

Part 2

Mipham · Mipham

source: https://web.archive.org/web/20060308195802/http://gileht.tripod.com/Mipham_Beacon_of_Certainty_Topic_5-7C.txt

MIPHAM'S BEACON OF CERTAINTY

(Illuminating the View of Dzogchen, the Great Perfection)

& A commentary by Khro shul 'Jam rdor

[Chapter 9 --

last 3 topics & conclusion only]

[see the other file for the other first four topics & introduction]

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

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

Paragraph starting with '¢(i.e. ...' are usually added comments by me.

L1: [CONTENTS] :L1

L1: [CONTENTS] :L1

L1: [THEMES:]

L1: [ORIGINAL SUBDIVISION OF THE TIBETAN TEXT]

L1: [Introduction]

[see the other file for this chapter]

L1: [Chapter 9. Stainless Light: A Commentary on the Beacon of Certainty]

L1: [9.0. Introduction [The need to induce certainty by the two types of valid cognition – investigating the real nature of the Two Truths]]

[see the other file for this chapter]

L1: [9.1. Topic 1 [The problem of negation: Emptiness is also empty; it is not the real non-dual nature beyond all conceptualization]]

[see the other file for this chapter]

L1: [9.2. Topic 2 [About the limited realizations of the arhats in the Hinayana: they do not realize the full extent of the emptiness of phenomena; they still reify elementary dharmas, and are stuck hiding in cessation]]

[see the other file for this chapter]

L1: [9.3. Topic 3 [Sudden vs. Gradual vs. dropping all: Should meditation involve conceptualization, modal apprehension, such as apprehending emptiness?]]

[see the other file for this chapter]

L1: [9.4. Topic 4 [The Union of Shamatha vs Vipashyana – we need both depending on the situation]]

[see the other file for this chapter]

L1: [9.5. Topic 5 [Basing the Tantric practices on adapted skillful means and views, based on a gradually induced certainty of the inseparability of conventional & Ultimate Truths]]

L5: [[0.2.2.1.2.] 5. An explanation of which of the two truths is more important:]

L6: [5.1 The question]

L6: [5.2 An extensive discussion of its meaning]

L7: [5.2.1 Refuting other systems that maintain that either of two truths is more or less important]

L8: [5.2.1.1 Refuting the claim that ultimate reality is more important]

L9: [5.2.1.1.1 Setting up the purvapaksa's claim [ultimate is most important]]

L9: [5.2.1.1.2 Refuting it]

L10: [5.2.1.1.2.1 The two truths are essentially non-different]

L11: [5.2.1.1.2.1.1 Explaining the meaning of the statement that deceptive reality is delusive]

L11: [5.2.1.1.2.1.2 Explaining that the two truths are of equal force whether they both exist or both do not exist]

L10: [5.2.1.1.2.2 Explaining why it is a mistake to cling to their difference]

L11: [5.2.1.1.2.2.1 How your position contradicts the tradition of the great system-builder Nagarjuna]

L11: [5.2.1.1.2.2.2 How Chandrakirti's statement of fault applies equally to you]

L11: [5.2.1.1.2.2.3 Therefore, how your position is mistaken with respect to the final meaning]

L8: [5.2.1.2 Refuting the claim that deceptive reality is more important:]

L9: [5.2.1.2.1 Refuting the system of some Nyingmapas]

L10: [5.2.1.2.1.1 Staking the claim [putting aside the ultimate]]

L10: [5.2.1.2.1.2 Refuting it]

L11: [5.2.1.2.1.2.1 Deceptive reality alone cannot be an extraordinary Dharma [grasping at conventional truths, paths, visualizations]]

L11: [5.2.1.2.1.2.2 Explaining the reason for that through examples [without the certainty induced by the correct reasonings on the inseparability of the Two Truths, they are just faking self-purity in Tantrayana practices]]

L9: [5.2.1.2.2 Refuting other philosophical systems]

L10: [5.2.1.2.2.1 Expounding the way of ascertaining the philosophical system of the purvapaksa [like saying that emptiness in nothing more than dependent origination]]

L10: [5.2.1.2.2.2 Refuting it by showing that its theory and praxis have gone their separate ways]

L7: [5.2.2 Expounding our own system [basis, path, result]: which maintains that there is no degree of importance in the inseparability of the two truths]

L8: [5.2.2.1 Ascertaining the basis, the coalescence of the two truths]

L9: [5.2.2.1.1 [A brief demonstration of our staying away from all extremes: the Buddha-nature is not permanent, not impermanent ...]]

L9: [5.2.2.1.2 The extensive explanation [about the basis of Dzogchen]:]

L10: [5.2.2.1.2.1 A general explanation of the inseparability of the two truths]

L11: [5.2.2.1.2.1.1 Setting up the proof of the inseparability of the two truths]

L12: [5.2.2.1.2.1.1.1 Establishing the subject (phyogs chos) [of the syllogism] [by demonstrating that] one cannot posit the basis, path, and result if either of the two truths is taken individually as a basis]

L12: [5.2.2.1.2.1.1.2 In the context of any of those three, taking the position that there is no accepting or abandoning of the two truths]

L12: [5.2.2.1.2.1.1.3 Establishing that with the logical reason that the inseparable essence is equanimity]

L11: [5.2.2.1.2.1.2 Establishing the pervasion:]

L12: [5.2.2.1.2.1.2.1 Although appearance and emptiness are different isolates, in relation to their inseparable essence, both are mere designations]

L12: [5.2.2.1.2.1.2.2 Even from the perspective of ascertaining the isolates by two valid cognitions, they are inseparable as method and methodical result]

L12: [5.2.2.1.2.1.2.3 With respect to the way of inducing certainty through valid cognition in the inseparable essence [of the two truths], the convention of "the coalescence of appearance and emptiness" conforms to things as they are]

L12: [5.2.2.1.2.1.2.4 These two truths, in the context of the valid cognition that analyzes the way ultimate reality abides, are different isolates of one essence]

L10: [5.2.2.1.2.2 Explaining the need for beginners to realize this gradually]

L9: [5.2.2.1.3 Summarizing with the idea that this is the cornerstone of the authentic view of all of sutra and tantra]

L8: [5.2.2.2 The different [tantric] paths:]

L9: [5.2.2.2.1 With the view of the subject who realizes the crucial point of the inseparability of the two truths progressively, the [four and] six tantric systems are posited]

L10: [5.2.2.2.1.1 Brief demonstration [The case of abandoning impure perceptions – it has to be done in stages]]

L10: [5.2.2.2.1.2 The extensive explanation [The case of abandoning impure perceptions and seeing everything as pure – it cannot be faked, it has to be based on true emerging wisdom, certainty]]

L11: [5.2.2.2.1.2.1 A general discussion of the difference between wishful-thinking meditation (mos bsgom) and complete certainty]

L12: [5.2.2.2.1.2.1.1 Explanation that the views of wishful thinking meditation and complete certainty are not the same]

L12: [5.2.2.2.1.2.1.2 Demonstrating the specifics of that through examples [the difference between wishful magic and wisdom]]

L11: [5.2.2.2.1.2.2 Because we do not teach that the two truths that qualify the view are separate, that fault mentioned earlier does not also apply to us [so all virtuous methods have to be united with wisdom to be efficient because in accord with the inseparability of the Two Truths, the way things really are, toward the great equanimity]]

L12: [5.2.2.2.1.2.2.1 How the divine appearance of deceptive reality arises from the attainment of a clear perception of ultimate reality]

L12: [5.2.2.2.1.2.2.2 Thus, how the ranking of the paths is not just with respect to ultimate reality [the stages are a gradual progression toward being more and more in accord with the way things really are]]

L12: [5.2.2.2.1.2.2.3 Therefore, the ranking of the six tantric systems is taught with respect to differences in their capacity to cultivate vision of the inseparability of the two truths [the stages are skilful means adapted to the capacity of the students, but they all have the same essence]]

L10: [5.2.2.2.1.3 Summary [the stages are one natural progression toward realizing the way things really are, toward the great equanimity]]

L9: [5.2.2.2.2 The difference between how our own and other tantric systems are practiced:]

L10: [5.2.2.2.2.1 The difference between ascertaining and not ascertaining the authentic abiding reality through the view [one has to base his practice on the certainty induced through authentic valid cognition, otherwise it is only faking and inefficient]]

L11: [5.2.2.2.2.1.1 How meditation on the meaning of the view that correctly realizes the abiding nature is free of doubt]

L11: [5.2.2.2.2.1.2 Demonstrating that by not understanding that, meditating with doubts has no result]

L10: [5.2.2.2.2.2 The difference of a result arising or not arising from meditation]

L11: [5.2.2.2.2.1 Showing how, having distinguished modes of reality and appearance, one connects the view and meditation by meditating according to the mode of reality [it is all about realizing the way things really are, pure, inseparable appearances and emptiness; with great equanimity]]

L11: [5.2.2.2.2.2 The opposite of that]

L12: [5.2.2.2.2.2.1 The view and meditation are not connected [Faking to see purity]]

L12: [5.2.2.2.2.2.2 Demonstrating through examples that that cannot achieve the result [mere conceptual understanding]]

L9: [5.2.2.2.3 [The gradual development of the final view] If there are not different levels of views in the tantric systems, their different modes of activity would be mistaken]

L10: [5.2.2.2.3.1 Setting up the claim that there are no differences in the views [of the different tantric systems]]

L10: [5.2.2.2.3.2 Refuting it [the view has to match the adapted skillful means – both are progressive, adapted to the level of the students]]

L11: [5.2.2.2.3.2.1 If the lower tantric systems had the same view as the higher tantric systems, activity would contradict the view [discriminating while having a pure view is contradictory]]

L11: [5.2.2.2.3.2.2 If the higher systems had no view other than the lower systems' view, then the profound activity [of the higher tantras] would be pointless [non-discriminating while having an impure view is contradictory]]

L9: [5.2.2.2.4 The especially exalted meditations and activities of [the higher tantras] exist because of that [The stages – methods and views – are defined according to the level of progress of this “certainty”]]

L10: [5.2.2.2.4.1 With respect to how the nine vehicles integrate the two truths, how one maintains meditation and activity in the state of ascertaining the view]

L10: [5.2.2.2.4.2 Disposing of faults: [nine arbitrary vehicles are defined along this one continuous unique path]]

L11: [5.2.2.2.4.2.1 Setting up the dispute about the indefiniteness of nine vehicles]

L11: [5.2.2.2.4.2.2 Demonstrating the response that disposes of it—the response that the fault applies equally]

L8: [5.2.2.3 A summary of the meaning of attaining the result of the coalescence of the two kayas:]

L9: [5.2.2.3.1 There are different ways of seeing with respect to great and small powers of gnosis]

L9: [5.2.2.3.2 By practicing according to the way of seeing the conformity of actual and apparent modes, one attains the result [the inseparable two kayas]]

L1: [9.6. Topic 6 [Using the mantrayana technique called “pure vision / deity yoga” in order to realize this coalescence beyond conceptualization]]

L4: [[0.2.2.2.] Secondly, the explanation of the view of the subjective viewer: [explanation of the view of the dharma-possessor through the stages of the manner of pure divine self-appearance / Yidam yoga]]

L5: [6.1 The question about what the commonly perceived object is [the purity of objects depend on the subject perception / karma purity]]

L5: [6.2 The extensive explanation:]

L6: [6.2.1 Refuting other systems that claim that different subjects perceive the same object [no real objects of perception independent of the mind; but still not completely non-existent or from the mind-only]]

L7: [6.2.1.1 Refuting the claim that water is the common object]

L8: [6.2.1.1.1 Setting up the purvapaksa's claim [absolute objects]]

L8: [6.2.1.1.2. Refuting that [not the same, not different]]

L9: [6.2.1.1.2.1 If only water were established as the common object, both valid cognizers and non-valid cognizers would be impossible]

L9: [6.2.1.1.2.2 If there were no common object, an object of perception would be impossible]

L7: [6.2.1.2 Refuting the claim that liquidity is the common object [absolute basis characteristics]]

L8: [6.2.1.2.1 The purvapaksa]

L8: [6.2.1.2.2 Its refutation:]

L9: [6.2.1.2.2.1 It is not reasonable for liquidity to be a basis of perception [not the same, not different]]

L10: [6.2.1.2.2.1.1 If liquidity is the basis of perception, visual perceptions of it would have to be non-different]

L10: [6.2.1.2.2.1.2 The different visual perceptions would have nothing to perceive]

L10: [6.2.1.2.2.1.3 Demonstrating indetermination for the infinite space realm]

L9: [6.2.1.2.2.2 Refutation by analysis of whether it is the same as or different than the water [characterized and characteristic are not different, not the same]]

L7: [6.2.1.3 Combining the meanings together [there is no dharmin independent of the mind, nor from the mind only]]

L8: [6.2.1.3.1 Positing in relation to a contextual object of perception]

L9: [6.2.1.3.1.1 The actual [argument]]

L9: [6.2.1.3.1.2 The unreasonableness of appearing to the mind]

L10: [6.2.1.3.1.2.1 The unreasonableness of maintaining cognition as the object, like the Cittamatras]

L10: [6.2.1.3.1.2.2 The reason that mind and appearance are equal in deceptively existing]

L10: [6.2.1.3.1.2.3 Are equal in not existing ultimately [the mind is also like an illusion, empty]]

L8: [6.2.1.3.2 Showing the final object of perception to be a mere appearance [all appearances are empty because dependent on accumulated karma, that is the only way to explain the similarities and differences while perceiving the same object]]

L9: [6.2.1.3.2.1. The reasonableness of all common and uncommon [perceptions] having mere appearance as their common object of perception, which all beings have in common]

L9: [6.2.1.3.2.2 If not, it would be unreasonable for different individual perceptions to arise]

L9: [6.2.1.3.2.3 The unreasonableness of various conditions for appearance being the object of perception]

L6: [6.2.2 Secondly, according to our own system [inseparability of appearances and emptiness]]

L7: [6.2.2.1 Showing what common perceptual object is posited]

L8: [6.2.2.1.1 Positing inseparable appearance and emptiness as the actual basis of perception]

L8: [6.2.2.1.2 Explaining how it can appear as anything]

L7: [6.2.2.2 Disposing of objections about it]

L8: [6.2.2.2.1 The disagreement [does that “relativism” means everything is meaningless, chaotic]]

L8: [6.2.2.2.2 Its disposal]

L9: [6.2.2.2.2.1 A general discussion of our own system's disposal of faults]

L10: [6.2.2.2.2.1.1 The reasoning that posits a valid cognition dependently is established as an inclusive judgment (yongs chod, pariccheda) [valid cognition is still established in

its context]]

L11: [6.2.2.2.2.1.1.1 Contextually, the mind that apprehends in dependence upon an objective basis is established as a valid cognition]

L11: [6.2.2.2.2.1.1.2 The positing of one and many by that mind in dependence upon that object of investigation establishes that object as validly cognized]

L10: [6.2.2.2.2.1.2 The fact that such reasoning is established by its own power is proven automatically by an excluding judgment (rnam chad, vyavaccheda) [It is exactly “because” everything is empty of inherent existence that there can be valid cognition: perception and inference]]

L11: [6.2.2.2.2.1.2.1 Generally, it is not reasonable for all dharmas to be established under their own power]

L11: [6.2.2.2.2.1.2.2 A single, particular instance of water does not exist under its own power, and it is reasonable for it to have a relation of dependence]

L10: [6.2.2.2.2.1.3 And therefore, valid cognition is meaningful [so there are valid rules of inference]]

L9: [6.2.2.2.2.2 Other systems cannot dispose of faults [a system where the basis for each of the six realms perceptions are mixed together in the same object]]

L9: [6.2.2.2.2.3 A special reasoning for our own system's disposal of faults:]

L10: [6.2.2.2.2.3.1 Explaining the contextual establishment of valid cognition without referring to grades of defilement by causes of perceptual error [even if all perception are relative to the individual or collective karma, there is still the notion of getting closer and closer to the way things really are, which is defined as the only common basis possible: the inseparability of appearances and emptiness]]

L11: [6.2.2.2.2.3.1.1 Explaining that an object perceived by an unflawed sense faculty established for oneself is established as valid]

L11: [6.2.2.2.2.3.1.2 For that reason, in relation to defilement, what is sometimes perceived by humans as water is established as valid]

L11: [6.2.2.2.2.3.1.3 Otherwise, it would not be established according to deceptive or ultimate truth]

L11: [6.2.2.2.2.3.1.4 Therefore, in dependence upon the lower, the higher is established as valid [the arrow of progress]]

L10: [6.2.2.2.2.3.2 Establishing final valid cognition through the reasoning of dharmata [a unique point of view that is taught to be superior]]

L11: [6.2.2.2.2.3.2.1 Because suchness is unitary, self-cognizant pristine awareness is established as a single valid cognition]

L11: [6.2.2.2.2.3.2.2 Therefore, it is reasonable for samsara and nirvana to have their origin in unawareness and awareness [relative to this unique truth]]

L11: [6.2.2.2.2.3.2.3 The strength of the great glorious Rong zom is in [uniquely] establishing apparent objects as deities in that manner]

L11: [6.2.2.2.2.3.2.4 Others do not have reasoning established in this way, so whatever claims they make are contradictory]

L6: [6.2.3 Emptiness and appearance are not something to view separately:]

L7: [6.2.3.1 A synopsis [Inseparability of appearances and emptiness]]

L7: [6.2.3.2 An extensive explanation]

L8: [6.2.3.2.1 Emptiness [alone] cannot be a basis of perception]

L9: [6.2.3.2.1.1 Refuting that emptiness is something to perceive]

L10: [6.2.3.2.1.1.1 The consequence that space, vases, and so forth, both entities and non-entities, would be the same]

L10: [6.2.3.2.1.1.2 They would be the same in being causeless]

L10: [6.2.3.2.1.1.3 If the basis of perception were emptiness, it would contradict appearance]

L9: [6.2.3.2.1.2 That fault does not apply to us:]

L10: [6.2.3.2.1.2.1 Setting up the fault]

L10: [6.2.3.2.1.2.2 Disposing of it]

L11: [6.2.3.2.1.2.2.1 They are contradictory as the object of a conventionalizing valid cognition]

L11: [6.2.3.2.1.2.2.2 How they are not contradictory as the object of gnosis, which sees the abiding nature of things]

L8: [6.2.3.2.2 A non-empty appearance [alone] cannot be a basis for perception:]

L9: [6.2.3.2.2.1 Claiming that it is impossible]

L9: [6.2.3.2.2.2 Explaining the reason for that]

L10: [6.2.3.2.2.2.1 If there were an indistinguishable appearance, cognizing validating cognition would be impossible]

L10: [6.2.3.2.2.2.2 If there were a distinguishable appearance, it could not be a general basis of perception]

L10: [6.2.3.2.2.3 None of the specific possibilities is suitable to be a common basis of perception]

L7: [6.2.3.3 A summary [they are inseparable]]

L6: [6.2.4 The necessity [of ascertaining the common object of perception in our system] [the “pure vision / Yidam yoga”]:]

L7: [6.2.4.1 Briefly explaining how, by ascertaining [finding out with certainty] the common object of perception, [which is the coalescence of inseparable appearance and emptiness,] one goes to the heart of the authentic philosophical system [the Great equanimity, the goal]]

L7: [6.2.4.2 The extensive explanation:]

L8: [6.2.4.2.1 By ascertaining [finding out with certainty] the basis of perception, [which is the coalescence of inseparable appearance and emptiness,] one acquires an excellent certainty in the meaning of mdo, sgyu, and sems [gaining confidence about “pure vision” as taught in Tantrayana]]

L9: [6.2.4.2.1.1 Attaining confidence in the meaning of the vajra words of the Great Perfection of equanimity]

L9: [6.2.4.2.1.2 Discovering the intention of the Magical Net Tantra]

L8: [6.2.4.2.2 Explanation of the reasoning that establishes their final intent on the nature of things [justification of “pure vision”]]

L9: [6.2.4.2.2.1 The actual reasoning that establishes that]

L10: [6.2.4.2.2.1.1 Showing what the final valid cognition is through gradually purifying sullyng obscurations [gradually realizing the inseparability of the Two Truths is equivalent to gradually purifying our body, speech and mind, or gradually purifying our perception]]

L10: [6.2.4.2.2.1.2 The way in which our position, which accords with that way of seeing, is established as the culmination of all vehicles [the final result is pure vision, or great equanimity, so it is the ultimate valid cognition]]

L11: [6.2.4.2.2.1.2.1 Other than just that pure vision, there is no other authentic final reality of things]

L11: [6.2.4.2.2.1.2.2 Explaining conventional valid cognition according to the cognitive [mode] of that [pure vision] [Buddha-nature]]

L10: [6.2.4.2.2.1.3 Showing that other [systems] cannot realize it in this way]

L9: [6.2.4.2.2.2 Cutting off doubts:]

L10: [6.2.4.2.2.2.1 This authentic meaning of the abiding nature of things can arise as anything, so one cannot prove that the subject (chos can) only appears as a deity]

L10: [6.2.4.2.2.2.2 The ultimate deity of dharmata is the inseparability of the expanse and gnosis, so it is not challenged by an ultimate analysis]

L10: [6.2.4.2.2.2.3 Therefore, the vision bereft of the two obscurations is the object established by the two valid cognitions]

L8: [6.2.4.2.3 Purifying obscurations [advice to purify the stains of the mind for which reality and appearance are discordant]]

L9: [6.2.4.2.3.1: A précis]

L9: [6.2.4.2.3.2 [The extensive explanation:]]

L10: [6.2.4.2.3.2.1 Because the subject is pure, the way the appearance of the object arises is pure]

L11: [6.2.4.2.3.2.1.1 The actual [explanation]]

L11: [6.2.4.2.3.2.1.2 Cutting off doubts]

L10: [6.2.4.2.3.2.2 Therefore, advice that the stains of the subject must be purified]

L11: [6.2.4.2.3.2.2.1 Advice to purify the stains that obscure the abiding nature of things]

L11: [6.2.4.2.3.2.2.2 In the authentic meaning, stains to be purified are not established]

L9: [[6.2.4.2.3.3 ??] 6.2.4.2.3.2.2.3 The summary:]

L10: [6.2.4.2.3.2.2.3.1 One is bound in samsara by the nescience of ignorance]

L10: [6.2.4.2.3.2.2.3.2 How one achieves liberation through the gnosis of awareness]

L8: [6.2.4.2.4 The benefits [analysis of the Two Truths ? confidence ? pure vision technique ? entering the range of Buddhahood]]

L9: [6.2.4.2.4.1 By taking such a position, one gives rise to tolerance for the profound meaning]

L10: [6.2.4.2.4.1.1 From the dharmata, which does not exist anywhere, things can arise anywhere]

L11: [6.2.4.2.4.1.1.1 The actual explanation]

L11: [6.2.4.2.4.1.1.2 The inappropriateness of other reifications for that]

L10: [6.2.4.2.4.1.2 Explaining from the perspective of gaining confidence in that]

L11: [6.2.4.2.4.1.2.1 Generating profound tolerance through realizing emptiness as dependent origination]

L11: [6.2.4.2.4.1.2.2 That can engage the cognitive domain of the Buddhas]

L9: [6.2.4.2.4.2 If one has no karmic connection, it is difficult to realize]

L10: [6.2.4.2.4.2.1 The specifics of the Dharma terminology of the tradition of the early translations]

L10: [6.2.4.2.4.2.2 Without a karmic connection, one will have no interest (mos pa) in it]

L7: [6.2.4.3 The summary:]

L8: [6.2.4.3.1 An explanation of the greatness of this establishment of the view of our system]

L8: [6.2.4.3.2 Summarizing by explaining the difference between abiding and apparent natures]

L1: [9.7. Topic 7 [No absolute, only adapted skillful means – no absolute position, but a conventional position about a view (the inseparability of the Two Truths), a path and the result // the Great Perfection’s meditation]]

L4: [[0.2.2.3.] Third, in the analysis of whether the great Madhyamaka has a position or not [explanation of the view of dharmata, which recognizes its nature as equality]]

L5: [7.1 The question [whether it, the great Madhyamaka, upholds a position on the conventional level, since it doesn’t have one at the ultimate level]]

L5: [7.2 Extensive discussion of its meaning]

L6: [7.2.1 Refuting the system of earlier [philosophers], which exclusively asserts that it is without a position. [No absolute position, but a conventional position on a view, a path, and a result]]

L7: [7.2.1.1 Positing other philosophical systems [rejecting all positions]]

L7: [7.2.1.2 Explaining how they are opposed to our own Prasangika tradition [They do have a position on a view, path and result]]

L6: [7.2.2 Discussing the origin of our own system, which proceeds by way of differentiating [the meaning of the expressions] "with" and "without a position" [The Middle Way: not accepting any position as absolute, not rejecting all positions as useless]]

L7: [7.2.2.1 Earlier systems are a mixture of good qualities as well as faults [jumping from one extremes to the other]]

L7: [7.2.2.2 Analysis of the position of our own system, which eliminates those faults [staying away from the two extremes about positions; not accepting, not rejecting]]

L8: [7.2.2.2.1 When one determines that nothing is established in reality, one has no position [not accepting any position as absolute]]

L8: [7.2.2.2.2 When one establishes the system of the path and result in apparent reality, one distinguishes the two truths and maintains them [as a position] [not rejecting all positions as completely useless]]

L6: [7.2.3 Refuting other systems that one-sidedly maintain that there is a position to maintain [Staying away from extremes like reifying the duality of the two truths]]

L7: [7.2.3.1 Setting up the philosophical systems of others [the dualism of the Two Truths]]

L7: [7.2.3.2 Secondly, refuting that view:]

L8: [7.2.3.2.1 In general, it contradicts the view of the Prasangika school to say that there is a position]

L9: [7.2.3.2.1.1 Explaining and analyzing the reason for that]

L10: [7.2.3.2.1.1.1 Establishing a sign that it is difficult to assert a position [how could we have an absolute position since everything is relative to its context]]

L10: [7.2.3.2.1.1.2 Explaining the reason for that [the Madhyamaka is a tool to show the absurdity of all views, not an absolute position]]

L11: [7.2.3.2.1.1.2.1 In our Madhyamika tradition, the object of ascertainment is the ultimate nature of reality]

L11: [7.2.3.2.1.1.2.2 Whatever else is not established from that perspective is not our own system]

L9: [7.2.3.2.1.2 How the point under consideration is harmed by reasoning [all views are ultimately empty, even the view that all views are empty: so we should not accept, nor reject]]

L10: [7.2.3.2.1.2.1 If our system had any position, then it would consequently be ultimately established]

L10: [7.2.3.2.1.2.2 If not, it would contradict the statement that we do have a position]

L8: [7.2.3.2.2 Regarding the internal contradiction of the two truths: [the problem with the duality of the Two Truths]]

L9: [7.2.3.2.2.1 A question about whether or not we have a position on analysis and non-analysis]

L9: [7.2.3.2.2.2 Refuting the answer to that]

L10: [7.2.3.2.2.2.1 If our system were one or the other, then each would contradict the other]

L10: [7.2.3.2.2.2.2 If it were both, showing its untenability]

L11: [7.2.3.2.2.2.2.1 If it were both, both would consequently be resistant to analysis]

L11: [7.2.3.2.2.2.2.2 And there would be no point]

L12: [7.2.3.2.2.2.2.1 Both of those cannot combine]

L12: [7.2.3.2.2.2.2.2 Even if they could, it could be proved meaningless from each side]

L13: [7.2.3.2.2.2.2.2.1 Even if one realizes that exclusive emptiness, it does not cut off attachment to deceptive reality, so analysis becomes futile]

L13: [7.2.3.2.2.2.2.2.2 That apprehension of non-existence lacks the context of view, meditation, action, and fruition, so systems of conventionality become futile]

L6: [7.2.4 Differentiating according to the quintessential [meaning] of our own tradition, namely, the way one settles in meditative equipoise [Transcending the duality of the Two Truths: not accepting it as absolute, not rejecting it as useless conventionally]]

L7: [7.2.4.1 Explanation of the Prasangika Madhyamaka, which emphasizes the non-conceptual ultimate [Ultimately we need to transcend the duality of the Two Truths]]

L8: [7.2.4.1.1 Explaining that, when one ascertains [ultimate reality] in accordance with the gnosis of sublime equipoise, the two truths are not established, and there is no position [The duality of the Two Truths (conventional truths vs. ultimate truth) cannot be the very ultimate truth beyond conceptualization]]

L9: [7.2.4.1.1.1 The pacification of elaborations in accessing the expanse of integrated appearance and emptiness [the view is established as the coalescence beyond all extremes, all conceptualization]]

L9: [7.2.4.1.1.2 Aside from this, coalescence and absence of elaborations are pointless]

L10: [7.2.4.1.1.2.1 That mere emptiness is neither [coalescent nor non-elaborated]]

L10: [7.2.4.1.1.2.2 Explaining each of them]

L11: [7.2.4.1.1.2.2.1 That mere emptiness does not have the sense of coalescence]

L11: [7.2.4.1.1.2.2.2 Does not have the sense of non-elaboration]

L9: [7.2.4.1.1.3 Therefore, from the perspective of the great Madhyamaka, which investigates according to the nature of reality, there is no position [it is beyond all views, establishment or negation]]

L8: [7.2.4.1.2 Setting up the system of the two valid cognitions conventionally, without confusing them [But the duality of the Two Truths and their inseparability is a useful conventional tool, pointing at something beyond conceptualization]]

L9: [7.2.4.1.2.1 In analyzing the manner of appearance from the perspective of a conventionalizing valid cognition, there is a position on the two truths]

L10: [7.2.4.1.2.1.1 The main point [both truths exists conventionally]]

L10: [7.2.4.1.2.1.2 Explaining the reason for how it appears in that way [but they should not be thought as real, or existing independently of each other]]

L11: [7.2.4.1.2.1.2.1 The two truths as objects of engagement are only modes of appearance vis-à-vis their inseparability]

L11: [7.2.4.1.2.1.2.2 The two valid cognitions that engage them are trivial vis-à-vis gnosis]

L9: [7.2.4.1.2.2 In relation to the ascertainment of those two by means of two types of valid cognition, how [our] system is established [both are established by their valid cognition alternatively; but we should know that these two are inseparable]]

L10: [7.2.4.1.2.2.1 Each of the objects found by the ascertainment of the two ascertaining analytical wisdoms has its respective essence]

L10: [7.2.4.1.2.2.2 The position that the two truths to be ascertained are entered alternately]

L8: [7.2.4.1.3 Eliminating faults [We don't have these faults and contradictions because we can distinguish between the conventional / path Madhyamika and the result Madhyamika beyond conceptualization – and aim at transcending the duality]]

L9: [7.2.4.1.3.1 Setting up the argument]

L9: [7.2.4.1.3.2 and eliminating its faults]

L10: [7.2.4.1.3.1.1 Actually giving the response, that there is no fault]

L11: [7.2.4.1.3.1.1.1 Summary of the specifics of the response, that both faults are absent]

L11: [7.2.4.1.3.1.1.2 Explaining its meaning extensively]

L12: [7.2.4.1.3.1.1.2.1 The first answer to the fault]

L13: [7.2.4.1.3.1.1.2.1.1 Criticizing others who have a position [Ultimately we have no position]]

L13: [7.2.4.1.3.1.1.2.1.2 Criticizing others who don't have a position, and the fact that their fault is also not applicable to us [Conventionally we have a position about a view, path and result]]

L12: [7.2.4.1.3.1.1.2.2 The second answer]

L13: [7.2.4.1.3.1.1.2.2.1 The internal contradiction and the fault of withstanding analysis do not apply in the context of ultimate reality [Ultimately the two truths are transcended, their Union is realized]]

L13: [7.2.4.1.3.1.1.2.2.2 They do not apply even with respect to deceptive reality [But conventionally they are established by their valid cognition respectively]]

L10: [7.2.4.1.3.1.2 Refuting others with that:]

L11: [7.2.4.1.3.1.2.1 Having differentiated the abiding and apparent natures of a thing and differentiated appearance and emptiness, all designations are the deceptive reality of modes of appearance [But all of this is still only conventional truths]]

L12: [7.2.4.1.3.1.2.1.1 Explaining that existing things and non-existing things (dngos dang dngos med) are not immune to analysis]

L12: [7.2.4.1.3.1.2.1.2 Explaining that even though those two are posited as the two truths, they are [actually] modes of appearance]

L13: [7.2.4.1.3.1.2.1.2.1 Explaining that uninvestigated deceptive reality is the way things appear]

L13: [7.2.4.1.3.1.2.1.2.2 Explaining that unreality (bden med) is just conceptual]

L11: [7.2.4.1.3.1.2.2 By explaining that abiding and apparent realities are without sameness and difference, one dispels other false conceptualizations [The two truths are not different, not the same]]

L12: [7.2.4.1.3.1.2.2.1 The sameness and difference of appearance and reality]

L12: [7.2.4.1.3.1.2.2.2 Excluding misconceptions about that [sameness or difference]]

L13: [7.2.4.1.3.1.2.2.2.1 In general, there are different systems according to the great and small vehicles]

L13: [7.2.4.1.3.1.2.2.2.2 Therefore, as the Buddha nature is the definitive meaning [of all vehicles], it is not harmed by reasoning]

L13: [7.2.4.1.3.1.2.2.2.3 Showing that it is meaningful to purify the stains that obscure it]

L7: [7.2.4.2 Explanation of the Svatantrika Madhyamaka, which emphasizes the conceptual ultimate that is easy to understand [The concepts of the duality of the Two Truths is very useful as long as we specify the context, and always consider both together. This permits to stay away from all extremes.]]

