapa's] saying this in both of his Great Explanations — of Nagarjuna's Treatise on the Middle Way and Chandrakirti's Supplement — is a very important, good explanation of the great texts from his experience. However, it seems that most of those who write on the Middle Way School put this in a category of minor importance. In any case, they discuss it very briefly.

L10: [1' Refutation of Production from SELF] :L10

The refutation of the production [of an effect] from a cause that is the same entity [as that effect] is this:

- ~ If a sprout that is being produced were produced again from its own entity, that production would be senseless.
- ~ For, the sprout's own entity would have already attained existence earlier at the time of its causes.
- ~ There is entailment because production is for the sake of [an effect's] attaining its own entity.

Objection: It is not contradictory for something to have already attained its own entity but to be produced again.

Answer: If that were the case, then continuations similar to the effects — such as sprouts — would never be produced and the causes' similar continuations — such as seeds — would be produced without interruption until the end of cyclic existence. For, just that which was already produced would have to be produced in duplicate again and again.

Chandrakirti's Supplement to (Nagarjuna's) "Treatise on the Middle Way" says:228

\ ###

\ [51cd-52]
 \ There is no point in the production of something from itself.
 \ Also, the production again of what has been produced is just not feasible.
 \ If it is thought that the already produced is produced again,
 \ One would not find the production of such things as sprouts here [in the world],
 \ And a seed would just be produced to the end of cyclic existence.

 \ ###
 \ [VI.8.c]
 \ 51c.
 \ There is no point in it arising from itself.

 \ ###
 \ 51d.
 \ Moreover, it is not reasonable that what has been produced is produced again.

 \ ###
 \ 52.
 \ If you assert that what is already produced is produced again,
 \ Then the production from sprouts and so forth is not found here,
 \ And seeds will continue to be produced until the end of time.

Concerning this, since the Samkhyas assert that seed and sprout are mutually different, they do not assert that a sprout²³⁰ is produced from a sprout; however, they assert that the nature of the sprout and the nature of the seed are one and that their natures are mutually each other. Therefore, the previously explained fallacies apply [to their position] .

The [Samkhyas] themselves do not assert such, but because the two, seed and sprout, are [for them] one by inherent nature, their being one becomes the mode of subsistence of seed and sprout, whereby they would be undifferentiable. [The Samkhyas] are logically forced [into this position] whereupon the fallacy is demonstrated.

[When production from self] is refuted in Chandrakirti's Supplement and in his commentary on it, the reasonings used are those that he makes in commentary as well as [other] reasonings [cited] from Nagarjuna's Treatise on the Middle Way.

[The first are:]

- 1. If cause and effect were one entity, it would [absurdly] follow that seed and sprout would not differ with respect to shape, color, taste, and capacity.
- 2. It would [absurdly] follow that when its former state [as a seed] was given up, the single nature of seed and sprout would be lost.
- 3. It would [absurdly] follow that during each of the states of seed and sprout, both seed and sprout would be equally apprehendable or not.
- 4. Worldly renown damages [the position] that seed and sprout are of one nature.

In refuting production from self, [Chandrakirti] also uses the reasonings in Nagarjuna's Treatise on the Middle Way that it would [absurdly] follow that the producer and the produced would be one and that the three — action, agent, and object — would be one.²³⁴ (see Meditation on Emptiness, pp.640-643)

L10: [2' Refutation of Production from OTHER] :L10

"Other" in "production from other" is not merely other; it is other that is established by

way of its own character. Moreover, those who propound production from other assert that in the same way that a rice seed is established by way of its own character as other than the sprout of rice that is its own effect, so such things as fire and charcoal also are established by way of their own character as other than the sprout of rice. If those two modes of being other are asserted to be similar, then thick darkness which [is supposed to be] cleared away [by light] would [absurdly] arise even from a blazing flame that [is supposed to] clear away [darkness], and anything would come from anything else, whether they are cause and effect or not. For, they would all equally have otherness that is established by way of its own character.

This is the reasoning taught in the twentieth chapter of Nagarjuna's Treatise on the Middle Way:237

~ If cause and effect had otherness,
~ Cause and non-cause would become equal.

\ ###

\ 20:20.

\ If there were a oneness of the cause and product, then there would be an identity of the originator and what is originated.

\ If there were a difference of product and cause, then a cause would be the same as that which is not a cause.

This reasoning is also taught in Buddhapalita's commentary on this point and by the glorious Chandrakirti who says:238

~ If, depending on others, another were to arise,
~ Then thick darkness would arise even from a tongue of flame
~ And all would be produced from all
~ Because even all non-producers would equally have otherness. ...

\ ###

\ [VI.14]

\ 57.

\ If other arises in dependence upon other,

\ Then thick darkness arises even from flames.

\ Indeed everything arises from everything

\ Because all non-producers are similar in also being other.

Objection: Things are not posited as cause and effect merely because they are others that are established by way of their own character. Things are posited as cause and effect only because they are a special kind of others — [the cause] having the ability to bring about the effect and so forth. Thus, the determination of causes and non-causes [with respect to a particular effect] is feasible.

Answer: That also is incorrect, for once things are established by way of their own character as other, being other must be their mode of subsistence. Once that is the case, they must be other factualities that are utterly devoid of any relation with each other. Thus, it would be utterly impossible for a rice seed and a barley seed to differ with regard to having or not having the ability to produce a rice sprout and so forth.

Furthermore, if production from other existed by way of its own entity, the effect would have to exist before it was produced. For once production is asserted, the two — the ceasing

of the cause and the nearing to production of the effect — must be simultaneous, and in that case the two actions of production and cessation also would have to be simultaneous, whereby cause and effect would also have to be simultaneous. The reason for [the consequent simultaneity of cause and effect] is that an action of nearing production has to depend on something, such as a sprout, that is the agent in the expression, "This effect is growing." Therefore, they are supporter and supported. If such a supporter and supported were established by way of their own character, then whenever the activity of growing existed, the sprout would have to exist. For, its nature could not possibly change. Therefore, Chandrakirti's Supplement to (Nagarjuna's) "Treatise on the Middle Way" says,²³⁹

\ ###
 \ "Without an agent, this growing is also not a feasible entity."

\ ###
 \ [VI.19]
 \ So how are they similar to a balance?
 \ This production [of the sprout] without an agent [the sprout itself] is also an unacceptable entity.

In terms of nominally existent production, if things become supporter and supported at some time, it is not necessary that they be so at all times. Therefore, [mere, conventional production] does not have these fallacies. The Foremost Omniscient [Tsong Khapa] maintains that this is a subtle²⁴⁰ and very meaningful reasoning in this system that refutes production from other.

Not only is production from other not asserted even conventionally by this system, but also it is asserted that no innate consciousness conceives causes and effects as others that are different by way of their own character. Chandrakirti's Supplement says,²⁴¹

\ ###
 \ "There is no production from other even in the world."
 \ ###
 \ [VI.32]
 \ From having only sown the seeds
 \ The worldly claim 'I produced this child',
 \ Or think 'I planted this tree';
 \ Therefore there is no production from other, even for the worldly.

L10: [3' Refutation of Production From BOTH SELF AND OTHER] :L10

That part which is production from self is refuted by the reasoning refuting production from self; that part which is production from other is refuted by the reasoning refuting production from other.

Chandrakirti's Supplement says:²⁴³

~ Production from both is also not an admissible entity
 ~ Because the fallacies already explained are incurred.
 \ ###
 \ [VI.98]
 \ 141.
 \ Production from both is also not a suitable entity.

\ Why? Because all the faults already explained apply.
 \ It does not exist for the worldly, nor is it asserted in thatness,
 \ Because production from either is not established.

L10: [4' Refutation of CAUSELESS Production – NEITHER SELF OR OTHER] :L10

If [things] were produced causelessly, there would be no causes for production at a certain place and time and of a certain nature. Therefore, something produced from one thing would be produced from all things, and all work would be just senseless.

[Chandrakirti] says:245

~ If it is viewed that [things] are only produced causelessly,
 ~ Then everything would always be produced from even everything,
 ~ And this world also would not gather in so many ways
 ~ Such things as seeds for the sake of their effects.

\ ###
 \ [VI.99]
 \ 142.
 \ If there is production entirely without causes,
 \ Then everything is produced from everything all the time;
 \ And so to obtain fruit, the people of this world
 \ Do not have to gather seeds and so forth in a hundred ways.

Through refuting production of the four extreme types in this way, production that is established by way of its own character is negated. However, the refutation of production of the four extreme types does not refute merely conventional production. For, merely conventional production does not have to be any of the four extreme types of production. Not only that, but also dependent production itself establishes that things are not produced from the four extremes.

Tsong Khapa's Great Commentary on (Nagarjuna's) "Treatise on the Middle Way" says:

~ Therefore, that, by the very necessity of accepting that a sprout is produced in dependence on a seed, one is able to refute these four [extreme types of production] is a distinguishing feature of the reasoning of dependent-arising, the king of reasonings.

Furthermore, the master Buddhapalita, who attained yogic feats, says:

~ Here [an objector] says, "Show how this which is called production is only a convention."

Answer: This is shown initially [in the first stanza of the first chapter of Nagarjuna's Treatise on the Middle Way]:250

~ There is never production
 ~ Anywhere of any thing
 ~ From itself, from others,
 ~ From both, or causelessly.

\ \ ###
 \
 \ 1:1.

\ Never are any existing things found to originate
\ From themselves, from something else, from both, or from no cause.

Also, the Buddhapalita Commentary says, "Hence, because there is no [inherently existent] production, this which is called production is only a convention."

L9: [b] REFUTATION OF PRODUCTION OF THE FOUR ALTERNATIVES [about cause(s) and effect(s) (#5)] :L9

[Some of] our own recent scholars apply the reasonings explained in the basic text and commentary of [the Middle Way Autonomist] Jnanagarbha's Discrimination of the Two Truths here [in the Middle Way Consequence School. However] most texts concerning the Consequence School describe just the reasons of the diamond fragments as a refutation of the four alternatives. Except for this, it does not appear that what Jnanagarbha explains in the Discrimination of the Two Truths is set forth with much emphasis in the Consequence School.

L9: [c] REASONING REFUTING PRODUCTION OF THE EXISTENT AND NON-EXISTENT [Is the effect existent, non-existent, both, neither? (#4)] :L9

Causes do not produce inherently existent effects, for the inherently existent has no need for causes.²⁵⁵ Non-existent effects also are not produced, because causes could not do anything for the non-existent. Effects that are both existent and non-existent also are not produced, because a composite of these two does not occur. Also, causes do not produce effects that are neither existent nor non-existent, for something that is neither of these two does not occur. This [reasoning] is explained in the basic text and commentary of Chandrakirti's Supplement, in Shantideva's Engaging in the Bodhisattva Deeds, and also in Atisha's Lamp for the Path to Enlightenment.²⁵⁶

L9: [d] REASONING REFUTING BEING ONE OR MANY () :L9

One can understand [the reasoning of] the lack of being one or many through the explanation of the sevenfold reasoning.

L2: [Refuting a Self of Persons] :L2

L8: [II.A.2.b.2) REASONING REFUTING A SELF OF PERSONS] :L8

The presentation of the reasoning for ascertaining the selflessness of persons has three parts:

- (1) ascertaining the self as not inherently existent,
- (2) showing that this also establishes the mine as not inherently existent,
- (3) how this reasoning is applied to other [phenomena].

L9: [a] Ascertaining the self as not inherently existent] :L9

Nagarjuna's Treatise on the Middle Way describes a fivefold reasoning:²⁶¹

\ ###
\ The One Gone Thus is not the aggregates, nor is he other than the aggregates.
\ The aggregates are not in him, nor is he in them.

\ The One Gone Thus does not possess the aggregates.
 \ What One Gone Thus is there?
 \ ###
 \ 22:1.
 \ That one [who is "fully-completed"] is not the "groups of universal elements"
 (skandha),
 \ nor something other than the "groups";
 \ the "groups" are not in him, nor is he in them;
 \ The "fully completed" does not possess the "groups."
 \ What, then, is the "fully completed"?

Three positions, the two of mutual dependence and the one of possession, are included in the two positions of sameness and difference; however, in consideration of the modes of conception in which the [false] view of the transitory collection operates, five positions are set out in the tenth and twenty-second chapters [of Nagarjuna's Treatise on the Middle Way].

Objection: [Buddha] says in sutra that (1) forms are not the self, (2) the self does not possess forms, (3) the self is not in forms, (4) nor are forms in the self, and he spoke similarly with respect to the remaining four aggregates. In this way, he taught antidotes to the twenty parts of the [false] view of the transitory collection. Hence, would a fourfold analysis not be appropriate? Why is it explained as having five aspects?

Answer: [Buddha] spoke this way in sutra because the [false] view of the transitory collection is unable to conceive of self without there being first an apprehension of the aggregates and, hence, within observing the aggregates in these four ways, it engages in [the conception of] self [inherent existence]. Therefore, a fifth base of the apprehension of self as something other, beyond the aggregates, does not occur except in [the philosophies of the non-Buddhist] Forders.²⁶⁴ This is the reason why [Buddha] did not speak of a fifth position.

Nagarjuna spoke of a fifth position in the Treatise on the Middle Way because he wanted to refute the systems of the Forders as well. Furthermore, one should understand [the refutation of the Forders' systems] as a branch of the process of coming to a decisive conclusion when refuting the innate self within settling selflessness in one's own continuum.

The honorable, glorious Chandrakirti made a sevenfold reasoning, adding two more to those negations:

-- that the mere collection [of the bases of designation] is the self
 -- and that the shape [of the body] is the self.

[Chandrakirti] added [these two refutations] in order to refute the Buddhist schools of tenets that propound true existence and certain Autonomists who posit the mind as the self or who posit some attribute of a person such as the collection of the aggregates or their shape [to be the self].

Furthermore, sutra teaches that the conventionalities of self and chariot are posited similarly:

~ "Self" is a devilish mind.
 ~ You are under the control of a [bad] view.

- ~ These conditioned aggregates are empty.
- ~ There is no sentient being here.
- ~ Just as a chariot is designated
- ~ In dependence upon collections of parts,
- ~ So, conventionally, a sentient being
- ~ [Is designated] in dependence upon the aggregates.

Moreover, Chandrakirti sets forth the sevenfold reasoning to clarify that [the Consequence School] has a special mode of positing the similarity [between a chariot and a person] that is not shared with the Autonomists or the other lower [systems of tenets]. This can be understood in detail from one who has become skilled in the word of the Foremost [Tsong Khapa].

Thus the sevenfold reasoning is neither too extensive nor too brief and has many features.

Tsong Khapa's Great Exposition of the Stages of the Path to Enlightenment (Lam-Rim-Chen-Mo) says:

- ~ This presentation, as explained earlier, starting from [examining] a chariot, has, in brief, three features:
- ~ (1) the feature of easily refuting the view of permanence which is the superimposition of inherent existence on phenomena,
- ~ (2) the feature of easily refuting the view of annihilation which is to think that dependent-arising is not feasible in the context of no inherent existence, and
- ~ (3) the stages of a yogi's analysis, through the practice of which the first two features are achieved.

The third is explained to be the feature of easily gaining conviction about illusory-like dependent-arising when one analyzes with this mode of analysis.

Now I will explain the sevenfold reasoning itself.

The explanation is in two parts:

- stating the example
- and applying it to the meaning.

L10: [1' Stating the Example [ANALYZING CHARIOT IN THE SEVEN WAYS (#2)] :L10

Chandrakirti's Supplement says that although upon analyzing a chariot in the seven ways — whether it is one with its own parts, different from them, and so forth — it is not found, it is permissible for valid cognition to posit, without invalidation, a chariot designated in dependence upon the parts of the chariot, and that likewise the self, the aggregates, and so forth are posited in a similar manner.

The Supplement says:

- \ ###
- \ A chariot is not asserted to be other than its parts,
- \ Nor non-other.
- \ It also does not possess them.
- \ It is not in the parts, nor are the parts in it.
- \ It is not the mere collection [of its parts], nor is it [their] shape.
- \ [The self and the aggregates are] similar.

\ ###
 \ [VI.150]
 \ 193.
 \ Therefore the basis of grasping at I is not a thing.
 \ It is not other than the aggregates, and it is not the entity of the aggregates;
 \ It does not depend upon the aggregates, and it does not possess them.
 \ It exists in dependence upon the aggregates.

\ ###
 \ 194.
 \ It is like a cart, which is not other than its parts,
 \ Not non-other, and does not possess them.
 \ It is not within its parts, and its parts are not within it.
 \ It is not the mere collection, and it is not the shape.

-- Concerning this, the subject, a chariot, is not inherently the same as its parts — axles, wheels, nails, and so forth — because, if it were, there would be the fallacies that (1) just as there are many parts, so there also would be many chariots, (2) or in another way, just as the chariot is one, so the parts also would be one, and (3) agent and object would be one, etc.

-- The subject, a chariot, is not inherently different from its parts because otherwise they would be different entities and whatever are different entities and simultaneous must be unrelated other factualities; hence, like a horse and an ox, a chariot would have to be observed separately from its parts but it is not.

-- With regard to a chariot, the subject, the two positions of dependence — that a chariot inherently depends on its parts or that its parts inherently depend on it — also are not feasible. For, if [either of] these two [positions] were the case, [the chariot and its parts] would have to be inherently different, whereas this has already been explained as not feasible.

-- With regard to a chariot, the subject, either way in which the chariot could inherently possess its parts — in the sense that, for instance, Devadatta possesses an ox or in the sense that Devadatta possesses ears — also is not feasible. For, according to the former mode of possession, they would be inherently established as different entities, and, according to the latter, they would be inherently established as one entity, and both of these have already been refuted.

-- With regard to a chariot, the subject, it is not feasible to posit the mere collection of its parts as it, because in that case it would [absurdly] follow that once all the parts of the chariot — wheels, axles, etc. — without anything missing were piled unassembled, in one place, there would be a chariot even in that mere collection. Our own [Buddhist] Proponents of True Existence [that is, Great Exposition School, Sutra School, and Mind Only School] maintain that although there is no whole,²⁶⁷ there is a mere composite²⁶⁸ of the parts. However, even this [composite] is not feasible [as a chariot] because [according to them] the whole does not exist and, therefore, the parts also would not exist.

-- With regard to the subject, a chariot, it is also not admissible to posit the special shape of its parts to be it. For, it is not feasible for the shapes of the individual parts to be the chariot, nor is it feasible for the shape of the collection of the parts to be the chariot. The first [reasoning, that it is not feasible for the shapes of the individual parts to be the chariot] is established because it is not feasible for shapes that are not different from the shapes of the parts before they were assembled to be a chariot, nor is it feasible for some other shapes that are unlike the shapes previous [to their being

assembled] to be a chariot. The first [reason, that it is not feasible for shapes that are not different from the shapes of the parts before they were assembled to be a chariot] is established because, otherwise, since there is no difference in the shapes of the wheels and so forth before being assembled and afterwards, just as there was no chariot before [the parts] were assembled, so there would be no chariot even after [the parts] are assembled. The second [reason, that it is not feasible for some other shapes that are unlike the shapes previous to their being assembled to be a chariot] is established because if the wheels, axles, and so forth have some other, different shapes after they have been assembled that they did not have before they were assembled, this would have to be observed, but it is not.