L8: [7.2.4.2.1 A general discussion of their exposition of the two truths [Until we can transcend the Two Truths, we need to realize both essences about anything; and that they are inseparable: not the same, not different]]

L9: [7.2.4.2.1.1 The claim that the two truths have one essence and different isolates]

L9: [7.2.4.2.1.2 The position that those two are equally potent, based as they are on [their respective] objects]

L9: [7.2.4.2.1.3 Determining that the objects found by the two subjective validating

cognitions are the two truths]

L9: [7.2.4.2.1.4 Explaining that there is no choice but [to conclude that] those two are neither the same nor different]

L8: [7.2.4.2.2 How qualifiers are applied [It is useful to specify the context of any statement: from a conventional or ultimate point of view. And to always consider these two aspects about anything.]]

L9: [7.2.4.2.2.1 The common way of explaining the reasonableness of applying the qualifier]

L10: [7.2.4.2.2.1.1 Showing through analogy the way Svatantrikas apply the qualifier at the time of ascertaining the two truths]

L10: [7.2.4.2.2.1.2 How it is applied in the sutras and sastras]

L9: [7.2.4.2.2.2 The reasonableness of specific cases of application]

L10: [7.2.4.2.2.2.1 The actual reasoning behind those qualifiers]

L11: [7.2.4.2.2.2.1.1 Applying a qualifier at the time of ascertaining ultimate reality]

L11: [7.2.4.2.2.2.1.2 The necessity of likewise applying it to conventional systems]

L10: [7.2.4.2.2.2.2 Its meaning summarized [they are inseparable]]

L8: [7.2.4.2.3 Disposing of criticisms:]

L9: [7.2.4.2.3.1 The criticism [does that mean that things are inherently existing]]

L9: [7.2.4.2.3.2 Its disposal [both are empty of inherent existence, but not completely non-existent either]]

L10: [7.2.4.2.3.2.1 Summary demonstration that from the perspective of a final analysis of ultimate truth, both are without intrinsic reality]

L10: [7.2.4.2.3.2.2 An extensive explanation of that]

L11: [7.2.4.2.3.2.2.1 The way in which one is liberated in emptiness, because appearance is not established in truth]

L11: [7.2.4.2.3.2.2.2 The way relativity appears, because emptiness is not established in truth]

L11: [7.2.4.2.3.2.2.3 The ways of cognizing arise as cause and effect, are of equal force, and are inseparable]

L11: [7.2.4.2.3.2.2.4 Being known to be thus indivisible, they cannot revert to truly existing;]

L11: [7.2.4.2.3.2.2.5 The proof that they are that way]

L7: [7.2.4.3 Combining the Prasangika (non-conceptual ultimate) and Svatantrika (conceptual ultimate) into a single stream : [Using the duality of the Two Truths, then realizing its emptiness, and later transcending it]]

L8: [7.2.4.3.1 The reason why one should meditate upon the view in gradual stages, starting with the causal small Madhyamaka;]

L9: [7.2.4.3.1.1 On the sutra path, in dependence upon dichotomizing analytical wisdom, non-dual gnosis is generated]

L10: [7.2.4.3.1.1.1 If one does not rely upon the two stainless forms of valid cognition, the forces contrary to gnosis will prevent it from arising]

L10: [7.2.4.3.1.1.2 If the causal factors of either of those two forms of analysis are not complete, gnosis is not generated]

L10: [7.2.4.3.1.1.3 Thus, to separate them is not the authentic path]

L9: [7.2.4.3.1.2 On the mantra path, there are many methods that can indicate the essence of gnosis, by means of empowerment and symbolic means]

L9: [7.2.4.3.1.3 Summary:]

L10: [7.2.4.3.1.3.1 Showing the Madhyamika path that differentiates the two truths and their purpose]

L10: [7.2.4.3.1.3.2 Summarizing by explaining that the non-conceptual gnosis of coalescence

that is the result [of the two truths] is a crucial point common to both sutra and tantra]

L8: [7.2.4.3.2 The fact that this requirement [the Two Truths] represents the intention of the scriptures and treatises]

L8: [7.2.4.3.3 The consciousness and gnosis that meditate in this way are the context for applying the conventional designations "small," "great," and so forth]

L9: [7.2.4.3.3.1 The causal small Madhyamaka of analytical wisdom]

L10: [7.2.4.3.3.1.1 The two truths maintained as a position in our own tradition]

L11: [7.2.4.3.3.1.1.1 The reason for being "small"]

L11: [7.2.4.3.3.1.1.2 The reason for having a position]

L11: [7.2.4.3.3.1.1.3 The fact that the two truths are our own system]

L10: [7.2.4.3.3.1.2 The fact that to do otherwise would be unreasonable]

L11: [7.2.4.3.3.1.2.1 That denigrating view is not reasonable as a basis, path, or result]

L11: [7.2.4.3.3.1.2.2 It can be refuted by both scripture and reasoning]

L9: [7.2.4.3.3.2 On the fruitional Madhyamaka [the Great Perfection]]

L10: [7.2.4.3.3.2.1 The reason why it is both "Madhyamaka" and "great"]

L11: [7.2.4.3.3.2.1.1 The way of meditating on the essence of the intentions of the causal and fruitional vehicles, the Madhyamaka that is the gnosis of the coalescence of the two truths]

L11: [7.2.4.3.3.2.1.2 Such a gnosis is the great Madhyamaka]

L11: [7.2.4.3.3.2.1.3 If that is not touched upon, then it is neither Madhyamaka nor great]

L10: [7.2.4.3.3.2.2 The reason for positing coalescence and fruition]

L11: [7.2.4.3.3.2.2.1 The gnosis of sublime beings that is free of elaboration is designated as the state of coalescence and fruition]

L11: [7.2.4.3.3.2.2.2 From the perspective of that equipoise, deceptive elaborations are eliminated]

L11: [7.2.4.3.3.2.2.3 How all conventionalities are engaged in the aftermath state through words and concepts]

L11: [7.2.4.3.3.2.2.4 How, from the perspective of that equipoise, neither the presence nor absence of appearance is established]

L7: [7.2.4.4 The differences among Madhyamika, Mahamudra, and the Great Perfection:]

L8: [7.2.4.4.1 The differences in practicing the path]

L9: [7.2.4.4.1.1 The differences in the view of analytical wisdom]

L10: [7.2.4.4.1.1.1 In the sutric path, by gradually practicing the path, one realizes the views of Mahamudra and the Great Perfection]

L10: [7.2.4.4.1.1.2 Such a view is explained as effortless in the path of the Great Perfection]

L10: [7.2.4.4.1.1.3 By realizing it, one comprehends the profound doctrine, and is able to help others]

L9: [7.2.4.4.1.2 The differences in both analytical wisdom and skillful means]

L8: [7.2.4.4.2 Differences in the manner of ascertaining the basis:]

L9: [7.2.4.4.2.1 The dharmadhatu free of elaborations is the unique object]

L9: [7.2.4.4.2.2 Differences in the analytical wisdom that meditates upon it—whether it has an intentional apprehension or not]

L9: [7.2.4.4.2.3 In the view that ascertains that, the difference between the expanse and direct or inferential [valid cognition]]

L8: [7.2.4.4.3 A summary:]

L9: [7.2.4.4.3.1 How to show that those stages of the various vehicles have different subjective views]

L10: [7.2.4.4.3.1.1 Understanding the views of sutra and tantra by explaining the difference

between the great and small Madhyamakas to be that of mind and gnosis]

L10: [7.2.4.4.3.1.2 Praising the state of gnosis with the word "great."]

L9: [7.2.4.4.3.2 Likewise, though its name is the same, the object also has a different meaning understood in accordance with different contexts]

L1: [9.8. Conclusion]

L2: [0.3 Thirdly, the final virtue, knowing well the complete and perfect conclusion:]

L3: [0.3.1 The reason why the interlocutor should be humbled and awed at the extensive explanation]

L4: [0.3.1.1 The way the interlocutor generates humility]

L4: [0.3.1.2 The destruction of his arrogance]

L3: [0.3.2 Joyfully praising the undertaking and explanation of the profound and extensive meaning]

L4: [0.3.2.1 The greatness of the teaching and lineage holders of Padmasambhava]

L5: [0.3.2.1.1 Although the author has not simply repeated the words of others, Rong zom's and Klong chen pa's tradition is like a treasure-house of jewels]

L5: [0.3.2.1.2 Therefore, by taking up those important points of the good Dharma of the Nyingmapas on the path of reasoning and explaining them properly, confidence is gained]

L5: [0.3.2.1.3 Moreover, in dependence upon this path of reasoning, one can prove and refute with explanation and debate]

L5: [0.3.2.1.4 Therefore, it is reasonable to rely upon this kind of Dharma, which is the supreme jewel of the profound meaning that dispels ignorance]

L4: [0.3.2.2 This treatise's praise for the holders of that [lineage]]

L5: [0.3.2.2.1 Whoever is able to hold an authentic Dharma teaching like this receives the name of "bodhisattva"]

L5: [0.3.2.2.2 Because the meaning of the Dharma, like a treasury of gems, is attained, how to study and contemplate common and uncommon subjects]

L5: [0.3.2.2.3 This elegant explanation is not something made up, but is the oral tradition of the vidyadhara lineage]

L3: [0.3.3 Once again to summarize the meaning and give advice:]

L4: [0.3.3.1 An exhortation to be a vessel containing meaning that condenses the quintessence of vastness]

L4: [0.3.3.2 The actual advice]

L5: [0.3.3.2.1 The way of giving advice with respect to the establishment of a profound and vast intellect]

L4: [0.3.3.2.2 The actual meaning of that advice]

L5: [0.3.3.2.2.1 The six-syllable mantra, which is explained before, etc., is the entrance way for these [résumé of the seven answers]]

L5: [0.3.3.2.2.2 Those ways are accomplished in dependence upon the yogas of calm abiding and special insight [the Union of Shamatha and Vipashyana]]

L6: [0.3.3.2.2.2.1 By practicing in that way, the individually realized analytical wisdom blazes]

L6: [0.3.3.2.2.2.2 Its result is consummation in the non-conceptual state of the perfectly pure Manjusri]

L6: [0.3.3.2.2.2.3 Having abandoned obscuring stains through that, one attains eloquence with respect to the ultimate meaning]

L3: [0.3.4 Stating the meaning of the treatise, including both questions and answers]

L4: [0.3.4.1 Including both questions and answers, the way of composing the crucial points of scripture]

L4: [0.3.4.2 Having cast away arrogance, the presence of profound and extensive meaning in

this treatise]

L4: [0.3.4.3 Differentiating joyfully the meaningful speech that posed questions in that way]

L4: [0.3.4.4 Stating the colophon, which is made for the sake of those with profound and extensive minds]

L4: [0.3.4.5 In dependence upon this, finding the excellent path of the supreme vehicle]

L1: [THEMES:]

[Investigating the Two Truths is the basis of all authentic paths]

Introduction [The need to induce certainty by the two types of valid cognition – investigating the real nature of the Two Truths]

[Clarifying the authentic meaning of emptiness, and of the final view]

-- Topic 1 [The problem of negation: Emptiness is also empty; it is not the real non-dual nature beyond all conceptualization]

-- Topic 2 [About the limited realizations of the Hinayana's arhat: they do not realize the full extent of the emptiness of phenomena; they still reify elementary dharmas, and are stuck hiding in cessation]

[The role of the Two Truths teachings in Madhyamika meditation]

-- Topic 3 [Sudden vs. gradual vs. dropping all: should meditation involve conceptualization, like a modal apprehension of emptiness, or should we drop all conceptualization following Hashang's path]

-- Topic 4 [The Union of Shamatha vs. Vipashyana – we need both depending on the situation;]

-- Topic 5 [Basing the Tantric practices on adapted skillful means and views, based on a gradually induced certainty of the inseparability of conventional & Ultimate Truths]

[The role of the Two Truths teachings in symbolic Tantrayana]

-- Topic 6 [The importance of investigating the basis of perception in order to induce this certainty – inseparability of appearances and emptiness]

[Transcending the Two Truths with the Great Perfection]

-- Topic 7 [Whether or not Madhyamikas have a thesis – No absolute, only adapted skillful means; The Middle Way: not accepting, not rejecting. We need to use the Two Truths together until we can transcend the duality.]

Conclusion

The six-syllable mantra [résumé of the 7 answers]

L1: [ORIGINAL SUBDIVISION OF THE TIBETAN TEXT]

o.1 The introduction to the composition of the treatise, which is virtuous at the beginning; [Introduction]

o.2 the consummate main body of the treatise that has the enumeration of royal accouterments, which is virtuous in the middle;

o.2.1 a general explanation of the view of emptiness;

0.2.1.1 The actual explanation [topic 1]
 0.2.1.2 an incidental analysis of whether sravakas and pratyekabuddhas have realization of the view of emptiness. [topic 2]
 0.2.2 a specific discussion of the three views. [Madhyamaka-Sutra, Tantrayana, Great Perfection ?]
 0.2.2.1 explanation of the view of intrinsic awareness, which realizes the equal taste of the coalescence of the two truths;
 [0.2.2.1.1] The actual explanation;
 [0.2.2.1.1.1] 3. Whether the maintenance of the actual practice of the view involves apprehension or not; [topics 3]
 [0.2.2.1.1.2] 4. whether analysis or equipoise is correct; [topics 4a]
 [0.2.2.1.1.3] 4.3. combining those two into a common meaning. [topics 4b]
 [0.2.2.1.2] analyzing which of the two truths is most important by positing the differences of the views of the various vehicles [topic 5].
 [0.2.2.2.] explanation of the view of the dharma-possessor (dharmin) through the stages of the manner of pure divine self-appearance; [topic 6]
 [0.2.2.3.] explanation of the view of dharmata, which recognizes its nature as equality. [topic 7]
 0.3 an excellent auspice of fulfillment, the conclusion that is virtuous in the end.
 [Conclusion & Colophon]

L1: [Introduction]

[see the other file for this chapter]

L1: [Chapter 9. Stainless Light: A Commentary on the Beacon of Certainty]

L1: [9.0. Introduction [The need to induce certainty by the two types of valid cognition – investigating the real nature of the Two Truths]]

ϕ(i.e. Résumé of the Introduction: Many beginners in Buddhism have much doubts and are not certain about the authentic view, path and result. Many have fallen into the reification of emptiness, or into nihilism. Many think the path consist of dropping all conceptualization and just resting with a blank mind. Many think that conceptualization is just plain bad and have no place on the path since the ultimate realization is beyond all conceptualization anyway. Many are far away from the authentic path and don't even know they are lost. Many are just tired of all of those skillful means and temporary views and want to know what is the truth behind all of this, what is the logic. Mipham wants to bring some light onto those doubts and mistakes with this text. He intends to prove that, even if the goal is beyond conceptualization, this doesn't mean that we should reject all conceptualization, logic, reasonings, and virtuous methods right now. On the contrary, it is when we are not using them that we are fooled by mistakes and end up into one extreme or another. According to him, the only way to remove all doubts, stay away from all extremes, be sure to be on the authentic path, and have a strong faith in the view path and result, is to study,

contemplate, and meditate on the theory of the Two Truths as presented by Nagarjuna & al. And this is done using the teachings of both Chandrakirti (pramana or syllogism) and Dharmakirti (prasanga). We need both.)

[see the other file for this chapter]

L1: [9.1. Topic 1 [The problem of negation: Emptiness is also empty; it is not the real non-dual nature beyond all conceptualization]]

¢(i.e. Résumé of Topic 1: In this section Mipham clarifies the authentic meaning of emptiness; and shows the danger of misinterpreting it and falling into one extreme or the other. The Tetralemma, or the negation of the four extremes – of existence, non-existence, both, neither – doesn't mean that emptiness is the very ultimate truth, the Union of The Two Truths, the inseparability of appearances and emptiness, the coalescence. Emptiness is only a part of this Union of the Two Truths. It only means that this coalescence, this union, is beyond all description, all conceptualization. Even if everything is empty of inherent existence, that doesn't mean that everything is completely non-existent, nor that there is a basis of imputation that is real, that there are real conventional things. It means that, to find the meaning of this, one has to go beyond all conceptualization, to look directly at the real nature of his own mind without using conceptualization. – So the conceptual emptiness is a complete negation without affirming anything, without leaving anything on the base; but ultimately the non-conceptual emptiness is beyond establishment and negation. The very ultimate truth is beyond inherent existence and emptiness, beyond emptiness and non-emptiness.)

[see the other file for this chapter]

L1: [9.2. Topic 2 [About the limited realizations of the arhats in the Hinayana: they do not realize the full extent of the emptiness of phenomena; they still reify elementary dharmas, and are stuck hiding in cessation]]

¢(i.e. Résumé of Topic 2: In this section Mipham confirms that emptiness is a concept also used in the Hinayana; but that they do not cover the full extent of its authentic meaning by applying it to all dharmas without exception. They still believe in real elementary external and internal dharmas. And, this way, they still grasp at the seeds of their self; they still hold on to the causes for a subtle self, and thus cannot reach true authentic Liberation. So they do realize the two emptinesses of persons and phenomena, but not completely. To realize the selflessness of person is not enough. At one point or another, the arhat stuck in cessation (rejection and hiding) will have to realize that the job is not finish and continue within the Mahayana.)

[see the other file for this chapter]

L1: [9.3. Topic 3 [Sudden vs. Gradual vs. dropping all: Should meditation involve conceptualization, modal apprehension, such as apprehending emptiness?]]

¢(i.e. Résumé of Topic 3: About sudden vs. gradual vs. Hashang's method of dropping all How to meditate on the way things really are. Should we drop all conceptualization, or concentrate one pointedly on the idea of emptiness? Mipham discusses the dangers of misinterpreting the instructions for meditating on emptiness. It is true that ultimately one meditate in a state beyond conceptualization, but this state cannot be faked by artificially dropping all conceptualization and making the mind blank like a rock. Going beyond all conceptualization has to be a natural consequence of directly seeing the real nature of our own mind and of everything. Faking it will not bring us closer to this direct realization. Until then we need to analyze the way things really are using the teachings and reasonings based on the Two Truths. This permits to stay away from all extremes in meditation and out of meditation. And going beyond conceptualization doesn't mean to reject all conceptualization as if they were essentially bad; it means to directly see their real nature and not being attached or conditioned by them. It is a state beyond thought and no-thought; beyond emptiness and non-emptiness; where a mind with or without thoughts are seen as not different, not the same, or inseparable, non-dual: not two, not one. It is a state where there is no acceptance, no rejection of thoughts, or anything else. It is a state of great equanimity.

[see the other file for this chapter]

~ This state can be reached very fast by some immediately after having been introduced to the real nature of his mind by their teacher. But for most of us it is a state that is reached after a long gradual process using techniques from either the sutras or the tantras. Those techniques are there in order to create a mind state that is not bending toward any one of the four extremes. But the final realization is beyond those four extremes, beyond any analysis, or concepts, beyond all causality.

~ And while meditating on it, it is important to go beyond simple non-existence (reifying emptiness), beyond the duality existence vs. non-existence (the Two truths), beyond thinking they are the same: dependent origination and emptiness.)

L1: [9.4. Topic 4 [The Union of Shamatha vs Vipashyana – we need both depending on the situation]]

¢(i.e. Résumé of Topic 4: More on how to meditate and finally directly see the real non-dual nature of our own mind – intrinsic awareness. This is the continuation of the theme started with topic 3, whether we should use conceptualization and analysis in meditation, or simply drop all apprehension, all analysis, all conceptualization. In other words, which is the best: to develop concentration without conceptualization (Shamatha), or to analyze the real nature of everything using Vipashyana. The answer is again on the Middle Way: one alone is not enough, we need the Union of the Two. All traditions agree on that. To correctly determine when to use one or the other, we need to understand about the distinction between the sudden and gradual path. It is true that the final meditation is beyond all analysis or

conceptualization, but in order to get there we need to use analysis and conceptualization so we do not fall into any extremes. Whether we use the sutric path or the symbolic tantric path, our practice needs to be based on a correct understanding and certainty about the basis, the inseparability of the Two truths. Just faking a state of non-conceptualization, or faking a state of perceiving oneself as a deity and everything else as pure, without basing those practices on true wisdom, is not going to work. They just become like going to an extreme, and missing the whole point. These practices have to be based on a certainty induced by virtuous methods and correct reasonings.)

[see the other file for this chapter]

L1: [9.5. Topic 5 [Basing the Tantric practices on adapted skillful means and views, based on a gradually induced certainty of the inseparability of conventional & Ultimate Truths]]

¶(i.e. Résumé of Topic 5: In all vehicles, the essence always come down to ultimately realizing the great equanimity, the non-duality, the inseparability of the Two Truths, etc. The adapted skillful means and temporary views used in the different vehicles may be different, but the essence is unique. Ultimately the Dharma has only one flavor. And that is described as equanimity, non-duality, the inseparability of the Two Truths, the Union of the Two Truths, inseparability of bliss and emptiness, inseparability of compassion and emptiness, the coalescence, etc. etc. The name change with the vehicle, the depth of understanding becomes more and more subtle, but the source, Buddha, and the essence, Dharma, are the same. Why is that? Because this is the way things really are. And without first having a correct conceptual understanding of these Two truths, and without generating a minimal level of certainty through correct reasonings and virtuous methods, one is never sure to be on the authentic path, or simply going toward one extreme or another. Meditating while faking, while going to one extreme or another, or while having doubts has no result.)

L5: [[0.2.2.1.2.] 5. An explanation of which of the two truths is more important:]

L6: [5.1 The question]

\ ###
\ 5.1
\ Which of the two truths is more important?

¶(i.e. The Two Truths: conventional truths or ultimate Truth. Ultimate truth is “emptiness”, or wisdom. Conventional truths are methods like: the Four Noble truths, karma, dependent origination, space time, compassion, bliss, the various paths and adapted skillful means, the sciences, the laws, ... The Buddha said we need the two together all the time. Why? Because only then is it in accord with the real non-dual nature of everything; only then is it efficient.)

Thus, the claim that there is no difference between the views of sutra and tantra, and the claim that there is a difference, are stated in response to the question, "Which of the two truths is more important?"

L6: [5.2 An extensive discussion of its meaning]

L7: [5.2.1 Refuting other systems that maintain that either of two truths is more or less important]

L8: [5.2.1.1 Refuting the claim that ultimate reality is more important]

L9: [5.2.1.1.1 Setting up the purvapaksa's claim [ultimate is most important]]

\ ###
\ 5.2.1.1.1
\ Some claim the ultimate is most important.
\ "Deceptive reality is a deluded perception," they say,
\ Understanding it as something to be abandoned.
\ "Ultimate reality is not deluded, so that ultimate
\ Is the perfectly pure view," they say.

Some holders of philosophical systems in the new schools claim that ultimate reality is more important. Their reason is that the dharma-possessor, deceptive reality, is only "deluded appearance," and realized to be an adventitious object of abandonment. Ultimate reality is non-deluded and is the basic reality of things, so only the view of that ultimate reality is a perfectly pure view, they say.

L9: [5.2.1.1.2 Refuting it]

L10: [5.2.1.1.2.1 The two truths are essentially non-different]

L11: [5.2.1.1.2.1.1 Explaining the meaning of the statement that deceptive reality is delusive]

\ ###
\ 5.2.1.1.2.1.1
\ If deceptive reality were not erroneous, were indeed true,
\ Ultimate reality could not be emptiness, so
\ They are expressed differently in this way.

ϕ(i.e. They are inseparable, not different, not the same non-dual: not two, not one. So one cannot be more important than the other one.)

Of course, deceptive reality and ultimate reality are explained as being "delusive" and "non-delusive," respectively, but that doesn't mean that they are more and less important. If the deceptive appearances of dependent origination—the apprehension of self and dharmas as being truly existent—were not delusive, but true, then it would be impossible for the other aspect [of the two], ultimate reality, to be posited as emptiness; for besides the non-empty deceptive reality, there is nothing else to posit as empty. Therefore, although the statement "Deceptive reality is delusive" is used metonymically to indicate the ultimate reality of emptiness, aside from stating in effect that "a mind that apprehends a non-empty appearance is deluded," it does not mean that the mere appearance of deceptive reality should be abandoned. If that were the case, then the ultimate reality of emptiness would not be found, since ultimate reality is posited as the essential emptiness of deceptive reality.

L11: [5.2.1.1.2.1.2 Explaining that the two truths are of equal force whether they both exist or both do not exist]

\ ###
\ 5.2.1.1.2.1.2
\ However, no ultimate can be established
\ Over and against the deceptive;
\ The two of them are method and methodical result.
\ Without depending on an entity for examination,

\ Its non-substantiality cannot be established—
\ Therefore both substance and non-substance
\ Are the same in being mere relativity.

¢(i.e. They represent the fact that everything is not existent, not non-existent, not both, not neither. But they are both empty of inherent existence, both conventional truths. Emptiness is also empty of inherent existence; it is not an absolute. It is merely the antidote to inherent existence. When there is no more belief in inherent existence, then there is no more need for its conventional antidote: emptiness. The real nature of everything is none of those two, nor the two together, nor anything else. It is called the Union of The Two Truths, or the coalescence, but it is beyond all conceptualization.)

Thus it is not reasonable to posit greater and lesser importance. If one abandons the dependently arisen appearance of deceptive reality, there is no empty or non-empty ultimate reality left over; appearance and emptiness are related as method and methodical result. In dependence upon the appearance of this method of deceptive reality, one realizes the ultimate reality that is the methodical result of knowing its lack of intrinsic reality. And from the method of knowing ultimate reality as emptiness, one realizes the infallible occurrence of the appearance of deceptive reality as illusion-like relativity, as the methodical result of profound dependent origination. Without relying upon the entity that is investigated, or without relating to it, the non-entity of that entity cannot be, because each is posited in relation to the other.

The Avatara commentary says:

~ If this exist, this arises; for example,
~ If there is "long," there is "short."
~ If this is born, this arises; for example,
~ If a lamp arises, there is light.

For that reason, in relation to entities, there is production, and in relation to non-entities, there is designation; both are entirely equivalent, whether they exist or not, insofar as they are both mere appearances of dependent origination.

The Bodhicaryavatara says:

~ When you say that something is "non-existent,"
~ Unless you refer to the entity under investigation,
~ Its non-entity cannot be apprehended.

L10: [5.2.1.1.2.2 Explaining why it is a mistake to cling to their difference]

L11: [5.2.1.1.2.2.1 How your position contradicts the tradition of the great system-builder Nagarjuna]

\ ###
\ 5.2.1.1.2.2.1
\ If that clinging to emptiness
\ Were to fully exclude appearance,
\ It would mess up Nagarjuna's fine system.

¢(i.e. Grasping at emptiness, thinking it is an absolute, is a major fault.)

If one only maintains ultimate emptiness, and if clinging to that excludes the deceptive reality of appearance, this makes a mess of the good system of the profound view of Nagarjuna, according to which emptiness only arises as dependent origination. If appearance

is excluded, there will be no distinction of greater or lesser importance. Also, if one clings to a non-empty appearance as being ultimate reality, even if that excludes other appearances of deceptive reality, it will also make a mess of the system of Nagarjuna, because [his system] does not fall into a biased interpretation of appearance or emptiness as being the nature of things, which both of these positions do in their biased claims about appearance and emptiness.

L11: [5.2.1.1.2.2.2 How Chandrakirti's statement of fault applies equally to you]

\ ###
\ 5.2.1.1.2.2.2
\ If by cultivating the path by that seeing of emptiness,
\ One were only to realize the expanse of emptiness,
\ Then one would have to accept that the
\ Sublime equipoise on emptiness
\ Would be a cause for the destruction of substantial entities.

¢(i.e. After going beyond realism, one has to go beyond emptiness (idealism or nihilism). Then beyond the Two Truths (dualism), and beyond thinking that they are “One” (oneness or monism). That is the meaning of the Heart Sutra, and of its mantra: “TAYATA OM GATE GATE PARAGATE PARASAMGATE BODHI SOHA” – “Thus, Om, gone, gone, gone beyond, gone well beyond, enlightenment, hail” . Beyond the four extremes.)

If one sees the ultimate reality of emptiness and cultivates that as the path, and if through that cultivation there is some kind of exclusive expanse or emptiness to be realized that excludes appearance, then that kind of emptiness seen by the equipoise of sublime beings would be a cause for destroying entities. This would not only apply to the Svatantrikas, but to you as well, because your equipoise would render non-existent one half of the coalescence of emptiness and dependent origination. If the object to be realized is not exclusively emptiness, this would damage the claim that emptiness is most important.

L11: [5.2.1.1.2.2.3 Therefore, how your position is mistaken with respect to the final meaning]

\ ###
\ 5.2.1.1.2.2.3
\ Therefore, though things are empty from the beginning,
\ Appearance and emptiness are not separate things;
\ Adhering to the statement "Only emptiness is important"
\ Is an unskilled approach to the final meaning.

¢(i.e. Grasping at emptiness, thinking it is an absolute, is a major fault.)

For those reasons, even though all afflicted and purified dharmas abide primordially in emptiness, that emptiness does not exclude appearance. Because emptiness and appearance are not separate and distinct, the views that apprehend that only the ultimate truth of emptiness is important, or that only some non-empty ultimate reality is important, are not adequate to the final meaning of the nature of things, because they are not established through reasoning.

L8: [5.2.1.2 Refuting the claim that deceptive reality is more important:]

L9: [5.2.1.2.1 Refuting the system of some Nyingmapas]

L10: [5.2.1.2.1.1 Staking the claim [putting aside the ultimate]]

\ ###
\ 5.2.1.2.1.1
\ Some people put aside the ultimate
\ And from the perspective of mere conventionality,
\ Differentiate the levels of the view in the tantric classes.

¢(i.e. Grasping at the paths, at the skillful means, at the virtuous methods, as if they were absolute is also a major fault. Sectarism is a major fault. Thinking one vehicle is superior than others is stupidity and missing the whole point.)

Some Nyingmapas exclude the ultimate reality of emptiness and posit the views of the tantric systems as higher and lower merely from the perspective of the deceptive reality of knowing the aspect of appearance as deities and mandalas.

L10: [5.2.1.2.1.2 Refuting it]

L11: [5.2.1.2.1.2.1 Deceptive reality alone cannot be an extraordinary Dharma [grasping at conventional truths, paths, visualizations]]

\ ###
\ 5.2.1.2.1.2.1
\ Viewing oneself as a deity conventionally
\ Without complementing the view with the ultimate reality
\ of emptiness
\ And thus differentiating "higher" and "lower" teachings,
\ is incorrect.

¢(i.e. The reason why Tantrayana is dangerous is because idiots end-up thinking they are real deities or Buddhas, and forget to dissolve everything into emptiness at the beginning and ending of their practice. They lose touch with conventional reality and emptiness.)

If that positing of higher and lower systems only from the perspective of deceptive reality is not completed by ultimate reality, or is not related to ultimate reality, then that kind of deceptive reality of divine appearance is not suitable as a teaching for ranking the views of the tantric systems of our own tradition. If the essence is not empty, then it is not right to establish anything as a deity, because that kind of deity is not possible as an object of cognition.

L11: [5.2.1.2.1.2.2 Explaining the reason for that through examples [without the certainty induced by the correct reasonings on the inseparability of the Two Truths, they are just faking self-purity in Tantrayana practices]]

\ ###
\ 5.2.1.2.1.2.2
\ Without having confidence in ultimate reality,
\ Just meditating on deceptive reality as divinity
\ Is mere wishful thinking, not a view;
\ Just as some heretical awareness mantras
\ Involve visualizing oneself differently during recitation.

¢(i.e. They are just faking it, without basing their Tantric practices on real wisdom.)

Therefore, if one does not have confidence in the realization of the great equality of

apparent and possible phenomena—which is the abiding character of ultimate reality—to divide the two truths and meditate only the aspect of deceptive reality as a deity is only wishful thinking that is not completed by the view. It is not a meditation that possesses the meaning of the view that realizes the nature of things. For example, when one recites certain awareness mantras of heretical systems, one imagines that one's own body is different.

L9: [5.2.1.2.2 Refuting other philosophical systems]

L10: [5.2.1.2.2.1 Expounding the way of ascertaining the philosophical system of the purvapaksa [like saying that emptiness is nothing more than dependent origination]]

\ ###
\ 5.2.1.2.2.1
\ Some say deceptive reality is more important;
\ They say you must integrate the two truths,
\ But then they heap praise on deceptive reality.

¢(i.e. Saying one thing, and doing the other. They think that the Two Truths are the same; that emptiness is nothing more than dependent origination. Like prof. Hayes. That is the fourth extreme of the Tetralemma: thinking the Two Truths are the same. That is not the meaning of non-duality, or the Union of the Two Truths: not two, not one.)

Some scholars of the new schools of the Land of Snows say that between the two truths, the appearance of dependent origination in deceptive reality is most important. The reason, they say, is that "the two truths of appearance and emptiness must be integrated." But then, again and again, they praise the position of deceptive reality and its establishment through conventional validating cognition. They say that deceptive reality is not empty of its own essence, because if it were empty, that would denigrate conventionality, and that, since it would be a nihilistic view, would be inappropriate.

L10: [5.2.1.2.2.2 Refuting it by showing that its theory and praxis have gone their separate ways]

\ ###
\ 5.2.1.2.2.2
\ At the time of maintaining the view of coalescence,
\ They desert coalescence and grasp a blank emptiness.
\ Thus the toddler of practice cannot keep up
\ With the mother of good explanations.

¢(i.e. Saying one thing, and doing the other.)

Having made this explanation, when meditating on its meaning, that is, when maintaining the view of coalescence that has been ascertained in that way, they [in fact] abandon the coalescence that has been ascertained and do not meditate upon it. Instead, they explain that one meditates with modal apprehension on an exclusive emptiness that is the absence of true existence. This is like a thoughtless, wandering boy of meditative practice who does not follow his mother—the view [ascertained] through study and reflection, according to good explanations. The meditation does not follow suit after the explanation. It is like, for example, throwing a gtor ma to the north for a ghost staying in the east.

L7: [5.2.2 Expounding our own system [basis, path, result]: which maintains that there is no degree of importance in the inseparability of the two truths]

L8: [5.2.2.1 Ascertaining the basis, the coalescence of the two truths]

L9: [5.2.2.1.1 [A brief demonstration of our staying away from all extremes: the Buddha-nature is not permanent, not impermanent ...]]

Original section title: A brief demonstration, with respect to the inseparability of appearance and emptiness, that our own tradition, the Early Translation school, does not fall into any bias of intrinsic emptiness, non-emptiness, permanence, non-permanence, and so forth.

\ ###
\ 5.2.2.1.1
\ Therefore, here in our early translation tradition,
\ Our Dharma terminology for the basis, path, and result
\ Does not fall into extremes or bias with respect to
\ Permanence, impermanence, the two truths, and so forth;
\ We maintain only the philosophical position of coalescence.

¢(i.e. They stick to non-duality beyond conceptualization, the inseparability of conventional truths and emptiness; staying away from all extremes as Nagarjuna taught,...)

Thus, in explaining the basic meaning, some positions of the new schools, as explained before, maintain that the basic Buddha nature is impermanent and empty.

-- In that respect, the sutras of the intermediate turning that teach emptiness and their interpretive commentaries are said to be of definitive meaning,

-- and the sutras of the final turning and their interpretive commentaries are said to be of provisional meaning.

Also, some claim that the Buddha nature is not empty of essence, and is stable and permanent; they say that the sutras and interpretive commentaries of the final turning are of definitive meaning, and the scriptures and interpretive commentaries of the middle turning are of provisional meaning. Thus, with a few exceptions, most of them interpret the scriptures and commentaries through dividing them in this way.

Some sutras, such as the Aksayamatipariprccha and the Samadhiraja, say that the middle turning is definitive; some, such as the Dhamnisvampariprccha, praise the final turning as supreme, and the Samdhinirmocana, and so forth, say that the final turning is of definitive meaning. Some sources agree with others, and some do not.

Therefore, here in our own tradition of the Early Translation school, in our terminology of the basic nature of objects of cognition, the dharmas of the path that is traveled, and the essence of the result that is to be attained, we do not favor either side of the two truths by asserting either permanence or impermanence, or an empty or a non-empty appearance, and so forth. Not falling into any extreme, we maintain only the philosophical system of the equanimity of the coalescence of appearance and emptiness that is free of the ambivalence of false imagination.

As it is said:

- ~ If a fortunate disciple practices sutra and mantra
- ~ Properly, without being influenced by others' ways —

Accordingly, whether it is the sutric or tantric path under consideration, we do not have any interpretive bias. With respect to sutra, the sutras and interpretive commentaries of the middle turning emphasize and explain the way of engaging the ultimate reality of the

Buddha nature, the abiding reality of coalescence of the two truths; therefore, they teach the abiding character of primordial purity. Also, the sutras and interpretive commentaries that teach the essence of the final turning emphasize the systems of the conventionality of the appearance of the Buddha nature, which is the abiding nature of the coalescence of the two truths; thus, they are held to teach the system of the spontaneous presence of the qualities of natural clarity. Therefore, it was said, "All the scriptures and interpretive commentaries are perfect."

Likewise, as far as Mantrayana is concerned, not only do we maintain that all of the branches of the tantric systems and practice systems of the old and new schools, as well as the distant lineage of the transmitted precepts of the Nyingmapa, are authentic paths, the close lineage of treasures and its branches are complete and perfect.

It says:

- ~ In the scriptural great ocean of true speech,
- ~ The jewels of the profound Dharma treasure are beautifully manifest.

According to the previous explanation, in the teaching of the final nature of reality that integrates all those [scriptures and commentaries], when one has determined the coalescence of primordial purity and spontaneous presence, one practices the coalescent self-arisen gnosis on either the path of trekcho or togal. (i.e. Two Dzogchen Atiyoga techniques.)

The result, the purity of the inner expanse, is held to be the attainment of the goal of the inseparable coalescence of the three kayas.

¶(i.e. The result is the inseparable pure body, speech and mind, representing the real nature of the three realms: desire, form, formless, and their inseparability. For more on this see : Longchenpa's Great Chariot.)

The commentary to the Sems nyid ngal gso says:

- ~ In the apparent aspect of the natural luminosity of the mind—which abides primordially, is the holy gnosis of the Buddhas, the nature of mind, whose essence is stainless and which is naturally pure—the qualities of the formal kayas of the Buddhas are spontaneously present. This is taught with nine examples. For the emptiness aspect, the quality of dharmakaya is explained in all the sutras and tantras as being like space. The inseparability of those two [the dharmakaya and the formal kayas] is the virtue of the beginningless dharma realm. Because it is changeless, it is the naturally abiding lineage, and because it is purified of stains and has extensively manifested qualities, it is called the "expanded lineage" (rgyas gyur gyi rigs). But at its root, it is just the luminous gnosis of self-awareness.

Also, along the same lines, the great Rong zom said:

- ~ By realizing the two truths inseparably, one can engage dharmas and dharmata non-dualistically. This is called "abiding in the view of the Great Perfection."

L9: [5.2.2.1.2 The extensive explanation [about the basis of Dzogchen]:]

L10: [5.2.2.1.2.1 A general explanation of the inseparability of the two truths]

L11: [5.2.2.1.2.1.1 Setting up the proof of the inseparability of the two truths]

L12: [5.2.2.1.2.1.1.1 Establishing the subject (phyogs chos) [of the syllogism] [by demonstrating that] one cannot posit the basis, path, and result if either of the two truths is taken individually as a basis]

\ ###

\ 5.2.2.1.2.1.1.1
\ If deceptive and ultimate reality are separated,
\ One cannot posit the basis, path, or result on the basis of
\ either.

¢(i.e. The basis, path and result are all based on the inseparability of the Two Truths.
Taking only one would result in absurdity, extremist paths, and no Liberation.)

The reason for not dividing the two truths is that the basis, path, and result cannot be posited on the basis of either deceptive reality or ultimate reality, if either of those two is taken separately. For exclusive emptiness and exclusive appearance cannot possibly be objects of cognition. The object of cognition and the object of attainment are impossible; if they are impossible, the path that connects the two of them as agent and agenda cannot be posited.

L12: [5.2.2.1.2.1.1.2 In the context of any of those three, taking the position that there is no accepting or abandoning of the two truths]

\ ###
\ 5.2.2.1.2.1.1.2
\ Basis, path, and result are all
\ Without the distinction of abandoning one thing
\ or accepting another.
\ For if one abandons deceptive reality,
\ There is no ultimate; there is no deceptive
\ Reality apart from the ultimate.

¢(i.e. The basis, path and result are all based on the inseparability of the Two Truths.
That is the Middle Way: not accepting, not rejecting. The perfect great equanimity.)

Therefore, our position is that, with respect to the aspect of appearance and the aspect of emptiness, the triad of the basis, path, and result does not involve any acceptance of "this" aspect, on the one hand, and abandonment of "that" aspect on the other. For once one has abandoned deceptive reality, there is no ultimate reality of exclusive emptiness, and once one has abandoned the ultimate reality of emptiness, there is no other exclusive appearance of deceptive reality either.

L12: [5.2.2.1.2.1.1.3 Establishing that with the logical reason that the inseparable essence is equanimity]

\ ###
\ 5.2.2.1.2.1.1.3
\ Whatever appears is pervaded by emptiness,
\ And whatever is empty is pervaded by appearance.
\ If something appears, it cannot be non-empty,
\ And that emptiness cannot be established as not appearing.

¢(i.e. One cannot exist without the other; one implies the other; they are inseparable, non-dual: not two, not one. Thus the result is the great equanimity.)

By virtue of that absence, whatever appears is pervaded by emptiness, because if that appearance is analyzed, it is not established. Whatever is empty is pervaded by appearance, because if the emptiness is analyzed, it is the nature of that appearance; and sublime

beings see emptiness arising as dependent origination. Moreover, it is impossible for whatever appears not to be empty, because if a sublime being sees it as empty and if one analyzes it, it cannot possibly be established as immune to analysis. Also, emptiness is not established as not appearing, because the nature of appearance is analyzed into emptiness, and it is impossible to have an independent emptiness as an object of cognition. Therefore, if something appears, it is impossible for it not to be empty; and if something is empty, it cannot be nothing whatsoever—the two cannot be separated. This is the nature of things.

L11: [5.2.2.1.2.1.2 Establishing the pervasion:]

L12: [5.2.2.1.2.1.2.1 Although appearance and emptiness are different isolates, in relation to their inseparable essence, both are mere designations]

\ ###
\ 5.2.2.1.2.1.2.1
\ Since both entities and non-entities should both
\ Be taken as bases for establishing emptiness,
\ All appearances are just designations,
\ And emptiness too is just a mental designation.

¢(i.e. All conventional truths are empty of inherent existence because dependently originate, and dependently designated. Emptiness is also dependent on conventional truths, thus empty. Dependent origination and emptiness are interdependent; one cannot exist without the other; one implies the other; they are inseparable, non-dual: not two, not one. Since they are both interdependent, they are both empty, both conventional truths, and ultimate truth.)

From the perspective of an analysis of the final ultimate reality, produced substantial entities and non-substantial entities that are dependently designated are both by nature dependently originated. Therefore, aside from being [separately] posited as the dharma-possessors that are bases of emptiness, they are no different in being necessarily empty. Thus, having divided the two truths, all aspects of the posited appearance of deceptive reality are just designations that depend upon emptiness. Because it depends upon appearance, conceptual emptiness (stong pa rnam grangs pa) is also just a designation of the intellect. Therefore, in the final meaning, both are the same in not being established.

L12: [5.2.2.1.2.1.2.2 Even from the perspective of ascertaining the isolates by two valid cognitions, they are inseparable as method and methodical result]

\ ###
\ 5.2.2.1.2.1.2.2
\ For the certainty of rational analysis,
\ These two are method and methodical result;
\ If there is one, it is impossible not to have the other,
\ As they are inseparable.

¢(i.e. Even in terms of the correct reasonings, emptiness is the “effect” of seeking “inherent existence”, thus dependent on its cause.)

With certainty about that manner [of inseparability] of the two truths—which is induced through authentic analysis by reason or through the two validating cognitions—[it is seen that] they are mutually dependent as method and methodical result; without one, the other is impossible.

It is not the case that they were previously combined; nor is it the case that what was previously combined has been rent asunder.

L12: [5.2.2.1.2.1.2.3 With respect to the way of inducing certainty through valid cognition in the inseparable essence [of the two truths], the convention of "the coalescence of appearance and emptiness" conforms to things as they are]

\ ###
\ 5.2.2.1.2.1.2.3
\ Therefore appearance and emptiness
\ Can each be conceived separately,
\ But in fact they are never different.
\ Therefore, they are called "coalescent,"
\ Since the confidence of seeing the nature of things
\ Does not fall to any extreme.

¢(i.e. The Two Truths are not different, not the same. Not two, not one. Non-dual, or coalescent. Remembering this one, stay away from all four extremes.)

For those reasons, appearance and emptiness are both capable of being expressed and known verbally and conceptually in all systems of the two truths, as different isolates. But since they have the same essence, they can never in fact be separated. Thus the expression "coalescence of the two truths," since, from the perspective of the confidence that sees the abiding nature of things, appearance and emptiness do not fall into any extreme whatsoever.

L12: [5.2.2.1.2.1.2.4 These two truths, in the context of the valid cognition that analyzes the way ultimate reality abides, are different isolates of one essence]

\ ###
\ 5.2.2.1.2.1.2.4
\ In the perspective of the wisdom of authentic analysis
\ Appearance and emptiness are considered to be
\ A single essence with different aspects, for
\ If one exists, the other exists, and if
\ One does not exist, the other does not exist.

¢(i.e. The Two Truths are not different, not the same. Not two, not one. Inseparable; non-dual: not two, not one; or coalescent.)

From the perspective of the two validating cognitions that analyze the nature of things authentically, both appearance and emptiness are different isolates of the same essence, such that if one of them exists, the other equally exists; and if one of them does not exist, the other equally does not exist. We maintain the division of the two truths in this way.

In the Shing rta chen po it says:

~ The two truths are not different like two horns. When seeing the abiding reality of deception as being like the reflection of the moon in water, the aspect of the appearance of the form of the moon is deceptive reality, and from the perspective of the moon not being real, there is ultimate reality. Those two have one essence, apparent though non-existent in the pond; [thus one should understand] the inseparability or coalescence of the two truths. Therefore, as a mere conventionality, water and the reflection of the moon in water are of one essence and are different isolates, etc.

~ (i.e. Not different, not the same. No need to accept or reject, to establish or negate in absolute terms. The great equanimity.)

And so on. The Theg mchog mdzod says:

~ With respect to the apparent aspect of deceptive reality, there is spontaneous presence, and with respect to the emptiness aspect of ultimate reality, there is primordial purity. Aside from being mere verbal expressions, those two are not different substances and are not independent, just as there is no contradiction in saying, "If he is a Brahmin, he is a man," or "a vow-holder is a renunciate."

The great Rong zom said:

~ As mere deceptive realities, dharmas and dharmata have the same nature. Because ultimately all elaborations are pacified, they are non-dual. That is the meaning of enlightened awareness.

~ (i.e. The great equanimity of dharmata.)

L10: [5.2.2.1.2.2 Explaining the need for beginners to realize this gradually]

\ ###
\ 5.2.2.1.2.2
\ Nonetheless, for beginners
\ They appear as negation and negandum;
\ At that time they are not combined as one.
\ (i.e. not as one, but as non-dual: not two, not one)
\ When the nature of emptiness
\ Arises as appearance, one attains confidence.
\ Thus, everything is primordially empty,
\ And these appearances are empty;
\ Though empty, they appear; though apparent,
\ They are seen as empty—this is the birth of certainty.

¢(i.e. Until we can realize the perfect Union of The Two Truths, their inseparability, their non-duality: not two, not one, we have no choice but to deal with them as two complementary concepts. But not falling in any of the four extremes.)

How, by practicing that, the four stages of Madhyamaka appear gradually: Nonetheless...

Moreover, beginners who are practicing that meaning of the two truths

1. ascertain emptiness through Madhyamika reasoning and cultivate it; then appearance appears like a negandum, and emptiness appears like a negation.
2. At that time, even though emptiness and appearance are not mixed together, one meditates again and again on the nature of that appearance as emptiness, and
3. when the nature of that emptiness appears, in spite of being empty, one attains confidence in coalescence.
4. Once again, appearance and emptiness are not mixed together, but rather, primordial emptiness as well as appearance are coalescent. Being empty of elaborations, they appear even though empty, and although apparent, they are seen as empty. Thus, one generates certainty in the equality of appearance and emptiness.

L9: [5.2.2.1.3 Summarizing with the idea that this is the cornerstone of the authentic view of all of sutra and tantra]

\ ###

- \ 5.2.2.1.3
- \ This is the root of the profound paths
- \ Of sutra, tantra, and pith instructions.
- \ This is the meaning of cutting off misconceptions
- \ Through study and reflection;
- \ It is the unmistakable, authentic view.

Summarizing: This equality [i.e. non-duality] of the coalescence of appearance and emptiness [i.e. this great equanimity] is the root [i.e. essence] of all profound points of the paths of sutra [i.e. Hinayana and Mahayana] and commonly held tantric systems [i.e. all traditions], as well as of the pith instructions that are not held in common with [lower systems – i.e. like other religions, philosophical systems, and even sciences]. This meaning, which eliminates all false conceptions through the study of and reflection upon the scriptures and interpretive commentaries, is the unmistakable authentic view that is the foundation of all practices of sutra and tantra.

Thus, one must analyze [and determine] its unmistakability. Manjusri Sakya Pandita said:

- ~ Some other Dharmas that lack the crucial points
- ~ Are not complete, go too far,
- ~ Or are somewhat in error, so
- ~ One cannot take great pleasure in them.
- ~ If one distorts the crucial points of Dharma,
- ~ Even though it looks good, one will not reach Buddhahood.
- ~ Therefore, in some [systems] it is easy to make mistakes.
- ~ One needs to analyze crucial points without mistakes.

¶(i.e. The other vehicles, or religions, also talk about emptiness and appearances, non-duality, equanimity, the mystery of the inseparability of the three kayas, etc, but they do not cover the subject extensively. And this way can easily lead to extremes and the belief in absolutes. In short, the essence of all Buddhist vehicles and other religions is this equanimity beyond all conceptualization, this non-duality: not two, not one, the inseparability of the three realms. Why? Because that is the way things really are. One can understand and see this partially or completely; but the essence is always the same as confirmed by those who have seen it completely. All other explanations lead to absurdity and extremes. Gaining this certainty is the main goal of this text, and of all logical reasonings and virtuous methods. That is the essence.)

L8: [5.2.2.2 The different [tantric] paths:]

L9: [5.2.2.2.1 With the view of the subject who realizes the crucial point of the inseparability of the two truths progressively, the [four and] six tantric systems are posited]

L10: [5.2.2.2.1.1 Brief demonstration [The case of abandoning impure perceptions – it has to be done in stages]]

- \ ###
- \ 5.2.2.2.1.1
- \ By realizing that crucial point more and more profoundly,
- \ Clinging to the characteristics of appearances of
- \ Deceptive reality will gradually be abandoned.
- \ The stages of the vehicles of the various tantric classes
- \ Appear in that way.

That crucial point of the inseparability of the two truths is taught and realized more and more profoundly with respect to the differences among the various vehicles. Thus, if that naturally pure emptiness and the dharma-possessor of appearance that is inseparable from it are capable of abandoning clinging to impure, ordinary characteristics without depending on anything else, then the various higher and lower levels of the view of the "vehicle of tantric systems" appear to be the same with respect to the crucial point of integrating the two truths.

The Wish-fulfilling Treasury says:

- ~ There, at first it is important to know the nature of things.
- ~ Though there are many types of vehicle,
- ~ The determinate essence is the inseparability of the [two] truths.
- ~ This is the treasure house of all the Buddhas.

L10: [5.2.2.2.1.2 The extensive explanation [The case of abandoning impure perceptions and seeing everything as pure – it cannot be faked, it has to be based on true emerging wisdom, certainty]]

L11: [5.2.2.2.1.2.1 A general discussion of the difference between wishful-thinking meditation (mos bsgom) and complete certainty]

L12: [5.2.2.2.1.2.1.1 Explanation that the views of wishful thinking meditation and complete certainty are not the same]

- \ ###
- \ 5.2.2.2.1.2.1.1.
- \ Intellectual wishful thinking and
- \ The view of certainty that finds confidence in the
- \ Divine appearance of animate and inanimate phenomena
- \ Cannot possibly be the same.

¢(i.e. Pure illusions and tantric visualizations are different; one is based on ignorance, the other on wisdom. One is artificial, like the dropping of Hashang's method, the other is the result of developing wisdom and certainty through correct logical reasonings – gradually realizing that everything is already pure in emptiness, or in non-duality. And thus developing this great equanimity.)

If you think that the meditation on one's own body and so forth as divine are meditations, but not a view—this is obviously true, but it is also possible that they are meditations that are not complemented by a view. With that kind of intellectual wishful thinking, aside from meditating on [the mere form of] divinity, one has no understanding of the way things are. To determine that the animate and inanimate universes are deities and mansions through scripture and reasoning, and then to meditate on the meaning of the view in which one has become confident through the certainty of knowing the abiding nature of things, is something else. Although both are called "meditation," there is no way they could be the same.

L12: [5.2.2.2.1.2.1.2 Demonstrating the specifics of that through examples [the difference between wishful magic and wisdom]]

- \ ###
- \ 5.2.2.2.1.2.1.2.
- \ The determination that phenomena are truthless
- \ By Madhyamika reasoning is a view.
- \ But when a Brahmin recites a mantra over a sick person,

\ His imagining a lack of illness is not the view.

For example, in Madhyamaka the ascertainment of all dharmas as being empty of true existence is a view. It is not the same as when a Brahmin recites a mantra over a sick person and has the view of wishing that the person were not sick. Therefore, these two are different in being or not being [informed by the] view of dharmata. Here, the difference between having previously integrated the dharma-possessing view with dharmata, and not having previously done it, is like the earth and sky.

L11: [5.2.2.2.1.2.2 Because we do not teach that the two truths that qualify the view are separate, that fault mentioned earlier does not also apply to us [so all virtuous methods have to be united with wisdom to be efficient because in accord with the inseparability of the Two Truths, the way things really are, toward the great equanimity]]

L12: [5.2.2.2.1.2.2.1 How the divine appearance of deceptive reality arises from the attainment of a clear perception of ultimate reality]

\ ###

\ 5.2.2.2.1.2.2.1.

\ By realizing the abiding nature of ultimate reality,
\ One grows confident in the divine appearance of deceptive
\ reality.
\ Otherwise, if one dwells on the manner of deceptive
\ appearance,
\ How can divinity be established?

Thus, by realizing the conformity of the abiding and apparent natures in the state of the ultimate abiding nature of the coalescence of the two truths, one has confidence that all aspects of the dharma-possessor—deceptive reality—are the unobstructed divine appearance of the expanse. Besides this view, some assert that the vision of sublime beings is only emptiness, and by the power of that, in some other place or another, there is a Buddha adorned with the marks and signs. If one persists in apprehending that deluded appearances—which comprise suffering and emotional afflictions—are established just as they appear by way of their own characteristics, one will not know the abiding nature of the dharma-possessor at all. How can these appearances be established as divine? For this is to maintain that worldly vision is valid cognition.

L12: [5.2.2.2.1.2.2.2 Thus, how the ranking of the paths is not just with respect to ultimate reality [the stages are a gradual progression toward being more and more in accord with the way things really are]]

\ ###

\ 5.2.2.2.1.2.2.2.