The second part of the earlier reason — that the shape of the collection of its parts cannot be posited as the chariot — is so because in the systems of the Proponents of True Existence the collection is not substantially established, and, therefore, it is not feasible for the shape of that [collection] to be substantially established, whereas they assert that a chariot is substantially established. Moreover, it is the case [that they assert a substantially existent chariot] because those systems maintain that the bases of designation of all imputed existents are substantially existent. Furthermore, in our own system, in which the basis of designation of an imputed existent is not asserted to be substantially existent, the shape of the collection of parts is the basis of designation of a chariot, not a chariot.

Objection: When sought thus in these seven ways, a chariot is not found, and, therefore, a chariot does not exist. However, this is not feasible, for such [expressions as] "Bring the chariot!" "Buy a chariot!" and "Prepare the chariot!" are renowned in the conventions of the world.

Answer: There is no such fallacy. In our system, when a chariot is analyzed in these seven ways, it is not found, and it is not found either as an ultimate truth or as a conventional truth, but this does not make a chariot non-existent. For, (1) the assertion of a chariot is not made due to [the chariot's] being established by reasoning analyzing whether it inherently exists or not, but is established by only a non-defective, ordinary, worldly — that is, conventional — consciousness without any analysis that searches for the object designated, and (2) moreover, the way in which [a chariot] is posited is that it is established as only existing imputedly in the sense of being designated in dependence upon its parts, wheels and so forth.

Chandrakirti's Supplement says:269

- ~ That [chariot] is not established in these seven ways
- ~ Either as [its own] suchness or in the world,
- ~ But without analysis it is designated here
- ~ From [the viewpoint of] the world in dependence upon its parts.

\ ###

\ 201.

\ Indeed it is not established by the seven ways,

\ Either in thatness or for the worldly;

\ But from the point of view of the worldly without analysis

\ It is imputed here in dependence upon its parts.

Chandrakirti's Auto commentary on the "Supplement to (Nagarjuna's) 'Treatise on the Middle Way' " clearly speaks of how [phenomena] are established in a nominal way:

~ Not only does this position just very clearly establish the designation of the convention, chariot, from the viewpoint of what is renowned in the world, but also these nominalities should be asserted from the viewpoint of worldly renown without analysis.

The Autonomists and the other lower tenet systems — having seen that if the collection of parts, etc., were not posited as an illustration of a whole, etc., [no phenomenon could be posited at all since] there is no whole, etc., which is a separate entity from those — assert that [something] from within²⁷⁰ the bases of designation is posited as this and that phenomenon. They do not know how to posit a phenomenon if an object that is designated as that phenomenon is not found when sought. Therefore, because they do not accept that chariots and so forth are mere nominal designations, they assert that chariots and so forth conventionally are established by way of their own character.

Although this supreme system does not hold that anything such as the collection of parts or something within it is an illustration of the whole and so forth, it is able to present well all actions and agents within the context of mere nominal designation of whole, etc. The Foremost Omniscient [Tsong Khapa] advised that since this mode of commenting on the meaning of the scriptures is the Subduer [Buddha's] own uncommon thought, those who are discriminating should train in this system of interpreting Buddha's thought. It appears that this way [of positing phenomena within the context of mere nominal designation] is a supremely difficult point that was not in the province of mind of many who were famed as great pandits in the land of the Superiors [India], and except for the Omniscient Father [Tsong Khapa] and his spiritual sons [Gyel-tsap and Kay-drup] most of the scholars and adepts in snowy Tibet also were unable to see even a part of this.

This mode of analysis is a profound means of quickly finding the view of emptiness.

Chandrakirti's Auto commentary on the "Supplement to (Nagarjuna's) 'Treatise on the Middle Way' " says:²⁷²

~ Because these worldly conventionalities do not exist when investigated in this way but do exist by way of non-analytical renown, yogis, when they analyze these in these stages, will penetrate very quickly to the depths of suchness.

L10: [2' Applying the Example to the Meaning [is the self the same or different than the five aggregates] :L10

One should consider whether this so-called person or self which is the basis of the conception thinking "I" is the same as one's own [mental and physical] aggregates or different from them because, if it exists, it must be one of those two. For, in general, it is seen in the world that if something is affirmed by the mind to have a counterpart, it is excluded from being without a counterpart; and, if something is affirmed as not having a counterpart, it is excluded from having a counterpart. Therefore, oneness and otherness are a mutually exclusive dichotomy.

L11: [a' Refutation of Oneness / THE SAME] :L11

If the self and the aggregates were one, there would be three fallacies:

- (1) asserting a self would be senseless;
- (2) there would be many selves;
- (3) the self would have production and disintegration.

(1) If the self and the aggregates were inherently one, asserting a self would be senseless

because "self would merely be a synonym of "aggregates", like "moon" and "rabbit-bearer".

Nagarjuna's Treatise on the Middle Way, Called "Wisdom" says:278

~ When it is taken that there is no self
~ Except for the appropriated [aggregates],
~ Then just the appropriated [aggregates] are the self,
~ In which case your self is non-existent.

\ ###
\ 27:5.
\ If it were held that: "There is no individual self without the acquisition,"
\ Then the individual self would be [only] the acquisition or it is not an individual self [at all].

(2) If the self and the aggregates were inherently one, then just as there are many aggregates, so there would be many selves.

Chandrakirti's Supplement to (Nagarjuna's) "Treatise on the Middle Way" says:279

~ If the self were the aggregates, then,
~ Since they are many, those selves would also be many.

\ ###
\ 170.
\ If the aggregates are [the same as] the self, then since they are many,
\ The self is also many.
\ The self is a substance,
\ And the view of it is not wrong because it apprehends a substance.

(3) If the self and the aggregates were one, it would [absurdly] follow that the self would be subject to production and disintegration. For, the aggregates are subject to production and disintegration.

Nagarjuna's Treatise on the Middle Way says:280

~ If the self were the aggregates,
~ It would have production and disintegration.

\ ###
\ 18:1.
\ If the individual self (atma) were [identical to] the "groups" (skandha), then it would partake of origination and destruction.
\ If [the individual self] were different from the "groups," then it would be without the characteristics of the "groups."

Objection: What fallacy is there in the selves having production and disintegration?

Answer: If production and disintegration are only conventions, there is no fallacy. However, if the self has production and disintegration that are established by way of their own character, there would be three fallacies: (a) remembering [former] births would be impossible; (b) actions done would be wasted; (c) one would meet with [the effects of] actions not performed [by oneself]. Moreover, those three fallacies arise due to [the consequence that] if the selves of former and later births were individuals that are

established by way of their own character, they would be unrelated other factualities.

Objection: There is no fallacy. For, although [former and later births] are individuals that are established by way of their own character, they are of one continuum.

Answer: That also is not feasible because if [former and later lives] were different by way of their own entities, they could not be one continuum just as, for example, Maitreya and Upagupta are not.

Chandrakirti's Supplement says:281

- ~ The phenomena dependent on Maitreya and
- ~ Upagupta Are just other and thus do not belong to one continuum.
- ~ It is inadmissible for things that are individual
- ~ By way of their own character to belong to one continuum.

\ ###
\ Phenomena dependent upon Maitreya and Upayagupta
\ Are not included in the same continuum because they are other.
\ Thus it is not reasonable that whatever are different by way of their own characteristics
\ Are included within the same continuum.

L11: [b' Refutation of the Position That the Self and the Aggregates are DIFFERENT] :L11

If the self were established by way of its own character as different from the [mental and physical] aggregates, it would not have the character of the aggregates: production, abiding, and disintegration. For, [the self] would be an other factuality unrelated to the aggregates. It is like, for example, a horse, which, since it is different from an ox, does not have [the specific characteristics of an ox, which are] a hump [on the shoulders] and so forth. If this were the case, [the mental and physical aggregates] would not exist as the basis for the designation of the convention of a self, nor would they exist as an object of a [consciousness] conceiving self. For, the self would be uncompounded, like a sky-flower. Chandrakirti sets this forth in his Clear Words in the form of an other-renowned syllogism.

Moreover, if the self and the aggregates were inherently different, [the self] would have to be observed as a different factuality from the characteristics of the aggregates, such as being suitable [to be called] form, just as form and consciousness, for example, are observed as different.

The former reasoning is taught in the eighteenth chapter [of Nagarjuna's Treatise on the Middle Way] with:283

\ ###
\ If [the self] were other than the aggregates,
\ It would not have the character of the aggregates.

\ ###
\ 18:1.
\ If the individual self (atma) were [identical to] the "groups" (skandha), then it would partake of origination and destruction.
\ If [the individual self] were different from the "groups," then it would be without the characteristics of the "groups."

The latter reasoning is taught in the twenty-seventh chapter [of Nagarjuna's Treatise on the Middle Way] with:284

\ ###
\ If [the self] is other, then it should be apprehended
\ Without the appropriation; but it is not [so] apprehended.

\ ###
\ 27:7.
\ Moreover, it does not obtain that the individual self is different from the acquisition.
\ If the individual self were different, it would be perceived without the acquisition; but [in fact] it is not so perceived.

There are a great many difficult points to be explained with regard to these reasonings refuting oneness and difference, but I will not elaborate on them here.

L11: [c' How THE REMAINING [OF THE SEVEN] POSITIONS are Refuted by These Reasonings] :L11

Through having refuted those two [positions of] oneness and difference of entity, the two positions of dependence — that the self exists in dependence on the aggregates and that the aggregates exist in dependence on the self — also are refuted. For, although these two [positions of dependence] would be feasible if [the self and the aggregates] were different entities, the position that they are different entities has already been refuted.

The position that the self possesses the aggregates is also not feasible. For, as was explained at the time of the chariot, the two modes of possession do not pass beyond the positions of oneness and difference.

Moreover, it is also not feasible that the mere collection of the aggregates is the self. For since it is said that the self is designated in dependence upon the five aggregates, the five aggregates are the basis of designation and the person is the phenomenon designated, and it is not feasible that the basis of designation be the phenomenon designated. The thrust of this reasoning [that the basis of designation cannot be the phenomenon designated] is slightly difficult to realize.

Moreover, this should be understood from (1) the [Consequence School's] uncommon way of interpreting the force of the words in the previously quoted sutra:

~ Just as a chariot is designated
~ In dependence upon collections of parts,
~ So conventionally a sentient being
~ [Is designated] in dependence upon the aggregates.

and (2) from detailed285 realization of the essentials of reasoning in Chandrakirti's Auto Commentary on the "Supplement to (Nagarjuna's) 'Treatise on the Middle Way' " that illuminate this reasoning through proof statements.

Moreover, if the collection [of the aggregates] is the self, there is also the fallacy that agent and object would be one. This also refutes the assertion made by some of our own [Buddhist] schools of tenets that the self is the continuum of the aggregates.

It is also not feasible to assert that the shape of the aggregates is the self. For, shape exists only in physical things, and, therefore, [if the self were shape] the self could not

be posited [in dependence] upon mind and so forth.

The non-finding of a self anywhere, when analyzed thus with reasoning in these seven ways, is the meaning of the absence of inherent existence of the self. Since this fact is similar in terms of both of the two truths, there is no self established by way of its own character even conventionally. Nevertheless, when there is no analysis seeking the object designated, the self or person is established by valid cognition, with no possibility of denial, as being able to perform activities. Therefore, persons exist conventionally.

Moreover, when an awareness thinking, "I," is produced, it is produced in dependence on having taken the five aggregates in one's own continuum as a basis. Therefore, [the I] exists as a mere designation in dependence upon the five aggregates.

Moreover, these [points] are the thought of the root text and Auto Commentary of Chandrakirti's Supplement quoted earlier:²⁸⁷

- ~ That [chariot] is not established in these seven ways
- ~ Either as [its own] suchness or in the world,
- ~ But without analysis it is designated here
- ~ From [the viewpoint of] the world in dependence upon its parts.

Chandrakirti's Commentary on (Aryadeva's) "Four Hundred" says that something illusory must be left over as a remainder:

- ~ For that reason, when analyzed thus, the inherent existence of things is not established. Hence, just an illusory-like nature is left over as a remainder with respect to things individually.

The Foremost Omniscient [Tsong Khapa] says:

- ~ This combination of the following two [factors] barely occurs — (1) refuting, without residue, the object of negation [inherent existence] through reasoned analysis and (2) the feasibility of positing, as left after the negation, without losing anything, all the functionalities of dependently arisen causes and effects as like illusions. Therefore, it is very difficult to gain the view of the Middle Way.

Regarding that, all proponents of tenets among our own schools of the high and low vehicles, present their own systems as systems that are free from the extremes. And, in particular, the other [i.e., non-Consequentialist] great chariots of the Mind Only and Middle Way Schools have ways of presenting the meaning of the middle free from extremes and of presenting illusory-like [appearances]. If you understand well how assertions on these by the higher schools of tenets are more to the point²⁸⁸ and more difficult to realize than those of the lower systems of tenets and that nevertheless all of those [non-Consequentialist schools] do not contain the essentials of being free from all extremes as in the presentation of the two truths in this supreme system and if you understand well how only this system avoids all the very subtle extremes and how it also has profound features totally unlike the other systems in its positing illusory-like [appearances], you will develop firm and genuine faith, induced through the path of reasoning, in general in the texts of the father [Nagarjuna] and his spiritual sons and in particular in the texts of the great lords of adepts who properly expounded the Consequentialist system as well as in the high sayings of the father, the Foremost Great Being [Tsong Khapa] and his spiritual sons [Gyel-tsap and Kay-drup].

You must understand, just as they are, the essentials of the reasonings explained previously and the essentials of the presentation [of appearances] as like illusions, and you must also understand the stages in which these are properly taken to mind as well as the subtle distinctions in generating experience of them. These understandings come (1) through penetrating well in depth, not just superficially, the scriptures of the Foremost [Tsong Khapa] in general and his great and small Expositions of the Stages of the Path to Enlightenment in particular; (2) through properly relying on excellent spiritual friends who, along with meeting [exalted beings in meditative vision], have obtained certain subtle and secret essentials of the speech of the Foremost Great Being [Tsong Khapa] which were given orally to the excellent among his spiritual children, great Bodhisattvas abiding on the grounds, transmitted in stages and put down in writing by the scholars and adepts of this system; (3) through taking to mind the meaning of these texts again and again by means of properly thought out reasoning; and moreover (4) through engendering unusually great effort in the many external and internal causal collections. Moreover, it is very right to strive in this way.

For the omniscient Gyel-tsap says:289

- ~ Until I found the Foremost Holy [Tsong Khapa],
- ~ I had not even partially realized
- ~ Dependent-arising, the middle free from extremes
- ~ The path severing the root of cyclic existence.

Even [Gyel-tsap] the Great Lord of Reasoning who rivals the likes of the six ornaments²⁹⁰ of Jambudvīpa, the land of Superiors [India], did not realize even a portion of this view of the Middle Way free from extremes, prior to meeting the Foremost Great Being [Tsong Khapa].

Also, [Gyel-tsap] says that he realized the meaning of the middle free from extremes through the kindness of the Foremost Omniscient [Tsong Khapa]:²⁹¹

- ~ In the good explanations of the excellent spiritual
- ~ friend Is explained, just as it is, the meaning of
- ~ dependent-arising, the middle free from extremes
- ~ Which is just as asserted by the protector Nagarjuna,
- ~ And is the single thought of Buddhapaṇita,
- ~ Chandrakīrti, and Śāntideva.

[Gyel-tsap] also says that it is necessary to work hard at this²⁹² way because it is the excellent life of the path of liberation and omniscience:²⁹³

- ~ Without realizing the principle of the middle free from the extremes,
- ~ One cannot reach the levels²⁹⁴ of the supreme Superiors.
- ~ Therefore, having concluded that emptiness means dependent-arising,
- ~ Make effort at practice, striving in the proper way.

[Gyel-tsap] also says that upon understanding that this supreme system is difficult to find and that in not very long it will disappear, discriminating people should generate effort quickly, quickly:²⁹⁵

- ~ Since proponents of the two truths of Nagarjuna's good system,
- ~ Difficult to find in even a billion eons,
- ~ In not long will disappear from this world,
- ~ The discriminating should quickly generate effort.

These points are very important, appearing to be advice of the utmost profundity. Since I wish to explain about the Consequence School 296 only briefly here, you should understand the essentials of the tenets of this system at length from other [texts].

L9: [b] Showing that this [ascertainment of persons as not inherently existent] also establishes the mine as not inherently existent] :L9

When the self is sought in this way by means of reasoning that examines whether or not it is inherently existent, it is not found to be any of these seven, whereby inherent existence is negated with respect to the self. At this point, that the mine is established by way of its own character is also easily negated.

Nagarjuna's Fundamental Text Called "Wisdom" says:297

~ If [an inherently existent] self does not exist,
~ How could [inherently existent] mine exist?

Moreover, although just an awareness that realizes the I to be without inherent existence does not explicitly apprehend the mine to be without inherent existence, when the mind turns to the mine in a manner of analyzing whether inherent existence exists or not, based on the functioning of the former awareness, [the mine] is easily established as without inherent existence. Because [this mind] does not consider another proof, no separate reasoning [for refuting the inherent existence of the mine] is set forth in the great texts. Two different ways of asserting [mine] appear. [One system explains that] the eyes, ears, and so forth included in one's own continuum are illustrations of mine but are not objects of observation of an innate [false] view of the transitory collection that conceives [inherently existent] mine. They explain that this is the thought of the Foremost Father [Tsong Khapa] and his spiritual sons [Gyel-tsap and Kay-drup].

[Another system explains that] the eyes, ears, and so forth are the bases of designation300 of the mine but are not illustrations301 of mine because it is not feasible for a basis of designation to be the phenomenon designated. [Jam-yang-shay-ba says that] the explanation in Kay-drup's Opening the Eyes of the Fortunate that eyes, ears, and so forth are illustrations of mine merely indicates that these are illustrations of things taken as mine; it does not indicate they are mine itself.302 [Jam-yang-shay-ba says that] this way of explaining [mine] is the thought of Tsong Khapa's Great Commentary on (Nagarjuna's) "Fundamental Text Called 'Wisdom' ".303 Although there appears to be much to be investigated in both these assertions, I wish to elaborate on them elsewhere.

L9: [c] How this reasoning is applied to other phenomena] :L9

Chandrakirti's Supplement to (Nagarjuna's) "Treatise on the Middle Way" says that all these phenomena, renowned in the world, do not exist when sought in the seven ways and that they are posited as existent for a non-analytical, conventional consciousness:304

\ ###
\ Parts, qualities, passion, definition, fuel, and so forth
\ As well as whole, qualificand, the impassioned,305 illustration,306 fire, and so forth —
\ These do not exist in the seven ways when subjected to the analysis of the chariot;
\ They exist through worldly renown which is other than that.

\ ###
 \ 210.
 \ Parts and part-possessors, qualities and quality-possessors, attachment and the attached,
 \ Characteristics and bases of characteristics, firewood and fire, and so forth-
 \ Objects such as these do not exist in seven ways when analyzed like a cart;
 \ But otherwise do exist by way of worldly renown.