\ Aside from this deluded appearance of subject and object,
\ There is no such thing as samsara;
\ The divisions of the path that abandons it
\ Are not only made from the perspective of ultimate reality,
\ Because ultimate reality has a unitary character.

¢(i.e. The Tantric stages are based on getting closer and closer to this non-dual nature, this purity of everything, getting more and more closer to the real non-dual nature of everything. That is why all the stages have the same essence.)

Aside from the mistaken appearances comprised by both subject and object, the animate and inanimate universe, there is no such thing as "samsara," because the nature of suffering that is to be abandoned is precisely this. The divisions of the path that cause the abandonment of impure samsara—the nine vehicles—do not exist from the exclusive perspective of ultimate reality, because the mode of ultimate reality is unitary.

The Sher rgyan says:

- ~ Because the dharmadhatu is indivisible,
- ~ Lineages cannot be different.

L12: [5.2.2.2.1.2.2.3 Therefore, the ranking of the six tantric systems is taught with respect to differences in their capacity to cultivate vision of the inseparability of the two truths [the stages are skillful means adapted to the capacity of the students, but they all have the same essence]]

\ ###
\ 5.2.2.2.1.2.2.3.
\ With respect to the mental ability gained
\ Through seeing and cultivating all phenomena
\ Of apparent deceptive reality, the subject (of qualities),
\ With respect to ultimate reality, the action tantra,
\ Performance tantra, yoga tantra, and unexcelled yoga tantra
\ are taught.

¢(i.e. The various stages of Tantra are progressive adapted skillful means depending on the capacity of the students to accept this ultimate non-duality and purity.)

Thus, these factors of dualistic appearance of the dharma-possessor—deceptive reality—are gradually cultivated and seen as non-dual with reference to the basic reality of the ultimate dharmata, like ice gradually melting into water. By the power of that cultivation, to the whatever extent that one develops the ability to understand the coalescence of the two truths, one will attain certainty in the great pure equality of actual and potential phenomena. The various tantras—the kriyatantra, its functional equivalent caryatantra, yogatantra, and anuttarayogatantra—are taught with those views in mind.

L10: [5.2.2.2.1.3 Summary [the stages are one natural progression toward realizing the way things really are, toward the great equanimity]]

\ ###
\ 5.2.2.2.1.3.
\ Therefore, the tantric classes are not differentiated as higher
\ Or lower with respect to either of the two truths individually.
\ According to one's attainment of confidence
\ In the coalescence of the two truths,
\ The practice of [each of the tantric classes naturally] follows.

¢(i.e. The various stages of Tantra are progressive adapted skillful means depending on the capacity of the students to accept this ultimate non-duality and purity. Depending on the development of his “certainty”.)

Thus, for that reason, the ranking of the tantric systems is not done with respect to either of the two truths individually. If an abiding nature that is an exclusive appearance or emptiness is not possible, and if its realization is also not possible, then a Dharma that

ranks the tantric systems as higher and lower [according to such a nature] will be non-existent. Thus, to whatever degree one has cultivated the abiding nature of the coalescence of the two truths and attained confidence through it, all of one's practice of meditation and activity will follow suit, because the view and meditation are necessarily practiced in connection with each other.

L9: [5.2.2.2.2 The difference between how our own and other tantric systems are practiced:]

L10: [5.2.2.2.2.1 The difference between ascertaining and not ascertaining the authentic abiding reality through the view [one has to base his practice on the certainty induced through authentic valid cognition, otherwise it is only faking and inefficient]]

L11: [5.2.2.2.2.1.1 How meditation on the meaning of the view that correctly realizes the abiding nature is free of doubt]

\ ###
\ 5.2.2.2.2.1.1.
\ Therefore, if one properly practices without mistakes
\ The peerless Vajra Vehicle,
\ The path that bestows liberation in a single life,
\ Then, just like the example of water seen
\ By several different types of sentient beings,
\ With respect to pure vision
\ It will be impossible for anyone not to see
\ Actual and potential phenomena as a manifested mandala.

Therefore, as explained above, if one correctly practices without error the three paths of the extraordinary quick unexcelled Vajrayana path—the creation phase, completion phase, and coalescence (i.e. or Mahamudra)—which bestow liberation in a single lifetime, it goes without saying that one should [follow the practices of] accepting and abandoning [modes of conduct] according to the example of the different perceptions of beings who see water in different ways that are impure, and Buddhas, who see it as pure. For, among those various visual perceptions, in dependence upon the vision that is purified of sullyng obscurations, who would not become confident about the utterly pure sublime vision of the self-arisen mandala of actual and potential phenomena abiding in the basis? It would be unreasonable not to be confident. For example, it is appropriate for sublime beings to have confidence in the emptiness of all dharmas.

L11: [5.2.2.2.2.1.2 Demonstrating that by not understanding that, meditating with doubts has no result]

\ ###
\ 5.2.2.2.2.1.2.
\ If you don't know things that way,
\ Meditating on deities while holding
\ The nature of samsara to be impure
\ Is like spraying a vomit-filled vase with perfume.
\ Alas! That sort of meditation on the Vajra Vehicle of
\ equanimity
\ Is just like a drawing of a butter lamp.

If one doesn't know how to experience the animate and inanimate universe abiding as divinities and mansions through authentic valid cognition, and asserts that there is nothing

else besides this truth of suffering, which is the nature of samsara—the impure appearances of karma, emotional afflictions, and the resultant origination of suffering—then it will be difficult to accomplish the goal of inseparability from divinity by meditating upon Cakrasamvara, Hevajra, Vajrabhairava, Guhyasamaja, etc. For example, like a vase filled with vomit, if one has no view of realizing the pure abiding nature, and sees things as impure, then meditating upon the generation and completion phases and thinking that the calm abiding and mere methods are the special teachings of the Vajrayana is like spraying the outside of the vase with perfume. This is not to see the special teaching of Vajrayana, and Mipham thinks, "Alas! All the meditations on the meaning of the Vajrayana, [which teaches] the equality of samsara and nirvana, would be just like a drawing of a butter lamp; with only an image, it would be difficult to dispel the darkness of ignorance and illuminate the realization of the pure equality of the abiding nature." (i.e. the great equanimity)

L10: [5.2.2.2.2 The difference of a result arising or not arising from meditation]

L11: [5.2.2.2.2.1 Showing how, having distinguished modes of reality and appearance, one connects the view and meditation by meditating according to the mode of reality [it is all about realizing the way things really are, pure, inseparable appearances and emptiness; with great equanimity]]

\ ###
 \ 5.2.2.2.2.1.
 \ The way things appear is impure,
 \ But that is the system of delusion.
 \ We say that authentically seeing the nature of things
 \ Is the meaning of the undivided Vajrayana system.

¢(i.e. Basing it on the induced certainty of true wisdom.)

Those claims do not distinguish the modes of reality and appearance. In that mode of appearance, the five appropriated aggregates of sentient beings of the impure animate and inanimate worlds appear as impure. Who would assert this as the result of accomplishment or a philosophical system? That sort of appearance is the "philosophical system" that is posited by a mistaken mind that clings to impure appearances that are the result accomplished by delusion—karma and emotional afflictions.

With respect to what actually exists, it is not appearance, but the abiding nature, that is great pure equality. (i.e. the great equanimity) Whose philosophical system is this? Having consummated the result of accomplishment on the authentic path, the inseparability of the two truths, which is the pure equality that is the object seen by pure vision, is maintained as the inseparability of the basis and result, and is expounded as the philosophical system of the Vajrayana. Thus, having discriminated individual philosophical systems, it is appropriate to practice all views and meditations according to the philosophical system of the Vajrayana, since it is the Vajrayana that directly sets up the vision of gnosis, and because one should not rely upon consciousness, but upon gnosis.

If a philosophical system that establishes things according their appearance for deluded perception actually corresponded to the way things are, the emptiness that is the emptiness of true existence would not be established and that [system] would be in error, because it would apprehend self and dharmas as truly existent. For if one analyzes things, they are not established, they abide in emptiness. And since the appearances of the impure animate and inanimate universe are also not established if analyzed, according to pure vision, the

animate and inanimate universes are the same in abiding both as a pure basis and as that which is based upon it.

L11: [5.2.2.2.2.2.2 The opposite of that]

L12: [5.2.2.2.2.2.2.1 The view and meditation are not connected [Faking to see purity]]

\ ###
\ 5.2.2.2.2.2.2.1
\ Seeing the animate and inanimate universe
\ As lacking the nature of pure support and supported,
\ But meditating while imagining that they do—
\ This path evinces an obvious contradiction,
\ And is just a reflection of the Vajrayana path.
\ Coal cannot be whitened by washing;

¢(i.e. Faking it.)

Conversely, if one thinks, "the external animate realm and internal animate realm do not have the nature of a pure basis and that which is based upon it, deities and mansions," and while seeing them as impure, one meditates on the generation and completion phases, thinking, "they are deities and mansions"—that is just a separation of the view and the meditation, and is a sign that clearly indicates that the philosophical system has the fault of internal contradiction. Though it satisfies others, that path is a hollow reflection of the Vajrayana. For example, if one washes coal, it does not become white, and there is no way to make it white.

L12: [5.2.2.2.2.2.2.2 Demonstrating through examples that that cannot achieve the result [mere conceptual understanding]]

\ ###
\ 5.2.2.2.2.2.2.2
\ Likewise, a fabricated meditation that thinks
\ "It is not, but it is"
\ Attaining some kind of result
\ Would be like the heretical sun worshippers (nyi ma pa)—
\ Who have no confidence in the emptiness of true
\ existence—
\ Abandoning emotional afflictions through meditating
\ On an emptiness devoid of appearance, etc.

¢(i.e. It cannot be artificially gained or fake. It is not like magic.)

Though it doesn't have anything to do with the real meaning, if with a fabricated meditation that thinks, "I am a deity" it were possible to attain the goal of a resultant deity, then consequently, without any certainty in the emptiness of true existence, the heretical Sun-worshippers (nyi ma pa), and so forth, would be able to realize selflessness by meditating on an emptiness bereft of appearance and abandon the emotional afflictions. The reasoning is the same [as in the previous example of a vase].

L9: [5.2.2.2.3 [The gradual development of the final view] If there are not different levels of views in the tantric systems, their different modes of activity would be mistaken]

L10: [5.2.2.2.3.1 Setting up the claim that there are no differences in the views [of the different tantric systems]]

\ ###
 \ 5.2.2.2.3.1.
 \ What if the action, performance, and unexcelled tantric
 \ classes
 \ Did not have different levels of view?

Certain philosophical systems in Tibet maintain that kriya, carya, yoga, and anuttarayoga tantras have different methods of meditation and activity, but do not have any differences in their respective views.

L10: [5.2.2.2.3.2 Refuting it [the view has to match the adapted skillful means – both are progressive, adapted to the level of the students]]

L11: [5.2.2.2.3.2.1 If the lower tantric systems had the same view as the higher tantric systems, activity would contradict the view [discriminating while having a pure view is contradictory]]

\ ###
 \ 5.2.2.2.3.2.1.
 \ If you have confidence in the view that realizes
 \ The pure equality of actual and potential phenomena,
 \ But fail to take advantage of the correct view,
 \ Seeing yourself and the deity as superior and inferior
 \ And discriminating things as pure and impure,
 \ You will only harm yourself.

¢(i.e. So the path is gradual: gradual adapted skillful means, and adapted skillful views, that are more and more close to the real non-dual nature of everything, as the students develop certainty. Other wise there is a real danger.)

If, in the lower tantric systems, in spite of having confidence in the view that realizes the great equal purity according to the higher tantras, one viewed oneself, the pledge being (dam tshig pa), and the deity as wisdom being (ye shes pa), as "good" and "bad," or as "master" and "slave," and, while maintaining pure behavior, apprehended impure things as something to abandon, then that would be to discriminate good and bad, acceptance and abandonment, without respect to the view. Not meditating according to the meaning of the view, one would go astray from the authentic path, and this would only be an obstacle to quickly achieving the result.

L11: [5.2.2.2.3.2.2 If the higher systems had no view other than the lower systems' view, then the profound activity [of the higher tantras] would be pointless [non-discriminating while having an impure view is contradictory]]

\ ###
 \ 5.2.2.2.3.2.2.
 \ And, if you are still attached to what is accepted and abandoned in the lower
 tantras
 \ But practice the equality of what is accepted and abandoned
 \ in the unexcelled tantras,
 \ Such as "union and liberation," eating meat, drinking alcohol, etc.,
 \ This is known as the "reckless behavior of
 \ misunderstanding"—Isn't that despicable?

¢(i.e. So as one progress along the gradual path, one should be able to go beyond the views and methods of the lower stages, gaining more and more subtlety and wisdom.)

If, in accord with the lower tantric systems, one maintained the view that clings to good and bad, acceptance and abandonment, and if one undertook the profound secret activities of the higher systems, such as union and liberation, and acted within the equality of acceptance and abandonment, without considering what is clean and unclean, without abandoning meat and alcohol, etc., then wouldn't this be the "reckless behavior of not understanding the view" in which the view and behavior are contradictory, which is condemned by the wise?

L9: [5.2.2.2.4 The especially exalted meditations and activities of [the higher tantras] exist because of that [The stages – methods and views – are defined according to the level of progress of this “certainty”]]

L10: [5.2.2.2.4.1 With respect to how the nine vehicles integrate the two truths, how one maintains meditation and activity in the state of ascertaining the view]

\ ###
\ 5.2.2.2.4.1.
\ The view is defined according to one's certainty
\ In the vision of the nature of things;
\ According to one's confidence acquired by the view,
\ One maintains the practice of meditation and conduct.

¢(i.e. The stages – methods and views – are defined according to the level of progress of this “certainty”.)

Whether one considers sutra or tantra, the different types of meditation and action follow after their respective views. Their views are said to be precisely how they have the confidence of seeing the profound meaning of the abiding nature of things. Thus, with respect to sharp and dull faculties, there are higher and lower views; but in accordance with how the view of each vehicle ascertains the meaning of the abiding nature without any doubt, so do they abandon and accept things in their activity. The Manjusrinamasamgiti says, "Having awareness and legs."

L10: [5.2.2.2.4.2 Disposing of faults: [nine arbitrary vehicles are defined along this one continuous unique path]]

L11: [5.2.2.2.4.2.1 Setting up the dispute about the indefiniteness of nine vehicles]

\ ###
\ 5.2.2.2.4.2.1.
\ "Because the vehicles are differentiated
\ By different levels of view, they are not necessarily nine in
\ number"—

"If in your tradition you posit nine levels of vehicle, then because you differentiate those nine with respect to their views, there are not definitely nine, because the view is certainty, and it is not certain that certainty has many different forms."

L11: [5.2.2.2.4.2.2 Demonstrating the response that disposes of it—the response that the fault applies equally]

\ ###

- \ 5.2.2.2.4.2.2.
- \ From the lowest of the Buddhist philosophical systems
- \ Up to the ultimate vajra pinnacle of Atiyoga,
- \ There is a specific reason for positing
- \ The enumeration of nine classes.
- \ Of course there are many levels of vehicle,
- \ But they are posited by necessity, as is the three-vehicle
- \ system.

That is not a fault. Among Buddhist philosophical systems, from the lowest system of the sravakas up to the peak of the ultimate Vajrayana, the Atiyoga, there is a reason for positing each of the nine. What is that? Even though there are many higher and lower vehicles, if one condenses their type, they can be summarized as the three vehicles of sravakas and bodhisattvas, etc.; those are established by necessity. If, with respect to the differences of disposition, intelligence, and aspiration among superior, mediocre, and inferior disciples, etc., it is appropriate to posit three vehicles, then it is also appropriate to posit nine. If they are not definitely nine in number, then they are not definitely three either.

L8: [5.2.2.3 A summary of the meaning of attaining the result of the coalescence of the two kayas:]

L9: [5.2.2.3.1 There are different ways of seeing with respect to great and small powers of gnosis]

- \ ###
- \ 5.2.2.3.1
- \ Thus, according to the relative strength
- \ Of inner gnosis, the animate and inanimate
- \ Worlds are seen as pure or impure.

¢(i.e. So, depending on the level of certainty that we have induced through the virtuous methods and wisdom, one sees the worlds as more or less pure, more or less the way they really are: non-dual, inseparable appearances and emptiness; and one abides more or less in the great equanimity.)

Therefore, although there is no difference in the dharmadhātu, which is the coalescence of appearance and emptiness, the condition for increasing the subjective internal gnosis is the distinction of sharp intelligence, practice of the path, etc. To whatever extent the power of gnosis has been previously increased, to that extent one sees that animate and inanimate realms naturally abide in primordial purity. For example, if one is cured of an eye problem, one sees the whiteness of a conch shell more clearly; thus, when the subject-mind has an impediment, the conch is seen to be yellow, so it is seen impurely. Therefore, those various ways of seeing, where actual and apparent modes are or are not concordant, refer to the subjective mind, but not to any difference in the object.

L9: [5.2.2.3.2 By practicing according to the way of seeing the conformity of actual and apparent modes, one attains the result [the inseparable two kayas]]

- \ ###
- \ 5.2.2.3.2
- \ Therefore, the basis of inseparable appearance and emptiness
- \ Is realized as the inseparability of the two realities;

\ As you cultivate the path in that way,
\ You will see the gnosis,
\ The coalescence of the two Buddha bodies.

¢(i.e. The result is the purification of the three kayas, directly seeing their real non-dual nature and inseparability.)

For that reason, without mistaking the basic abiding nature of the inseparable truths of appearance and emptiness, a mind that is authentically concordant with its object realizes the two truths as being inseparable. By cultivating the path of the inseparability of the generation and completion phases in that way, one attains the gnosis of [knowing everything] that is just as it is, which is the fruition of the integrated two kayas, and one will be able to liberate disciples of the high and low vehicles.

I say:

- ~ Wishing to imbibe sweet juice from the fruit of an excellent view,
- ~ Even though one collects the milk of ultimate reality,
- ~ Without this fine brass vessel of deceptive reality,
- ~ Bare emptiness gets burnt in the Madhyamika oven.

L1: [9.6. Topic 6 [Using the mantrayana technique called “pure vision / deity yoga” in order to realize this coalescence beyond conceptualization]]

[i.e. “Topic 6 concerns the common object of disparate perceptions; also serves as the occasion for differentiating the various levels of view in the Vajrayana—in particular those of Mahayoga and the Great Perfection—and for demonstrating the necessity of Mipham's fourfold classification of valid cognition.”]

(Résumé of Topic 6: This topic is about the validity of assuming a dharmin, something really existing out there, independently of the mind, and that is the basis of direct objective / impartial perception. It would be the “thing” or “phenomena” that everybody is perceiving the same; a commonly accepted phenomenon, a commonly understood subject; the basis for further discussion and inference.

In this section it is shown that all perceptions are conditioned by accumulated karma, that there is no real object existing out there independently of the mind, that there is no real objective / impartial perception by the senses organs. But the emptiness of inherent existence of the appearances doesn't mean that everything is completely non-existent, useless, from the mind-only. The Middle Way is between the two extremes of existence (appearances) and non-existence (emptiness). Everything is inseparable appearances and emptiness.

That means that all of our discriminations in terms of good vs. bad, pure vs. impure, objects of attachment or fears, are like illusions. That there is not an authentic perception based on the way things really are.

To perceive everything more in accord with their very ultimate nature, would be to perceive everything with Great Equanimity. In short, it is like as if samsara was caused by an erroneous perception of reality, while Nirvana was caused by a correct perception of

reality, in accord with the principle of the inseparability of appearances and emptiness. Using this model, the progression on the path correspond to a purification of our perceptions. By analyzing this and getting to the essence of the problem of perception, one gain certainty in the validity of “pure vision” as practiced in Tantrayana. This technique cannot be faked, it is efficient only if based on certainty induced by analyzing the problem of perception through correct reasonings. If “pure vision” is practice without this certainty, that is with doubts, then it will be useless. That why Tantrayana must be practiced only after studying and mastering the Mahayana sutras and techniques.)

L4: [[0.2.2.2.] Secondly, the explanation of the view of the subjective viewer:
[explanation of the view of the dharma-possessor through the stages of the manner of pure divine self-appearance / Yidam yoga]]

L5: [6.1 The question about what the commonly perceived object is [the purity of objects depend on the subject perception / karma purity]]

\ ###
\ 6.1.
\ When a single instance of water appears
\ As different substances to various sentient beings,

¢(i.e. There is no absolute good and bad, not absolute objective perception; everything is perceived in dependence of the accumulated karma. All perceptions are conditioned by past habits. Whether an object is perceived as samsara or Nirvana mostly depend on the subject, not the object. So to understand samsara, one has to investigate the perception by the subject.)

The perfect Buddha, who taught the ways of acceptance and abandonment, appeared in the world of human beings, and the exponents of his teaching are human beings; so in this context "water" is taken as a topic of discussion. In that respect, various beings perceive it variously as the viable (don byednus, arthakriya) substances of pus, blood, nectar, and so forth. Among those, which is the commonly perceived object? This is the question.

L5: [6.2 The extensive explanation:]

L6: [6.2.1 Refuting other systems that claim that different subjects perceive the same object [no real objects of perception independent of the mind; but still not completely non-existent or from the mind-only]]

L7: [6.2.1.1 Refuting the claim that water is the common object]

L8: [6.2.1.1.1 Setting up the purvapaksa's claim [absolute objects]]

\ ###
\ 6.2.1.1.1.
\ Some say there is a single object of perception
\ And that all perceptions of it are valid.

¢(i.e. The belief in absolute objective perception of independent objects with true characteristics. The assumption is that there is a “dharmin”, something really existing, and that is why everybody see it the same. It is the “commonly accepted phenomena”, the conventional truths supposedly directly perceived by all.)

Some scholars say that the common object of beings' perceptions is water. By dint of the fact that it is water, they say minds that perceive it as such are valid cognizers, and those for whom it appears otherwise are mistaken.

L8: [6.2.1.1.2. Refuting that [not the same, not different]]

L9: [6.2.1.1.2.1 If only water were established as the common object, both valid cognizers and non-valid cognizers would be impossible]

\ ###
\ 6.2.1.1.2.1
\ If water had some kind of essence,
\ Valid and invalid cognitions would be impossible [here].

¢(i.e. Not the same / not independent of the mind: If there were pure objective direct perception of the essence of things, then everybody would perceive everything the same. But that is not the case. There is valid and invalid perceptions conventionally.)

If, from the perspective of a mind [that analyzes] ultimate reality, there were a water that was established by way of its own non-empty nature, and [thus] beings unanimously perceived water, all of them would be valid cognizers. But if on that same basis there were no other non-valid cognition and its corresponding perception, such as pus, blood, nectar, and so forth, it would be impossible for valid and invalid cognitions to be distinguished, because if one is not present, the other, which depends upon it, is not possible.

L9: [6.2.1.1.2.2 If there were no common object, an object of perception would be impossible]

\ ###
\ 6.2.1.1.2.2.
\ If the various objects that appear were distinct,
\ It would not be possible for [different minds]
\ To perceive the same pillars, vases [etc.].

¢(i.e. Not different / not from the mind only: On the other hand, the perceptions are not totally from the mind only, otherwise there would be no conventional truths at all. So it is sort of in the Middle. All perceptions are dependent on the mind perceiving, but not totally from this mind.)

On the other hand, if various beings' individual visual perceptions, such as water, pus, nectar, and so forth, were not based on a commonly appearing object, they would not be based upon the same thing. This would be similar to, for example, the minds of a single person that variously perceive pillars, vases, etc. If a common object were not possible for [different] sentient beings, it would be like the system of the Vijnaptimatrins.

L7: [6.2.1.2 Refuting the claim that liquidity is the common object [absolute basis characteristics]]

L8: [6.2.1.2.1 The purvapaksa]

\ ###
\ 6.2.1. 2.1.
\ Some say [that in the case of water] there is just wetness;

¢(i.e. The belief in absolute basic characteristics directly perceptible.)

Also, some scholars say that since water, pus, blood, and so forth, all without a doubt possess liquidity, that must be the common object.

L8: [6.2.1.2.2 Its refutation:]

L9: [6.2.1.2.2.1 It is not reasonable for liquidity to be a basis of perception [not the same, not different]]

L10: [6.2.1.2.2.1.1 If liquidity is the basis of perception, visual perceptions of it would have to be non-different]

\ ###
\ 6.2.1.2.2.1.1
\ But if [different appearances] are not different aspects [of the same substance,
\ But merely perceptions belonging to different perceivers],
\ Different perceptions [of the same thing] would be
\ impossible.

¢(i.e. Not the same / independent of the mind: Same thing about the so called basic characteristics of things; they are not directly perceived either; their essence is not impartially directly perceived. These perceptions are also dependent on accumulated karma, on acquired habits, of assimilation schema.)

Thus, if the dissimilar visual perceptions of the beings of the six realms unmistakably possessed the individual characteristic of liquidity as the common object of their various perceptions, then those beings would not be able to have different visual perceptions, because [liquidity] would have an individual characteristic and would be able to stand on its own. If there were no such individual characteristic, and water, pus, and nectar were simply known as mutually exclusive aspects of liquidity, to claim a basis of perception would be pointless, because it would be non-substantial. It would be like the saying:

~ Whether a eunuch is beautiful or not—
~ What good does it do for a desirous person to consider this?

In some texts it says, "many arise," which is a bit awkward, so one should investigate whether this is a typographical error.

L10: [6.2.1.2.2.1.2 The different visual perceptions would have nothing to perceive]

\ ###
\ 6.2.1.2.2.1.2
\ If what one [being sees as] water, pus, and so forth,
\ Is not present to other [beings],
\ What would be the basis of [those perceptions of] water,
\ pus, etc.?

¢(i.e. Not different / from the mind only: But again, this doesn't mean that all perceptions of characteristics are from the mind only, otherwise there would be no conventional truths at all.)

Thus, if the water and so forth that are seen by each of the six realms' beings is not there for the gods, for example, because they see nectar, then one cannot posit what the common object of perception for the water, pus, and so forth, of those dissimilar [perceptions] would be. For liquidity cannot have several different visual perceptions, and water, pus, etc., are different visual perceptions, and having and not having distinct perceptions are mutually exclusive. Thus, a single basis of perception would become many, as in the case of individual visual perceptions of pillars, vases, etc.

L10: [6.2.1.2.2.1.3 Demonstrating indetermination for the infinite space realm]

\ ###
\ 6.2.1.2.2.1.3
\ Moreover, what would happen to the wetness basis
\ In the case of beings of the realm of infinite space?

¢(i.e. Beings of the different realms see the same things and characteristics differently, depending on their accumulated karma. All perceptions are dependent on the mind perceiving, but not from this mind only.)

Also, if there is a basis of perception such as liquidity, it becomes indefinite for the beings of the infinite space realm. When they perceive nothing but space, what kind of basis will liquidity be? It won't be.

L9: [6.2.1.2.2.2 Refutation by analysis of whether it is the same as or different than the water [characterized and characteristic are not different, not the same]]

\ ###
\ 6.2.1.2.2.2
\ If wetness were the same as water,
\ It could not appear as pus and so on;
\ If it were different from water and so on,
\ Liquidity would not be perceived anywhere.

¢(i.e. Characterized and characteristic are not different, not the same.)

If "liquidity" were identical to the water that is the visual perception relative to human beings, it would not be appropriate for liquidity to appear in pus and so forth, for that very reason. Also, if it were different from the water perceived by humans, it would likewise also be distinct from pus, nectar, and so forth; so as the identifying characteristic of liquidity is not perceived anywhere, this would be mere fancy.

L7: [6.2.1.3 Combining the meanings together [there is no dharmin independent of the mind, nor from the mind only]]

L8: [6.2.1.3.1 Positing in relation to a contextual object of perception]

L9: [6.2.1.3.1.1 The actual [argument]]

\ ###
\ 6.2.1.3.1.1
\ It is not possible for there to be a common object
\ Of each distinct perception,
\ Because it is not possible for a suitable common substance
\ To appear in different ways.
\ If one accepts an analytically [determined] basis
\ Other than a dependently designated one,
\ One must establish its existence in reality—
\ However you look at it, it's unreasonable.

¢(i.e. Not independent of the mind: There cannot be an inherently existing object of perception, an essence, that would be perceived differently, in dependence. Dependent origination and inherent existence are not compatible.)

For those reasons, for the various individual visual perceptions, such as water, pus, and blood, a common perceptual object is not possible, because it is impossible for those beings

to perceive a commonly appearing substance, such as water, pus, and so forth. Therefore, that basis of appearance, from the perspective of humans, is water, and in reference to gods, is nectar. Aside from a mere appearance, which is not immune to analysis, and which dependently arises from positing a variety of perceptions on a single objective basis, if one maintained the existence of a basis that was immune to analysis by the two kinds of valid cognition, it would have to be established as the abiding character of reality, because no matter how one analyzes [the basis] in relation to the two truths, it is simply not reasonable.

L9: [6.2.1.3.1.2 The unreasonableness of appearing to the mind]

L10: [6.2.1.3.1.2.1 The unreasonableness of maintaining cognition as the object, like the Cittamatras]

```
\   ###
\   6.2.1.3.1.2.1
\   If the common object were non-existent,
\   There would be no object as in Cittamatra,
\   And one would have to accept that consciousness itself is the object;
\   That is unreasonable.
```

¢(i.e. Not from the mind-only: On the other hand, the object perceived is not completely non-existent either, otherwise there would be no possible conventional truths at all, no sciences, no paths, no possible communication. So the objects perceived are not independent on the mind perceiving it, on the accumulated karma; nor is it completely non-existent, or from the mind only.)

Thus, if those various visual perceptions of the beings of the six realms had no common perceptual object, like the proponents of the Cittamatra philosophical system, one would have to maintain that there was no object of cognition, and that the apprehending cognition was the object itself. To claim that is not reasonable.

The Wish-fulfilling Treasury says:

- ~ The ignorant think everything is mind.
- ~ They are extremely confused about the meaning of the three kinds of appearance.
- ~ There are many faults of internal contradiction and absurd consequence,
- ~ So please abandon the tradition that they maintain.

L10: [6.2.1.3.1.2.2 The reason that mind and appearance are equal in deceptively existing]

```
\   ###
\   6.2.1.3.1.2.2
\   The subjective apprehension of a non-existent object
\   Would also be non-existent in fact.
```

¢(i.e. Thinking that everything is from the mind only, like in the Cittamatra tradition, leads to nihilism.)

How is it unreasonable? Subject and object are posited in dependence upon one another. While there is no object, it would seem that the apprehending possessor of the object is likewise in fact non-existent. Among those two, if one claims the existence of an apprehending mind, an apprehended object must likewise exist in dependence upon it; so both subject and object are equal in being deceptively existent as mere appearances. For example, if there is "the mountain thither," there must be "the mountain hither" also.

L10: [6.2.1.3.1.2.3 Are equal in not existing ultimately [the mind is also like an illusion, empty]]

\ ###
\ 6.2.1.3.1.2.3
\ Both subject and object are equally apparent
\ In relative truth, so considering whatever appears
\ It is not reasonable to differentiate
\ Subject and object as existent and non-existent.
\ Although an object appears, it is false.
\ Likewise apprehension of an object appears but is
\ not established.

¢(i.e. To think that the mind is real, but that the objects are from the mind only doesn't make sense. The perceiver and the objects perceived have the same nature: empty of inherent existence because dependently arisen, inseparable, non-dual: not two, not one.)

If one examines the appearance of an object, and, finding it unreasonable, thinks it is non-existent, unreasonableness under examination also applies to the subject, so if one examines any subject and object that appear, it is unreasonable to differentiate them and find one existent and the other non-existent. Although there is the appearance of an object, it appears in a deceptive manner. Likewise, though apprehension appears, it is not established as the same as or as different from mere appearance.

The Avatara says:

- ~ If there is formlessness, do not apprehend it as the existence of the mind.
- ~ If there is an existing mind, do not apprehend it as formless.
- ~ Those were abandoned by the Buddha
- ~ In sutras dealing with wisdom, and spoken about in the abhidharma.

L8: [6.2.1.3.2 Showing the final object of perception to be a mere appearance [all appearances are empty because dependent on accumulated karma, that is the only way to explain the similarities and differences while perceiving the same object]]

L9: [6.2.1.3.2.1. The reasonableness of all common and uncommon [perceptions] having mere appearance as their common object of perception, which all beings have in common]

\ ###
\ 6.2.1.3.2.1
\ The common perceptual object is a mere appearance
\ That is established as the basis of similar and dissimilar
\ perceptions,
\ Because otherwise it would be unreasonable, as in seeing
\ a dance.

¢(i.e. There is no inherently existing objects of perceptions, independent on the mind. Only conventionally defined objects and characteristics based on shared conditioning and accumulated karma.)

Thus, without being partial to either the external thing or the internal cognition, the mere appearance that can appear anywhere, which is the very nature of emptiness, is posited as the commonly perceived object. That mere appearance is established as the basis of the appearance of all common and uncommon perceptions of sentient beings; for it goes along with

all things pure and impure, and there is no scripture or reasoning whatsoever that can refute that mere appearance. Therefore, without that, any other position is unreasonable. For example, if there is a dancer, there are many who will see or not see the dance; if there is not an appropriate actor [that is, one visible] for the various gods and raksasas, those appearances [of gods' and raksasas' dances] will not exist [for them].

L9: [6.2.1.3.2.2 If not, it would be unreasonable for different individual perceptions to arise]

\ ###
\ 6.2.1.3.2.2
\ Aside from this mere existence [of an appearance],
\ It is not possible for it to come from some other existent;
\ Without this, all appearances
\ Would be non-apparent, like space.

¢(i.e. There is no other alternative.)

For that reason, aside from this merely existent or merely apparent dependent origination that is the basic nature of things, a particular existent thing is not possible either internally or externally; however much one searches, it becomes a cause for pointless fatigue. If that kind of merely existent basis of perception did not exist, all phenomena pure and impure would not appear anywhere and would become like the empty expanse of space. Because it is unreasonable, it is reasonable to posit [a mere appearance] here.

L9: [6.2.1.3.2.3 The unreasonableness of various conditions for appearance being the object of perception]

\ ###
\ 6.2.1.3.2.3
\ On the basis of outer and inner conditions,
\ One does not see the thing itself as it is,
\ But in the manner of seeing horses and cattle
\ In the place of wood blessed by illusion mantras.

¢(i.e. Everything is like an illusion.)

"If the basis of perception is not seen, how can things appear in different ways?" That is due to various external circumstances of appearance and internal propensities, etc. Not seeing the object of the basis of perception just as it is, is due to fabrication [of perception] through the admixture of circumstance and conceptual dividing. For example, when the eyes are impaired by a magical spell, a piece of wood appears like a horse or an ox; therefore, one does not see the actual thing. One cannot say that a piece of wood, which is the appearance of the special condition for the appearance of such things as horses and cattle, is the common object of perception, because that fragmentary appearance [of a piece of wood] does not go everywhere.

L6: [6.2.2 Secondly, according to our own system [inseparability of appearances and emptiness]]

L7: [6.2.2.1 Showing what common perceptual object is posited]

L8: [6.2.2.1.1 Positing inseparable appearance and emptiness as the actual basis of perception]

\ ###
 \ 6.2.2.1.1
 \ Therefore the common object of perception
 \ Cannot be specified as "this" or "that."
 \ So in our system appearance and emptiness
 \ Are not differentiated in the basis itself,
 \ Which is not established anywhere.
 \ Because it is the same in everything that appears,
 \ A single substance appears as various things.

☿(i.e. So there is no real common dharmin, no real object or characteristic directly perceived by all. The only thing in common is the inseparability of appearances and emptiness; the fact that the appearances is conditioned by accumulated karma when ignorance is predominant. But, of course, this is only pointing at the moon beyond all conceptualization.

As explained above, the indivisibility of appearance and emptiness is reasonable as the basis of perception. Therefore, in our own system, in the earlier context of the two truths "we only maintain the philosophical system of coalescence free of divisions and partiality." Accordingly, on the basis of the impartial and indivisible equanimity of appearance and emptiness, samsara and nirvana are not in any way established, and because that [indivisibility of appearance and emptiness] equally accompanies whatever appears in samsara and nirvana, a single substance can appear in various pure and impure ways, and we accept just that as the basis of perception.

The Great Omniscient One said:

- ~ The primordial state of inseparable appearance and emptiness
- ~ Cannot be conceived as one or many (i.e. non-dual), is without elaboration (i.e. beyond conceptualization),
- ~ Without partiality or divisions, it is all-embracing equanimity (i.e. not accepting, not rejecting),
- ~ Equal in appearance, equal in emptiness, equal in truth, equal in falsity,
- ~ Equal in existence, equal in non-existence, equal beyond all limits—
- ~ It is the primordially pure state of the unique expanse.

L8: [6.2.2.1.2 Explaining how it can appear as anything]

\ ###
 \ 6.2.2.1.2
 \ For whomever appearance and emptiness are possible,
 \ Everything is possible;
 \ For whomever appearance and emptiness are impossible,
 \ Nothing is possible.

☿(i.e. That is the only common thing that can explain samsara and Nirvana.)

For whichever philosophical system, yogi, and so forth, this basis of the equanimous coalescence of appearance and emptiness is possible and reasonable, it is also possible, from their perspective, for samsara, nirvana, the path, and all the various pure and impure appearances to appear on that single basis, and they will see the reasonableness of this, as they have minds that are in tune with the power of the way things are. Moreover, for whomever the inseparability of appearance and emptiness is not possible and appearance and

emptiness are cut off from each other, it is difficult to rationalize a common basis of perception. So for them it goes without saying that the reasoning of all appearances of samsara and nirvana arising on a single basis, etc., would not be possible.

The Dharmadharmatavibhanga says:

- ~ If aside from unreal appearance nothing
- ~ Whatsoever were possible, delusion and non-delusion,
- ~ And likewise mental afflictions and
- ~ Liberation, would be impossible.

Accordingly, if one thinks that the delusion and liberation of samsara and nirvana are somehow possible apart from emptiness and appearance, this kind of position, which does not accord with the meaning of the way things actually are, cannot be justified by scripture and reasoning.

L7: [6.2.2.2 Disposing of objections about it]

L8: [6.2.2.2.1 The disagreement [does that “relativism” means everything is meaningless, chaotic]]

- \ ###
- \ 6.2.2.2.1
- \ "Well then, the distinction of valid and invalid cognitions
- \ Would be invalid."

"Well then, this means that the distinction of valid and invalid cognition would be unreasonable for you! For a single substance can appear in any which way. Therefore, the appearances of the beings of the six realms, cause, effect, samsara, and nirvana would all be confused together, because they can appear anywhere. Thus, all systems would be contradictory."

L8: [6.2.2.2.2 Its disposal]

L9: [6.2.2.2.2.1 A general discussion of our own system's disposal of faults]

L10: [6.2.2.2.2.1.1 The reasoning that posits a valid cognition dependently is established as an inclusive judgment (yongs chod, pariccheda) [valid cognition is still established in its context]]

L11: [6.2.2.2.2.1.1.1 Contextually, the mind that apprehends in dependence upon an objective basis is established as a valid cognition]

- \ ###
- \ 6.2.2.2.2.1.1.1
- \ Whatever appears does not appear otherwise,
- \ So it is not the case that the perception of its being thus
- \ Does not establish it as a cognandum.

☿(i.e. There is still room for conventional truths, and valid correct reasonings, even in a Buddha. He is just never fooled by the appearances thinking they represent something inherently existing or absolute.)

It is true that you, the opponent, do not understand the great secret Nyingmapa's uncommon way of engaging valid cognition, but the fault you find here does not exist.

Glorious Candrakīrti said:

- ~ When a wise person has abided in the sublime vision and made a valid cognition, at that

time there is no harm from worldly [forms of perception] . Wise persons should also analyze from this perspective.

And from the Varttika:

- ~ To understand the essence of something from itself:
- ~ This is to validate something conventionally.

Likewise, the Don rnam par nges pa'i shes rab ral gri [DRG] says:

- ~ Since conventionally the abiding and actual natures [of a thing]
- ~ Have different ways of appearing,
- ~ With respect to impure, narrow-minded perception (tshur mthong, arvagdarsana)
- ~ And the pure vision of [sublime beings],
- ~ There are two conventional valid cognitions,
- ~ Like the eyes of humans and gods.

According to those statements, valid cognition that engages a cognandum comprises both the conventionalizing valid cognition that refers to the pure vision [of sublime beings], and the conventionalizing valid cognition of narrow-minded perception. The difference between them is said to be delineated by essence, causality, and function.

If you ask how one experiences with [those validating cognitions]: If one analyzes according to the conventional statements made in treatises about the objects of narrow-minded perception, through the direct and inferential valid cognitions [based on] autonomous syllogisms, one will be able to induce an unmistaken experience of that conventional thing. Likewise, with respect to the inconceivable object that is beyond narrow-minded perception, by analyzing in accordance with the conventions of treatises, one can ascertain that the pure vision that engages that cognandum is unmistaken. Because the meanings taught in this context are not contradictory in their prior and latter modes of expression, nor in what is actually said and what is implied, one can engage that extremely obscure object, without its being hidden.

Therefore, having realized the coalescence of the two truths, for the vision that comprises the harmony of the reality and the appearance of things, anything can arise from the great expanse of equality without divisions of time and place. Because all those arisings do not waver from that expanse, in relation to it everything abides in equanimity without discriminating truth and falsehood, such as the misperception of a mirage as water. Therefore, aside from the valid cognition that experiences according to pure vision, divisive appearances are all equally eliminated, and in that way, in relation to each subject, there are no harmful consequences whatsoever of one kind of substance becoming another, of the karmic perceptions of sentient beings, etc., belonging to one another [as mentioned above], and of both valid and invalid cognitions being impossible, because the possibility of any such thing happening is not established at all.

Thus, worldly beings do not understand that dharmata, because they apprehend a self in various dharma-possessioners (chos can). As a result of that, all appearances that grow out of propensities are apprehended individually and separately, and become objects of attachment. At that time anything that appears, appears in that [apprehension] and does not appear otherwise. Because each [phenomenon] has its own defining characteristic, which is not mixed with others', the various karmic appearances of virtue, vice, and their effects, etc., cannot appear in a confused way.

The Varttika says:

- ~ As all things naturally
- ~ Abide in their own essence,
- ~ Similar things are complementary to other things,
- ~ From which they differ.

Therefore, that narrow-minded [perceiver] does not fail to establish that object of experience. That mind easily establishes whatever system it tries to experience, as validly or invalidly cognized, etc.

L11: [6.2.2.2.2.1.1.2 The positing of one and many by that mind in dependence upon that object of investigation establishes that object as validly cognized]

\ ###
 \ 6.2.2.2.2.1.1.2
 \ For all things naturally abide in their own essences,
 \ Because they are established by valid cognitions
 \ That determine their sameness and difference.

¢(i.e. There is still room for common characteristics and classifications (conventionally) even in a Buddha. He is just never fooled by the appearances thinking they represent something inherently existing or absolute.)

For the reason that things do not appear indistinctly, all things that appear in that way do not become otherwise or discard their mode of being by force of their individual natures or dharmatas, because their very nature is not to be combined with other things. Thus, the identifying characteristics of water, pus, and so forth, are not muddled together. The ways in which things, such as water, mirages, pus, etc., are the same or different are all valid.

The glorious Rong zom said:

~ What is something identical to that? The defining characteristic of a pillar is to hold up a roof. The defining characteristic of a vase is to contain water. If you say, "Those are both produced," the producedness of a pillar abides in the essence of a pillar. The producedness of a vase abides in the essence of a vase. Although their individual defining characteristics are perceived as different, their producedness is not perceived as different. Although the producedness is not perceived separately, that doesn't make a pillar into a vase, nor a vase into a pillar. The characteristics of roof-holding and water-holding are not lost.

And, from the Rigs gter:

- ~ The intentional apprehension that discerns the sameness and difference
- ~ Of defining characteristics makes possible the four alternatives (catuskoti).

Thus, apprehending a single characteristic as one, different characteristics as different, many aspects (ldog pa) for one characteristic, and one characteristic for many aspects, are the four alternatives.

Therefore, although words and thoughts apply various conventions, because of the fact that individual characteristics are not confused, it is a valid cognition for humans to apprehend water as water, because it is infallible; and it is an invalid cognition to apprehend a mirage as water, because that is fallible. Moreover, by the power of the karmic appearances of beings, the apprehension of water as water by humans is a valid cognition in the context of the defiled perception of hungry ghosts. When the perception of pus and blood occurs for hungry ghosts, it is infallible with respect to attainment and loss and is a valid

cognition. But in relation to humans, it is an invalid cognition, because it has a fault that must be eliminated. Therefore, because the ways in which cognitions are valid and invalid are by nature differentiable and infallible, they are established as valid or reasonable. But nonetheless, they are not established by their own power, because whatever is posited in dependence upon different beings is not established ultimately.

Therefore, Rong zom Chos bzang said:

~ Thus, in the case of an appearance like this, it does not appear differently everywhere; it appears on a single basis. Not everything appears concordantly; things appear individually as pure or impure. Accordingly, there is the distinction of "completely pure" and "not completely pure" appearances.

In this context, "established as a valid cognition" means that because of being generally renowned, a single subject can generate understanding; this is the same as saying, "Dharmata reasoning should rely on the object."

The great Rong zom said:

~ Thus, the particular way in which each thing abides in its own state, and the mind that accords with it, are both engaged with words of reasoning....

Thus, I think valid cognition is also like that.

L10: [6.2.2.2.2.1.2 The fact that such reasoning is established by its own power is proven automatically by an excluding judgment (rnam chad, vyavaccheda) [It is exactly "because" everything is empty of inherent existence that there can be valid cognition: perception and inference]]

L11: [6.2.2.2.2.1.2.1 Generally, it is not reasonable for all dharmas to be established under their own power]

\ ###
\ 6.2.2.2.2.1.2.1
\ Thus, things by their very nature are
\ That in dependence upon which valid cognitions are
\ established,
\ But they are not themselves established by valid cognition;
\ If they were, they would be reality itself.

¢(i.e. Dharmas are accepted conventionally as common truths, and used to establish other things. But they never can be established themselves in absolute terms – otherwise they would be inherently existing. They themselves are dependently arisen, conditioned by accumulated karma – that may be common to many who accepts the dharmas as valid basis.)

For that reason, in dependence upon defiled appearances, there is a dependent origination—which is not immune to analysis—that is posited as the establishment of a valid cognition. External objects of knowledge are not established by valid cognition independently, by their own power. If they were thus established, they would just be an ultimate abiding reality, and that is not reasonable.

L11: [6.2.2.2.2.1.2.2 A single, particular instance of water does not exist under its own power, and it is reasonable for it to have a relation of dependence]

\ ###
\ 6.2.2.2.2.1.2.2

- \ An instance of water that is established
- \ By the valid cognition of one's own apprehension
- \ Is not independently established under its own power.
- \ It is not established by ultimate reasoning,
- \ Nor is it [established] for a hungry ghost.

¢(i.e. These are not inherently existing, they are always dependently arisen and conventionally labeled. But for those who do not share the same conditioning, they are not accepted.)

Since all dharmas are generally not established by their own power, although a single instance of water is established by a validating cognition that is quite infallible from the perspective of the humans who apprehend just that water, it is not established in any way under its own independent power. Just how is it not established? It is not immune to an analysis vis-à-vis ultimate truth, because it is not even established conventionally from the perspective of a hungry ghost.

L10: [6.2.2.2.1.3 And therefore, valid cognition is meaningful [so there are valid rules of inference]]

- \ ###
- \ 6.2.2.2.1.3
- \ If one determines the objects of one's own perception
- \ By means of direct perception and inference,
- \ One is not deceived with regard to engaging and avoiding
- \ The objects of those [valid cognitions];
- \ So valid cognition is not pointless.

¢(i.e. It is not because everything is empty of inherent existence that everything is completely non-existent, not dependently arisen, not functional, not logical, random, chaotic. There is room for direct perception, logical reasonings, inference, ...)

The meaningfulness of valid cognition: Moreover, an object such as water is perceived directly by a mind or sensory faculty that apprehends it. And if it is ascertained through a valid inferential cognition from a mark that is complete in the three aspects, just as it is determined, the object is infallible with respect to both engagement and disengagement. So, although it is not one-sidedly established under its own power, it is not meaningless to posit "valid cognition," because although it is posited for a contextual object like water, it is infallible in engaging and disengaging both mundane and supramundane objects.

L9: [6.2.2.2.2 Other systems cannot dispose of faults [a system where the basis for each of the six realms perceptions are mixed together in the same object]]

- \ ###
- \ 6.2.2.2.2
- \ Thus, when we say "a single instance of water,"
- \ We refer to the visual perception of human beings.
- \ In the divine context,
- \ A single instance of nectar is understood as the basis of perception.
- \ When water is seen as pus, water, and nectar,
- \ The three are not mixed together.
- \ If one of those three were not valid,

\ Then it could not be established as validly cognized
 \ By being cognized as a different substance, and
 \ All three objects of visual perception would be non-existent.
 \ If this instance of water perceived by a human being
 \ Were not water, it would not be viable as water for another,
 \ And "water" would be completely non-existent.
 \ In such a system, a system of valid cognition
 \ Would also be untenable.

¶(i.e. The same object cannot contain the six basis for the perceptions of all six realms.
 This theory leads to absurdity.)

Other systems cannot dispose of faults: Therefore, as a mere indication, the stated convention of "basis of perception" is made for a single instance of water with respect to human vision, without depending upon [the vision of] other beings, who see that water in different ways. For the gods a single [instance of] nectar is apprehended as the basis of perception. But if and when hungry ghosts, humans, and gods each see the different substances of pus, water, and nectar in the water of a single vessel, not all three [perceptions] are assembled in the mind of each being. Because the human does not have the dominant karmic influence of the other two beings, pus and blood do not appear, and the same goes for the other two beings. If that vessel has the three substances [according to our purvapaksa], and if when the human drinks from it the three become water, when the hungry ghosts drinks from it the three become pus, and when the god drinks from it the three become nectar, then, among those three, which would be the basis of perception, and which a valid cognition? Which would be deluded, and which an invalid cognition? For they would all become each other, like the appearances of a dream.

Thus, if those three were identical but not valid cognitions, there would have to be another substance other than those three that might serve as the basis of perception of those three and that could not be established through valid cognition. Therefore, for that reason, it would not be possible to establish any of those three objects of vision, nor a basis different from them, by valid cognition.

Accordingly, if this water seen by a human were filled with the six types of non-water substances, such as pus and nectar, it would be unreasonable, because something different from [water] cannot be water. Therefore, a human's seeing [the vessel] filled with a flow of water would have to be completely impossible as a valid cognition. Thus, since there would not be invalid cognitions of seeing that water as another substance, like pus, it would seem that in that tradition the ways of positing "valid" and "invalid" cognitions would be unreasonable, wouldn't it?

L9: [6.2.2.2.2.3 A special reasoning for our own system's disposal of faults:]

L10: [6.2.2.2.2.3.1 Explaining the contextual establishment of valid cognition without referring to grades of defilement by causes of perceptual error [even if all perception are relative to the individual or collective karma, there is still the notion of getting closer and closer to the way things really are, which is defined as the only common basis possible: the inseparability of appearances and emptiness]]

L11: [6.2.2.2.2.3.1.1 Explaining that an object perceived by an unflawed sense faculty established for oneself is established as valid]

\ ###

\ 6.2.2.2.2.3.1.1
 \ Thus, the object of a sense faculty
 \ That is undistorted by accidental conditions
 \ Should be established as validly cognized,
 \ As in the appearance of water and mirages.

¢(i.e. So even if ultimately all perceptions are conditioned by accumulated karma, it is conventionally accepted to call valid perception, one that is not fooled by relatively temporary conditions. It is just never absolute.)

For that reason, there are no external things that are established as valid without depending upon each other. However, that object of a sense faculty that is not flawed by adventitious causes of error must be established as valid in relation to flawed perception. For example, the water perceived by a human being's unflawed eyes is established as valid, and the perception of water in a mirage by flawed faculties is posited as invalid.

L11: [6.2.2.2.2.3.1.2 For that reason, in relation to defilement, what is sometimes perceived by humans as water is established as valid]

\ ###
 \ 6.2.2.2.2.3.1.2
 \ Thus, in the context of hungry ghosts
 \ Karmic obscurations cause clean water
 \ To appear as pus, but if the fault [of such obscuration]
 \ Is dispelled, it then appears as water.
 \ For this reason, what is seen by human beings
 \ Is posited contextually as validly cognized,
 \ Because the other is distorted by perceptual fault.

¢(i.e. We always judge other's perceptions and judgments in our own frame of reference, conditioned by our own accumulated karma.)

Although water and mirages are alike in appearing as water, they are respectively true and false, flawed and unflawed. Thus, for a particular hungry ghost, when the fault of karmic obscuration that causes pure water to appear as pus is dispelled, the appearance of pus then appears as water. Therefore, those two [appearances]—the water seen by a human, and the faulty perception of hungry ghosts and so forth, which is a cause of suffering for them—are, respectively, valid or mistaken appearances. In this way the water that is free of defilement should be established as valid.

L11: [6.2.2.2.2.3.1.3 Otherwise, it would not be established according to deceptive or ultimate truth]

\ ###
 \ 6.2.2.2.2.3.1.3
 \ For now water is established by a valid cognition.
 \ But if one analyzes with ultimate reasoning,
 \ Everything is the appearance of karmic propensity.
 \ Since [for sublime beings] water appears
 \ As the pure realms and kayas,
 \ The human perception cannot itself
 \ Be established one-sidedly as the [only] valid cognition.

¢(i.e. Anyway we have to realize that whatever frame of reference we have, it is never an absolute impartial basis. It is always dependent on our own accumulated karma, thus empty of inherent existence. There is no absolute basis to judge all appearances, reasonings, logic, ...)

In any case, all of these impure karmic appearances are just erroneous appearances of [karmic] propensities if one analyzes them with a final, ultimate reasoning. There is not one that is established by way of its own nature. Although pure and impure appearances are equivalent in their way of lacking intrinsic nature, if, from the perspective of conventional analysis, a hungry ghost removes the obscuration that causes the appearance of pus, there will be only a perception of water. And likewise, for some pure disciples, pure realms and Buddha bodies will appear. Therefore, human experience is not exclusively or one-sidedly viable as valid cognition, because in relation to the higher [form of experience, that is, pure vision] it is flawed.

L11: [6.2.2.2.3.1.4 Therefore, in dependence upon the lower, the higher is established as valid [the arrow of progress]]

\ ###
\ 6.2.2.2.3.1.4
\ Thus, by progressively purifying the causes of obscuration,
\ It is reasonable to posit higher forms of seeing
\ In relation to lower forms of seeing.
\ Since the final nature of things is unique,

¢(i.e. But, even if everything is relative, there is still the notions of better or worst perceptions and reasonings conventionally. There is still possible progress along the path, like a direction pointing toward Enlightenment. And this “direction” is defined relative to the very ultimate view of a Buddha. And this is imperfectly defined as “perceiving the Two Truths and their inseparability”. The more we get to this very ultimate view, the better it is. It can also be defined as “the further we get from all extremes”. – Note: this very ultimate truth, the way things really are, is still beyond conceptualization, but it seems that by pointing toward the mood, we have at least accepted a direction.)

Therefore, it is reasonable to accept as valid the vision of progressively higher forms of perception over lower forms of perception, because the conditions of karma that obscure the [final] meaning where actual nature and appearance are concordant become progressively worse [the lower one goes].

The Bodhicaryavatara says:

- ~ Yogis, by the difference of their minds
- ~ Progressively refute lower [types of minds].
- ~ The idea is the same here.

L10: [6.2.2.2.3.2 Establishing final valid cognition through the reasoning of dharmata [a unique point of view that is taught to be superior]]

L11: [6.2.2.2.3.2.1 Because suchness is unitary, self-cognizant pristine awareness is established as a single valid cognition]

\ ###
\ 6.2.2.2.3.2.1
\ The valid cognition that sees only it

\ Is likewise unique; a second type is impossible.

¢(i.e. Ultimately there is a unique transcendental vision without faults. The vision of a Buddha: that which we call the inseparability of appearances and emptiness; of dependent origination and emptiness ... the perfect Union of The Two truths. Knowing that we are just pointing at the moon. But it is reasonable to assume that there is one and that it is unique. – That is Mipham’s position here.)

Thus, when the ultimate result of the path is made manifest, there is no second to the unique suchness of the object, the dharmadhatu, and there is also only one valid cognition that sees in that way, namely, gnosis. A second, dissimilar object or valid cognition is impossible.

The Avatara says:

- ~ There is nothing else to do; reality does not admit of divisions,
- ~ And likewise, what perceives reality is not differentiable.

L11: [6.2.2.2.2.3.2.2 Therefore, it is reasonable for samsara and nirvana to have their origin in unawareness and awareness [relative to this unique truth]]

\ ###
\ 6.2.2.2.2.3.2.2
\ Reality is a unique truth, coalescence,
\ And valid cognition is self-arisen gnosis.
\ Since there is nothing to abandon except unawareness,
\ It is simply a case of awareness and unawareness.

¢(i.e. So, since all perceptions are dependently arisen, conditioned by accumulated karma, thus empty of inherent existence; and since seeing this one becomes free from any attachment or fear; then we can define samsara as unawareness of this (ignorance), and Nirvana as awareness of this (wisdom). The final vision of a Buddha is knowing the real nature of appearances as they arise, being aware of the way the mind work, and not being fooled by it. – Purifying our body, speech and mind consist simply of realizing their real nature and their inseparability. That is the meaning of the inseparable three kayas.)

Therefore, this abiding reality, ultimate reality, is unique; it is the coalescence of appearance and emptiness, or suchness. The way to cognize it validly is by self-arisen gnosis. The root of all that which must be abandoned for it [to arise] is nothing other than the single fact of unawareness. Thus, the only thing that obscures abiding reality is unawareness, and samsara depends upon it. When the self-radiance of the gnosis of awareness is manifest, without relying on any other support, the unawareness to be abandoned is purified automatically, and the three kayas are spontaneously present. Therefore, it is reasonable to say that samsara and nirvana have simply awareness and unawareness as their roots.

The great glorious Rong zom said:

- ~ Therefore, aside from the fact of conventionally designating knowledge and misknowledge as mental afflictions and purified constituents, all dharmas have no entity whatsoever to be removed, nor any entity to be added.

L11: [6.2.2.2.2.3.2.3 The strength of the great glorious Rong zom is in [uniquely] establishing apparent objects as deities in that manner]

\ ###
 \ 6.2.2.2.2.3.2.3
 \ Thus, this system of valid cognition
 \ Establishes the nature of all appearances as deities.
 \ This is the unique tradition of the early translations,
 \ The lion's roar of the elegant works
 \ Of the omniscient Rong zom Pandita.

¢(i.e. So in order to purify our perceptions toward this unique destination, there is the practice of perceiving all appearances as mandala of deities.)

Therefore, as explained above, with respect to this type of valid cognition it is reasonable for the perceptions of these sentient beings to be mistaken. This establishment of apparent objects as naturally being mandalas of deities is little known in the New Translation schools (i.e. I don't think so; this seems common in all Tantra traditions), and is the unique tradition of the Early Translation school. This emphasis is the eloquent lion's roar of the great pandita, the omniscient Rong zom.