In the Chapter Showing the Three Vows Sutra [Buddha] says that what is renowned in the world is not refuted by reasoning:

~ The world argues with me,
 ~ I do not argue with the world.
 ~ Whatever is accepted in the world as existent and non-existent, that I also accept in that way.

L2: [Dependent-Arising] :L2

L8: [3] KING OF REASONINGS, THE REASON OF DEPENDENT-ARISING (#3), REFUTING A SELF OF BOTH PERSONS AND PHENOMENA] :L8

The presentation of the king of reasonings, the reason of dependent-arising, has two parts:
 -- the actual explanation
 -- and how the other reasonings derive from this.

L9: [a] Actual explanation of dependent-arising] :L9

The Questions of Sagaramati Sutra³⁰⁸ says that inherent establishment is refuted through the reasoning of dependent-arising:

~ Those which arise dependently
 ~ Are free of inherent existence.

And the Questions of Anavatapta, the King of Nagas, Sutra says:

~ Those which are produced from conditions are not produced.
 ~ They do not have an inherent nature of production.
 ~ Those which depend on conditions are said to be empty.
 ~ One who knows emptiness is aware.

In that, production from conditions is the reason. No production is the probandum. The meaning of not being produced is indicated by the second line. It is not that mere production is being eliminated; inherently established production is being eliminated. Moreover, in the Descent into Lanka Sutra, the Teacher [Buddha] himself clarifies his thought:

~ O Mahamati, thinking of no inherently existent production, I said that all phenomena are not produced.

[In the passage from the Questions of Anavatapta Sutra,] through the relating of [the relative] "which" and [the correlative] "those", the subjects that are the substrata [of an

absence of inherently existent production] are indicated. They are external things such as sprouts and internal things such as compositional activity. The third line means that just dependence and reliance on conditions is the meaning of [being] empty of inherent existence. This statement indicates that an emptiness of inherent existence is the meaning of dependent-arising. It does not indicate an emptiness that is the absence of the capacity to perform functions — that is, a negative of mere production.

Seeing that just this teaching of this reasoning as refuting all extremes is an unsurpassed distinctive feature elevating his teacher, the Supramundane Victor, above all other teachers, Nagarjuna's mind was captivated by this mode [of dependent-arising], whereupon the glorious protector, the Superior Nagarjuna — in his Fundamental Text Called "Wisdom", Sixty Stanzas of Reasoning, his Collection of Praises, and so forth — praised the Supramundane Victor from the viewpoint of just his speaking of dependent-arising.

Also, our own excellent leader, the Foremost Great Being [Tsong Khapa] says:³⁰⁹

- ~ Homage to the Conqueror who perceived
- ~ And gave instruction on dependent-arising.
- ~ Through perceiving and setting forth such
- ~ He has unsurpassed wisdom and is the unsurpassed teacher.

And so on. Praising Buddha in this way is pure speech of praise induced by genuine faith induced by the path of reasoning; therefore, these are not artificial words or words of flattery.

The Sanskrit original of dependent-arising is *pratityasamutpadah*.³¹¹ Most earlier masters said that *prati* is a distributive, [meaning] diversely, and that *i*, [the verbal root meaning] going, is used [to mean] departing and disintegrating. Through adding the affix *ya* to that [verbal root *i*], *itya* is taken as a secondary derivative noun, which comes to mean "that which goes". Hence, they say that [*pratityasamutpada* means] the arising of what possess going and disintegration diversely.

In that case, except for the general dependent-arising, which is the arising of effects from causes, when each particular case is specified such as in "A consciousness arises in dependence upon an eye [sense power]," [the etymology] is not suitable because within one thing there is no way to explain the term "diversely". Taking it as a secondary derivative noun is not feasible also because, in that case, it would be wrong [for the text] to read, "Having depended on an eye sense power and forms" (*caksuh pratitya rupani ca*) and would instead have to read on all occasions, "A consciousness which departs to an eye [sense power] and forms" (*caksuh pratityam vijñanam rupani ca*) [and it is obvious to anyone who has seen the text that it is not written that way]. Since no case ending is to be seen [with *pratitya*],³¹⁴ it is suitable only to be a continuative with an indeclinable ending.

Also, the master Bhavaviveka does not make individual explanations of the meanings of *prati*, and so forth. He explains it only as a term used to mean that "When this is, that arises," or "Due to having this condition, that arises," like [the term] wild sesame.

For Chandrakirti's Clear Words says:

- ~ Such is said [by Bhavaviveka] having asserted *pratityasamutpada* to be a conventional term [not necessarily following its etymological meaning] like *aranyetilaka*, etc.

That also is not feasible because the master, the Superior Nagarjuna spoke within dividing [the term] into its individual components, pratitya (brten pa) and samutpada ('byung ba) [in his Sixty Stanzas of Reasoning]:³¹⁶

\ ###
\ That which is produced having met this and that [collection of causes and conditions]
\ Is not inherently produced.
\ (Tat tat prapya yad utpannam notpannam tatsvabhavatah.)³¹⁷

\ ###
\ 19.
\ Whatever arises depending on this and that has not arisen substantially.
\ That which has not arisen substantially:
\ How can it literally be called 'arisen'?

¢(i.e. No real causality, or dependent origination: Everything is empty of inherent existence because dependently arisen. If it is empty, how can we talk about anything being caused?)

Even if [Bhavaviveka] wants to set forth [this position] as the meaning of the passage in Nagarjuna's Precious Garland,³¹⁸

\ ###
\ "When this³¹⁹ is, that arises, like long when there is short,"

\ ###
\ 48. When this is, that arises,
\ Like short when there is long.
\ Due to the production of this, that is produced,
\ Like light from the production of a flame.

he has to explain [pratitya] as having the meaning of "meeting" ('phrad pa, prapya/prapti). This is because³²⁰ he has to assert just that long comes to be having met short and having depended on short, or in reliance upon short.

Therefore, the honorable master Chandrakirti's own system is: Because prati is used for "meeting" and i is used for "going", pratitya — which has the continuative affix, ya³²³ on that [i base] — through being modified by the modifier [prati], is used for "meeting", that is to say, "depending" or "relying". [The verbal root] i alone is generally used for "going", but when it is combined with prati³²⁴ it comes to mean "meeting" and so forth. That this is so is like, for example, the fact that the water of the Ganges is extremely sweet, but when it mixes with the ocean, it comes to have a salty taste.

Moreover, in that way, Chandrakirti's Clear Words says:

~ In that, prati has the meaning of meeting ('phrad pa, prapti). [The verbal root] i has the meaning of going. The term pratitya, a continuative, is used for "meeting" — that is, "relying" — because the root is completely modified by a modifier [i.e., the prefix prati]. It is explained:
~ Through the force of a modifier
~ The meaning of the verbal root is completely changed.
~ Just as, though the water of the Ganges is sweet,

~ [It is completely changed] by the water of the ocean.

The term pada, which has samut preceding it, is used for "arising". It is also suitable to be explained as "existing" (yod pa, sat) and "established" (grub pa, siddha).

Therefore, in brief, our own system is this: The meaning of pratityasamutpada is the existence, establishment, or arising of things in dependence upon causes and conditions.

Chandrakirti's Clear Words says, "Hence, the meaning of pratityasamutpada³²⁵ is the arising of things in reliance upon causes and conditions." In that way, it is very important to know well the many different ways that [those great scholars, called] great chariots, etymologized pratityasamutpada because, in dependence upon their etymologies, there are many essential points of the different ways of generating ascertainment about the extent of the meaning of dependent-arising and about the depth of penetration of such-ness.

Furthermore, since I wish to explain this extensively elsewhere, I will express [here] just a little about the assertions of the glorious Chandrakirti. In that way, the meaning of dependent-arising is explained as meeting, relying, and depending. The reason for this is as follows. In general, meet, rely, and depend are said even to be synonymous. However, if we separate them in order to facilitate understanding, "meeting" as a reason [for the absence of inherent existence of things] bears within it the sense of dependent-arising as the production of things from their own causes.

This is [an assertion held in] common also with lower tenet systems. Moreover, since [the Middle Way School and the lower tenet systems] are similar in their assertions of the meaning of dependent-arising just to that point, this is said to be "common". However [Proponents of the Middle Way School] do not [assert] the truly existent dependent-arising that those [of the lower systems] assert; also, [in lower tenet systems] they do not assert that the absence of true existence is what is proved [by dependent-arising].

"Meeting" refers to the meeting of the actions of production of the effect and cessation of the cause. It is not that cause and effect meet.

"Relying" indicates a reason [for the absence of inherent existence of phenomena] that is the attainment by compounded and uncompounded phenomena of their own entities in reliance upon their own parts. This is in terms of explaining samutpada as [meaning] "established".³²⁷ [Here the meaning of dependent-arising] has a wider application than the former [because it applies to all phenomena, both the permanent and impermanent]. The mere meaning that is explicitly indicated [in "establishment-in-reliance"] is in common with other Proponents of the Middle Way School.

"Dependence" indicates a reason [for the absence of inherent existence of things] that is the dependent designation of all phenomena — their being established as mere designations in dependence upon their own bases of designation. This is a feature of only this supreme system; it is not common to Autonomists and below.

Accordingly, if you take the meaning of arising in the phrase "arising of things" from that passage in Chandrakirti's Clear Words to be mere production, it then indicates the first reason, and if you take it as establishment or existence, then it also indicates the two latter reasons. If you take "causes and conditions" as merely the seed that is the substantial cause of a sprout and the water, manure, and so forth that are its contributing conditions, then it indicates the former reason. If you take "causes and conditions" to mean the cause for something's achieving its own entity — its basis of imputation or parts — then

it indicates the middle reason. If you take "causes and conditions" to be the respective conceptual consciousnesses that impute phenomena, then it indicates the last reason.

Therefore, the "causes and conditions" in Chandrakirti's phrase "in reliance upon causes and conditions" should not be taken as only the causes and conditions of compounded phenomena such as seeds, water, manure, and so forth. That it must also refer to the imputing conceptual consciousness is the special thought of the glorious Chandrakirti and the Foremost Great Being [Tsong Khapa]. Nevertheless, most of those discriminating persons whose heads are adorned with pandita hats with very sharp points have still not drawn out³²⁸ [this topic]. There also is a mode of explanation — that others have not drawn out³²⁹ — in which meeting, relying, and depending [are taken as indicating] only the third reason from the viewpoint of treating them as synonyms. I will not elaborate on this here.

Also, regarding those, the Foremost Great Being [Tsong Khapa] says in his Small Exposition of the Stages of the Path To Enlightenment:

~ Therefore, external things, such as sprouts, and internal things, such as compositional activity, arise in dependence upon, respectively, seeds, etc., and ignorance, etc.

This indicates the first reason.

Also, that same work says:

~ [Whatever is established by way of its own entity-ness] must be inherently established, that is, be able to set itself up under its own power, whereby it is contradictory for it to rely on causes and conditions.

This indicates the middle reason.

Also, that work says:

~ Through this, you should understand that persons, pots, and so forth are without inherent establishment because of being imputed in dependence on their own collections [of parts].

This indicates the third reason. However, [Tsong Khapa,] collecting them all into the common and the uncommon, says in that same work,

~ "Those are the two presentations of the reasoning of dependent-arising."

Not only that, but also Tsong Khapa's Great Explanation of (Chandrakirti's) "Supplement to (Nagarjuna's) 'Treatise on the Middle Way' " says:

~ The Supramundane Victor said, "The essence of phenomena is this: When this is, that arises; because this is produced, that is produced.

Through the condition of ignorance, there are compositional activities," and so forth.

And Nagarjuna's Precious Garland says:³³³

~ When this is, that arises,
~ Like short when there is long.
~ When this is produced, that is produced,
~ Like light from the arising of a flame.

\ ###
 \ 48. When this is, that arises,
 \ Like short when there is long.
 \ Due to the production of this, that is produced,
 \ Like light from the production of a flame.

And Nagarjuna's Fundamental Text Called "Wisdom" also says:334

~ A doer arises in dependence on a doing
 ~ And a doing arises in dependence upon just that doer.
 ~ Except for that, we do not see
 ~ Another cause for their establishment.

Even each of these three passages which [Tsong Khapa] cites in series are suitable to indicate all three presentations [of the meaning of dependent-arising], but in terms of what they mainly indicate and in terms of sequence, they set forth the three different presentations of the reasoning [of dependent-arising].

This [threefold interpretation of dependent-arising] is also the assertion of the glorious Chandrakirti.

Chandrakirti's Commentary on (Aryadeva's) "Four Hundred" says:335

~ Here, that which has its own intrinsic existence, has inherent existence, has its own power, or has no dependence on others would be self-established; therefore, it would not have a dependent arising. However, all compounded things are dependent-arising. In that way, things that have dependent arising are not self-powered because they are produced in dependence upon causes and conditions. All these [phenomena] are not self-powered; therefore, no things have self, inherent existence.

If you know in detail [Tsong Khapa's] mode of interpretation of the meaning of this citation [as set forth] in his Great Exposition of Special Insight, you will understand [how the passage indicates the threefold interpretation of dependent-arising] .

In dependence on certain such special points, the definitive great scholar Nor-sang-gya-tso336 is renowned to have said, "Whatever is an established base [i.e., whatever exists] is a compounded phenomenon." About this, many skilled and unskilled people have said, "It [absurdly] follows that the subject, uncompounded space, is a compounded phenomenon because it is an established base,"337 etc. These neophytes at elementary logic and epistemology demonstrate many commonly proclaimed points of damage [to such a position] and scornfully laugh. However, how could this great scholar and adept, who penetrated all of sutra and tantra, not know this little bit of reasoning? Though he said such within hoping that, in dependence on his words, [people would] have an effective way of forming understanding of the meaning of dependent-arising, it appears that they have become examples of:

~ "For persons pained by karma, even medicine given becomes poison."

The above explanation of the meaning of the reasoning of dependent-arising is the unsurpassed thought of Chandrakirti's etymological explanation of pratityasamutpada. This is also indeed the final thought of the Foremost Great Being [Tsong Khapa], but since it appears that others have not explained it clearly, I have explained it a little.

Now, I will say a little about the way that the two extremes are cleared away by this

reasoning [of dependent-arising] . The main places for going wrong with respect to realizing the pure view here [according to the Consequentialist system] are of two types. One is the view of permanence, or the view of superimposition, that has a process of apprehension conceiving true existence, i.e., the conception that phenomena truly exist. The second is the view of annihilation, or deprecation, when the measure of the object of negation is not apprehended and, instead, is taken too far, whereby one is not able to induce ascertainment with respect to all the causes and effects of purification³³⁸ and thorough affliction. Both of these [extremes] can be refuted without residue in dependence on just this reasoning of dependent-arising. Through ascertaining the reason, one avoids the extreme of nihilism and finds ascertainment with regard to the dependent-arising of cause and effect, and through ascertaining the probandum, one avoids the extreme of permanence and gains ascertainment with regard to absence of inherent existence.

With respect to gaining such ascertainment, that which has very strong force is just the reasoning of dependent imputation. Moreover, this is the incomparable lion's roar of the good explanations of the Foremost Lama [Tsong Khapa]. Also, both extremes are avoided even through ascertainment of the reason and the thesis individually. Furthermore, in general, the extreme of existence is avoided through appearance, and the extreme of non-existence is avoided through emptiness. These are said to be distinguishing features³³⁹ of the Middle Way Consequence School.

In dependence upon secret essentials of the word of this Foremost One [Tsong Khapa], you should know that there is a distinctive way that these become distinguishing features of the Middle Way Consequence School that is not just what is explicitly indicated. For, otherwise, even in each of the four schools of tenets, there are explanations that both the extreme of existence and the extreme of non-existence are avoided through appearance and that both extremes are also avoided through emptiness.

In general, there is the way that the two extremes are avoided with respect to things because they are dependent-arisings. In particular, there are ways that the two extremes are avoided, in dependence on reasoning, for the awareness of a person at the time of hearing and thinking about the texts of the Middle Way School, as well as ways that the two extremes are avoided for one's awareness when realization that arises from meditation has been generated — on the two levels of an ordinary being and a Superior. Furthermore, even among Superiors, due to the gradual increase of the force of mind of those on higher levels, there are many differences of subtlety in how, for one's mind, the two extremes are avoided as this becomes more³⁴⁰ profound than on lower levels.

For, Shantideva says:³⁴¹

~ Even among yogis, at each level the higher
 ~ Damage [the lower] through features of their intelligence.

\ ###

\ [4]

\ Due to the difference in their intelligence, even contemplatives are refuted by successively higher ones by means of analogies accepted by both parties, regardless of what they aim to prove.

\ ###

\ [5]

\ Ordinary people see and imagine things as real and not illusory.

\ It is in this respect that there is disagreement between the contemplatives and the ordinary people.

Therefore, all the presentations of the two truths of the Middle Way Consequence School are taken from within the sphere of this reasoning of dependent-arising, and there are also many important reasons regarding many uncommon features at the time of path and fruit.

Furthermore, these can be known well by persons who have complete understanding (1) that identifies the factor of emptiness by reason of having ascertained³⁴⁴ the factor of appearance and (2) that induces ascertainment with respect to the factor of appearance through having taken the factor of emptiness as the reason. However, it is not possible that all these could be complete in the mode of initial dawning [of rough ideas to someone] who has not found well an understanding of the view. Moreover, these are seen to depend upon knowing well the meaning of how all presentations of cyclic existence and nirvana are only imputedly existent and, within that, knowing well what is eliminated and what is included within the term "mere nominality, only imputed existence".

~ Alas, I wonder whether this — endowed with an array of ambrosia-lights
~ Of Lo-sang-drak-ba's good explanations
~ Which has come to the peak of the eastern mountain of not low merit
~ For the sake of generating manifest joy — is glorious only for my own mind.
~ .
~ The form of a rainbow of the subtle body of a hundred texts' good meanings,
~ Written with the pen³⁴⁵ of pure reasoning
~ Through being reflected in the mirror of my mind,
~ Bestows joy through thousands of visions and transformations.
~ .
~ That sage who, dwelling in the forest of Nagarjuna's ten million procedures,
~ Is skilled at summoning the beautiful woman of emptiness and dependent-arising
~ Through the messenger of the meditative stabilization of stainless reasoning
~ Is called a Proponent of the Middle Way School.
~ .
~ Those who have abandoned afar the bliss of setting the mind in reality
~ And who proceed crookedly with the pace of explanation and debate of generalities
of words
~ Speak from their mouths about dependent-arising a hundred times
~ But such is empty of meaning like a butter lamp in a picture.³⁴⁶
~ .
~ If those who randomly study limited texts and, though lacking the force of mind
~ To discriminate what requires interpretation and what is definitive,
~ Nonetheless take up the burden of making "is" and "is not" all equal
~ Did not say anything, how could it not be nice!
~ .
~ Even though I have not experienced the supreme taste of realization arising from
meditation,
~ Which is the fruit of laboring at the stainless texts,
~ How marvelous it is that the Foremost Father Lo-sang has caused to be born in me
~ The lot of propounding dependent-arising just as it is.

Those are stanzas between sections.