On that, the great glorious Rong zom said:

~ Hungry ghosts see a river as pus. But one of them might say, "My friends! This river of pus, which hungry ghosts like us see as if filled with pus, is seen by humans to be a river of water! If those who enjoy it as water dedicate it to us, then even we hungry ghosts will see it as water and be able to enjoy it. This the very same water that we have, on occasion, been able to find in the past." Likewise, I have heard that the bodies and enjoyments that appear in accordance with human [perception] are seen by some very pure persons as mandalas of deities, and according to the way of secret mantra, they are taught actually to be mandalas of divinity. Someone might then say, "My friends! These appearances of ordinary enjoyments that humans like us perceive are, according to the vision of pure persons, the mandalas of deities. If those who have the power to enjoy the domain of purity bestow spiritual boons upon us, we human beings also will see this domain [of ordinary objects] as divinity and be able to enjoy it, just as persons like myself, who have occasionally gained spiritual accomplishments [in previous lives], have been able to reach the domain of divine [experience]."

L11: [6.2.2.2.2.3.2.4 Others do not have reasoning established in this way, so whatever claims they make are contradictory]

\ ###
 \ 6.2.2.2.2.3.2.4
 \ Other [systems] do not explain [this] point correctly;
 \ In this respect whatever other systems say is contradictory.

Elsewhere, in other philosophical systems, no explanation whatsoever is made according to this way of authentic reasoning, which in this tradition establishes the great pure equality of actual and potential phenomena. And it goes without saying that they have nothing to say [about it on the basis of] realization and meditation. Therefore, whatever positions other philosophical systems uphold in the context of this [particular discussion of] the view and meditation are all seen to be contradictory to reason and scripture, [Mipham] says.

This is the same as what the Avatara says:

~ Elsewhere, this Dharma
 ~ Is not present, and likewise

- ~ The system presented here is not found in other [systems]—
- ~ The wise should be certain of this!

L6: [6.2.3 Emptiness and appearance are not something to view separately:]

L7: [6.2.3.1 A synopsis [Inseparability of appearances and emptiness]]

```
\   ###
\   6.2.3.1
\   The claim that the common object of perception
\   Is either appearance or emptiness is untenable.
```

The claim that the common object is exclusively appearance, or exclusively emptiness, is not correct, because of the faults explained below.

L7: [6.2.3.2 An extensive explanation]

L8: [6.2.3.2.1 Emptiness [alone] cannot be a basis of perception]

L9: [6.2.3.2.1.1 Refuting that emptiness is something to perceive]

L10: [6.2.3.2.1.1.1 The consequence that space, vases, and so forth, both entities and non-entities, would be the same]

```
\   ###
\   6.2.3.2.1.1.1
\   If it were only emptiness,
\   It would be possible for any sentient being
\   To perceive space as vases,
\   And vases would disappear like space.
\   If emptiness without appearance
\   Were viable as an object of perception,
\   What would not appear?
```

If the object of perception were merely emptiness, for that reason any being would be able to [perceive] it. And if an exclusive emptiness could appear or were the basis of appearance, then the consequence would be that non-apparent space would also appear as a vase. If exclusive emptiness were not capable of appearing, an apparent vase would also not appear like space, because its basis of appearance is that [emptiness]. Therefore, if a mere emptiness without appearance could be an object of perception, why wouldn't it appear? It should appear.

L10: [6.2.3.2.1.1.2 They would be the same in being causeless]

```
\   ###
\   6.2.3.2.1.1.2
\   Things would either be permanently existent,
\   Or become entirely non-existent, being causeless;
\   Either way, it is the same.
```

Also, things like vases and so forth would be either permanently existent or permanently non-existent. If an exclusive emptiness fit to be a basis for appearance were simultaneous [with the appearance], they would have to be completely identical; and if it were not simultaneous with the object, they both would have to be completely distinct. Therefore, the reasonings adduced for causelessness all apply in this context as well.

L10: [6.2.3.2.1.1.3 If the basis of perception were emptiness, it would contradict

appearance]

- \ ###
- \ 6.2.3.2.1.1.3
- \ In the context of emptiness there is no appearance,
- \ Because they are contradictory;
- \ If there were something non-empty,
- \ It would contradict the position
- \ That mere emptiness is the basis of appearance.

Also, in this way, as the occasion for [there being a] basis of perception is [the fact of] emptiness, the karmic appearances of individuals would not appear. Like rabbit horns and cattle horns, those two [appearance and emptiness] exclude one another as existence and non-existence, respectively. If there were something non-empty, it would contradict the position of a mere emptiness as the basis of appearance.

L9: [6.2.3.2.1.2 That fault does not apply to us:]

L10: [6.2.3.2.1.2.1 Setting up the fault]

- \ ###
- \ 6.2.3.2.1.2.1
- \ "Well, didn't you say earlier
- \ That appearance and emptiness are not contradictory?"

"Well then, how is it that you said before that 'non-empty' and 'appearance' are non-contradictory?"

L10: [6.2.3.2.1.2.2 Disposing of it]

L11: [6.2.3.2.1.2.2.1 They are contradictory as the object of a conventionalizing valid cognition]

- \ ###
- \ 6.2.3.2.1.2.2.1
- \ Here, the object of visual perception is understood
- \ In the context of conventional valid cognition,
- \ For which existence and non-existence are contradictory;

Here, in the context of demonstrating that the claim that emptiness is the basis of perception is problematic, since the mutual exclusivity of appearance and emptiness is made with reference to the way visible objects are [objects of] valid cognition, the absence of a basis of appearance and the presence of the appearance of karma are contradictory, insofar as one is existent and the other is non-existent. Because they cannot combine in a single substratum, there is a problem.

L11: [6.2.3.2.1.2.2.2 How they are not contradictory as the object of gnosis, which sees the abiding nature of things]

- \ ###
- \ 6.2.3.2.1.2.2.2
- \ On the basis of a single thing the two truths
- \ Are non-contradictory only for gnosis.

¢(i.e. Appearances and emptiness are inseparable; not different, not the same; non-dual: not two, not one.)

The non-contradictory coalescence of both truths, appearance and emptiness, on the basis of one entity is the context for ascertaining the ultimate object of the equipoise of gnosis. Therefore, if one can discern it in that way, there is no fault of contradiction in our way of expressing it.

L8: [6.2.3.2.2 A non-empty appearance [alone] cannot be a basis for perception:]

L9: [6.2.3.2.2.1 Claiming that it is impossible]

\ ###
\ 6.2.3.2.2.1
\ If a mere appearance bereft of emptiness
\ Were not viable as the basis of appearance,
\ That appearance could appear any which way;

If an exclusive appearance without emptiness were not viable as a basis of appearance or perception, [or] if that kind of non-empty basis of appearance were possible, it would have to be established in truth, and from that fact alone all the various objects of knowledge that are karmic appearances could not appear.

L9: [6.2.3.2.2.2 Explaining the reason for that]

L10: [6.2.3.2.2.2.1 If there were an indistinguishable appearance, cognizing validating cognition would be impossible]

\ ###
\ 6.2.3.2.2.2.1
\ For there is no appearance that is not
\ Distinguished in one way or another.
\ [A non-empty appearance] is not established as the basis
\ of appearance,
\ It is not perceived by a valid cognition that causes one
\ to know it;
\ To say that it exists is only a claim.

If one had to say that this kind of non-empty appearance of a basis of perception is the way an entity's own nature appears, then one could not posit a distinct appearance such as water [as the basis of perception]. An appearance that is indistinguishable from its basis has no way of being made to appear to a mind, and thus cannot be thought, so that kind of appearance is not established as the basis of appearance. It has no basis in scripture, and to say that something "exists" without perceiving it with a valid cognition is nothing more than a claim, like claiming the existence of a thoughtless actor.

L10: [6.2.3.2.2.2.2 If there were a distinguishable appearance, it could not be a general basis of perception]

\ ###
\ 6.2.3.2.2.2.2
\ If whatever appeared were entirely separate,
\ Nothing other than it could appear;
\ Because it would be a non-empty appearance,
\ It would be immune to an ultimate analysis.

Moreover, if the thing that appears is distinguished by its identifying characteristic (rang mtshan) [as in the case of liquidity and water, pus, etc.], it could not appear in any other

way but with that [characteristic]. As [the root text said] earlier, "For a common object that appears according to [various perceivers]/ Distinct appearances are not possible." Therefore, that distinct appearance cannot be a basis of perception, because it is an exclusive appearance that is not empty of its own essence. Therefore, not only is that kind of appearance not conventionally viable as a basis of perception, ultimately an exclusive appearance is also not reasonable. If there were such a thing, it would be immune to rational analysis. Among knowable things, this kind of thing—heavier than the hundred thousand vajra mountains of analytical reasoning and able to withstand them—is not possible, even in the slightest degree.

L10: [6.2.3.2.2.2.3 None of the specific possibilities is suitable to be a common basis of perception]

```
\   ###
\   6.2.3.2.2.2.3
\   Whether one understands the basis as water, pus,
\   Nectar, or whatever, there is contradiction.
\   If that water were pus,
\   How could it appear as water?
\   If it were water and not pus,
\   How would it appear otherwise as pus, etc.?
\   If you say that the object that appears to hungry ghosts
\   Is water, then you would have to accept that the pus
\   That appears is non-existent.
```

Even if one believes it to be a non-empty appearance, whether one takes the basis of perception to be the water, pus, nectar, etc., of humans, ghosts, or gods, etc., it will be contradictory. How is that? If that water were pus, how could it appear as water for humans? It is not reasonable. If it is not pus, but water, it is reasonable for humans, but how would it appear as pus for ghosts and nectar for the gods? You might think, "That which appears as the object for ghosts is essentially water." Then even if it appears as pus for ghosts, you would have to accept that it [the pus] is non-existent, because its essence is water.

L7: [6.2.3.3 A summary [they are inseparable]]

```
\   ###
\   6.2.3.3
\   For aside from whatever appears to oneself,
\   There is no separate basis of appearance,
\   Because if there were it would be something different,
\   Like pillars and vases, having a single basis but being
\   different.
```

A summary: For all those reasons, the basis of appearance of whatever appears to various perceivers is not a separate exclusive emptiness, because if it were, the appearance and the basis of appearance would be different. For example, a pillar and a vase would exist individually while having a single basis of appearance, and if they were not different [from the basis of perception], the above-mentioned fault would apply to them.

L6: [6.2.4 The necessity [of ascertaining the common object of perception in our system] [the "pure vision / Yidam yoga"]:]

L7: [6.2.4.1 Briefly explaining how, by ascertaining [finding out with certainty] the common object of perception, [which is the coalescence of inseparable appearance and emptiness,] one goes to the heart of the authentic philosophical system [the Great equanimity, the goal]]

\ ###
\ 6.2.4.1
\ Therefore the coalescence of appearance and emptiness,
\ Or the absence of true existence and mere appearance,
\ [Is equivalent to] the original pure equality of all phenomena
\ In the great equal taste of the coalescence
\ That is free of partiality and extremes.

¢(i.e. Non-duality = great equanimity: Everything is already pure in emptiness, or in the coalescence. So seeking the coalescence is the equivalent of gradually purifying our perceptions; or purifying our body, speech and mind. In Vajrayana this is done by developing the “vision of purity”. Since this vision of purity is in accord with the goal, it is efficient by itself, and by its feedback it permits to gain confidence in this goal: the equality of the coalescence.)

As explained above, since neither appearance nor emptiness taken alone and exclusively is viable as a basis of perception, the coalescence of inseparable appearance and emptiness, or the illusion-like appearance that is inseparable from the expanse of emptiness of true existence—that and that alone does not, as a cause, fall into either of samsara or nirvana; nor does it fall into the partiality of appearance or emptiness. All dharmas of samsara, nirvana, and the path abide primordially in equanimity, in the great equal taste of the coalescence free of any extreme of existence or non-existence. Therefore, in the innate spontaneously present equanimity of the Great Perfection, the meaning established by the three valid cognitions, which is the actual basis of perception, is ascertained by refuting, positing, and abandoning. Then one should realize the way the nature [of things] abides in the basis.

L7: [6.2.4.2 The extensive explanation:]

L8: [6.2.4.2.1 By ascertaining [finding out with certainty] the basis of perception, [which is the coalescence of inseparable appearance and emptiness,] one acquires an excellent certainty in the meaning of mdo, sgyu, and sems [gaining confidence about “pure vision” as taught in Tantrayana]]

L9: [6.2.4.2.1.1 Attaining confidence in the meaning of the vajra words of the Great Perfection of equanimity]

\ ###
\ 6.2.4.2.1.1
\ In that way, when one determines the essence of accomplishment
\ In the Great Perfection of equality,
\ In the context of the path where one cultivates [that essence],
\ In dependence upon the vision of purity,
\ Impure appearances self-liberate.
\ Hence one attains confidence in the meaning
\ Of the statement from the vajra scriptures,
\ "Dharmakaya, which is the purity of all appearances."

¢(i.e. Having ascertained [found out with certainty] the common object of perception, [which is the coalescence of inseparable appearance and emptiness,] one has real confidence on this “vision of purity” as used in Tantrayana. Both have the meaning of the Great Equanimity beyond all extremes, beyond samsara and Nirvana.)

Thus, in the context of the self-composing, effortless path of cultivating that way of realizing the basic abiding character of reality, one must first cut off one's doubts on the path of both scripture and reasoning. Reasoning [here] means relying upon pure vision, for which the abiding and apparent natures are concordant. When the coalescence of the great equal taste is manifest, one experiences according to that kind of vision, so one does not have to abandon ordinary appearances and cling to antidotes. One has no doubts about the manner of letting everything rest in its own nature of self-liberation. Scripture here means that, when one attains an inviolable, extraordinary confidence through experiencing what is called in the Atiyoga tantras "the pure dharmakaya of actual and potential phenomena," one's mind connects with the meaning of the scriptural corpus that is the vajra pinnacle of luminosity.

The Kun byed rgyal po says:

- ~ However things appear, they are one in suchness.
- ~ Here, nobody fabricates anything.
- ~ In that sovereign of uncontrived equanimity,
- ~ Without abiding, the primordial dharmakaya is spontaneously present.

L9: [6.2.4.2.1.2 Discovering the intention of the Magical Net Tantra]

\ ###
\ 6.2.4.2.1.2.
\ So, in the Magical Net Tantra, it is taught that
\ The continuous appearance of the five aggregates
\ Is the "pure divine body of thatness";
\ This is confidence in the intended meaning [of that
\ scripture].

¢(i.e. So this “pure vision”, this great equanimity, is based on this “inseparability of appearances and emptiness”.)

Because one abides in the great exalted dharmakaya, which is the inseparability of the truth of the abiding nature of things, then, as it says in the Magical Net of Vajrasattva, "Right now, the five aggregates, which as mere appearances are empty of true existence, are illusion-like appearances of the indivisible suchness that is naturally pure, and appear as the divine mandala of the five families and five gnoses." One attains confidence in the sense intended by the magical net of inseparable thought and deity.

The Le lag says:

- ~ In the illusory gnosis of the five aggregates,
- ~ The five self-cognizant families of method are emanated.

L8: [6.2.4.2.2 Explanation of the reasoning that establishes their final intent on the nature of things [justification of “pure vision”]]

L9: [6.2.4.2.2.1 The actual reasoning that establishes that]

L10: [6.2.4.2.2.1.1 Showing what the final valid cognition is through gradually purifying sullyng obscurations [gradually realizing the inseparability of the Two Truths is

equivalent to gradually purifying our body, speech and mind, or gradually purifying our perception]]

\ ###
\ 6.2.4.2.2.1.1
\ Similarly, when the apprehension of pus is removed,
\ It is realized to be delusion, and by cultivating that
\ Water appears in its place.
\ A great bodhisattva [on the] pure [stages]
\ Sees countless Buddha fields in each drop of water,
\ And water itself manifests as Mamaki.

¢(i.e. Just by developing this “vision of purity” artificially in the beginning, it gradually permits to see things with a vision more and more in accord with the goal; or one sees more and more the illusory nature of appearances. The proof is in the pudding ... by trying it. Ultimately this leads to the realization of the coalescence. But this has to be done in stages.)

Thus, the proof that pure vision is a valid cognition is completed by analyzing in this way: when a person cultivating the path has reversed the tendencies of the lower realms that cause the experience and apprehension of pus, which is a delusive appearance, one realizes that apprehension of pus to be delusion, and that appearance of pus to be sullied (bslad pa). When one is free of clinging to appearances, the previous appearance is purified and water appears. And by cultivating the path further, for the yogi that appearance of water is somewhat further purified compared to the previous appearance. In general, because sullied appearances are impure, when they have been gradually purified, the great bodhisattva sees each of the atoms of water as numberless pure Buddha fields, and water appears as the great mother Mamaki. When it is touched, it performs the action of moistening, and when it is enjoyed, the bliss of samadhi and non-conceptual gnosis are produced, etc. It is manifestly apparent as a pure appearance of support [entity] and supported [experiences of it].

Then, when one has cultivated the path in its entirety, on the bhumi where the two obscurations and their propensities have been abandoned, one consummates the character of perfectly pure vision in the great equal taste of samsara and nirvana, the basic abiding nature of pure equal coalescence.

The Uttaratantra says:

~ Sentient beings and bodhisattvas
~ And tathagatas are said to be
~ Impure,
~ purified of impurity, and
~ Extremely pure,
~ in stages.

L10: [6.2.4.2.2.1.2 The way in which our position, which accords with that way of seeing, is established as the culmination of all vehicles [the final result is pure vision, or great equanimity, so it is the ultimate valid cognition]]

L11: [6.2.4.2.2.1.2.1 Other than just that pure vision, there is no other authentic final reality of things]

\ ###
\ 6.2.4.2.2.1.2.1

\ On the bhumi where the two obscurations are finally
 \ abandoned,
 \ One sees the great equal taste of coalescence.
 \
 \ As for pure vision,
 \ If in order to abandon all obscurations
 \ The unerring reality of things is seen
 \ By it and it alone,
 \ It is taken to be the final valid cognition

☿(i.e. It is in accord with the goal. Realizing the great equanimity and seeing everything as pure, is the same as the perfect Union of The Two Truths, the coalescence.)

For that reason, on the bhumi of the consummated fruition, all actual and potential phenomena are seen as the great extraordinary dharmakaya, the inseparable [two] truths of pure equality, which has abandoned all obscurations and their tendencies without exception. Since, aside from the pure vision, free of the cataracts [of delusion], which knows the actual nature of things unerringly, there is nothing else, one should accept that alone as a valid cognition and ascertain the view [accordingly].

The Avatara says:

- ~ Just as the perception of one with cataracts
- ~ Cannot challenge the cognition of one without cataracts,
- ~ Likewise the intellect that is bereft of stainless gnosis
- ~ Cannot challenge the stainless intellect.

L11: [6.2.4.2.2.1.2.2 Explaining conventional valid cognition according to the cognitive [mode] of that [pure vision] [Buddha-nature]]

\ ###
 \ 6.2.4.2.2.1.2.2
 \ And is established for those with the eyes of reason
 \ Who abide on the pinnacle of the establishment of the statement
 \ "Everything abides originally in the purity of dharmakaya."

☿(i.e. It corresponds to the real non-dual nature of everything. Everything is equal in emptiness, or in the coalescence.)

That very vision that is bereft of the two obscurations and free of defilements is held to be the ultimate valid cognition beyond all contextual valid cognitions. Moreover, since all the various appearances are primordially contained in the profound and vast Dharma essence that has the nature of purity, there is the statement that "they abide in the dharmakaya Buddha nature." This is the meaning established by the ultimate validating cognition. This is precisely the intention of the Great Perfection of the supreme secret bindu, the pinnacle of all vehicles of sutra and tantra. By relying upon the presence of perfectly pure scripture, it is proven for those honest individuals who have the guiding eyes of reason.

L10: [6.2.4.2.2.1.3 Showing that other [systems] cannot realize it in this way]

\ ###
 \ 6.2.4.2.2.1.3
 \ Moreover, this vehicle has thousands
 \ Of wonderful rays of light.

\ The low-minded, like spirit birds,
\ Are as if blind to it.

¢(i.e. But it is something hard to accept for ordinary people, this purity of everything. So most people will reject the teachings of the Tantrayana because of lack of faith in this “vision of purity”. But we have proven here that it does make sense because it is in accord with the goal.)

This extremely profound vehicle is supported by that particular crucial point of establishment, and the result that is acquired through hundreds of efforts in other vehicles is here shown spontaneously, without effort. That vehicle, like the orb of the sun, "does indeed have the beautiful rainbow body, the unique teaching of the king of vehicles." But, because it possesses a thousand light rays of amazing and wonderful qualities, most people, like spirit birds with inferior lineages and dull faculties, are as if blind and cannot easily understand it.

The Lord Maitreya said:

- ~ Their aspirations are low, and their faculties are extremely dim.
- ~ They are completely surrounded by unworthy friends, so
- ~ How can they accomplish, without aspiration,
- ~ This Dharma, which is explained in a profound and vast way?

L9: [6.2.4.2.2.2 Cutting off doubts:]

L10: [6.2.4.2.2.2.1 This authentic meaning of the abiding nature of things can arise as anything, so one cannot prove that the subject (chos can) only appears as a deity]

\ ###
\ 6.2.3.2.2.2.1
\ Although it cannot be incontrovertibly proven
\ That the final space of equality
\ Only appears as divinity,

¢(i.e. The way we see everything depends primarily on our accumulated karma. One may see deities, another may see anything else. It is not because appearances varies with the individual that the ultimate nature is not purity, or non-duality, the coalescence ... It is exactly because everything is empty that everything can appear differently, and that everything is ultimately pure.)

There, with regard to how appearance manifests from the basic expanse of the equality of samsara and nirvana, the final nature of things, one cannot prove that deities ought to appear to everyone without appearing otherwise, because it is not contradictory for [the basic expanse] to appear as anything whatsoever. Nagarjuna said, "Everything works for him/ For whom emptiness works."

L10: [6.2.4.2.2.2.2 The ultimate deity of dharmata is the inseparability of the expanse and gnosis, so it is not challenged by an ultimate analysis]

\ ###
\ 6.2.4.2.2.2.2
\ To the extent that the expanse of original natural purity
\ And its apparent aspect, the wisdom body,
\ Are inseparable, the apparent aspect is
\ Originally pure divinity,

\ And cannot be harmed by ultimate reasoning,

¢(i.e. So once one has purified his perception, purified his body speech and mind, what is left in the inseparable appearances and emptiness, is the appearance of an originally pure deity. It is not nothingness; that would be the extreme of nihilism. And it is nothing that is inherently existing either; that would be the extreme of realism. So that is the basis of the pure vision where one sees oneself as a deity, and everything else as pure mandalas. That is the basis of the so called Buddha-nature.)

Moreover, in general all aspects of discordance between reality and appearance are the neganda of any path or form of reasoning. Both the dharmadhatu, which is by nature primordially pure, and the self-radiance of that dharmadhatu, the apparent aspect that is the body of gnosis, are by nature inseparable. Therefore, not only is the apparent aspect—which is primordially pure as divinity—not negated on the path, it is also not harmed by an ultimate analysis. By virtue of the fact that, however much one analyzes it, one is made to see the empty nature of gnosis, the two obscurations are purified, and one is made to see the aspect of clear appearance as the arising of the self-radiance of emptiness. For example, it is like the purification of gold by fire.

On that, Nagarjuna also said:

- ~ The sutras teaching emptiness
- ~ That were spoken by the Buddha
- ~ All reverse mental afflictions.
- ~ That faculty [the Buddha nature] is not harmed.

And, the Lord Maitreya:

- ~ The ultimate limit is devoid
- ~ Of all kinds of fabrication;
- ~ Afflictions, karma, and ripening
- ~ Are said to be like clouds.

L10: [6.2.4.2.2.2.3 Therefore, the vision bereft of the two obscurations is the object established by the two valid cognitions]

- \ ###
- \ 6.2.4.2.2.2.3
- \ For the expanse of coalescent form and emptiness,
- \ Which is free of the two obscurations,
- \ Is the final suchness of things.

¢(i.e. That establishes the parallel between the purification of the two obscurations and the realization of the inseparability of the Two Truths using the two valid cognitions. So valid cognitions would not invalidate pure perception, and Buddha-nature.)

For which reason is it not harmed? The perfectly pure vision that has abandoned the two obscurations and their tendencies, which are the things to be abandoned on the path, is the primordial expanse of the coalescence of appearance and emptiness; precisely that is the final object established by the two valid cognitions. Therefore, since it is the result of accomplishment, it is not something to negate.

Thus, the Wish-fulfilling Treasury says:

- ~ Statements to the effect that "In establishing ultimate reality, there is no appearance" are meant to indicate that, conventionally speaking, the object thus established

is authentic. But it should not be understood to mean that [ultimate reality] is truly existent over and against that [appearance]. For this would contradict statements above and below, such as "In the expanse, appearance and emptiness are inseparable; thus, that reality is called inseparable."

Thus, since earlier and later statements are contradictory, they should be understood according to the teaching of inseparability, which is explored exhaustively in the eighteenth chapter [in this text, the Yid bzhin mdzod} .

L8: [6.2.4.2.3 Purifying obscurations [advice to purify the stains of the mind for which reality and appearance are discordant]]

L9: [6.2.4.2.3.1: A précis]

\ ###
\ 6.2.4.2.3.1
\ Aside from this, whatever else one analyzes
\ Is not the final meaning;
\ For if the two obscurations are not completely abandoned,
\ Abiding and apparent natures are always discordant.

¢(i.e. The result is beyond all analysis, all conceptualization, all karma formation. All appearances of the six senses are always like illusions, conditioned by accumulated karma. In that sense our body, speech and mind have to be gradually purified.)

If, unlike above, one takes this self-centered intellect as a valid cognition, no matter which aspect one exclusively analyzes, be it appearance or emptiness, it is not the final meaning. As one does not completely abandon the two obscurations, the subjective intellect has defilements, because as long as one does not integrate the object of cognition, the two truths, the abiding and apparent natures of things are in all respects discordant.

The Samadhiraja says:

- ~ Eyes, ears, and nose are not valid cognizers.
- ~ Likewise the tongue and the body are not valid cognizers.
- ~ If these sense faculties were valid cognizers,
- ~ What could the sublime path do for anyone?

L9: [6.2.4.2.3.2 [The extensive explanation:]]

L10: [6.2.4.2.3.2.1 Because the subject is pure, the way the appearance of the object arises is pure]

L11: [6.2.4.2.3.2.1.1 The actual [explanation]]

\ ###
\ 6.2.4.2.3.2.1.1
\ Contextual appearances in the practice of the path
\ Are like healing a cataract;
\ By purifying defilements of the subject,
\ The object is likewise seen in its purity,
\ Because for a pure subject
\ There are no impure objects.

¢(i.e. This suggest that the way to finally see everything as pure is to purify the subject first – to purify our own body speech and mind – to purify our perception. By ultimately realizing the real nature of our own body, speech and mind, everything will be seen as pure

inseparable appearances and emptiness.)

Therefore, contextual appearances of the path appear as a mixture of pure and impure. Practicing the path is like purifying a defect of the eyes—for instance, removing a cataract—in that purifying the subject's stains likewise purifies the object. Internally, when the subject is purified of stains, externally there is no object that is not purified. For that reason, from the form realm up to omniscience there is no difference in the naturally pure state.

The Sutrasamuccaya says:

- ~ The purity of form should be considered as the purity of result.
- ~ The resultant purity of form becomes the purity of omniscience.
- ~ The purity of the result of omniscience and pure form
- ~ Are the same as the element of space and are indivisible.

L11: [6.2.4.2.3.2.1.2 Cutting off doubts]

\ ###
\ 6.2.4.2.3.2.1.2
\ Thus, when an ordinary person becomes a Buddha,
\ [There is no impurity], but impurity still appears to others,
\ Because they obscure themselves with their own
\ obscurations.

¢(i.e. The same thing, the same experience, can be samsara for one, and Nirvana for another. Everything depends on the way we see things, on our ignorance or wisdom. So it is not about the purity of the objects of perception, but about the purity of the perception, of the perceiver.)

In that way, if an individual practices the path, in his own perception all dharmas are manifestly fully enlightened, and at that time there is only pure appearance, but that doesn't mean that impure things—the animate and inanimate universe—will not appear to other individuals, since sentient beings who do not practice the path are themselves obscured by self-appearing obscurations. For example, to purify the eyes of another person does not benefit the person with cataracts.

L10: [6.2.4.2.3.2.2 Therefore, advice that the stains of the subject must be purified]

L11: [6.2.4.2.3.2.2.1 Advice to purify the stains that obscure the abiding nature of things]

\ ###
\ 6.2.4.2.3.2.2.1
\ Thus, although object and subject
\ Are originally pure,
\ They are obscured by adventitious defilements,
\ So one should strive to purify them.

¢(i.e. Although we are the unborn Buddha-nature, we are still conditioned by accumulated karma because we still don't understand its true nature, we are still fooled by our perceptions because we still haven't realize their true nature. So realizing the real nature of everything is like a gradual purification of our own body, speech and mind. Then everything becomes pure.)

Therefore, both subject and object—the object-possessor and clinging to ordinary

appearances—abide in the non-dual equanimity that is naturally pure from the beginning. Nonetheless, when one misunderstands that and errs due to extrinsic conditions, one is obscured by adventitious stains of the way things appear. Therefore, the advice is given that one should strive diligently with one's three doors in the methods for purifying those kinds of obscurations.

The Varttika says:

- ~ This is the nature of things; other than this,
- ~ By other causes, one will err.
- ~ The opposite also depends upon the condition,
- ~ Like the unstable mind that perceives a serpent.

L11: [6.2.4.2.3.2.2.2 In the authentic meaning, stains to be purified are not established]

\ ###
\ 6.2.4.2.3.2.2.2
\ Because there is nothing impure with respect to
\ The purity of one's own nature,
\ There is the equality of natural luminosity.
\ Not realizing it, one apprehends
\ Various appearances individually.