L9: [b) How the other reasonings derive from dependent-arising] :L9

The essentials of all the reasonings that prove selflessness and are cases of non-observation of something inextricably related [with inherent existence] meet back to just this reasoning of dependent-arising. This is (1) because the main purpose of all those reasonings is just to generate in the [mental] continuum the view of the middle way upon simultaneously clearing away the two extremes, and just this reasoning of dependent-arising explicitly accomplishes this and (2) because those reasonings also meet back to just this mode [of dependent-arising] when followed out.

As was established earlier, the main reasonings that this system uses for settling the two selflessnesses must be taken to be the two, the refutation of production from the four extremes and the sevenfold reasoning. The way that their essentials meet back to dependent-arising is set forth clearly in Chandrakirti's Supplement to (Nagarjuna's) "Treatise on the Middle Way" because (1) in that text [Chandrakirti] clearly speaks of how the reasoning of the refutation of production from the four extremes meets back to the reasoning of dependent-arising:

```
\      ###
\      Because things are not produced causelessly,
\      Or from Ishvara and so forth as causes,
\      Or from self, from other, or both,
\      They are dependently produced.

\      ###
\      157.
\      Because things are not produced without a cause,
\      Not from causes such as Ishvara and so forth,
\      And not from self, other, or both,
\      They are produced completely dependently.
```

And (2) in that same text [Chandrakirti] clearly speaks of how the sevenfold reasoning meets back to dependent-arising: 349

```
\      ###
\      That [chariot] is not established as [its own] suchness
\      Or in the world in the seven ways,
\      But without analysis, here in the world,
\      Is imputed in dependence on its parts.

\      ###
\      201.
\      Indeed it is not established by the seven ways,
\      Either in thatness or for the worldly;
\      But from the point of view of the worldly without analysis
\      It is imputed here in dependence upon its parts.
```

Moreover, when, having sought for the object imputed in the imputation of, for instance, the convention, "A sprout is growing," you find ascertainment that [a sprout] is not produced from self, from other, from both, or causelessly, this — through its own force — induces ascertainment that the growing of the sprout, etc., is just an imputation, and also when you find ascertainment that the convention "growing" [or "production"] is just an imputation, this — through its own force — induces ascertainment with respect to non-findability when the object imputed in the imputation of the convention of growing is sought.

This way [in which understanding the one helps in understanding the other] is the way that the essentials of the reasoning refuting production from the four extremes meet back to dependent-arising.

Tsong Khapa's Essence of the Good Explanations (Essence of True Eloquence) says:³⁵⁰

~ Through [the reasoning that] external things, such as sprouts, and internal things, such as compositional activity, arise in dependence upon causes and conditions — such as a seed and ignorance — their production and so forth are empty of an inherent nature in the sense of being established by way of their own character and are not produced from self, other, both or causelessly. Since [Chandrakirti] refutes [the four extreme types of production] in this way, [the object of negation] is refuted in a manner that meets back to just the reasoning of dependent-arising, the king of reasonings cutting all the nets of bad views.

This mainly is the reasoning of [things] being dependently produced, but when [considered] finely, it must also meet back to the reasoning that things are dependently imputed. This latter is more difficult to understand than the former. The way in which the essentials of the sevenfold reasoning meet back to dependent-arising is that (1) just the non-findability in seven ways induces ascertainment with respect to the person's being merely imputed in dependence upon the [mental and physical] aggregates and (2) just the realization [that the person is] only imputedly existent induces ascertainment with respect to the other [i.e., ascertainment that phenomena are not findable in these seven ways].

Tsong Khapa's Essence of the Good Explanations (Essence of True Eloquence) says:³⁵¹

~ This also meets back to the reasoning of dependent-arising since the non-finding of the person as those seven due to being just imputed in dependence upon the aggregates is the meaning of the selflessness of persons.

Thus, even the other reasonings proving selflessness that are non-observations of related factors contain all these features.

Even each of those reasonings refutes the view of permanence through the conceptually isolatable function of the reasoning itself, which is its negating findability at the end of searching for the object imputed — this findability being something that is necessarily related with inherent establishment, the object of negation. [Each of those reasonings] also refutes the extreme of annihilation through the conceptually isolatable function of the fact that being merely dependently imputed — the opposite of the object of negation, inherent establishment — becomes the reason. You should know that there are two imprints in dependence upon individual functions. Nevertheless, you also must differentiate well how, in dependence on the way [the reason] is explicitly stated, it is an observation of what is opposite or a non-observation of what is necessarily related.

The likes of the very great ability of this reasoning of dependent-arising explicitly to clear away the two extremes do not exist in other reasonings that state factors of emptiness [such as not being produced from self, from other, from both, or causelessly] as the reason. Also, within the reasoning of dependent-arising itself, just the reasoning of dependent imputation is very powerful.

[The Middle Way Autonomists] Bhavaviveka and his spiritual son [Jnanagarbha] as well as Shantarakshita and his spiritual son [Kamalashila] also assert that the root of the reasonings refuting true existence meets back to having parts and that having parts is the

meaning of dependent-arising. However, the way that these [Consequentialists] have the other reasonings meet back to dependent-arising is utterly different. Also, the way that the reasoning of dependent-arising explicitly eliminates the two extremes [in the Consequentialist system] is not like [what is asserted in] those systems. The masters of the Autonomy School and their students also say that emptiness and dependent-arising have the same import, but the way that they have the same import is not like this system of the [Consequence School]. Furthermore, just the Consequentialists mainly use the expression "king of reasonings" for this reasoning [of dependent-arising].

Tsong Khapa's Great Exposition of the Stages of the Path to Enlightenment (Lam-Rim-Chen-Mo) says:

~ When other sentient beings apprehend that [a phenomenon] is produced in dependence on causes and conditions, based on this they apprehend [that phenomenon] as having an inherent nature in the sense of existing by way of its own entityness, whereby they are bound [in cyclic existence]. The wise, in dependence on that sign [i.e., being a dependent-arising], refute that the phenomenon has inherent existence and induce ascertainment with respect to its absence of inherent existence, [thereby] cutting the bonds of views conceiving extremes. Therefore, this establishment of the absence of inherent existence through the sign of dependent-arising is a wondrous, great skillfulness in method.

And Tsong Khapa's Praise of the Supramundane Buddha from the Point of View of Dependent-Arising says:

~ Just that which, through being apprehended,
~ Makes, for children, the bonds of extreme conceptions more firm,
~ For the wise is the door to cutting
~ All the nets of elaboration [of the conception of inherent existence].

His saying that just the reasoning of dependent-arising is, for the wise, the door to cutting all the bonds of extreme conceptions is in consideration that emptiness and dependent-arising come to have the same import.

Furthermore, that Nagarjuna and his [spiritual] children as well as the Foremost Omniscient [Tsong Khapa] say that emptiness has the meaning of dependent-arising is not like positing that which is bulbous as the meaning of pot. It also is not merely that a consciousness realizing one also realizes the other. Therefore, that emptiness comes to mean dependent-arising is not just for any person but is posited as so in the perspective of one who has already ascertained the pure view and has not forgotten it.

Tsong Khapa's Ocean of Reasoning, Explanation of (Nagarjuna's) "Treatise on the Middle Way" says:

~ The meaning of emptiness coming to be the meaning of dependent-arising is for Proponents of the Middle Way School who have refuted inherent existence through valid cognition, not for others.

Therefore, even though some of our own [Gelugpa] scholars assert that this is for persons ranging up from other parties [in a debate] whose continuums have been ripened [such that they are about ready to realize emptiness] and even though some others assert that it is for those whose analysis of the view is complete, I think just what was explained above is correct.

The Foremost Omniscient [Tsong Khapa] says [in his Three Principal Aspects of the Path]:³⁵²

\ ###
\ When [the two realizations of appearance and of emptiness exist] simultaneously
without alternation,
\ And when from only seeing dependent-arising as infallible,
\ Ascertaining knowledge entirely destroys the mode of apprehension [of inherently
existent objects],
\ Then one has completed analysis of the view.

\ ###
\ [12]
\ When these two realizations are simultaneous and not alternating,
\ The mere sight of infallible dependent arising
\ Brings the certainty that destroys all modes of apprehending objects.
\ Then, your analysis of the profound view is complete.

\ ###
\ Or

\ ###
\ 12.
\ When [the two understandings exist] simultaneously without alternation,
\ And when, from just seeing dependent-arising to be infallible,
\ Definite knowledge destroys the mode of apprehending [an inherently existent]
object,
\ Then the analysis of the view is complete.

And after that, he says:

\ ###
\ Further,³⁵³ the extreme of [inherent] existence is avoided by [knowledge of the
nature of] appearances [as existing as only nominal designations],
\ And the extreme of [total] non-existence is avoided by [knowledge of the nature
of] emptiness [as the absence of inherent existence and not the absence of nominal
existence].
\ If, from within emptiness, you know the mode of appearance of cause and effect,
\ Then you will not be captivated by extreme views.

\ ###
\ [13]
\ Furthermore, appearances eliminate the extreme of existence
\ And emptiness eliminates the extreme of non-existence.
\ When you understand the way emptiness appears as cause and result,
\ You will not be carried away by extreme views.

\ ###
\ Or

\ ###
\ 13.
\ Further, [knowledge of the nature of] appearances [existing only nominally]
excludes the extreme of existence

\ And [knowledge of the nature of] emptiness [as the absence of inherent existence] excludes the extreme of non-existence.

\ If [within] emptiness, one knows the mode of the appearance of causes and effects,

\ One will not be taken over by extreme views.

Through those statements [Tsong Khapa] clearly speaks of how emptiness comes to have the import of dependent-arising, but the meaning of those statements is very difficult to realize. I do not think that it would be correct to assert that the meaning of the former passage is a mere ability to have a simultaneous appearance, with respect to one phenomenon, of its being a dependent-arising arisen from causes and conditions and of its not being inherently existent.

The Foremost Ren-da-wa³⁵⁴ also says something quite similar to that statement:

- ~ When the two wisdoms of faith in non-delusive cause and effect
- ~ And the realization that dependent-arisings are empty
- ~ Are understood in inseparable union, then one has entered
- ~ The path of the middle way free of extremes.

And:

- ~ At the very time they appear, [phenomena] are realized as empty
- ~ And when³⁵⁵ emptiness is realized, appearance is not refuted.
- ~ When ascertainment is found with respect to the way that these two are unified,
- ~ Then the thought of the Conqueror has been realized.

Therefore, just as much as when one thoroughly analyzes with stainless reasoning, one generates greater ascertainment with respect to how these and those phenomena lack inherent existence, to that extent the inducement of ascertainment with respect to how those phenomena are merely dependent imputations develops in greater force. Also, just as much as the inducement of ascertainment with regard to the way that phenomena are only dependent imputations increases in greater force, to that extent the inducement of ascertainment with regard to the way the phenomena are empty of inherent existence increases in greater force.

Moreover, once an ascertaining consciousness — induced by inferential cognition that a sprout is without inherent existence through the sign of its being a dependent-arising — has been generated and does not deteriorate, it is evident that there are many different stages of levels of capacity with respect to how these two ascertaining consciousnesses assist each other due to gradual progress higher and higher. Since this topic [of how the two realizations assist each other] is extremely difficult to understand and, when understood, is amazing, the Protector Nagarjuna says:

- ~ Relying on actions and effects
- ~ Within knowing this emptiness of phenomena
- ~ Is even more amazing than the amazing
- ~ And even more marvelous than the marvelous.

And the Foremost Great Being [Tsong Khapa] says:

- ~ What is more amazing
- ~ And what is more marvelous
- ~ Than that the two ascertainments —

- ~ That all these are empty of inherent existence
- ~ And that this effect arises from that [cause] —
- ~ Assist each other without impediment!

There are still many facets of the meaning of the sameness in import of emptiness and dependent-arising that should be understood in even more detail than what has been explained earlier. The likes of what appears in the Foremost Omniscient [Tsong Khapa's] scriptures — his "Great Exposition of Special Insight", "Middling Exposition of Special Insight", and Great Commentary on (Nagarjuna's) "Fundamental Treatise on the Middle Way Called 'Wisdom' " — do not appear in any of the essays of instruction on the view composed by later scholars, [even though these are] renowned to be very clear. Also, [what is found in Tsong Khapa's scriptures] does not appear in [others'] general presentations and critical analyses of the texts, etc. Therefore, it is evident that when those scriptures of the Foremost Lama [Tsong Khapa] are explained by someone who knows how to explain them and heard by someone who knows how to listen, there are many sources that generate joy.

L1: [Commentary] :L1

[see other file for the commentary]

L1: [Outline of Jang-gya's Text] :L1

Brief Expression of the System of the Glorious Middle Way Consequence School, Supreme Summit of All Schools of Tenets, Bearing the Subduer's Own System — 360-428, 36-354 (662.1-841.1, 407.8-525.15)

Note numbers refer to those given earlier in the commentary and thus are not necessarily sequential.-- The page numbers in this section are given first, followed by those in the commentary; the page numbers in parentheses refer respectively to the Lokesh Chandra edition and the Varanasi codex edition (see the Bibliography)

I. Definition — 360-363, 36-60 (662.2-666.3, 407.11-409.18)

II. Assertions of tenets — 364-428, 61-354 (666.3-841.1, 409.18-525.15)

A. How to settle the view of the bases — 364-428, 61-354 (666.4-739.2, 410.1-458.9)

1. Explaining what is negated in relation to what bases — 364-372, 61-122 (666.5-676.4, 410.3-416.16)

2. Settling the selflessness that is the negative of the object negated — 373-428, 123-354 (676.4-739.2, 416.16-458.9)

a. An identification of the main reasonings refuting the object of negation — 373-382, 123-155 (676.4-687.4, 416.18-424.3)

1) Purpose of refuting the object of negation through reasoning — 373-380, 124-147 (676.5-684.2, 416.20-421.17)

2) Identification of the main reasonings — 380-383, 148-155 (684.2-687.4, 421.17-424.3)

b. How those reasonings refute the object of negation, the two selves — 383-428, 156-354 (687.4-739.2, 424.3-458.9)

- 1) Reasonings refuting a self of phenomena — 383-390, 156-208 (687.5-696.1, 424.6-429.16)
 - a) Explaining the reasoning of the diamond fragments refuting production of the four extreme types — 383-390, 156-203 (687.5-695.2, 424.6-429.4)
 - 1' Refutation of production from self — 384-386, 161-171 (689.2-691.1, 425.4-426.8)
 - 2' Refutation of production from other — 386-388, 172-180 (691.1-693.4, 426.8-428.4)
 - 3' Refutation of production from both self and other — 338, 180-181 (693.4-694.1, 428.4-428.8)
 - 4' Refutation of causeless production — 388-390, 181-186 (694.1-695.2, 428.8-429.4)
 - b) Refutation of the production of the four alternatives — 390, 204-205 (695.2-695.3, 429.4-429.9)
 - c) Reasoning refuting production of the existent and non-existent — 390, 205-208 (695.3-696.1, 429.9-429.16)
 - 2) Reasoning refuting a self of persons — 391-408, 209-302 (696.1-716.1, 429.16-443.5)
 - a) Ascertaining the self as not inherently existent — 391-406, 394-398 (696.1-714.1, 429.19-441.19)
 - 1' Stating the example — 394-398, 224-248 (699.1-705.2, 431.17- 435.19)
 - 2' Applying the example to the meaning — 398-406, 262-292 (705.2-714.1, 435.19-441.19)
 - a' Refutation of oneness of self and aggregates (the same) — 398-400, 264-268 (705.4-707.2, 436.5-437.7)
 - b' Refutation of the position that the self and the aggregates are different — 400-401, 269-273 (707.2-708.2, 437.7-438.1)
 - c' How the remaining positions are refuted by these reasonings — 401-406, 273-292 (708.2-714.1, 438.1-441.19)
 - b) Showing that this also establishes the mine as not inherently existent — 406-407, 293-297 (714.1-715.3, 441.19-442.16)
 - c) How this reasoning is applied to other phenomena — 407-408, 297-302 (715.3-716.1, 442.16-443.5)
 - 3) King of reasonings, the reason of dependent-arising, refuting a self of both persons and phenomena — 409-421, 303-337 (716.1-739.2, 443.5-458.9)
 - a) Actual explanation of dependent-arising — 409-421, 303-337 (716.2-730.4, 443.7-452.17)
 - b) How the other reasonings derive from dependent-arising — 421-428, 337-354 (730.4-739.2, 452.17-458.9)

L1: [Notes] :L1

ϕ[The notes are for both the text, and the commentary in the other file]

1. Ichang skya rol pa'i rdo rje. The biographical material is drawn from E. Gene Smith's introduction to N. Gelek Demo, *Collected Works of Thu'u-bkwan Blo-bzang-chos-kyi-nyi-ma* (Delhi, 1969), vol. 1, pp. 2-12, and from a brief biography put together at my request by Geshe Thupten Gyatso of the Tibetan Buddhist Learning Center in New Jersey. The material was further amplified and explained by Khetsun Sangpo Rinbochay, who was visiting the University of Virginia under the auspices of the Center for South Asian Studies. Both Gene Smith and Geshe Thupten Gyatso are condensing Tu-gen-Io-sang-cho-gyi-nyi-ma's long biography of Jang-gya, found in the first volume of his *Collected Works*, which is 414 pages (827 sides) in length and is divided into twenty-five chapters. It need not be mentioned that the biography does not provide unbiased evidence for the events of this period and that it

certainly is written with the intent of glorifying Jang-gya's life; nevertheless, there is no denying his tremendous accomplishments at the Chinese court.

Another biography of Jang-gya, authored by his younger brother Chu-sang Nga-wang-tup-den-wang-chuk (chu bzang ngag dbang thub bstan dbang phyug, born 1736) in 1787, found at the beginning of the supplementary volume of the Peking edition of Jang-gya's Collected Works, has been translated by Hans-Rainer Kampfe in *Ni ma'i 'od zerlNaran-u gerel: Die Biographic des 2. Pekingers Leah skya-Qutuqtu Rol pa'i rdo rje (1717-1786)*,

Monumenta Tibetica Historica, Abt. II, Bd. 1, Wissenschaftsverlag, Sankt Augustin, 1976. For an illuminating review article of this, see Samuel M. Grupper, "Manchu Patronage And Tibetan Buddhism During the First Half of the Ch'ing Dynasty", *The Journal of the Tibet Society*, vol. 4, 1984, pp. 47-75. Grupper presents the view that the Manchu allegiance to Tibetan Buddhism during the first half of the Ch'ing dynasty was genuine and not just a technique for holding the loyalty of the Mongolian nobility. Among evidence (see pp. 58-59) not included in this chapter is the fact that an image of the Yung-cheng Emperor, depicted as a lama, was installed at the Sung chu Temple, the Jang-gya residence in Beijing. For additional reading about the inception of Manchu influence, see Tsepon W.D. Shakabpa, *Tibet: A Political History* (rep. New York: Potala Corp., 1984), pp. 140-152.

2. ye shes bstan pa'i sgron me.

3. According to one traditional system of dating, his birth is calculated as being 2632 years after Shakyamuni Buddha's death, which, by that system of calculation, would mean that Shakyamuni's death occurred in 915 B.C., instead of around 483 B.C. as is usually given in accordance with Southern Buddhist calculations.

4. The first month of the Tibeto-Mongolian calendar, which falls in February or March of the Western calendar.

5. nub pad mo'i sde. Khetsun Sangpo pointed out that the district name is clearly Tibetan (by way of Sanskrit for padmo) even though lang gru'u is Chinese.

6. lang gru'u sde bzhi, in the Ba-ri (dpa' ri) region of the Am-do Province of Tibet which the Chinese presently include in Qinghai Province, lang gru'u is not to be confused, as Gene Smith (p. 3) has done, with Ian gru, present-day Lanzhou in Gansu Province, China. Many thanks to Geshe Thupten Gyatso for identifying this.

7. a mdo.

8. tsong kha, a region that includes the birthplace of Dzong-ka-ba (tsong kha pa, 1357-1419), the founder of the Ge-luk-ba order of which Jang-gya was a prominent lama.

9. guru bstan 'dzin.

10. chi kya dpon po.

11. chi kya tshangs pa, the latter being a dialectical form for sngags pa.

12. bu skyid.

13. dgon lung byams pa gling.

14. Ichang skya ngag dbang bio bzang chos Idan, 1642-1714.

15. grags pa bsod nams.

16. thu'u bkvan bio bzang chos kyi nyi ma, 1737-1802.
17. chu bzang bio bzang bstan pa'i rgyal mtshan.
18. ngag dbang chos kyi grag pa bstan pa'i rgyal mtshan.
19. bstan 'dzin ching wang.
20. P. 3.
21. I am using my system of "phonetic" spelling rather than Gene Smith's transliteration which is "Lcang-skya".
22. ngag dbang chos kyi rgya mtsho, 1680-1736. For the third Tu-gen, see n. 1.
23. bsam yas. References for the debate are, as cited in Elizabeth Napper, "Dependent-Arising and Emptiness: A Tibetan Buddhist Interpretation of Madhyamika Philosophy Emphasizing the Compatibility of Emptiness and Conventional Phenomena", (Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1981), n. 40, p. 808:

Paul Demieville, *Le concile de Lhasa: une controverse sur le quietisme entre bouddhiste de l'Inde et de la Chine au VIIIe siecle de l'ere chretienne*, Bibliotheque de l'Institut des Hautes Etudes Chinoises, VII (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale de France, 1952); Giuseppe Tucci, *First Bhavanakrama of Kamalasila*, Minor Buddhist texts, II, Serie Orientale Roma IX, 2 (Rome: IS.M.E.G., 1958; G.W. Huston, *Sources for a History of the bSam yas Debate* (Sankt Augustin: VGH Wissenschaftsverlag, 1980); Yanagida Seizan's "The Li-tai fa-pao chi and the Ch'an Doctrine of Sudden Awakening" in Lai and Lancaster, ed, *Early Ch'an in China and Tibet*, Berkeley Buddhist Studies Series 5 (Berkeley: 1983); and Luis Gomez' "Indian Materials on the Doctrine of Sudden Enlightenment" in *Early Ch'an in China and Tibet*, op. cit., as well as his "The Direct and the Gradual Approaches of Zen Master Mahayana: Fragments of the Teachings of Moho-yen" in Gimello and Gregory, ed, *Studies in Ch'an and Hua-yen* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1983). See Alex Wayman's chapter, "Discursive Thought and the bSam-yas Debate", pp. 44-58, in his *Calming the Mind and Discerning the Real for interesting disagreements with opinions set forth by Demieville and Tucci*.
24. zhi byed pa.
25. pha dam pa sangs rgyas.
26. Gene Smith (p. 4) describes this identification as "a strange flower produced from Lcang-skya's fertile mind".
27. khri chen bio bzang bstan pa'i nyi ma, 1689-1746.
28. skal bzang rgya mtsho.
29. mgar thar.
30. This section on the political situation of the period preceding Jang-gya's mission is drawn from Snellgrove and Richardson, *Cultural History of Tibet*, (New York: Praeger, 1968), pp. 204-220.
31. lha bzang.
32. li thang.

33. sku 'bum.

34. pho lha bsod nams stobs rgyas, 1689-1747. For an account of his life, see K. Dondup, *The Water-Horse and Other Years: a history of 17th and 18th Century Tibet*, (Dharmasala: Library of Tibetan Works and Archives, 1984), pp. 73-100.

35. p. 219.

36. Snellgrove and Richardson, *Cultural History of Tibet*, p. 220.

37. bkra shis Ihun po.

38. bio bzang ye shes, born 1663.

39. tham ka bla ma.

40. bstan 'gyur.

41. bka' 'gyur.

42. dag yig mkhas pa'i byung gnas.

43. dga' Idan byin chags gling. For a description of this institution, see F.D. Lessing, *Yung-Ho-Kung; an iconography of the Lamaist cathedral in Peking*, (Stockholm, 1942).

44. rta tshag rje drung bio bzang dpal Idan.

45. 'phagspa, 1235-1280.

46. See David L. Snellgrove's translation of this tantra in *Hevajra Tantra, Parts I and II*, (London: Oxford University Press, 1959).

47. On the surface, it seems that Tibetan biographers frequently insist on not recognizing individual initiative for change and instead resort to explanations that make a good deal of human history a drama of the descent and intervention of the divine. Divine origins give more authority to institutions, but such exaggeration also seems to pervert the basic Buddhist notion of individual effort. Nevertheless, through a biographer's assumption of manifold perspectives, there remains a strong emphasis on individual effort by highly motivated beings. The extraordinary emphasis on divine intervention may reflect the fecundity of deity yoga, in which meditators rise from a state of dissolution into emptiness as whatever deity they wish. Such play seems present in the ready willingness to identify great personages as incarnations of deities.

48. sku 'bum.

49. btsan po dgon.

50. dkon mchog 'jigs med dbang po, 1728-1791.

51. skal bzang tshe dbang.

52. rin chen Ihun grub.

53. hu thog thu.

54. me gro ru thog.

55. phur bu Icog byams pa rin po che.

56. dpal Idan ye shes, born 1737.

57. gtsang.

58. The biography is called the Fruit Clusters of Wish-Granting Jewels (dpag bsam rin po che'i snye ma).

59. rje btsun dam pa, 1758-1773.

60. ye shes bstan pa'i nyi ma.

61. khri chen ngag dbang mchog Idan.

62. 'jam dpal zhal lung.

63. tshad ma mam 'grel, pramdnarttika.

64. rje btsun chos kyi rgyal mtshan.

65. dben sa pa.

66. lta ba'i gsung mgur.

67. rim Inga gsal sgron.

68. bra sti dge bshes.

69. ke'u tshang.

70. ri bo rise Inga.

71. "Manchu Patronage And Tibetan Buddhism During the First Half of the Ch'ing Dynasty", n. 37, p. 74. In an inscription at the so-called Lama Temple in Beijing, the Ch'ien-lung Emperor, late in his life, defensively explains his patronage of the Ge-luk-ba church, largely in terms of the need to control the Mongols, against criticism that he "over-patronized the Yellow Church". The tone and character of the inscription contrasts sharply with an earlier inscription from the time of the dedication of the temple.

As Ferdinand Lessing says:

~ A world separates this self-justification and philippic against Lamaism from the dedicatory inscription in front of Hall I; there the filial son, the pious friend of the priests, a Chinese Agoka Dharmaraja speaks, here a disappointed monarch perorates, an old man, full of acrimony and acerbity. Nearly half a century has elapsed between the composition of the two documents, almost sixty years of open, and covert warfare, a struggle for power, analogous to that which filled the middle ages in Europe, when emperor and pope fought for supremacy. The Chinese Emperor, in his self-defence, gives us glimpses into that world of ruse and intrigue which, as he supposed, menaced his temporal sway. At last, he thinks, he has won the game: By repulsing the Gurkhas he now enjoys his final triumph, feeling himself to be the saviour of the Yellow Church and simultaneously a good father to all his subjects. He makes an effort to prove that he is not, as his Chinese critics have asserted, a bigotted tool in the hands of the lamas. Far from that, he has acted as a sovereign arbiter who, by his Imperial authority, has put an end to all those sinister intrigues and glaring malpractices, pillorying the names of the conspirators by having them chiselled in stone and preserving them in the very Cathedral of Lamaism in Peking, as a warning to future generations. While the first inscription is permeated by religious

aspiration and couched in poetical diction, this document is conceived in the sober style of the Imperial Chancery.

Undoubtedly, the situation was very complex. See F.D. Lessing, *Yung-Ho-Kung; an iconography of the Lamaist cathedral in Peking*, pp. 61-62.

72. For these, see Gene Smith, Appendix II, pp. 3-7; for a list of Jang-gya's fourteen previous incarnations which includes Se-ra Jay-dzun Chb'-gyi-gyel-tsen (se ra rje btsun chos kyi rgyal mtshan, 1469-1546), as well as an additional list of three including Mar-ba Cho-gyi-Io-dro (mar pa chos kyi blogros, 1012-1097), see Appendix I of the same, pp. 1-2. The third Pan-chen Lama wrote a prayerpetition to the fourteen incarnations, and Gon-chok-jik-may-wang-bo gave short accounts of them in his ngo mtshar dad pa'i Ijon shing.

73. For a complete listing, see Lokesh Chandra, ed., *Materials for a History of Tibetan Literature*, New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture, 1963), Part One, pp. 192-199. One of the eight volumes is a volume of secret works; see p. 199 of the aforementioned work. The following description of Jang-gya's writings is drawn from the same as well as pp. 38-45.

74. See Johannes Schubert, *Tibetische Nationalgrammatik, Das Sum.cu.pa und Rtags.kyi. 'jug.pa des Grosslamas von Peking Rol. pai.rdo.rje* (Leipzig: 1937).

75. Lokesh Chandra (p. 39) reports that the large dictionary was composed in a year by a large staff, being completed by the end of 1742 and that the enumeration of the staff is reported in "Heissig, Blockdrucke, 99 p. 87".

76. As Lokesh Chandra reports (p. 39), the former is reproduced by Sergei Fedorovich Oldenburg in *Bibliotheca Buddhica V* (St. Petersburg, 1903), and the latter is reproduced by Walter Eugen Clark in *Two Lamaistic Pantheons*, vol. I and II (Cambridge, Mass., 1937).

77. The book is called tshad ma'i lam rim or gnyid mo che'i rmi lam gyi rol mtshor shar ba'i bstan bcos ngo mtshar zla ba'i snang brnyan, which Tu-gen reproduces on pp. 679-696 of the biography.

78. grub pa'i mtha'i rnam par bzhag pa gsal bar bshad pa thub bstan Ihun po'i mdzes rgyan. "Meru" is the mountain at the center of this world system in Buddhist cosmology. Three editions have been used:

1 Varanasi: Pleasure of Elegant Sayings Printing Press, 1970; in the notes, this will be called the "Varanasi codex edition".

2 an edition published under the sponsorship of gam bear phan bde legs bshad gling grva tshang dang rgyud rnying slar gso tshogs pa, in the royal year 2109 [n.d.]; since the first sponsor is the Nam-gyel College presently in Dharmasala, India, in the notes it will be called the "Nam-gyel edition".

3 Buddhist Philosophical Systems of Lcah-skya Rol-pahi Rdo-rje, edited by Lokesh Chandra, Sata-pitaka Series (Indo-Asian Literatures), v. 233, (New Delhi, 1977); in the notes, this will be called the "Lokesh Chandra edition".

The first in the list above has been used as the basic edition simply because of its readability. It has been checked primarily against the second in the list and emended as indicated in the notes.

The chapter on the Sutra School has been translated by Anne C. Klein in "Mind and Liberation: The Sautrantika Tenet System in Tibet", (Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1981), and the chapter on the Autonomy School has been translated by Donald S. Lopez jr. in A Study of Svatantrika, (Ithaca: Snow Lion, 1987).

79. grub mtha'i rnam bzhag.

80. P. 6.

81. grub mtha' chen mo, the longer title of which is Explanation of "Tenets", Sun of the Land of Samantabhadra Brilliantly Illuminating All of Our Own and Others' Tenets and the Meaning of the Profound [Emptiness], Ocean of Scripture and Reasoning Fulfilling All Hopes of All Beings (grub mtha'i rnam bshad rang gzhan grub mtha' kun dang zab don mchog tu gsal ba kun bzang zhing gi nyi ma lung rigs rgya mtsho skye dgu'i re ba kun skong), (Musoorie: Dalama, 1962). The section on the Consequence School in Jam-yang-shay-ba's text that corresponds to that of Jang-gya offered in this book is found in my Meditation on Emptiness, (London: Wisdom Publications, 1983), pp. 583-697.

82. rje is often used as a translation equivalent for svami. Just as in rdo rje, rje means the foremost of stones, i.e., a diamond, so here rje refers to a "foremost being", someone at the forefront of all beings.

83. As in rje yah sras "the Foremost Father and [Spiritual] Sons".

84. rje bdag nyid chen po.

85. rje bla ma.

86. rje thams cad mkhyen pa.

87. As in rje thams cad mkhyen pa yab sras "the Foremost Omniscient Father and Sons".

88. As in thams cad mkhyen pa yab sras "the Omniscient Father and Sons".

89. In the section translated in this book, Jang-gya cites, among Dzong-ka-ba's works, his:

- 1 Differentiation of the Interpretable and the Definitive, also called Essence of the Good Explanations, five quotations
- 2 Great Commentary on (Nagarjuna's) "Treatise on the Middle Way", also called Ocean of Reasoning, Explanation of (Nagarjuna's) "Treatise on the Middle Way", five quotations
- 3 Great Exposition of the Stages of the Path to Enlightenment, three quotations.
- 4 Praise of the Supramundane Buddha from the Point of View of Dependent-Arising, three quotations.
- 5 Great Explanation of (Chandrakirti's) "Supplement to (Nagarjuna's) 'Treatise on the Middle Way' "/ Illumination of the Thought, three quotations
- 6 Small Exposition of the Stages of the Path To Enlightenment, two quotations
- 7 Three Principal Aspects of the Path, two quotations.

For the complete Tibetan titles, see the Bibliography. For a complete list of the texts that Jam-yang-shay-ba cites in the corresponding part of his Great Exposition of Tenets, see Meditation on Emptiness, pp. 569-572.

90. The corresponding section in Jam-yang-shay-ba's presentation has 209 quotations (for a listing, see Meditation on Emptiness, pp. 569-572) whereas Jang-gya, as follows, has 111 (including a few references that are not actual quotations):

- 1 Chandrakirti's Supplement to (Nagarjuna's) "Treatise on the Middle Way", twenty-one quotations
- 2 Nagarjuna's Treatise on the Middle Way/ Fundamental Text Called "Wisdom", thirteen quotations
- 3 Nagarjuna's Precious Garland, six quotations
- 4 Chandrakirti's Clear Words, five quotations
- 4 Chandrakirti's Commentary on (Aryadeva's) "Four Hundred", five quotations
- 4 Dzong-ka-ba's Differentiation of the Interpretable and the Definitive/ Essence of the Good Explanations, five quotations
- 4 Dzong-ka-ba's Ocean of Reasoning, Explanation of (Nagarjuna's) "Treatise on the Middle Way"/ Great Commentary on (Nagarjuna's) "Treatise on the Middle Way", five quotations
- 5 Aryadeva's Four Hundred, four quotations
- 5 Buddhapalita Commentary on (Nagarjuna's) "Treatise on the Middle Way", four quotations
- 6 Chandrakirti's Autocommentary on the "Supplement to (Nagarjuna's) 'Treatise on the Middle Way' ", three quotations
- 6 Dzong-ka-ba's Great Exposition of the Stages of the Path to Enlightenment, three quotations
- 6 Dzong-ka-ba's Great Explanation of (Chandrakirti's) "Supplement to (Nagarjuna's) 'Treatise on the Middle Way' "I Illumination of the Thought, three quotations
- 6 Dzong-ka-ba's Praise of the Supramundane Buddha from the Point of View of Dependent-Arising, three quotations
- 7 Dzong-ka-ba's Small Exposition of the Stages of the Path, two quotations
- 7 Nagarjuna's Sixty Stanzas of Reasoning, two quotations
- 7 Shantideva's Engaging in the Bodhisattva Deeds, two quotations
- 7 Superior Sutra of the King of Meditative Stabilizations, two quotations
- 7 Dzong-ka-ba's Three Principal Aspects of the Path, two quotations
- 8 one quotation each:
 - Bhavaviveka's Heart of the Middle Way
 - Dharmakirti's Commentary on (Dignaga's) "Compendium of [Teachings on] Valid Cognition"
 - Gyel-tsap's, Explanation of (Shantideva's) "Engaging in the Bodhisattva Deeds": Entrance of Conqueror Children
 - Kay-drup's Opening the Eyes of the Fortunate
 - Nagarjuna's Praise of the Supramundane
 - Nor-sang-gya-tso
 - Ren-da-wa
 - Shura's (i.e., Ashvaghosha's) Essay on the Stages of Cultivating the Ultimate Mind of Enlightenment
 - Chapter Showing the Three Vows Sutra
 - Superior Sutra of the Sport of Mahjushri
 - Superior Sutra of the Cloud of Jewels
 - Questions of Brahma Sutra
 - Questions of Updli Sutra
 - Perfection of Wisdom Sutra
 - Taming Demons Chapter
 - Ajatashatru Sutra
 - Sutra on the Ten Grounds
- unidentified sutra
 - Questions of Sagaramati Sutra

Questions of Anavatapta, the King of Nagas, Sutra
Descent into Lanka Sutra.

The authors in order of frequency of quotation are:

- 1 Chandrakirti, thirty-four quotations
- 2 Nagarjuna, twenty-three quotations
- 3 Dzong-ka-ba, twenty-three quotations
- 4 Buddha (sutra), fifteen quotations
- 5 Aryadeva, four quotations
- 5 Buddhapalita, four quotations
- 6 Shantideva, two quotations
- 7 Bhavaviveka, Dharmakirti, Gyei-tsap, Kay-drup, Ren-da-wa, and Shura (i.e., Ashvaghosha), one quotation each.

Both Jam-yang-shay-ba and Jang-gya cite Chandrakirti most frequently, thereby indicating the central importance of Chandrakirti in interpreting Nagarjuna's thought. Jam-yang-shay-ba, however, cites Nagarjuna almost three times as often as he cites Dzong-ka-ba whereas Jang-gya cites them an equal number of times.

For both, however, Dzong-ka-ba is the dominant figure; as Jam-yang-shay-ba (Meditation on Emptiness, p. 594, adapted slightly) says:

~ For an unconfused account with respect to what is uncommon [to the Consequence School I, Jam-yang-shay-ba] having taken as valid the good explanations of the three — the great being, the foremost [Dzong-ka-ba who is the] father and his two spiritual sons [Gyel-tsap and Kay-drup], will explain the system of the Consequence School just according to them even though I might not cite them in quotation. For, free from error, they expounded clearly through millions of reasons.

Jang-gya is more explicitly concerned with putting Dzong-ka-ba's reasoned interpretations before his audience.