¢(i.e. But it should be understood that this purifications is just an image; there is no real stains to remove, no real purification. Those stains are also empty of inherent existence, like illusions, and that is part of what has to be realized. There is ultimately nothing to get, nothing to drop or reject or remove. So purifying the stains is to see their real nature, to see that everything is inseparable appearances and emptiness.)

Thus, though the "stain to be purified" is conventionally stated—like, for example, a rhinoceros [skin] vessel, which has no hairs—stains are perfectly pure insofar as they are empty of their intrinsic essence; otherwise, there are no impure substances. Though the term "adventitious" is applied conventionally, the fundamental nature of things is the beginningless luminosity of equanimity.

The Uttarantra says:

- ~ Because sentient beings are realized
- ~ To be just the peaceful dharmata
- ~ Because they are naturally completely pure,
- ~ They are primordially liberated from affliction.

L9: [[6.2.4.2.3.3 ??] 6.2.4.2.3.2.2.3 The summary:]

L10: [6.2.4.2.3.2.2.3.1 One is bound in samsara by the nescience of ignorance]

\ ###
\ 6.2.4.2.3.2.2.3.1
\ A childish person whose mind is attached
\ Is an ignorant child whose ignorance enslaves him;

¢(i.e. In short samsara is due to the ignorance of the real non-dual nature of everything, ignorance of the pure coalescence beyond all conceptualization. This is presented as impure body, speech and mind.)

Thus, when the abiding reality of the way the various karmic appearances appear, such as

water, pus, nectar, and so forth, is not understood, those children who are fooled by apprehending self and other, and so forth, are foolish children attached and clinging to things such as the appropriating aggregates. As long as they are thus fooled, they will be bound by that ignorance.

The Sutrasamuccaya says:

- ~ The lowest, middling, and greatest sentient beings
- ~ Are all arisen from ignorance, said the Sugata.
- ~ From the gathering of conditions, the machine of suffering is produced.
- ~ That machine of ignorance neither is exhausted nor increases.

L10: [6.2.4.2.3.2.2.3.2 How one achieves liberation through the gnosis of awareness]

\ ###
\ 6.2.4.2.3.2.2.3.2
\ But everyone who realizes this will seize
\ The citadel of fruition in the state of equality,
\ And become victorious in self-arisen gnosis
\ In the fundamental expanse of the three times and
\ of timelessness.

¢(i.e. In short Nirvana, abiding in equanimity, is due to the wisdom of the real non-dual nature of everything, having realized the pure coalescence beyond all conceptualization. This is presented as the pure inseparable body, speech and mind of a Buddha.)

If one realizes the mode of abiding of those modes of appearance, all dualistic dharmas—oneself and others, samsara and nirvana— are purified in the equal taste of samsara and nirvana, the coalescence of the two truths, and one reaches the haven of the ultimate fruition. Because, in the fundamental expanse of the primal purity of the three times and timelessness, there is no fruition arisen from an extrinsic cause; self-arisen gnosis is victorious over all fabricated phenomena.

That same text says:

- ~ The bodhisattva who knows relativity
- ~ As birthless and stainless with this analytical wisdom
- ~ Will vanquish the darkness of ignorance and attain the self-arisen
- ~ Just as the cloudless sun dispels darkness by radiance.

L8: [6.2.4.2.4 The benefits [analysis of the Two Truths ? confidence ? pure vision technique ? entering the range of Buddhahood]]

L9: [6.2.4.2.4.1 By taking such a position, one gives rise to tolerance for the profound meaning]

L10: [6.2.4.2.4.1.1 From the dharmata, which does not exist anywhere, things can arise anywhere]

L11: [6.2.4.2.4.1.1.1 The actual explanation]

\ ###
\ 6.2.4.2.4.1.1.1
\ This system, which accepts the principle
\ Of great pure equality, is well established.
\ Because appearance and emptiness are not established,
\ Whatever can appear appears anywhere and everywhere.

¢(i.e. The basis for the practice of “pure vision” is already established by showing the necessity to stay away from all extremes, which is based on correct reasonings.)

Thus, this way of positing the great indivisible pure equality of apparent and potential phenomena as explained above is already well established by the three types of validating cognition. Because the partial extremes of appearance and emptiness are not established anywhere, it is possible for pure self-effulgence to arise anywhere from the great vast expanse free from extremes. And when distorted by conditions, it is possible for impure appearance to arise anywhere.

The Madhyamakalamkara says:

- ~ As for the nature of things,
- ~ By following the path of reason,
- ~ One eliminates the claims of others,
- ~ So their criticisms are pointless.

L11: [6.2.4.2.4.1.1.2 The inappropriateness of other reifications for that]

\ ###
\ 6.2.4.2.4.1.1.2
\ However else you look at it,
\ Nothing can appear anywhere.

¢(i.e. There is no other way to look at it that would pass through the ultimate reasoning. Seeing everything as pure is the same as staying away from all extremes, the same as the Buddha’s equanimity.)

Otherwise, for the positions that maintain an exclusive emptiness or an exclusive appearance as the basis of perception, and so forth, aside from whatever is falsely mentally imputed on the actual object, nothing else can arise.

That same text says:

- ~ Wherever there is no entity,
- ~ There is nothing that knows it.

L10: [6.2.4.2.4.1.2 Explaining from the perspective of gaining confidence in that]

L11: [6.2.4.2.4.1.2.1 Generating profound tolerance through realizing emptiness as dependent origination]

\ ###
\ 6.2.4.2.4.1.2.1
\ The way to gain confidence in this system
\ Is the path of emptiness and dependent origination.
\ If one gains certainty in appearance and emptiness,
\ In the self-arisen changeless mandala,
\ Profound tolerance will be born within oneself
\ For the inconceivable dharmata
\ And for the emptying and non-emptying [of the limits of
\ existence].

¢(i.e. The way to gain certainty in this “pure vision” method is by analyzing the Two Truths and their inseparability. Developing this certainty, one can practice equanimity and pure vision more easily.)

The way to gain confidence in this object or way, which is extremely esoteric and beyond narrow-minded perception, is this excellent and profound path, where emptiness and dependent origination are inseparable. If through the path of the coalescence of the two valid cognitions one acquires certainty in the way divided fabricated appearances are, like illusions, inseparable from emptiness, then, regardless of how delusion and liberation, etc., appear, in the self-arisen mandala that is the basis of apparent and possible phenomena, which is beyond increase and decrease, one generates from the core of one's being a fearless tolerance in all the profound and inconceivable objects of dharmata, such as the fact that by attaining nirvana the limits of samsara are empty, and by not attaining it the limits of existence do not fail to be emptied, and so forth. (i.e. "The pure perception practice is gained through faith and devotion. You could try other methods, too; meditation is also very good." – the first one is the guru-yoga..., the other one is the path of the coalescence of the two valid cognitions.)

The mDo sdud pa. says:

- ~ The entrances to gnosis, methods, and all roots
- ~ All arise from the supreme perfection of wisdom.
- ~ From various conditions, the machine of gnosis issues forth.
- ~ In the perfection of wisdom, there is no exhaustion or increase.

L11: [6.2.4.2.4.1.2.2 That can engage the cognitive domain of the Buddhas]

\ ###
\ 6.2.4.2.4.1.2.2
\ In the width of an atom
\ One sees as many Buddha fields as are atoms,
\ And in a single instant an eon appears.
\ With certainty in the absence of true existence
\ Which is like an illusion,
\ One can enter the range of Buddhahood.

¢(i.e. So these are the steps: one has to gain confidence in the method using correct reasonings (as explained in previous topics), then use "pure vision" (of Tantrayana as explained in topic 6) to progress much faster.)

Not only that, by that entrance to tolerance of the profound object, in the space of a single atom one sees as many pure lands as there are atoms, without the atom becoming larger or the pure lands becoming smaller. And in a single moment, one can see an entire eon, without the moment becoming longer or the eon shorter. By this very certainty in the absence of true existence, which is like an illusion, one can enter the inconceivable domain of the Buddhas.

The Avatara says:

- ~ Empty things, such as reflections,
- ~ That do not depend upon aggregation are not known to exist.
- ~ Just as form from empty reflections, etc.,
- ~ The form of a cognition is produced,
- ~ Likewise, though all things are empty,
- ~ From emptiness itself they are produced.

L9: [6.2.4.2.4.2 If one has no karmic connection, it is difficult to realize]

L10: [6.2.4.2.4.2.1 The specifics of the Dharma terminology of the tradition of the early

translations]

\ ###
\ 6.2.4.2.4.2.1
\ One may have disciplined oneself and thought for a hundred years
\ About the meaning of the words of different philosophical systems, such as
\ The undifferentiability of one's own appearances [and their basis],
\ The absence of partiality and extremes,
\ The inconceivability of the fundamental expanse,
\ The dharmata that is not established anywhere,
\ The coalescence of form and emptiness, etc.,

¢(i.e. But to go through the steps required to gain this certainty is not easy. One has to have the required capacity, the predisposed karma to be able to start and progress.)

Thus, the creative expression of the primordial basis appears of itself, without distinction [of location]; at the time of arising, there is equality without differentiation or extremes; from the inconceivable basic expanse of equality, phenomena appear in every which way; at the time of appearing they are not established in reality in any way whatsoever; and thus, appearance and emptiness are coalescent. The meaning of these statements, which express the philosophical system of the early translations, is indeed difficult to fathom.

L10: [6.2.4.2.4.2.2 Without a karmic connection, one will have no interest (mos pa) in it]

\ ###
\ [6.2.4.2.4.2.2]
\ Yet if one lacks the cause of prior familiarity,
\ Then, even if one's intellect and training are not inconsiderable,
\ One will not get it.

¢(i.e. And the required karma to be able to go through it all. Somebody can be very intelligent in ordinary sciences, business or Hinayana, but be completely incapable of understanding even the most basic concepts of Mahayana, and possibly totally against anything like Tantrayana. And that is extremely sad.)

Though one disciplines the three doors of the bodily support, which lasts about one hundred years, and contemplates [the teaching], if one doesn't have a ripened cause or karmic connection from previous cultivation [of the path], then even if one has a great mind and is not a lowly person, and has both innate and acquired wisdom, that alone will not suffice for understanding. For example, it is like the Hinayanist who has consummated both innate and cultivated wisdom, but who cannot comprehend the Mahayana.

Glorious Candra said:

~ When this is explained, someone who has previously cultivated this frightening, profound meaning will definitely understand it, while another person, even if greatly learned, will not be able to comprehend it.

L7: [6.2.4.3 The summary:]

L8: [6.2.4.3.1 An explanation of the greatness of this establishment of the view of our system]

\ ###
\ 6.2.4.3.1

\ Thus the hundred rivers of elegant explanations
 \ In which flow the quintessences
 \ Of all philosophical systems
 \ Pour into this great ocean, which is amazing.

¢(i.e. So it all comes down to realizing the real non-dual nature of our own perceptions, or our own body, speech and mind; of purifying them.)

Therefore, although the sutric and tantric philosophical systems have various ways, according to context, of inducing their particular [forms of realization], this great ocean, wherein enter the great rivers of elegant explanations of the one hundred holy Dharmas that deal with the ultimate profundities, is the most wonderful.

From the bShad rgyud rdo rje:

- ~ The continuum of the ocean of individual teachings
- ~ Is taught here, is taught by this, is taught on account of this.
- ~ Because all meanings are completely perfected here,
- ~ It is explained as the "universal scripture."

L8: [6.2.4.3.2 Summarizing by explaining the difference between abiding and apparent natures]

\ ###
 \ 6.2.4.3.2.
 \ Other modes of appearance
 \ That appear in the process of transformation are indefinite;
 \ The consummate gnosis of coalescence
 \ Sees the infallible meaning and is changeless.

¢(i.e. So there are many adapted skillful means and temporary views along the path; but this coalescence is the final view. Although it is still just pointing at the moon conceptually.)

The basic mode of appearance where appearance and abiding natures are not concordant, as well as other appearances at the time of the path, are not certain, are deceptive, and appear with fluctuations, such as happiness and suffering. Therefore, they cannot be relied upon. By directly seeing the true sublime meaning that is not deceptive—the unfabricated gnosis that is the coalescence of the two bodies, the final stage of the path where appearance and reality are concordant—one attains the realm of the changeless, and one can rely upon it.

I say:

- ~ By preparing the maksa of deluded karmic appearances,
- ~ One does not see the excellent pure gold of the apparent basis.
- ~ Though one debates [the alchemical virtues of ice, fat, butter, and so forth,
- ~ This charcoal of analysis obviously only colors oneself.

L1: [9.7. Topic 7 [No absolute, only adapted skillful means – no absolute position, but a conventional position about a view (the inseparability of the Two Truths), a path and the

result // the Great Perfection's meditation]]

(Résumé of Topic 7: This topic is about the validity of assuming a dharmata, an absolute real nature of everything: either by calling it emptiness, or the Two Truths, ... Or by assuming that we should have no position at all.

Some might say, like the Consequentialists, that one doesn't need to adopt any conventional position of their own, but only adopt the opponent's position in order to show its absurdity from the inside. But with the Great Perfection, one adapt a conventional position consisting of a view, a path and a result.

The conclusion, is that we need adapted skillful means and views, but that we should not take any of them as the absolute truth which is beyond all conceptualization.

So we need to use the Two Truths, then realize their emptiness, then transcend this duality. On the path we need both together all the time; one alone is never enough. And without them together we fall into one extreme or another.)

L4: [[0.2.2.3.] Third, in the analysis of whether the great Madhyamaka has a position or not [explanation of the view of dharmata, which recognizes its nature as equality]]

L5: [7.1 The question [whether it, the great Madhyamaka, upholds a position on the conventional level, since it doesn't have one at the ultimate level]]

\ ###
\ 7.1
\ When analyzing whether or not there is a position
\ In the Great Madhyamaka of non-elaboration,

Having already determined that the great Madhyamaka, which is a facet of the "Middle, Mudra, and Perfection" triad (dbu phyag rdzogs gsum), has no position vis-à-vis ultimate reality existing or not existing, etc., the time has arrived to discuss the question of whether it upholds a position on the conventional level.

L5: [7.2 Extensive discussion of its meaning]

L6: [7.2.1 Refuting the system of earlier [philosophers], which exclusively asserts that it is without a position. [No absolute position, but a conventional position on a view, a path, and a result]]

L7: [7.2.1.1 Positing other philosophical systems [rejecting all positions]]

\ ###
\ 7.2.1.1
\ Earlier scholars univocally stated
\ That our own Madhyamika system has no position,
\ Because existence, non-existence, being, and non-being
\ Do not exist anywhere.

¢(i.e. Like: They do not abide in any position as absolute because the very ultimate truth is beyond conceptualization. No absolute, only adapted skillful means.)

The earlier [philosophers] of Tibet uniformly followed the meditative equipoise upon ultimate reality of the noble ones, which does not uphold either of the two truths, because it is utterly without any particular adherence to being, non-being, both, or neither, and existence, non-existence, and so forth. They said that, in reference to the worldly deceptive [reality] of others, "we have no such position."

L7: [7.2.1.2 Explaining how they are opposed to our own Prasangika tradition [They do have a position on a view, path and result]]

- \ ###
- \ 7.2.1.2
- \ In our texts, all the philosophical explanations
- \ Of path and result and relativity
- \ Are accepted as our own position [i.e. conventionally], so
- \ To say that all conventions are only set forth
- \ From other people's perspective
- \ Is to contradict both the words and the meaning.

¢(i.e. But they do accept conventional truths as conventional; they do use adapted skillful means and useful progressive views. But these are never accepted as absolute. So, in that sense, to say that they reject all positions is to miss the point. The Middle Way is: not accepting, not rejecting. Conventional truths are not inherently existing, but they are not completely non-existent either. That would be nihilism. – And they have a conventional position, the inseparability of the Two Truths. They do accept a view, a path, and a result ... conventionally. They do not only use Prasanga after adopting the opponent's position.)

Although it is reasonable to maintain that the ultimate Madhyamaka has no position, if one maintains that exclusively, there is a problem, because it contradicts the textual tradition of the Prasangikas. The [latter's] way is explained in our own tradition's texts, the Madhyamakavatara and the Bodhicaryavatara. [There] the basis is the two truths, the path is the perfection of the dual accumulation on the five paths and ten stages, and the result is incidental as well as conclusive. Conventionally, or deceptively, all dharmas exist as dependent originations, and for that reason our own system accepts all positions of the Madhyamika philosophical system. That being the case, to attribute all conventional positions to the perspective of other worldly beings' manner of perception would be to contradict both the words and the meaning of our Prasangika textual tradition.

L6: [7.2.2 Discussing the origin of our own system, which proceeds by way of differentiating [the meaning of the expressions] "with" and "without a position" [The Middle Way: not accepting any position as absolute, not rejecting all positions as useless]]

L7: [7.2.2.1 Earlier systems are a mixture of good qualities as well as faults [jumping from one extremes to the other]]

- \ ###
- \ 7.2.2.1
- \ According to Klong chen rab 'byams,
- \ Earlier scholars veered to the extremes of
- \ Asserting that Madhyamaka has or does not have a position;
- \ Each of those positions has defects and qualities.

¢(i.e. To accept a position, or to reject all positions, these are the two extremes that the Middle Way warned us about.)

As for that system, the victorious Lord Klong chen Rab 'byams bzang po said that, on the subject of whether the Prasangika Madhyamaka has a position or not, earlier philosophers such as Pa tshab and his four sons, and so forth, each adhered one-sidedly to either the position that there is, or that there is not, a position, and that each of those systems of

explanation had both its faults and its virtues. If one maintains those positions one-sidedly, one should understand their faults according to what is explained above and below.

L7: [7.2.2.2 Analysis of the position of our own system, which eliminates those faults [staying away from the two extremes about positions; not accepting, not rejecting]]

L8: [7.2.2.2.1 When one determines that nothing is established in reality, one has no position [not accepting any position as absolute]]

\ ###
\ 7.2.2.2.1
\ Thus, when approaching the nature of reality,
\ Nothing is established in the original state;
\ What then is there to accept as a position?

¢(i.e. Everything is dependently arisen, thus empty of inherent existence. So all views are flawed. Grasping at any view, any concept, is still grasping, creating karma and the cause for more suffering. Rejecting everything, thinking everything is non-existent, or useless, or from the mind only, is still a position.)

For the reason stated above, in Klong chen pa's interpretation, emptiness and dependent origination are in a state of equality, (i.e. Inseparability or non-duality of dependent origination and emptiness. None of them is the absolute truth, nor both, nor neither. Staying away from the four extremes.) and when one determines the nature of things that is free of all extremes of elaboration, none of the four extremes is established in any way whatsoever. So how could one hold any position about that nature of things vis-à-vis the two truths? It would be unreasonable. Therefore, a "philosophical system" [grub mtha'] is a way of determining just how things exist in reality, because it posits or maintains a system [that describes] that [reality]. Moreover, when debating the establishment of the view as a basis, and so forth, on that second occasion there is no position [of non-position] maintained when it is said that "In the nature of things, there is no position whatsoever."

L8: [7.2.2.2.2 When one establishes the system of the path and result in apparent reality, one distinguishes the two truths and maintains them [as a position] [not rejecting all positions as completely useless]]

\ ###
\ 7.2.2.2.2
\ Therefore, because a philosophical system
\ Is a position about the nature of things, at the time of
\ debate, etc.,
\ No position is taken, in accordance with the original state.
\ In meditative aftermath, the systems of path and result—
\ Whatever and however they are posited—
\ Are expounded according to their respective positions,
\ Without confusing them.
\ Klong chen pa said, "From now on, if someone knows
\ how to
\ Expound this, it is because of my elegant explanation."

¢(i.e. So one should not accept anything as absolute, nor reject everything. Conventional truths and adapted skillful means are still very useful.)

Also, with respect to the manner of appearance in the aftermath of meditation, according to the texts of the Prasangikas there is a philosophical system consisting of, for example, the triad of basis, path, and result. The establishment of these, whichever and however they exist, is carried out without confusing them, and they are asserted as a position.

"Henceforth, if Tibetan [scholars] are able to analyze and expound according to this system, it shall be by dint of my own elegant treatise, the White Lotus Commentary to the Wish-fulfilling Treasure" he [Klong chen rab 'byams] said.

L6: [7.2.3 Refuting other systems that one-sidedly maintain that there is a position to maintain [Staying away from extremes like reifying the duality of the two truths]]

L7: [7.2.3.1 Setting up the philosophical systems of others [the dualism of the Two Truths]]

\ ###
\ 7.2.3.1
\ In that respect, some Tibetan scholars
\ Established and overestablished the fact that
\ Their own systems had a position.

In Tibet, some scholars, such as gTsang pa, maintained that the Madhyamika system has a position. In dependence upon that one-sided view, some scholars in the Land of Snow proved over and over again that their [Madhyamika] system has a position. They distinguish the two truths by saying that ultimate reality is emptiness and deceptive reality is not empty of itself, thus establishing the point of view that there is a position.

L7: [7.2.3.2 Secondly, refuting that view:]

L8: [7.2.3.2.1 In general, it contradicts the view of the Prasangika school to say that there is a position]

L9: [7.2.3.2.1.1 Explaining and analyzing the reason for that]

L10: [7.2.3.2.1.1.1 Establishing a sign that it is difficult to assert a position [how could we have an absolute position since everything is relative to its context]]

\ ###
\ 7.2.3.2.1.1.1
\ But if one does not differentiate the context,
\ Because the meaning of the original state
\ Is not established anywhere, it is difficult
\ To assert one-sidedly that one has a position.

¢(i.e. All views, all theories, are relative to their own little context, and never absolute.)

If one maintains that there is a position without specifying a context, there is a problem. Because in the actual state of things, existence and non-existence are not established, and it is difficult for there to be an unequivocal position, because if one analyzes, there is nothing to maintain as a position. If the referent of excluding judgment is something merely existent, it is not the nature of things.

The Prajnamula says:

~ There is an end, there is no end, and so forth, the four positions:
~ How can there be any peace in these?

L10: [7.2.3.2.1.1.2 Explaining the reason for that [the Madhyamaka is a toll to show the absurdity of all views, not an absolute position]]

L11: [7.2.3.2.1.1.2.1 In our Madhyamika tradition, the object of ascertainment is the ultimate nature of reality]

\ ###
\ 7.2.3.2.1.1.2.1
\ If you say "Madhyamaka is our system,"
\ It should refer to the way that the Madhyamika system
\ Approaches the ultimate meaning.

¢(i.e. Madhyamika is a tool, not an absolute final view.)

As for "our Madhyamika system": having thoroughly analyzed the view of reality that is free of extremes, what is settled on [subsequent to] that [analysis] is the final meaning that is ascertained in the Madhyamika philosophical system. For that analysis is what causes one to know just what to contemplate in our [Madhyamika] tradition.

L11: [7.2.3.2.1.1.2.2 Whatever else is not established from that perspective is not our own system]

\ ###
\ 7.2.3.2.1.1.2.2
\ Anything else is not our own system,
\ Because when other systems are approached
\ By a Madhyamika, they cannot be established.

¢(i.e. It is a tool to deconstruct all other views.)

Aside from that, "our system" is not anything like what is known to a worldly old man. Why is that? Because, if we Madhyamikas investigate with that valid cognition of rational knowledge about ultimate reality, and do not maintain any system of conventionality in that respect, it goes without saying that those "other" things, for example, false theoretical imputations of philosophical systems, are not established.

L9: [7.2.3.2.1.2 How the point under consideration is harmed by reasoning [all views are ultimately empty, even the view that all views are empty: so we should not accept, nor reject]]

L10: [7.2.3.2.1.2.1 If our system had any position, then it would consequently be ultimately established]

\ ###
\ 7.2.3.2.1.2.1
\ Thus, if the Madhyamika accepts [deceptive reality],
\ Then he accepts it as established by its own power,
\ Because it is established by the force of reasoning.
\ That position would be established ultimately
\ And thus be immune to analysis.

¢(i.e. They do not accept any position in the sense of accepting it as absolute.)

For that reason, if a Prasangika Madhyamika analyzes and maintains each of the two truths individually as the ultimate reality that is empty of being truly existent from the perspective of a valid cognition of rational knowledge, and as the deceptive reality that is not empty of being established by valid cognition, then the mere conventional appearance that is not investigated or analyzed would not be ascertained relationally, but should, by

dint of [valid cognition], be analyzed and accepted as a position, precisely because it would be established by the force of reasoning. An empty non-entity that is maintained as a position [according to such a Madhyamika interpretation] would not be established in relation to entities, but would be ultimately existent. And deceptive realities would not just be what is renowned in the world, but would be immune to analysis and not empty of themselves, because they would be understood in the context of rational valid cognitions (rig shes kyi tshad ma)—for example, like the paratantra of the Vijnaptimatrins. Thus, the commentary to the Avatrabhasya says, "therefore, because it depends upon other things, what I maintain is not established by its own power."

L10: [7.2.3.2.1.2.2 If not, it would contradict the statement that we do have a position]

\ ###
\ 7.2.3.2.1.2.2
\ If our own system had no position,
\ This would contradict the statement,
\ "We do have a position
\ [That accords with worldly renown]."

ϕ(i.e. They do accept conventional truths as conventionally established. No more, no less.)

If such a way of explanation, vis-à-vis our own Madhyamika system, had no position, then it would contradict the extreme establishment of the aspect of saying "we do have a position."

L8: [7.2.3.2.2 Regarding the internal contradiction of the two truths: [the problem with the duality of the Two Truths]]

L9: [7.2.3.2.2.1 A question about whether or not we have a position on analysis and non-analysis]

\ ###
\ 7.2.3.2.2.1
\ We would have two positions according to
\ Whether or not there is analysis.
\ If both of them were definitely true,
\ Would "our system" be each of them separately,
\ Or would it be both of them together?

ϕ(i.e. The fault of taking position for emptiness as the ultimate truths, and the rest as conventional truths. That is dualism.)

[Someone objects:] If in our own Madhyamika system ultimate reality is emptiness—which is the analysis of [existing entities] into nonreality through a valid cognition of rational knowledge—and deceptive reality is not investigated and not analyzed, then we would have two positions. If both of them are true, then is "our system" one or the other of these, or both of them?

L9: [7.2.3.2.2.2 Refuting the answer to that]

L10: [7.2.3.2.2.2.1 If our system were one or the other, then each would contradict the other]

\ ###
\ 7.2.3.2.2.2.1
\ If it were each of them separately, then

- \ Each would contradict the other.
- \ If we do not accept "existence"
- \ But do accept "non-existence,"
- \ The position of "existence" would not
- \ Even be conventionally acceptable,
- \ Because of only accepting non-existence.

¢(i.e. To accept emptiness as absolute, and reject conventional truths, is impossible, because one cannot exist without the other.)

If, according to the first alternative, [our system were each of the two truths] separately, each would contradict the statements regarding [the other truth], as well as the received statements of our own Prasangika corpus. If in our Madhyamika system there were no existent to posit, and everything were posited as unreal, then the positing of something "existent" would not be possible, even according to deceptive reality. If this were the proper system of Madhyamaka, then it would have to posit only non-existence.

L10: [7.2.3.2.2.2.2 If it were both, showing its untenability]

L11: [7.2.3.2.2.2.2.1 If it were both, both would consequently be resistant to analysis]

- \ ###
- \ 7.2.3.2.2.2.2.1
- \ If we accepted both of them together,
- \ Having removed that which is susceptible to analysis,
- \ We would posit something not harmed by reasoning.
- \ Thus, both existence and non-existence
- \ Would be immune to analysis.

¢(i.e. To accept the dualism of both of them being real, like saying that both dependent origination and emptiness are real, is also impossible because conventional truths cannot resist ultimate analysis.)

Moreover, if our Madhyamika system did not posit them separately, but posited them both at the same time, since all lower systems and any position whatsoever, when analyzed, are the same in not resisting analysis, if we had no position, our way of thus having a position [of no-position] would posit a basis that is not refutable by reason, in the empty space left over once you have refuted all things not resistant to analysis. Thus, both [truths] would become resistant to analysis.

L11: [7.2.3.2.2.2.2.2 And there would be no point]

L12: [7.2.3.2.2.2.2.2.1 Both of those cannot combine]

- \ ###
- \ 7.2.3.2.2.2.2.2.1
- \ Accordingly, both existence and non-existence
- \ Cannot be mixed together;

¢(i.e. It is also impossible because then it would mean that existence and non-existence can exist simultaneously.)

According to that way of positing a claim, those two objects cannot possibly be combined together. A non-existent that withstands analysis cannot combine with an existent, and likewise an existent that withstands analysis cannot be combine with a non-existent either.

L13: [7.2.3.2.2.2.2.2.1 Even if one realizes that exclusive emptiness, it does not cut off attachment to deceptive reality, so analysis becomes futile]

\ ###
 \ 7.2.3.2.2.2.2.1
 \ For if they were, then even though one
 \ Could realize [coalescence] through analysis,
 \ When not analyzing, existence would be engaged.
 \ So what good would analysis do
 \ For eliminating clinging to deceptive realities?
 \ For deceptive reality to be established
 \ Through analysis is irrational.

⊥(i.e. Conventional truths are not resistant to ultimate analysis. If it were then this would not help us at all.)

If a combination were possible, then even if at the time that one realizes that things are unreal by means of reasoning that examines the nature of ultimate reality, does one still possess an understanding (rtogs pa) of deceptive existence or not? If one does, then just when one is not analyzing the nature of ultimate reality, one experiences (rtogs) something existing, so what good will an analysis of ultimate reality do to reverse the two kinds of self-apprehension? The consequence is that it would not benefit [the reversal], for the reason given earlier. Not only that: if we Prasangikas wanted to establish that conventional, deceptive reality is not harmed by reasoning, indeed is immune to reasoning, then wouldn't it be similar to the way in which the Svatantrikas reason, whereby conventional reality is proven to be immune to reasoning? For that would be similar to one's own position.