91. This is his Presentation of Tenets, A Precious Garland (grub pa'i mtha'i rnam par bzhag pa rin po che'i phreng ba), which has been translated by Geshe Lhundup Sopa and Jeffrey Hopkins in Practice and Theory of Tibetan Buddhism, (London: Rider, 1976; second edition, London: Wisdom Publications, 1987). This presentation of the schools of tenets is in a tradition, within Ge-luk-ba, of short presentations by Jay-dzun Cho-gyi-gyel-tsen (rje btsun chos kyi rgyal mtshan, 1469-1546), the Second Dalai Lama Ge-dun-gya-tso (dge 'dun rgya mtsho, 1476-1542), and Drak-ba-shay-drup (grags pa bshad sgrub, co ne ba, 1675-1748); see the bibliography for the book titles.

92. The only other major presentation of tenets within the Ge-luk-ba order was written by Jang-gya's biographer, Tu-gen-Io-sang-cho-gyi-nyi-ma, this being his Mirror of the Good Explanations Showing the Sources and Assertions of All Systems of Tenets (grub mtha' thams cad kyi khungs dang 'dod tshul ston pa legs bshad shel gyi me long), (Sarnath: Chhos Je Lama, 1963); it presents not only the Indian schools but also the Tibetan schools, though in a rather biased way. These texts owe much to a similar presentation of tenets by the great Sa-gya scholar Dak-tsang-shay-rap-rin-chen (stag tshang lo tsd ba shes rab rin chen, born 1405), despite their (especially Jam-yang-shay-ba's) opposition to many of his interpretations. That text is Dak-tsang's Ocean of Good Explanations, Explanation of "Freedom From Extremes Through Understanding All Tenets" (grub mtha' kun shes nas mtha' bral grub pa zhes bya ba'i bstan bcos rnam par bshad pa legs bshad kyi rgya mtsho), (Thimphu:

Kun-bzang-stobs rgyal, 1976). Other examples of the genre are to be found in the Treasury of Tenets, Illuminating the Meaning of All Vehicles (theg pa mtha' dag gi don gsal bar byed pa grub pa'i mtha' rin po che'i mdzod) and Precious Treasury of the Supreme Vehicle (theg pa'i mchog rin po che'i mdzod), (Gangtok, Dodrup Chen Rinpoche, 1969[?]) by the great Nying-ma scholar Long-chen-rap-jam (klong chen rab 'byams/ klong chen dri med 'od zer, 1308-1363).

93. dbu ma thai 'gyur pa, prdsahgika-mddhyamika.

94. For a brief description of the four seals, see Sopa and Hopkins, Practice and Theory of Tibetan Buddhism (London: Rider and Co., 1976), p. 68.

95. grub pa'i mtha', siddhdnta.

96. The term "Lesser Vehicle" (theg dman, hinaydna) has its origin in the writings of Great Vehicle (theg chen, mahaydna) authors and was, of course, not used by those to whom it was ascribed. Substitutes such as "non-Mahayana", "Nikaya Buddhism", and "Theravadayana" have been suggested in order to avoid the pejorative sense of "Lesser". However, "Lesser Vehicle" is a convenient term in this particular context for a type of practice that is seen, in the tradition which provides the perspective of this book, to be surpassed — but not negated — by a higher system of practice. The "Lesser Vehicle" is not despised, most of it being incorporated into the "Great Vehicle". The monks' and nuns' vows are Lesser Vehicle, as is much of the course of study in Ge-luk-ba monastic universities — years of study are put into the topics of Epistemology (tshad ma, pramana), Manifest Knowledge (chos mngon pa, abhidharma), and Discipline ('dul ba, vinaya), all of which are mostly Lesser Vehicle in perspective. ("Lesser Vehicle" and "Low Vehicle" are used interchangeably in this book.)

97. The Tibetan and Sanskrit for the four schools of tenets are:

Great Exposition School (bye brag smra ba, vaibhasika)

Sutra School (mdo sde pa, sautrantika)

Mind Only School (sems tsampa, cittamatra)

Middle Way School (dbu ma pa, madhyamika)

Autonomy School (rangrgyud pa, svatantrika)

Sutra Autonomy School (mdo sde spyod pa dbu ma rang rgyud pa, sautrantikasvatantrikamadhyamika)

Yogic Autonomy School (rnal 'byor spyod pa dbu ma rang rgyud pa, yogacarasvatantrikamadhyamika)

Consequence School (thai 'gyurpa, prdsahgika).

98. As cited in Gon-chok-jik-may-wang-bo's (dkon mchog 'jigs med dbang po, 1728-91) Presentation of Tenets, the Descent into Lanka Sutra (lang kar gshegs pa'i mdo, lankavatarasutra) says:

- ~ My doctrine has two modes,
- ~ Advice and established conclusions.
- ~ To children I speak advice
- ~ And to yogis, established conclusions.

G6n-chok-jik-may-wang-bo himself says:

- ~ The etymology for 'tenet' is: A tenet [literally, an established conclusion] is a meaning which was made firm, decided upon, or established in reliance on scripture and/or reasoning and which, from the perspective of one's mind, will not be forsaken for something

else.

The qualification "from the perspective of one's mind" indicates that, for the proponent at this time, the tenet is a decided conclusion; the qualification allows for changing one's mind and switching tenets later. See his *Presentation of Tenets, A Precious Garland* (grub pa'i mtha'i mam par bzhag pa rin po che'i phreng ba), translated by Geshe Lhundup Sopa and Jeffrey Hopkins in *Practice and Theory of Tibetan Buddhism*, p. 53, translation adjusted.

99. rang rgyud kyi sbyor ba, svatantraprayoga. Often, the pervasion, or major premise, is not explicitly expressed, as in, "The subject, a pot, is impermanent because of being a product — for example, a sound." Roughly speaking, the pervasion, or major premise, is: whatever is a product is necessarily impermanent. Since it is not explicitly expressed, the above statement is technically not a syllogism but an enthymeme, an argument containing one or more suppressed premises; however, as it is implicit in the above statement and the more formal Buddhist format does include such, the term "syllogism" is used here. See Daniel Perdue, "Practice and Theory of Philosophical Debate in Tibetan Buddhist Education" (Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1983), p. 1170; Perdue's massive and important work is forthcoming from Wisdom Publications, London.

100. thai 'gyur, prasahga.

101. tsongkhapa, 1357-1419.

102. zhi gnas, samatha.

103. tshogs lam, sambharamarga.

104. See the Fifth Dalai Lama's description of this in my forthcoming *Deity Yoga* (London: Wisdom Publications), chapter one. This is currently available in "Practice of Emptiness", trans. by Jeffrey Hopkins, (Dharmasala: Library of Tibetan Works and Archives, 1974), p. 10. The text itself is Nga-wang-lo-sang-gya-tso (ngag dbang bio bzang rgya mtsho, 1617-1682), *Instruction on the Stages of the Path to Enlightenment, Sacred Word of Manjushri* (byang chub lam gyi rim pa'i khrid yig 'jam pa'i dbyangs kyi zhal lung), (Thimphu, Bhutan: kun bzang stobs rgyal, 1976).

105. rise or rtsal.

106. tshig gsal, prasannapadd; for editions and translations, see the Bibliography. For the context of this quote, see *Meditation on Emptiness*, p. 526.

107. The bracketed addition is taken from the Four Interwoven Commentaries on (Dzong-ka-ba's) "Great Exposition of the Stages of the Path" (The Lam rim chen mo of the incomparable Tsong-kha-pa, with the interlineal notes of Ba-so Chos-kyi-rgyal-mtshan, Sde-drug Mkhan-chen Ngag-dbang-rab-rtan, 'Jam-dbyangs-bzhad-pa'i-rdo-rje, and Bra-sti Dge-bshes Rin-chen-don-grub, New Delhi: Chos-'phel-legs-ldan, 1972), 592.2. With respect to "who do not know suchness" the Sanskrit (Poussin, 36.1) is merely tadanabhijna "who do not know that [or those, which could refer to 'the definitions']" whereas the Tibetan reads de kho na mi shes pa'i "who do not know suchness". The Four Interwoven Commentaries (592.3) takes it even further: chos kyi de kho na nyid ma shes pa'i "who do not know the suchness of phenomena". I have followed the Tibetan as it presumably reflects a reading of tad as meaning tattva (see Poussin, p. 36, n. 3) by the translators. The "Poussin" references are to: Chandrakirti, *Mulamadhyamakakarikas de Nagarjuna avec la Prasannapadd Commentaire de Candrakirti* publiee par Louis de la Vallee Poussin, *Bibliotheca Buddhica* IV, (Osnabrlick:

Biblio Verlag, 1970).

108. The Four Hundred (bstan bcos bzhi brgya pa zhes by a ba'i tshig le'ur by as pa, catuhsatakasdrakarika), VIII. 19. For the context, see Karen Lang, "Aryadeva on the Bodhisattva's Cultivation of Merit and Knowledge", (Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1983), p. 320. See also the Four Interwoven Commentaries, 590.2; the passage is cited in Meditation on Emptiness, p. 837 n. 458.

109. For the context of this quote, see Meditation on Emptiness, p. 525.

110. dbu ma la 'jug pa'i bshad pal dbu ma la 'jug pa'i rang 'grel, madhyamakavatahdsya. For editions and translations, see the Bibliography.

111. Treatise on the Middle Way/ Fundamental Treatise on the Middle Way, Called "Wisdom" (dbu ma'i bstan bcos/ dbu ma rtsa ba'i tshig le'ur byas pa shes rab ces bya ba, madhyamakasdra/ prajnanamulamadhyamakakarika). For editions and translations, see the Bibliography.

112. In dbu ma la 'jug pa (madhaymakavatara), 'jug pa (avatara) is seen by some Tibetan scholars as meaning "add on" and hence "supplement". The basic meaning of the word is "enter", and thus in such titles other Tibetan scholars and most, if not all, Western scholars take the term to mean "introduction". For detailed discussion of my translation of madhyamakavatara as Supplement to the "Treatise on the Middle Way", see my Meditation on Emptiness, pp. 462-9 and 866-9.

113. rgyal po la gtam bya ba rin po che'i phreng ba, rajaparikatharatnavali.

114. mdo kun las btus pa, sutrasamuccaya.

115. See Nagarjuna's description of the ten grounds in Nagarjuna and Kaysang Gyatso, Precious Garland and the Song of the Four Mindfulnesses, (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1975), pp. 84-7, stanzas 440-461b.

116. rje btsun chos kyi rgyal mtshan, 1469-1546. See his A Good Explanation Adorning the Throats of the Fortunate: A General Meaning Commentary Clarifying Difficult Points in (Dzong-ka-ba's) "Illumination of the Thought: An Explanation of (Chandrakirti's) 'Supplement to (Nagarjuna's) 'Treatise on the Middle Way' (bstan bcos dbu ma la 'jug pa'i rnam bshad dgongs pa rab gsal gyi dka' gnad gsal bar byed pa'i spyi don legs bshad skal bzang mgul rgyan), Collected Works, (n.p.d. [Se-ra Jay College publication in India in early 1980's]), vol. ma 9a.5-11b.5, especially 11a.2.

117. byes.

118. se rva.

119. 'jam dbyangs bzhad pa, 1648-1721. See his Great Exposition of the Middle Way I Analysis of (Chandrakirti's) "Supplement to (Nagarjuna's) 'Treatise on the Middle Way' ", Treasury of Scripture and Reasoning, Thoroughly Illuminating the Profound Meaning [of Emptiness], Entrance for the Fortunate (dbu ma chen mo/ dbu ma 'jug pa'i mtha' dpyod lung rigs gter mdzod zab don kun gsal skal bzang 'jug ngogs), (Buxaduor: Go-mang, 1967), 6a.lff.

120. sgo mang.

121. 'bras spungs.

122. mngon par nogs pa'i rgyan, abhisamaydlamkara. For this point, see Jam-yang-shay-ba's Great Exposition of the Middle Way 7b.5.

123. The two bracketed additions are from Geshe Rabten, Annotations For the Difficult Points of (Dzong-ka-ba's) "Essence of the Good Explanations", Joyous Festival For The Unbiased With Clear Awareness (drang nges mam 'byed legs bshad snying po dka' gnad mams mchan bur bkod pa gzur gnas bio gsal dga' ston), (n.p.d. [edition in India in the early 1970's]), 271.1. For Robert A.F. Thurman's translation of this passage, see his *Essence of True Eloquence* (Princeton: 1984), p. 289. For more context, see the next note.

124. legs bshad snying po, (Varanasi, 1973), 140.20; the bracketed additions are taken from Geshe Rabten, Annotations, 272.5-272.6. With more context, the citation reads:

[Chandrakirti] describes his own system as not shared with the commentaries [on Nagarjuna's thought] by other Proponents of the Middle Way. His Autocommentary on the "Supplement to (Nagarjuna's) 'Treatise on the Middle Way' " says:

~ May scholars ascertain that just as, except for Nagarjuna's Treatise on the Middle Way, this doctrine called "emptiness" is not expressed non-erroneously in other treatises, so the system which appears in this [treatise] — set out together with objections and answers to any [other] system — does not exist, in terms of the doctrine of emptiness, in other treatises. Therefore, it should be understood that a certain [scholar's] propounding that just what is propounded as ultimate in the system of the Sutra School is asserted as conventional by the Proponents of the Middle Way is a proposition [made] only by one who does not know the suchness of Nagarjuna's Treatise on the Middle Way.

At the end of saying this, Chandrakirti also says with respect to the system of Great Exposition School:

This is because a supramundane doctrine is not fit to be similar to a mundane doctrine. Scholars should ascertain, "This system is uncommon."

Through the reason of his own system's not being shared with other Proponents of the Middle Way, he posits that one who asserts that what are propounded as ultimate by the two Proponents of [Truly Existent External] Objects [i.e., the Great Exposition School and the Sutra School] are propounded as conventionalities by the Proponents of the Middle Way does not know the Middle Way suchness. The reason is that in his own system, phenomena that are established by way of their own character are not asserted even conventionally, whereas those [phenomena presented in the two systems propounding truly existent external objects] are only posited in the context of that [establishment of objects by way of their own character].

For Robert Thurman's translation of this passage, see his *Tsong Khapa's Speech of Gold in the Essence of True Eloquence*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984), pp. 288-9.

125. kun gzhi rnam shes, alayavijnana.

126. don dam pa byang chub kyi sems bsgom pa'i rim payi ger bris pa, paramarthabodhicittabhavanakramavarnasamgraha, P5431, vol. 103 246.5.2. The passage is cited in *Meditation on Emptiness*, pp. 586-7; see also p. 857 n. 504. The Peking edition wrongly reads stong pa gnyis instead of stong pa nyid. The brackets are from Nga-wang-bel-den (ngag dbang dpal Idan, born 1797), Annotations for (Jam-yang-shay-ba's) "Great Exposition of Tenets", *Freeing the Knots of the Difficult Points, Precious Jewel of Clear Thought* (grub

mtha' chen mo'i mchan 'grel dka' gnad mdud grol bio gsal gees nor), (Sarnath: Pleasure of Elegant Sayings Press, 1964), dbu 59b.4-7, which confirms the latter reading as does Jang-gya, 409.10. Ngawang-bel-den says that since Buddha's teaching that all phenomena are selfless cannot be defeated by any opponent, his teaching was proclaimed like the great roar of a lion (whose roar no other animal dares to answer).

The Tibetan scholars with whom I have worked have identified Shura (dpa' bo) as Ashvaghosha. For references to controversy about this, see D.S. Ruegg's *The Literature of the Madhyamaka School of Philosophy in India* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrasowitz, 1981), 119-21.

For a very thorough discussion of the usage of the term "Thoroughly Non-Abiding Proponents of the Middle Way School" for Consequentialists and "Reason-Established Illusionists" for the Autonomists, see Appendix One in Elizabeth Napper, "Dependent-Arising and Emptiness: A Tibetan Buddhist Interpretation of Madhyamika Philosophy Emphasizing the Compatibility of Emptiness and Conventional Phenomena", pp. 576-631.

127. rgyal tshab dar ma rin chen, 1364-1432; mkhas sgrub dge legs dpal bzangpo, 1385-1438.

128. Guy M. Newland is translating the section on the two truths; Jules B. Levinson, on the path; and S. Brian Daley, on the fruits of the path.

129. bio gnod med la snang ba'i dbang gis bzhag pa ma yin par rang gi thun mong ma yin pa'i sdod lugs kyi ngos nas grub pa.

130. See pp. 178-191 of the Tibetan.

131. See *Meditation on Emptiness*, pp. 303-304, and Jam-yang-shay-ba's *Great Exposition of the Middle Way*, 179b.5ff.

132. This was the speculation of the late Go-mang scholar Geshe Gedun Lodro, who taught in his later years at the University of Hamburg.

133. mdo sde spyod pa'i dbu ma rang rgyud pa, sautrantikasvatantrikamadhyamika.

134. rnal 'byor spyod pa'i dbu ma rang rgyud pa, yogacarasvatantrikamadhyamika.

135. rang rgyal, pratyekabuddha.

136. byang chub sems dpa'i mal 'byor spyod pa bzhi brgya pa, bodhisattvayogacaracatuhsataka, VIII. 16. The title is cited this way in Chandrakirti's *Commentary on (Aryadeva's) "Four Hundred"* (byang chub sems dpa'i rnal 'byor spyod pa bzhi brgya pa'i rgya cher 'grelpa, bodhisattvayogacaracatuhsatakakd), Vol. 8 (No. 3865) of the sDe dge Tibetan Tripitaka — bsTan hgyur preserved at the Faculty of Letters, University of Tokyo, Tokyo, 1979. For the context, see Karen Lang, "Aryadeva on the Bodhisattva's Cultivation of Merit and Knowledge", (Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1983), p. 318.

136a. 35ab. The second line reads either de srid de las or de srid de la; the first reading is as given in the citation; the second would read:

As long as the aggregates are [misconceived, For that [person] there is [misconception of an I.

Both readings are seen as showing that a consciousness conceiving the inherent existence of the aggregates serves as a cause of a consciousness conceiving that a person inherently exists. In stanzas 29-32, Nagarjuna speaks of the mental and physical aggregates as arising

from misconception of I, but this does not contradict the above explanation because in these stanzas he is speaking about the mental and physical aggregates of a lifetime in cyclic existence as being produced from ignorance of the nature of the self, whereas in these two lines he is speaking about the consciousness conceiving the inherent existence of the I as being caused by the consciousness conceiving of the inherent existence of the aggregates.

137. shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa, prajnaparamita.

138. The Tibetan word for "true existence" here is *dnegos po*, which is usually translated as "thing" but is accepted as meaning *bden par grub pa* in certain contexts. For extended discussion of this, see Elizabeth Napper, "Dependent-Arising and Emptiness: A Tibetan Buddhist Interpretation of Madhyamika Philosophy Emphasizing the Compatibility of Emptiness and Conventional Phenomena", (Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1981), p. 83 and n. 87.

139. *byang chub sems dpa'i spyod pa la 'jug pa, bodhi [sattva] caryavatara*, IX. 41cd. This is cited in Dzong-ka-ba's *Illumination of the Thought (dgongs pa rab gsal)*; see *Compassion in Tibetan Buddhism*, (London: Rider and Co., 1980), p. 155.

140. *nyon mongs, klesa*.

141. *stong gzhi*.

142. *chos, dharma*.

143. VI. 179. Bracketed material is from Dzong-ka-ba, *Illumination of the Thought, Extensive Explanation of (Chandrakirti's) "Supplement to (Nagarjuna's) 'Treatise on the Middle Way' "* (*dbu ma la 'jug pa'i rgya cher bshad pa dgongs pa rab gsal*), (Dharmasala: *Shes rig par khang* edition, n.d.), 228.19.

144. This is with the significant exception that, according to *Nga-wang-bel-den*, even Dzong-ka-ba holds that in inferential realization of emptiness, the subject can still appear. See n. 580 and n. 581 in Elizabeth Napper, "Dependent-Arising and Emptiness: A Tibetan Buddhist Interpretation of Madhyamika Philosophy Emphasizing the Compatibility of Emptiness and Conventional Phenomena"; in n. 580 Napper refers to:

... *Nga-wang-bel-den's Presentation of the Grounds and Paths of Mantra (sngags kyi sa lam)*, (*rgyud smad par khang* edition, no other data), 10.2, where he says, "... it must be asserted that the conceptual reasoning consciousness that realizes emptiness perceives the subject — the basis of emptiness ..." and cites as his reason the fact that such is stated in Dzong-ka-ba's *Ocean of Reasoning, Explanation of (Nagarjuna's) "Treatise on the Middle Way"* and *Great Exposition of the Stages of the Path*. *Nga-wang-bel-den* cites those passages from Dzong-ka-ba in his *Presentation of the Two Truths*, 216.5-218.4; the first portion of the passage from the *Great Exposition* is given in the next note.

145. *Fundamental Treatise on the Middle Way Called "Wisdom"* (*dbu ma rtsa ba'i tshig le'ur byas pa shes rab ces bya ba, prajnanamulamadhyamakakarika*), XIII. 1. This is cited by Chandrakirti in his *Clear Words* (P5260, Vol. 98 8.1.8); for the Sanskrit, see Chandrakirti, *Mulamadhyamakakarikas de Nagarjuna avec la Prasannapadd Commentaire de Candrakirti publiee par Louis de la Vallee Poussin, Bibliotheca Buddhica IV*, (Osnabruck: Biblio Verlag, 1970), 42.10.

146. *rang bzhin, svabhava*.

147. *brtag pa mtha' bzung*.

148. rang ngos nas grub pa, yul steng nas grub pa, rang gi mtshan nyid kyis grub pa, don dam par grub pa, gdags gzhi'i steng nas grub pa, de kho na nyid du grub pa, yang dag par grub pa, khyod khyod kyis gnas lugs su grub pa, rang gi ngo bos grub pa.

149. yod pa (sat) and grub pa (siddhi).

150. bden par grub pa, don dam par grub pa, yang dag par grub pa.

151. rang bzhin gyis grub pa, rang gi mtshan nyid kyis grub pa, rang gi ngo bos grub pa.

152. rang dbang ba'i ngo bo.

153. rang rgyud, svatantra.

154. rang dbang, svairi; for the Sanskrit, see Jam-yang-shay-ba's Great Exposition of Tenets, ca 61a.l.

155. For a description of the three modes of a reason, see chapter two.

156. XIV.23; P5246, vol. 95 139.2.7. Brackets are from Chandrakirti's commentary, P5266, vol. 98 270.3.6.

157. See previous note; translated in context, the passage, as taken from Meditation on Emptiness, p. 632, is:

Here, that which has its own intrinsic existence, has inherent existence, has its own power, or has no dependence on another would exist by itself; therefore, it would not be a dependent-arising.

158. bio, buddhi/mati.

159. nog pa, kalpand.

160. P5246, vol. 95 136.2.1, VIII.3. Brackets are from Chandrakirti's commentary (P5266, vol. 98 229.5.3). This is cited by Jam-yang-shay-ba in his Great Exposition of Tenets; see Meditation on Emptiness, p. 627.

161. P5166, vol. 98 229.5.3, commenting on VIII.3. This is cited by Jam-yang-shay-ba in his Great Exposition of Tenets; see Meditation on Emptiness, p. 627.

162. This issue is addressed by the Fifth Dalai Lama, Nga-wang-Lo-sang-gya-tso (ngag dbang bio bzang rgya mtsho, 1617-1682), in his Instruction on the Stages of the Path to Enlightenment, Sacred Word of Manjushri (byang chub lam gyi rim pa'i khrid yig 'jam pa'i dbyangs kyis zhal lung) in terms of how the I is conceived:

Furthermore, consciousnesses innately conceiving I — which conceive an I or self based on the [nominally existent] person — are of three types:

-- 1 A conceptual consciousness [correctly] conceiving I which exists in a person who has generated the Middle Way view in his/her mental continuum. This consciousness [correctly] conceives of an I qualified as being only designated in the context of its basis of designation [mind and body].

-- 2 An actual innate [consciousness misconceiving an I qualified as being inherently existent. It is to be overcome through its antidote here on this occasion [of the path of wisdom].

-- 3 A conventional validly cognizing consciousness which establishes [the existence of] I. This consciousness exists [for example] in the continuums of those common beings whose

mental continuums have not been affected by systems of tenets and who thus do not differentiate between nominal imputation and inherent existence. In this case, the I is not qualified as being either nominally imputed or inherently existent.

For an English translation, see J. Hopkins, "Practice of Emptiness", (Dharamsala: Library of Tibetan Works and Archives, 1974), p. 10. A revised translation, from which the above quotation is taken, is forthcoming in my Deity Yoga (London: Wisdom Publications).

163. 'khrul ba and ma 'khrul ba.

164. phyin ci log pa and phyin ci ma log pa.

165' Nying-ma (mying ma), Ga-gyu (bka' rgyud), Sa-gya (sa sky a), and Ge-luk (dge lugs).

166. chos nyid kyi klong chen po gcig.

167. Literally (412.11), "as an illustration of a snake" (sprul gyi mtshan gzhir).

168. Literally (412.15), "as an illustration of that I" (nga de'i mtshan gzhir).

169. This is reported in the colophon to Chandrakirti's Clear Words; in the Tibetan Publishing House, 1968, edition, see 505.2.

170. nye ba 'khor gyis zhus pa, updlipariprecha. This passage is cited in Chandrakirti's Clear Words at the end of the eighth chapter; see Poussin, 191.6.

171. ting nge 'dzin rgyal po, samddhiraja.

172. Stanza 99.

173. 114bcd.

174. las, karma.

175. 'jig tshogs la Ita ba, satkdyadrsti.

176. See Meditation on Emptiness, pp. 679-680; for more discussion, see Meditation on Emptiness, n. 739, pp. 888-890.

177. See Meditation on Emptiness, pp. 685.

178. Oral teachings. A translation of his lectures of the three principal aspects of the path can be found in the first part of Compassion in Tibetan Buddhism (rpt. Ithaca: Snow Lion, 1985).

179. See the chapter on the Consequence School in Dak-tsang Shay-rap-rin-chen, Ocean of Good Explanations, Explanation of "Freedom From Extremes Through Understanding All Tenets," 277.3ff.

180. nges don, nitdrtha.

181. drang don, neyartha. The term term drang in drang don has the same spelling as drang po, meaning "honest" or "direct", but it can be seen from the Sanskrit neya, which is the gerundive derived from the verbal root ni meaning "to lead", that the Tibetan is derived from the verb 'dren, meaning "to lead", the past form being drang or drangs. As Jam-yang-shay-ba points out (see Meditation on Emptiness, p. 600), that which is being led is not trainees but the subject matter of texts — the subject matter requires

interpretation.

182. In the Varanasi codex edition, for thob pa la yang dag (417.4) read thob pa la yang gang zag dang chos la bdag med pa'i de kho na nyid nges par nogs dgos pa sher phyogs kyi mdo'i dgongs pa yin lei shes rab kyi pha ml tu phyin pa'i lung las dngos po'i 'du shes can la thar pa med par gsungs pa dang dus gsum gyi yang dag in accordance with the Nam-gyel edition 458.4.

183. dngos po, bhava. This term usually means "that which is able to perform a function" (don byed nus pa) and thus strictly refers to impermanent things, but more loosely it can also refer to any phenomenon, permanent or impermanent. Here, however, it is taken as referring to true existence (bden par grub pa, satyasiddhi). For discussion of these usages, see n. 138.

184. rigs pa drug cu pa'i tshig le'ur byas pa, yuktisastikakarika, 4ab. For the edited Tibetan with Sanskrit fragments and English translation, see Chr. Lindtner in Nagarjuniana, Indiske Studier 4, (Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag, 1982), pp. 100-119.

185. mngon mtho, abhyudaya. For discussion of "high status" and "definite goodness", see the first chapter of Nagarjuna's Precious Garland.

186. nges legs, naihsreyasa.

187. Stanza 35. The text, which gives only the first line and "and so forth" (sogs), has been expanded.

188. med dgag, prasajyapratishedha. The Tibetan and Sanskrit for "affirming negative" are ma yin dgag, paryudasapratishedha. For the various types of these, see Meditation on Emptiness, pp. 723-725.

189. Tenzin Gyatso, The Buddhism of Tibet and The Key to the Middle Way (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1975), p. 77. This book has been reprinted in a combined volume, which also includes a translation of Nagarjuna's Precious Garland, entitled The Buddhism of Tibet, (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1983).

190. snang yul.

191. 'jug yul.

192. There are many interpretations of this dictum among Ge-luk-ba scholars. Some posit that manifest and subliminal mental consciousnesses can occur simultaneously; others posit that mental consciousnesses of different but not opposite modes of apprehension can occur simultaneously. See Nga-wang-bel-den (ngag dbang dpal Idan, b. 1797), Stating the Mode of Explanation in the Textbooks on the Middle Way and the Perfection of Wisdom in the Lo-sel-ling and Go-mang Colleges: Festival For Those of Clear Intelligence (bio gsal gling dang bkra shis sgo mang grva tshang gi dbu phar gyiyig cha'i bshad tshul bkod pa bio gsal dga' ston), Collected Works, (New Delhi: Gurudeva, 1983), vol. ga, 461.4ff.

193. Geshe Gedun Lodro treated this topic in some detail during a series of lectures at the University of Virginia in 1979.

194. Ikog gyur, paroksa.

195. See Geshe Lhundup Sopa and Jeffrey Hopkins, Practice and Theory of Tibetan Buddhism (London: Rider and Co., 1976), p. 38.

196. This is from Chandrakirti's Supplement to (Nagarjuna's) "Treatise on the Middle Way" (VI.116ab). The stanza goes on to say:

- When [the conception of an inherently existent] phenomenon does not exist,
- These [extreme conceptions] do not arise, just as there is no fire when there is no fuel.

The bracketed additions are from Dzong-ka-ba's Illumination of the Thought, P6143, vol. 154 81.1.5ff.

197. A reason, such as the presence of smoke, can prove a predicate, such as the presence of fire, because the predicate (the presence of fire) pervades the reason (the presence of smoke); thus, the presence of the reason can serve as a sign of the presence of the predicate. The reason is the proof (prover), but the predicate is the pervader.

198. 'phags pa 'jam dpal ram par rol pa'i mdo, dryamanjusrivikridita.

199. IX.37.

200. 'phags pa dkon mchog sprin, dryaratnamegha.

201. tshangs pas zhus pa, brahmdpariprcchd.

202. dbu ma rtsa ba'i 'grepa buddha pd li la, Buddhapalitamulamadhyamakavrtti. For an edited Tibetan edition of chapters 1-12, see Max Walleiser, Bibliotheca Buddhica XVI, (Osnabrück: Biblio Verlag, 1970). For an English translation of chapter 1, see Judit Feher, in Louis Ligeti, ed., Tibetan and Buddhist Studies Commemorating the 200th Anniversary of the Birth of Alexander Csoma de K'oros, Vol. 1, (Budapest: Akademiai Kiado, 1984), pp. 211-240. For an English translation of chapter 18, see Chr. Lindtner in Indo-Iranian Journal 23 (1981), pp. 187-217.

203. VI.11Sab.

204. In the Varanasi codex edition (420.18) read dpang par for dbangpor in accordance with the Lokesh Chandra edition (682.2).

205. Stanza 77.

206. See the Dalai Lama's explanation of this in Tenzin Gyatso, The Buddhism of Tibet and The Key to the Middle Way (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1975), pp. 80-82. See also my introduction to The Kalachakra Tantra: Rite of Initiation for the Stage of Generation, (London: Wisdom Publications, 1985), p. 21.

207. In the Varanasi codex edition (420.18) read thos for thob in accordance with the Nam-gyel edition (462.5).

208. In the Varanasi codex edition (420.20) read phong ba for phong pa; the Nam-gyel edition (462.5) reads bong ba.

209. Aryadeva's Four Hundred, VIII.5. For the context, see Karen Lang, "Aryadeva on the Bodhisattva's Cultivation of Merit and Knowledge", p. 311.

210. See Lati Rinbochay and Elizabeth Napper, Mind in Tibetan Buddhism (London: Rider and Company, 1980), p. 24, 106-109.

211. Colophon of Chandrakirti's Clear Words, stanza 8cd, P5260, Vol. 98 92.1.7. For the Sanskrit see J.W. de Jong's very helpful article on this Colophon, missing in Poussin's edition of Chandrakirti's Clear Words, "La Madhyamakasastrastuti de Candrakirti" in Oriens

Extremus, Jahrg. 9, 1962, pp. 47-56 (reprinted in J.W. De Jong Buddhist Studies, pp. 541-50 [Rep. of China: Asian Humanities Press, 1979]).

212. bdud 'dul ba'i le'u.

213. ma skyes dgra'i mdo, ajatasatrusutra; for a more complete title, see the Bibliography.

214. mtshams med pa'i las kyi sgrib pa, literally, "karmic obstruction of immediate [retribution]". These are any of the five deeds of killing one's father, killing one's mother, killing a Foe Destroyer, causing blood to flow from the body of a Buddha with evil intent, and causing dissension in the spiritual community.

215. This is Dzong-ka-ba's Essence of the Good Explanations, the section identifying the main reasonings in the Consequence School. For Robert A.F. Thurman's translation, see his Essence of True Eloquence, p. 364.

216. sa bcu pa'i mdo, dasabhumika. See chapter six in M. Honda, "An Annotated Translation of the 'Dasabhumika' ", in D. Sinor, ed, Studies in Southeast and Central Asia, Satapitaka Series 74. (New Delhi: 1968), pp. 115-276. For a brief discussion of the ten samenesses, see Meditation on Emptiness, pp. 131-133.

217. This is the first stanza of the first chapter, not counting the expression of worship. Jang-gya gives merely the first line and "et cetera" (sags).

218. VI.8-119.

219. For Robert A.F. Thurman's translation, see his Essence of True Eloquence, p. 365.

220. VI. 160. The bracketed additions are drawn from Dzong-ka-ba, Illumination of the Thought, Extensive Explanation of (Chandrakirti's) "Supplement to (Nagarjuna's) 'Treatise on the Middle Way' " (dbu ma la 'jug pa'i rgya cher bshad pa dgongs pa rab gsal), (Dharamsala: Shes rig par khang edition, n.d.), 218.14-. 19.

221. For Robert A.F. Thurman's translation, see his Essence of True Eloquence, p. 366.

222. Chandrakirti's Supplement to (Nagarjuna's) "Treatise on the Middle Way" VI. 115. The bracketed additions are drawn from Dzong-ka-ba's Illumination of the Thought, 91.2-.6. Notice that Chandrakirti speaks of cutting through the nets of bad views, not of all views in general.

223. lam nm chung ngu, P6002, Vol. 152-3. See "The Middle Transcendent Insight" in Life and Teachings of Tsong Khapa, Robert A.F. Thurman, ed. (Dharmasala, Library of Tibetan Works and Archives, 1982), pp. 131-135.

224. The text (424.5) reads "in common" (thun mong du) which means that the reasoning of dependent-arising refutes a self of both persons and phenomena, and thus it has been translated this way.

225. With respect to the term for "diamond fragments", rdo rje gzegs ma, Kensur Lekden (1900-1971), an abbot of the Tantric College of Lower Hla-sa, said that this reasoning is called the "diamond fragments" because each of the four reasons is capable of overcoming a conception of inherent existence just as a piece of a diamond has the hardness and so forth of a diamond. Thus, gzegs ma (kana) means "piece"; hence my earlier translation as "sliver" is perhaps insufficient because it could suggest a weak, thin piece and not a fully functioning fragment. According to Apte, the Sanskrit term also means "facet"; this would

seem to be most appropriate when speaking of diamonds (and more appropriate to the meaning since each of the four reasons alone actually is not capable" of refuting inherent existence); however, none of my Tibetan sources, oral or written, has explained it this way. The oral traditions that I have contacted are by no means always accurate; nevertheless, when put together, the various oral strains are quite full, and no Tibetan scholar to date has given this interpretation (one said that gzegs ma refers to the points of a vajra). As mentioned above, a problem with the interpretation as fully functioning fragments is that each the four parts of the reasoning, taken alone, cannot refute inherent existence although it appears that the second of the four can.

226. I.I.

227. This section on positive and negative theses is drawn from Meditation on Emptiness, pp. 472-473; the material there is drawn from Jam-yang-shay-ba's Great Exposition of the Middle Way, 273b.1-2, and from Dzong-ka-ba's Great Exposition of the Stages of the Path, P6001, Vol. 152 156.2.2ff.

228. VI.8c-9b. P5262, vol. 98 101.3.4. For Chandrakirti's own commentary, see P5263, vol. 98 120.3.4ff. Louis de la Vallee Poussin's translation of the section on production from self is in Museon, n.s., v.11, pp. 280.4.

229. Tenzin Gyatso, The Buddhism of Tibet and The Key to the Middle Way, p. 68.

230. In the Varanasi codex edition (425.-4) read pas myu gu myu gu for pas myu gu in accordance with the Nam-gyel edition (468.1).

231. rang bzhin, prakrti.

232. mam rol, iila. "Sport" or "play" here does not carry the sense that emptiness somehow enjoys its "manifestations".

233. Practice and Theory of Tibetan Buddhism, p. 41.

234. For these reasonings, see Meditation on Emptiness, pp. 640-643, 58, and 136-139.

235. Chandrakirti's Supplement to (Nagarjuna's) "Treatise on the Middle Way", VI.32. Louis de la Vallee Poussin's translation of the section on production from other is in Museon, n.s., v.11, p. 309.

236. Dzong-ka-ba's Illumination of the Thought, 113, last line.

237. XX 20cd. This is quoted in Chandrakirti's Autocommentary on the "Supplement to (Nagarjuna's) 'Treatise on the Middle Way' ", commenting on VI.14ab. For more on the reasonings refuting production from other, see Meditation on Emptiness, pp. 643-648, 58, 140-148.

238. Chandrakirti's Supplement to (Nagarjuna's) "Treatise on the Middle Way", VI. 14. Louis de la Vallee Poussin's translation of the section on production from other is in Museon, n.s., v.11, p. 286ff.

239. VI.19d.

240. In the Varanasi codex edition (427.20) read phra la don for bral don in accordance with the Nam-gyel edition (470.3).

241. VI.32d.

242. Nagarjuna's Precious Garland, 48a.
243. VI.98ab. Louis de la Vallee Poussin's translation is in *Museon*, n.s., v.12, p. 256, which misnumbers the two lines as 95ab.
244. For a discussion of the names of this school, etc., see *Meditation on Emptiness*, pp. 327-330.
245. Chandrakirti's Supplement to (Nagarjuna's) "Treatise on the Middle Way", VI.99. Louis de la Vallee Poussin's translation is in *Museon*, n.s., v. 12, p. 239.
246. The text (429.2) gives just the first line and "etc."
247. For a discussion of Jam-yang-shay-ba's emphasis on the introductory and concluding remarks, see *Meditation on Emptiness*, p. 461; for a discussion of the general topic, see pp. 441-530.
248. mtha' bzhi skye 'gog.
249. rdo rje gzegs ma.
250. yod med skye 'gog.
251. mu bzhi skye 'gog.
252. snang yul.
253. rab tu Toyed pa lagpa'i tshad kyi tshig le'ur byaspa, hastavalaprakaranakarika. For speculation on the title, see *Meditation on Emptiness*, p. 863 n. 519.
254. For discussion of this reasoning, see *Meditation on Emptiness*, pp. 63-64, 155-160, and 653-658.
255. rkyen, usually translated as "conditions".
256. See *Meditation on Emptiness*, pp. 61-63, 151-154, and 651-653.
257. dmigsyul.
258. snang yul.
259. zhen yul.
260. For the evidence that Jam-yang-shay-ba cites for this claim that Autonomists do indeed assert this, see *Meditation on Emptiness*, pp. 695-696.
261. XXII. 1. See *Meditation on Emptiness*, p. 688.
262. gang zag, pudgala.
263. See *Meditation on Emptiness*, p. 177.
264. mu stegs pa, tirthika.
265. See n. 138.
- 265a. VI.151; Poussin's translation is in *Museon*, n.s. v. 12, p. 316. Brackets are from Dzong-ka-ba's *Illumination of the Thought*, P6143, vol. 154 90.2.4ff. Chandrakirti's own commentary is P5263, vol. 98 146.4. Iff.

266. Tenzin Gyatso, *The Buddhism of Tibet and The Key to the Middle Way* (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1975), pp. 55-56.

267. yan lag can.

268. yan lag 'dus pa tsam.

269. VI. 158. Louis de la Vallee Poussin's translation is in *Museon*, n.s., v. 12, p. 320. Dzong-ka-ba's *Illumination of the Thought* is 216, last line.

270. In the Varanasi codex edition (435.2) read gseb for gsed in accordance with the Nam-gyel edition (478.1).

271. See *Meditation on Emptiness*, pp. 695-696. The "evidence" for Bhavaviveka's asserting that conventionally phenomena are established by way of their own character is limited to a few rather tenuous indications. I hope elsewhere to go into the tenuousness of the evidence in detail.

272. In commentary prior to VI. 160.

273. For Robert Thurman's translation of this passage, see his "The Middle Transcendent Insight" in *Life and Teachings of Tsong Khapa*, p. 129.

274. Still, in order to prove some of the reasons that make up the sevenfold reasoning, it seems that you have to know that phenomena are selfless. For example, when you prove that the mere collection of the aggregates is not the person, it seems that you have to understand that this mere collection is not established by way of its own character. That itself means that you understand the selflessness with respect to a phenomenon other than a person since the collection of our own mental and physical aggregates is not us, is not a person.

Some scholars try to get around all of this by saying that to understand the selflessness of phenomena does not mean just to understand the selflessness of any phenomenon, but that you first understand the selflessness of persons and then turn your mind to some other phenomenon and understand its selflessness. Thus, although you might first understand the selflessness of some phenomenon other than the person, such as a chariot, this is not called a cognition of an emptiness of a phenomenon since the latter occurs only after the emptiness of persons has been cognized.

275. Nga-wang-Io-sang-gya-tso (ngag dbang bio bzang rgya mtsho, 1617-1682), Dalai Lama V, *Instruction on the Stages of the Path to Enlightenment, Sacred Word of Manjushri* (byang chub lam gyi rim pa'i khrid yig 'jam pa'i dbyangs kyi zhal lung), (Thimphu: kun-bzang-stobs-rgyal, 1976), 182.5-210.6. For an English translation, see J. Hopkins, "Practice of Emptiness", (Dharamsala: Library of Tibetan Works and Archives, 1974). For this citation, see p. 17.

276. Stanza 45:

- ~ Having thought a mirage to be
- ~ Water and then having gone there,
- ~ One would just be stupid to surmise
- ~ That [previously existent] water does not exist [now].

See Nagarjuna and Kaysang Gyatso, *Precious Garland and the Song of the Four Mindfulnesses*, (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1975), p. 25.

277. Cited in Dalai Lama V, *Instruction on the Stages of the Path to Enlightenment*, Sacred Word of Manjushri in "Practice of Emptiness", p. 21.
278. XXVII.5.
279. VI.127ab. Louis de la Vallee Poussin's translation is in *Museon*, n.s., v. 12, p. 292.
280. XVIII.lab.
281. VI.66.
282. gzugs su rung ba; see, for instance, Pur-bu-jok (phur bu Icog byams pa rgya mtsho, 1825-1901), *Explanation of the Lesser Path of Reasoning* (rigs lam chung ngu'i rnam par bshad pa) in the *Magical Key to the Path of Reasoning*, *Presentation of the Collected Topics Revealing the Meaning of the Treatises on Valid Cognition* (tshad ma'i gzhung don 'byed pa'i bsdus grva'i rnam bzhag rigs lam 'phrul gyi sde mig), (Buxa India: n.p., 1965). For an English translation, see Daniel E. Perdue, "Practice and Theory of Philosophical Debate in Tibetan Buddhist Education" (Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1983).
283. XVIII.led.
284. XXVII.7cd.
285. In the Varanasi codex edition (438.16) read zhib tu for zhig tu in accordance with the Nam-gyel edition (482.1).
286. See *Meditation on Emptiness*, pp. 545-546.
287. VI. 158. Louis de la Vallee Poussin's translation is in *Museon*, n.s., v. 12, p. 320. Dzong-ka-ba's *Illumination of the Thought* is 216, last line. See chapter fifteen, p. 245.
288. In the Varanasi codex edition (439.19) read tshabs for che pas in accordance with the Nam-gyel edition (483.3).
289. Explanation of (Shantideva's) "Engaging in the Bodhisattva Deeds": Entrance of Conqueror Children (byang chub sems dpa'i spyod pa la 'jug pa'i rnam bshad rgyal sras 'jug ngogs), (Varanasi: 1973), at the end of chapter IX, 280.6. This and the other three citations from this text were located by Geshe Thupten Gyatso of the Tibetan Buddhist Learning Center, Washington, New Jersey.
290. Nagarjuna, Aryadeva, Asahga, Vasubandhu, Dignaga and Dharmakirti.
291. Explanation of (Shantideva's) "Engaging in the Bodhisattva Deeds", at the end of the book, 295.4.
292. In the Varanasi codex edition (441.10) read 'di for bdi in accordance with the Nam-gyel edition (485.1).
293. Explanation of (Shantideva's) "Engaging in the Bodhisattva Deeds", at the end of chapter IX, 280.11.
294. In the Varanasi codex edition (441.8) read go 'phang for go 'thang in accordance with the Nam-gyel edition (485.1).
295. Explanation of (Shantideva's) "Engaging in the Bodhisattva Deeds", at the end of chapter IX, 280.13.

296. In the Varanasi codex edition (441.17) read *thai 'gyur ba'i* for *thai 'gyur ba'i ba'i* in accordance with the Nam-gyel edition (485.4).
297. XVIII.2ab.
298. For a discussion of differing interpretations of "mine", see *Meditation on Emptiness*, n. 739, pp. 888-890.
299. For Jam-yang-shay-ba's presentation, see *Meditation on Emptiness*, pp. 678-681.
300. *gdags gzhi*.
301. *mtshan gzhi*.
302. See *Meditation on Emptiness*, pp. 680-681.
303. See *Meditation on Emptiness*, p. 679.
304. VI. 167. Louis de la Vallee Poussin's translation ends with VI.165.
305. Dzong-ka-ba, as cited in Jam-yang-shay-ba's *Great Exposition of the Middle Way* (477a.l) identifies *chags pa* (*rakta*) in this context as referring to the mind or person that is desirous of an object — that which is made impassioned by passion, i.e., the impassioned.
306. "Illustration" (*mtshan gzhi*) is *laksya* in Sanskrit, which is translated into Tibetan both as *mtshon bya* "definiendum" and *mtshan gzhi* "illustration", the latter being a basis in which the definition illustrates the definiendum. It seems to make no difference here whether the term is translated as "illustration" or "definiendum". I prefer the latter for broader symmetry but have deferred to the Tibetan translation and used "illustration".
307. Stanza 162. See Nagarjuna and Kaysang Gyatso, *Precious Garland and the Song of the Four Mindfulnesses*, p. 41.
308. *bio gros rgya mtshos zhus pa, sagaramatiparipreccha*.
309. The first stanza of his *Praise of Dependent-Arising* (*rten 'brel stod pa*), the longer title being *Praise of the Supramundane Victor Buddha from the Approach of His Teaching the Profound Dependent-Arising, Essence of the Good Explanations* (*sangs rgyas beam Idan 'das la zab mo rten cing 'grel bar 'byung ba gsung ba'i sgo nas bstod pa legs par bshad pa'i snying po*), P6016, vol. 153.
310. In Tenzin Gyatso, *The Buddhism of Tibet and The Key to the Middle Way*, p. 82.
311. As is stated in n. 703, pp. 884-885, in *Meditation on Emptiness*:
- The Tibetan translators adopted a code for handling this three-part discussion of the formation of *pratityasamutpada*:
- *prati* = *rten cing*
 - *i* or *itya* = *'brel bar*
 - *samutpdā* = *'byung ba*
- Their overriding concern was with having a three-part translation equivalent that, when together, makes sense in Tibetan. As a result, the individual equivalents often make no sense when associated with these various interpretations.
- Some Tibetan scholars claim that *rten cing* and *'brel bar* have different meanings; however, since Chandrakirti says that *prati* (*rten cing*), which itself means *pradṛpti* (*phrad pa*),

modifies the meaning of itya ('brel ba) into meaning prdpti (phrad pa), the two words come to have just one meaning, and thus it seems that the two were separated out in Tibetan merely in order to convey, albeit not very well, this discussion of the meaning of the individual parts. Perhaps a better alternative would have been to transliterate the individual parts into Tibetan rather than attempt a translation.

In Chandrakirti's interpretation, pratitya has just one meaning as a continuative meaning "having depended" which in Tibetan is rten nas as in the commonly used rten nas 'byung ba or rten 'byung. Strictly speaking, therefore, in Prasargika rten nas 'byung ba or rten 'byung is the most appropriate general term, with rten cing 'brel bar 'byung ba suitable only as a code equivalent for the three-part discussion, rten 'brel is a common usage that is neither.

There also is an oral teaching that I have heard only once that rten 'byung refers to the dependent-arising of impermanent things and rten cing 'brel bar 'byung ba refers also to the dependent-arising of permanent things. However, it seems to me that the reason for the longer version is only to provide separate syllables to represent each element of the discussion in Sanskrit.

It should be noted that the general translation of the word into Tibetan follows Chandrakirti's understanding of it.

312. See Meditation on Emptiness, p. 666.

313. In modern Tibetan, dgon pa'i til would be a better translation of aranyetilaka than dgon pa'i thig le since til is commonly used for "sesame".

314. The text reads "between having depended and eye" (brten pa dang mig gi bar du), which somehow must refer to pratitya.

315. Jam-yang-shay-ba forms the term in considerable detail in order to show how pratitya is formed from the verbal root i as an indeclinable continuative. In brief, the continuative ending ya is substituted for tva; this, in turn, calls for a t infix; with prati, this yields pratitya. See Meditation on Emptiness, pp. 662-663.

316. P5225, Vol. 95 11.4.1.

317. For the shortcomings of the Tibetan translation of this line, see Meditation on Emptiness, n. 708 p. 885.

318. 48ab.

319. In the Varanasi codex edition (445.14) read 'di for 'da in accordance with the Nam-gyel edition (489.4).

320. In the Varanasi codex edition (445.17) read phyir ro for phyi ro in accordance with the Nam-gyel edition (489.5).

321. rten nas 'byung ba, pratityasamutpdda; 'phrad nas 'byung ba, prdpyasamutpdda; bltos nas 'byung ba, apeksayasamutpdda. See Meditation on Emptiness, pp. 166, 659, 674-675.

322. Avalokitavrata, Commentary on (Bhavaviveka's) "Lamp for (Nagarjuna's) 'Wisdom' ", P5259, vol. 96 170.2.1.

323. The Varanasi codex edition (445.18) and the Nam-gyel edition (489.6) both misread la yah, whereas it should read lyap, in accordance with the Lokesh Chandra edition, 719.5.

324. In the Varanasi codex edition (445.20) read prati for brati in accordance with the Nam-gyel edition (489.6).
325. In the Varanasi codex edition (446.12) read 'byung for 'gyur in accordance with the Nam-gyel edition (490.4).
326. dngos po, bhava.
327. grub pa, siddha.
328. In the Varanasi codex edition (448.4) read ma than for mthon in accordance with the Nam-gyel edition (492.2).
329. In the Varanasi codex edition (448.6) read ma thon for mthon in accordance with the Nam-gyel edition (492.3).
330. Annotations for (Jam-yang-shay-ba's) "Great Exposition of Tenets", Freeing the Knots of the Difficult Points, Precious Jewel of Clear Thought, dbu 156.2.
331. For Robert Thurman's translation, see "The Middle Transcendent Insight" in Life and Teachings of Tsong Khapa, pp. 144-145.
332. See two notes back.
333. Stanza 48.
334. VIII. 12. It is difficult to determine whether the term karma (las) means action or object. The eighth chapter of Nagarjuna's Treatise on the Middle Way can be read either way, but Dzong-ka-ba's Ocean of Reasoning, Explanation of (Nagarjuna's) "Treatise on the Middle Way" glosses las (karma) with by a ba and at the very end of his commentary on the second chapter he adapts VIII. 12 to the examination of going, interpreting las (karma) as 'gro ba, going (gamanam). For the latter, see "Analysis of Going and Coming", trans. J. Hopkins, (Dharmasala: Library of Tibetan Works and Archives, 1976), p. 34.
335. P5266, vol. 98 270.3.6, commenting on XIV.23.
336. nor bzang rgya mtsho, 1423-1513.
337. The text reads "The subject, uncompounded space, etc." The full statement of consequence is understood by those familiar with such debate and has thus been added.
338. In the Varanasi codex edition (450.13) read rang ngor for rang dor in accordance with the Nam-gyel edition (495.1).
339. In the Varanasi codex edition (451.2) read khyad chos for khyad sbyor in accordance with the Nam-gyel edition (495.4).
340. In the Varanasi codex edition (451.11) read;'e zab for rje zab in accordance with the Nam-gyel edition (496.1).
341. Shantideva's Engaging in the Bodhisattva Deeds, IX.4ab; see Shantideva, Bodhicaryavatara, ed. by Vidhushekhara Bhattacharya, Bibliotheca Indica Vol. 280, (Calcutta: The Asiatic Society, 1960), p. 185.
342. Dak-tsang Shay-rap-rin-chen, Ocean of Good Explanations, Explanation of "Freedom From Extremes Through Understanding All Tenets", 247.6.

343. Jang-gya, at the beginning of the section on the Middle Way School (301.4), says:

~ Dak-tsang divided [the teaching and the training] into the three stages of the non-analytical, slightly analytical, and very analytical and then described a view in which the earlier states are refuted by the later. [This description] is amazing because, instead of needing some other opponent to line up contradictions for one's tenets, he himself appears to destroy the presentation of the two truths that he himself posits.

Just before that, Jang-gya says:

~ With the exception of the Jo-nang system and, later, the system of the view of the translator Dak-tsang Shay-rap-rin-chen, the instructions on the view of most of the early scholars and adepts each had an Indian scholar or adept as their source.

The above translations are adapted from Donald S. Lopez, Jr. in "The Svatantrika-Madhyamika School of Mahayana Buddhism", (Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1982), pp. 405-406; Lopez's work is forthcoming from Snow Lion Publications.

In setting forth three phases, Dak-tsang (see 255.5) is interpreting such passages as that from Aryadeva's Four Hundred (VIII. 15) which describes three phases of turning away from the non-meritorious, self, and all views. In Ge-luk, "self in such a passage is interpreted as a self of persons or a coarse conception of self, and "all views" is interpreted as all bad views, the root of which is the conception of inherent existence. Does one eventually overcome all views or just all views of inherent existence? In the Ge-luk-ba interpretation, it is definitely just the view of inherent existence that must be overcome; the view of the emptiness of inherent existence must be gained and is never supplanted.

In any case, Dak-tsang presents refutations of Dzong-ka-ba's interpretation of the Consequence School, and this may be behind Jang-gya's suggestion, despite his otherwise broad-minded acceptance of other Tibetans' teachings, that Dak-tsang's three phase teaching and training is a fabrication. The issue, however, is by no means easy to settle.

344. In the Varanasi codex edition (451.17) read nges pa'i for nge sa pa'i in accordance with the Nam-gyel edition (496.3).

345. In the Varanasi codex edition (452.6) read pir gyis for pan gyis in accordance with the Nam-gyel edition (496.6).

346. In the Varanasi codex edition (452.12) read ri mo'i for ri bo'i in accordance with the Nam-gyel edition (497.2).

347. gtugs and thug are translated variously as "derive from" and "meet back to".

348. VI. 114.

349. VI.158. Dzong-ka-ba's Illumination of the Thought is 216, last line.

350. For Robert Thurman's translation of this passage, see his Tsong Khapa's Speech of Gold in the Essence of True Eloquence, p. 365.

351. For Robert Thurman's translation of this passage, see his Tsong Khapa's Speech of Gold in the Essence of True Eloquence, p. 366.

352. Stanza 13. For commentary by the Dalai Lama, see his Kindness, Clarity, and Insight (Ithaca: Snow Lion, 1984), pp.

148-153. See also the Fourth Panchen Lama's commentary in Geshe Lhundup Sopa and Jeffrey Hopkins, *Practice and Theory of Tibetan Buddhism*, 1976), p. 43, as well as in Geshe Wangyal, *Door of Liberation* (New York: Lotsawa, 1978), pp. 126-60. For Dzong-ka-ba's text, see Robert Thurman, *Life and Teachings of Tsong Khapa* (Dharmasala, Library of Tibetan Works and Archives, 1982), pp. 57-8.

353. In the Varanasi codex edition (456.15) read gzhanyang for gzhan gang in accordance with the Nam-gyel edition (501.5).

354. red mda' ba, 1349-1412. The Sa-gya master Ren-da-wa was Dzong-ka-ba's teacher especially for the view of the Middle Way School.

355. In the Varanasi codex edition (457.5) read nogs tshe for nogs cha in accordance with the Nam-gyel edition (502.2).

356. mngon sum, pratyaksa. For discussion of this, see Geshe Lhundup Sopa and Jeffrey Hopkins, *Practice and Theory of Tibetan Buddhism*, pp. 138-139.

[End]