L13: [7.2.3.2.2.2.2.2.2 That apprehension of non-existence lacks the context of view, meditation, action, and fruition, so systems of conventionality become futile]

\
 \ ###
 \ 7.2.3.2.2.2.2.2
 \ If there were no reality beyond the mere
 \ Exclusion of a negandum, an absolute negation,
 \ That modal apprehension could not have
 \ An apparent aspect; so why would this be any different
 \ Than the position of someone who thinks
 \ That view, meditation, and action are simply non-existent?
 \ For there would never be any need to meditate
 \ In accordance with the nature of things.

ϕ(i.e. And if emptiness were the absolute truth,, then that would be equivalent of nihilism.)

Moreover, according to the second [alternative] : If, apart from that absolute negation that excludes the negandum, there is no nature of things—that is, appearance, or a combination [of appearance and emptiness]—and an understanding of existence is unnecessary, then it will never be possible for that modal apprehension to have an apparent aspect. Thus, for that Madhyamika system of ours, why wouldn't the view, meditation, and conduct all share the context of that conception of non-existence? They would, because one must cultivate oneself

according to the nature of things [which would be non-existence].

L6: [7.2.4 Differentiating according to the quintessential [meaning] of our own tradition, namely, the way one settles in meditative equipoise [Transcending the duality of the Two Truths: not accepting it as absolute, not rejecting it as useless conventionally]]

L7: [7.2.4.1 Explanation of the Prasangika Madhyamaka, which emphasizes the non-conceptual ultimate [Ultimately we need to transcend the duality of the Two Truths]]

L8: [7.2.4.1.1 Explaining that, when one ascertains [ultimate reality] in accordance with the gnosis of sublime equipoise, the two truths are not established, and there is no position [The duality of the Two Truths (conventional truths vs. ultimate truth) cannot be the very ultimate truth beyond conceptualization]]

L9: [7.2.4.1.1.1 The pacification of elaborations in accessing the expanse of integrated appearance and emptiness [the view is established as the coalescence beyond all extremes, all conceptualization]]

\ ###
\ 7.2.4.1.1.1
\ Therefore, according to the statement
\ of the Omniscient One,
\ Our system should be understood as follows:
\ If ours is to be a definitive Madhyamika system,
\ It must be the Great Madhyamaka of coalescence,
\ Or the non-elaborated Madhyamaka.
\ Because, by defining it according to
\ The gnosis of sublime equipoise,
\ All extremes of existence, non-existence, and so forth,
\ Are completely pacified.

ϕ(i.e. The very ultimate truth beyond all conceptualization, beyond the four extremes, cannot be the concepts of the Two Truths. We usually call this transcending the Two Truths, the Union of The Two Truths, or the coalescence, or the inseparability of appearances and emptiness. But all of these are still merely pointing at the moon.)

One hears that the great awareness-holder 'Jigs-med gLingpa said that in the context of Madhyamaka, one establishes the system of conventionality according to the Gelugpas, who uphold intrinsic emptiness, and that Lo chen Dharmasri of sMin-grol gLing established Madhyamaka in the context of extrinsic emptiness. Since they were both great scholars of the Nyingma tradition, I think they must have had their reasons for so doing. However, if one should ask whether the explanatory tradition of the Early Translation school accords with either of those, it does not; for it is said that those systems are just other [traditions'] explanatory systems. Therefore, our own system should be understood in accordance with the explanation of the White Lotus commentary to the Wish-fulfilling Treasure by the omniscient Dharma king Klong chen pa, [which propounds] the intention of our own unique system, the Prasangika Madhyamaka. In accordance with that commentary, the sun of philosophers who was identical to Manjusri, Mi pham phyogs las rnam rgyal, was able to unpack the meaning clearly and unmistakably. He says that our own Madhyamika system, which integrates the intentions of the Prasangika masters and the Great Omniscient One [Klong chen pa], should be understood in this way: "Henceforth, if anyone knows how to explain it this way, it is by dint of my elegant composition [the White Lotus]."

Accordingly, if it is a qualified, non-abiding Madhyamaka of coalescence, it must be a great

Madhyamaka that is the coalescence of appearance and emptiness according to the interpretive commentaries and essential sutras of the Buddha's final turning of the wheel of Dharma, or it must be the great Madhyamaka free from all elaborations of the four extremes, as taught in the sutras and interpretive commentaries of the middle turning. Having ascertained that way of accessing ultimate reality, which combines those two without contradiction in a manner homologous to the way in which the equipoise of sublime beings engages gnosis, the dharmadhatu of coalescence does not need to be understood in terms each of the two truths alternately [in order to] eliminate extremes, because it has the nature of complete pacification of all the very subtle elaborations of extremes, such as existence and non-existence. As it is said, "profound, peaceful, free of elaboration, luminous, unfabricated."

L9: [7.2.4.1.1.2 Aside from this, coalescence and absence of elaborations are pointless]

L10: [7.2.4.1.1.2.1 That mere emptiness is neither [coalescent nor non-elaborated]]

- \ ###
- \ 7.2.4.1.1.2.1
- \ That path that objectifies emptiness alone
- \ Succumbs to each of the two realities one-sidedly;
- \ That trifling point of view
- \ Is neither coalescent nor unelaborated.
- \ Coalescence means the equality of
- \ Existence and non-existence,
- \ or of form and emptiness;

¢(i.e. So emptiness alone cannot be the very ultimate truth that is beyond all conceptualization; it cannot be the Union of The Two Truths alone, or the so called coalescence. Reifying emptiness is one extreme. Reifying dependent origination is the other extreme. The Middle Way is to stay away from all extremes.)

For that reason, that path that takes emptiness alone as the path falls into one of the two extremes of appearance and emptiness, so that trivial view does not have the sense of the coalescence of the final turning, or of the non-elaboration of the middle turning.

L10: [7.2.4.1.1.2.2 Explaining each of them]

L11: [7.2.4.1.1.2.2.1 That mere emptiness does not have the sense of coalescence]

- \ ###
- \ 7.2.4.1.1.2.2
- \ Whereas that view is just the subjective aspect
- \ Of the expanse of ultimate emptiness.
- \ Among all types of reification, such as
- \ The elaborations of existence and non-existence,
- \ This is nothing but an elaboration of non-existence,
- \ Because it reifies [emptiness].

¢(i.e. Emptiness alone is obviously not the Union of The Two Truths, since it is only one part of it. Emptiness alone is obviously not the very ultimate truth beyond all conceptualization since emptiness is a concept.)

One might wonder why there is no sense of coalescence here. The coalescence of appearance and emptiness is equal with respect to existence and non-existence, and has the nature of

non-dual equality of the coalescence of appearance and emptiness. But here, this is just a subjective intentionally apprehensive consciousness that takes as its exclusive object the expanse of ultimate emptiness.

L11: [7.2.4.1.1.2.2.2 Does not have the sense of non-elaboration]

7.2.4.1.1.2.2.2 Likewise, elaboration is any and all types of reification of existence, non-existence, both, neither, permanence, impermanence, etc. Among those possibilities, the present case is not free of an elaboration of non-existence, because it takes that emptiness as its object.

L9: [7.2.4.1.1.3 Therefore, from the perspective of the great Madhyamaka, which investigates according to the nature of reality, there is no position [it is beyond all views, establishment or negation]]

\ ###
\ 7.2.4.1.1.3
\ Therefore, from the perspective of Great Madhyamaka
\ There is no position whatsoever.
\ In order to realize the equality of appearance and emptiness,
\ It is free of all proof and negation such as
\ Reality, unreality, existence, and non-existence.
\ According to the sense of [ultimate] reality, all things
\ Cannot be asserted through rational proof;
\ Therefore, there is nothing to have a position about.

¢(i.e. No absolute truth that can be conceptualized.)

Since in that [exclusive emptiness] there is no sense of coalescence or non-elaboration, from the perspective of the great Madhyamaka free of extremes that encounters reality just as it is (gnas lugs ji bzhin 'jal ba), there is no position. Because the gnosis of sublime equipoise realizes the equality that is the coalescence of appearance and emptiness, it is free of all elaborations of establishment and negation, such as having and not-having, being and non-being. Therefore, when in that way one ascertains with a valid cognition of rational knowledge (rigs shes tshad ma), in accordance with the sense [of that form of cognition], all dharmas of samsara and nirvana are not established by reasoning no matter how they may be asserted to exist, and are thus not maintained according to any ontological extreme. The Teaching for Ocean-mind Sutra says, "Brahma, that dharma that is thoroughly non-established is not accepted as 'existence' or 'non-existence.'"

L8: [7.2.4.1.2 Setting up the system of the two valid cognitions conventionally, without confusing them [But the duality of the Two Truths and their inseparability is a useful conventional tool, pointing at something beyond conceptualization]]

L9: [7.2.4.1.2.1 In analyzing the manner of appearance from the perspective of a conventionalizing valid cognition, there is a position on the two truths]

L10: [7.2.4.1.2.1.1 The main point [both truths exists conventionally]]

\ ###
\ 7.2.4.1.2.1.1
\ Thus, although the ultimate meaning of reality
\ Has no position, in the way things appear
\ There is a position on the conventions of each of the two realities;

\ With respect to how the two realities abide inseparably,
\ They are both simply ways of appearing.

☐(i.e. But still useful conventional truths. And there is a truth that has to be directly realized beyond all conceptualization. And pointing toward this moon is the teachings of the inseparability of the Two truths.)

Thus, the fact that there is no position vis-à-vis the ultimate meaning of reality is proven by both reasoning and scripture, but from the perspective of the conventional valid cognition that analyzes things' manner of appearance, the two truths are posited.

The Meeting of Father and Son Sutra says:

~ You should not listen to others, but realize them for yourself, these two truths that are known by the world—namely, deceptive truth and ultimate truth. There is no third whatsoever.

Just as there are various modes of perception based upon a single cognandum, according to the way in which the meditative equipoise of sublime beings ascertains things—for which the way things are and the way they appear are concordant —there is an definitive ultimate truth, a reality (chod nyid) beyond all establishment and negation, not abiding in any extreme, which is the object of a non-conceptual gnosis. Thus, there is ascertainment of an ultimate truth that is free of extremes by means of a valid cognition that analyzes ultimate reality in accordance with that [gnosis of sublime equipoise], and there is also a deceptive reality, comprising objects and the subjects that perceive them, which are posited by a mind for which appearance and reality are discordant. All systems of things that are known or appear infallibly in the world for oneself and others—all dependently arisen appearances—are not destroyed and are not analyzed or investigated as to whether or not they exist ultimately; these are posited by conventional validating cognitions. The two truths that depend on those two kinds [of valid cognition] are each posited.

The Bodhicaryavatara says:

~ Deceptive and ultimate reality
~ Are held to be the two realities.

L10: [7.2.4.1.2.1.2 Explaining the reason for how it appears in that way [but they should not be thought as real, or existing independently of each other]]

L11: [7.2.4.1.2.1.2.1 The two truths as objects of engagement are only modes of appearance vis-à-vis their inseparability]

\ ###
\ 7.2.4.1.2.1.2.1
\ With respect to the gnosis that
\ Sees that they are inseparable, both valid cognitions

☐(i.e. Until we can transcend the duality of the Two Truths, we need both Truths together, virtuous methods and wisdom together, the two accumulations.)

Thus, the [conventions] of the two truths as modes of appearance are [mere appearances] in relation to the equipoise of sublime beings that engages the reality of the inseparable two truths just as it is. If, in the domain of an ultimate valid cognition, the objective non-elaboration—which is a conceptualized negation that is the exclusion of elaboration—is merely an appearance, it goes without saying that the establishment of deceptive reality visa-vis conventional valid cognition is also an appearance. Therefore, each of the two

valid cognitions is merely an appearance, and their objects are not the actual ultimate.

L11: [7.2.4.1.2.1.2.2 The two valid cognitions that engage them are trivial vis-à-vis gnosis]

- \ ###
- \ 7.2.4.1.2.1.2.2
- \ Are fragmentary, because with only one of them
- \ Both realities cannot be apprehended.

¢(i.e. Because one alone is not enough; it would lead to one extreme or the other.)

In relation to the subjective gnosis that sees the meaning of the inseparability of the two truths, both of the two kinds of valid cognition that ascertain the two truths are apprehensive of an exclusive object, and are thus fragmentary. Neither by itself is capable of simultaneously comprehending the two truths.

L9: [7.2.4.1.2.2 In relation to the ascertainment of those two by means of two types of valid cognition, how [our] system is established [both are established by their valid cognition alternatively; but we should know that these two are inseparable]]

L10: [7.2.4.1.2.2.1 Each of the objects found by the ascertainment of the two ascertaining analytical wisdoms has its respective essence]

- \ ###
- \ 7.2.4.1.2.2.1
- \ Therefore, if the wisdom of ultimate and
- \ Conventional valid cognition
- \ Both engage a vase, etc.,
- \ Two essences are found.

¢(i.e. Until we can realize the perfect Union of the Two Truths, the coalescence, we will see the two truths alternatively. So we use one to counterbalance the extreme tendency of the other. One alone is not enough.)

For that reason, the valid cognition that posits systems of deceptive or conventional reality, and the valid cognition that analyzes the nature of ultimate reality are both forms of discriminating analytical wisdom. If one investigates a subject, such as a vase, with those two valid cognitions, the objects one finds are the two essences of "abiding nature" and "apparent nature."

Likewise, the Madhyamakavatara says:

- ~ By seeing all things with respect to their falsity and their true nature,
- ~ One will comprehend the two essences found in things.
- ~ Whatever is the object of authentic seeing is reality;
- ~ False seeing is said to be deceptive reality.

L10: [7.2.4.1.2.2.2 The position that the two truths to be ascertained are entered alternately]

- \ ###
- \ 7.2.4.1.2.2.2
- \ But when one is engaged, the other is not, for
- \ In the mind of an ordinary person the two realities
- \ Can only appear in succession.

\ Thus, the positions based on each type of engagement
\ Are established in fact.

¢(i.e. Until we can realize the perfect Union of the Two Truths, the coalescence, we will see the two truths alternatively. So we use one to counterbalance the extreme tendency of the other. Only a Buddha can see both simultaneously in a way that cannot be described with concepts.)

When one of those two realities is investigated, the other is not present. At the time of ascertaining ultimate reality by a valid cognition that investigates the nature of things, there is no position whatsoever on conventional, deceptive reality; and at the time of positing systems of deceptive reality, one must make one's position without investigating or analyzing ultimately. Since, as an ordinary person, one cannot go beyond an alternating investigation of the two truths, be it in considering the view or actually meditating, it is established that there are two positions—namely, the systems of the abiding nature of things and their modes of appearance, which are established from the points of view of the different validating cognitions.

L8: [7.2.4.1.3 Eliminating faults [We don't have these faults and contradictions because we can distinguish between the conventional / path Madhyamika and the result Madhyamika beyond conceptualization – and aim at transcending the duality]]

L9: [7.2.4.1.3.1 Setting up the argument]

\ ###
\ 7.2.4.1.3.1
\ "Well, don't the faults of having or not having a position,
\ And the internal contradiction of the two realities
\ That you have ascribed to others above
\ Apply just as well to you?"

"Well then," someone might say, "As far as your previous statements are concerned—criticizing later scholars for saying that there is a position, and criticizing earlier scholars for saying that there is no position, and also saying that in having a position, an internal contradiction between the two truths follows—those faults you have ascribed to others also belong to you as well, don't they?"

L9: [7.2.4.1.3.2 and eliminating its faults]

¢(i.e. There is another error in the numbering here.)

L10: [7.2.4.1.3.1.1 Actually giving the response, that there is no fault]

L11: [7.2.4.1.3.1.1.1 Summary of the specifics of the response, that both faults are absent]

\ ###
\ 7.2.4.1.3.1.1.1
\ By making subtle distinctions,
\ I have differentiated the path Madhyamaka and
\ The equipoise Madhyamaka that is the main practice.
\ Since my explanation distinguishes great and little Madhyamakas
\ With respect to coarseness and subtlety,
\ Cause and effect, consciousness and gnosis,
\ How can that defect apply to me?

¢(i.e. We don't have this fault because we can distinguish between the conventional / path

Madhyamika and the result Madhyamika beyond conceptualization. Or between the coarse and subtle Madhyamika. Or the cause and the effect. Or the consciousness and the gnosis beyond consciousness. – In short, using adapted skillful means and also being aware of the emptiness of the three: subject, object, action.)

As for not having those faults, [Mipham says], I have made special distinctions—namely, the path Madhyamaka of meditative aftermath, and the principal (dngos gzhi) Madhyamaka of meditative equipoise. Those can be distinguished by degree of difficulty, as coarse and subtle; or by invariable concomitance, as cause and effect; or by reference to the subjective mind, as consciousness and gnosis. Thus differentiating by context both great and lesser Madhyamakās, the presence and absence of a position are variously determined. Because I have explained myself in that way, how can those faults of permanence and annihilation possibly apply to me?

Moreover, in the context of ultimate reality, you apply verbal qualifications, and thus discriminate between the two realities, so you have a position. In our system, at the time of determining the view in meditative equipoise of our own Madhyamaka, which is free of extremes and differentiation of the two truths, we have no position. And by differentiating the two validating cognitions, we differentiate two contexts for ascertaining systems of appearance in the aftermath, which involve positions. Therefore, all important points referring to the non-entailment of the two faults depend upon this kind of specification. I also think this is an important point for understanding the differentiation of Madhyamika systems in our own and other schools.

L11: [7.2.4.1.3.1.1.2 Explaining its meaning extensively]

L12: [7.2.4.1.3.1.1.2.1 The first answer to the fault]

L13: [7.2.4.1.3.1.1.2.1.1 Criticizing others who have a position [Ultimately we have no position]]

\ ###
\ 7.2.4.1.3.1.1.2.1.1
\ Thus, the Great Madhyamaka
\ With no position is our ultimate system.

¢(i.e. Ultimately the duality of the Two Truths is also empty of inherent existence; it is not the very ultimate truth beyond conceptualization.)

As has been said above, because in ascertaining the great Madhyamaka free of elaboration there is no position established, our own final system of Madhyamaka is the explanation that there is no position whatsoever. The Prasannapada says, "If one is a Madhyamika, one does not make inferences according to an entity existing in common, because one has not accepted anyone else's position." The Yuktisastikas says, "The great-minded, who do not engage in anything, have no position [to defend]. How can whoever has no position have some other position?"

Therefore, whatever position one maintains, be it the side of appearance or the side of emptiness, fails to eliminate conceptualization of characteristics. As long as there is imagination and modal apprehension, there will be some fault, and whoever has no theses or positions to uphold will have no fault whatsoever. That very text [the Yuktisastika] says, "If I have some thesis, then I have this fault. Since I have no thesis, I am quite free of fault." The fact that one must elucidate the definition of "position" does not mean that one has a thesis and a position, because one has the thesis of not having the position or

elaboration that characterizes the opponents' previously stated position, such as "produced" or "non-produced," etc. Thus, there is no fault whatsoever.

L13: [7.2.4.1.3.1.1.2.1.2 Criticizing others who don't have a position, and the fact that their fault is also not applicable to us [Conventionally we have a position about a view, path and result]]

\ ###
\ 7.2.4.1.3.1.1.2.1.2
\ In the context of meditative aftermath,
\ When the two realities appear separately,
\ All the proofs and negations engaged by
\ The validating cognitions of each of the two realities
\ Are for negating various misconceptions;

¢(i.e. But, still, the duality of The Two Truths, and its two valid cognitions, are useful adapted skillful means in order to fight the extreme tendencies, in order to help us to stay away from the four extremes. So we do not accept it as absolute, nor reject it as useless.)

Also, the faults that are shown to harm some others do not apply to us. Even though the Madhyamaka of meditative equipoise has no position, at the time of experiencing the aftermath, in reference to the mode of appearance of the basis, path, result, and so forth, the two truths appear to exist individually, without confusion. Then at that time it is not right to cast the aspersion of "non-existence." For that reason, from the perspective of the authentic experience wrought by the two distinct validating cognitions that cause the experience of both of the two truths, all conceptual elaborations adhering to philosophical extremes are eliminated. The correct establishment of all the systems of the path and result is for the purpose of eliminating all erroneous concepts in those contexts. Moreover, all biased views that adhere to notions of substantiality in Buddhist and non-Buddhist systems, as well as to existence and non-existence, are eliminated. On the basis of that ultimate reality, all good qualities of abandonment and realization are established, and assertions of the conventional non-existence of the path, result, and so forth, are eliminated. There is a position that maintains that all systems of basis, path, and result exist infallibly in their manner of appearance, and they are not something to be cast away as unnecessary.

Accordingly, the Prasannapada says, "Like a vessel for someone desirous of water, at first deceptive reality should definitely be accepted."

L12: [7.2.4.1.3.1.1.2.2 The second answer]

L13: [7.2.4.1.3.1.1.2.2.1 The internal contradiction and the fault of withstanding analysis do not apply in the context of ultimate reality [Ultimately the two truths are transcended, their Union is realized]]

\ ###
\ 7.2.4.1.3.1.1.2.2.1
\ But in the original state, there is
\ No position of refutation or proof.
\ Therefore, in the original state
\ The two realities are not divided,
\ Because neither of their positions
\ Is established in truth.

¢(i.e. And, ultimately, the apparent opposition between the Two Truths, or between existence and non-existence, is transcended. They are seen as inseparable, non-dual: not two, not one. There is no contradiction like when one think that the duality of the Two Truths is real. But it should be clear that transcending the duality doesn't mean to reject it completely, no more than to accept it as real.)

So at the time of experiencing the fundamental nature of all dharmas, there is no position whatsoever of establishment or negation.

From the dBu ma She rab la 'jug pa:

- ~ Both establishment and negation are just negated;
- ~ In fact there is no establishment or negation at all.

If you wonder why there is no position: In the fundamental nature of reality, both levels of truth are primordially without divisions or partiality. There is no fault whatsoever, either ontologically or psychologically, in saying that there is no position. Therefore, whichever of the two faults one implicates—either the internal contradiction, or immunity to analysis that establishes something in reality—that characterizes the systems of others who have positions about the differentiation of the two truths, in our tradition there is no fault of establishing something in truth, because there is no basis for the internal contradiction that arises from having no position, even though the two truths are dualistically perceived, nor is there a basis for [either of the two truths being] immune to analysis.

L13: [7.2.4.1.3.1.1.2.2.2 They do not apply even with respect to deceptive reality [But conventionally they are established by their valid cognition respectively]]

- \ ###
- \ 7.2.4.1.3.1.1.2.2.2
- \ If [a position] is posited [conventionally about either] of
- \ the two [truths],
- \ It is only with respect to the way things appear.
- \ For the time being, each is established as true
- \ In its own context, so there is no contradiction,
- \ And the fault of immunity to analysis, etc. does not apply.

¢(i.e. So the Two Truths are used conventionally as adapted skillful means, but should not accepted as absolute, because they would not resist the ultimate analysis. Both are empty of inherent existence.)

Not only that, [the criticism] does not apply to deceptive reality. Even though we accept both truths on the conventional level— insofar as all dharmas have both a fundamental as well as an apparent nature— because this is accepted in reference to deceptive reality, and even though it is not ultimately established, as long as one is temporarily abiding in this apparent reality level, both levels of reality are true from the perspective of the validating cognitions that apprehend them. The non-contradiction of there being both an abiding nature and an apparent nature on a single basis is the nature (chos nyid) of things, so there is no internal contradiction. Thus, the two truths are posited as mere designations, but because they are posited without analysis or investigation [into their ultimate nature], the faults of being immune to analysis and so forth do not descend upon us.

L10: [7.2.4.1.3.1.2 Refuting others with that:]

L11: [7.2.4.1.3.1.2.1 Having differentiated the abiding and apparent natures of a thing and differentiated appearance and emptiness, all designations are the deceptive reality of modes of appearance [But all of this is still only conventional truths]]

L12: [7.2.4.1.3.1.2.1.1 Explaining that existing things and non-existing things (dngos dang dngos med) are not immune to analysis]

\ ###
\ 7.2.4.1.3.1.2.1.1
\ Real entities are not immune to analysis;
\ Nor are unreal entities immune to analysis.
\ In the final analysis, they are the same;
\ They are just designated contextually.

¢(i.e. All dharmas of the three worlds are empty of inherent existence; there is no exception. This also applies to the Two Truths, to dependent origination and emptiness.)

So, in relation to the ultimate meaning, the dependently arisen psychosomatic aggregates, realms, and bases, etc., are things that are not immune to analysis, because they are neither one nor many, and because their non-substantialities, which are designated dependently, are likewise not immune to analysis, since they are designated in dependence upon entities. Therefore, in the final analysis, both substantiality and non-substantiality are equal in not being established, and are contextually dependent upon one another; they are just designated deceptive realities.

L12: [7.2.4.1.3.1.2.1.2 Explaining that even though those two are posited as the two truths, they are [actually] modes of appearance]

L13: [7.2.4.1.3.1.2.1.2.1 Explaining that uninvestigated deceptive reality is the way things appear]

\ ###
\ 7.2.4.1.3.1.2.1.2.1
\ Something that exists by consent, without investigation,
\ Is a mode of appearance, not the way things are;

¢(i.e. They are called the Two Truths, but they are also dependently arisen conventional truths empty of inherent existence. Merely adapted skillful means, antidotes to each other extreme tendency.)

Thus, a thing that exists merely because it is renowned in the world, without being investigated or analyzed, exists as a mode of appearance, but not in relation to its actual abiding nature. So there is no debate or doubt as to the fact of its being a deceptive reality.

L13: [7.2.4.1.3.1.2.1.2.2 Explaining that unreality (bden med) is just conceptual]

\ ###
\ 7.2.4.1.3.1.2.1.2.2
\ Whatever is seen by the rational knowledge
\ That analyzes truthlessness is considered
\ As the way things really are.
\ This is an ultimate reality in relation to
\ Deceptive reality, but in the final analysis
\ It is just a conceptual ultimate.

¢(i.e. Even emptiness is dependently arisen, thus empty of inherent existence. It is dependent on the belief of inherent existence. Without the belief of inherent existence there is no more need for its antidote: the reasonings proving the emptiness of inherent existence.)

By analyzing that mode of appearance into unreality with a rational cognition, one sees an emptiness of absolute negation. That of course is held to be emptiness, the abiding nature of things. That functions as the counterpart of deceptive reality, or as the contextual ultimate reality in relation to it; but in relation to the final, non-conceptual ultimate, it is a mere non-substantiality. Moreover, it is just a conceptual ultimate, and an authentic deceptive reality.

The master Bhavaviveka said:

- ~ Without the staircase of authentic deceptive reality,
- ~ It is not possible for a wise person
- ~ To ascend the staircase
- ~ Of the great house of the ultimate.

The Ornament says:

- ~ If it depends upon conceptuality,
- ~ It is still deceptive, and not ultimate.

L11: [7.2.4.1.3.1.2.2 By explaining that abiding and apparent realities are without sameness and difference, one dispels other false conceptualizations [The two truths are not different, not the same]]

L12: [7.2.4.1.3.1.2.2.1 The sameness and difference of appearance and reality]

- \ ###
- \ 7.2.4.1.3.1.2.2.1
- \ If the way things appear and the way things are
- \ Are mutually exclusive,
- \ The four faults of the two realities being different are incurred.
- \ If the two realities are mutually inclusive,
- \ The four faults of the two realities being identical are incurred.

¢(i.e. The Two Truths are not different, not the same, for the reason given here. They are non-dual: not two, not one. That is just a way to point toward the moon. No concept or sentence can really describe the very ultimate nature of everything. So to say that things appear one way, and are in reality another way, is to indulge into dualism.)

Then, if the above-mentioned ultimate, which is the way things are in reality, and the deceptive, which is the way things appear, are mutually exclusive, they should be ultimately different. Then, just as the Samdhinirmocana says, the four faults of the two truths being different would result: (1) Even if one directly realized the ultimate, the deceptive would not be included in it, and would have to be focused upon separately, so one would not obtain nirvana. (2) That ultimate that is different from deceptive reality would not be the dharmata of deceptive reality, as a vase is not the dharmata of a cloth. (3) The mere fact of a deceptive self not being totally established would not be an ultimate truth, just as a vase not being totally established does not make it a cloth. (4) Having realized ultimate reality and achieved nirvana, because one has imagined it separately from that deceptive reality, one will become afflicted again. It would be possible for both afflicted and purified constituents to exist simultaneously in the mind of a single person. These are the

four [faults].

Those who have delved into the Samdhinirmocana should analyze the two truths of their own systems with this in mind. Also, if those two realities—the way things are and the way they appear, which appear as though not mutually mixed—were conventionally non-different, there would be the four faults of the two truths being identical, which are stated in that same sutra. To wit: (1) Ordinary individuals would see ultimate reality, because they see deceptive reality; (2) just as defilement increases in dependence upon deceptive reality, it would likewise increase in dependence upon ultimate reality; (3) just as there are no divisions in ultimate reality, there would be no divisions in deceptive reality; and (4) just as deceptive reality does not need to be sought apart from what one sees and hears, ultimate reality would be the same.

L12: [7.2.4.1.3.1.2.2.2 Excluding misconceptions about that [sameness or difference]]

L13: [7.2.4.1.3.1.2.2.2.1 In general, there are different systems according to the great and small vehicles]

\ ###
\ 7.2.4.1.3.1.2.2.2.1
\ In this way, Buddhas and sentient beings
\ Are just the way things are and the way things appear;
\ The claim that they are cause and effect
\ Should be known as the Hinayana system.

¶(i.e. Everything is like that: not different, not the same. Even the duality sentient beings and Buddhas, even cause and effect.)

By explaining that the two truths are the abiding reality and apparent reality in that way, Buddhas and sentient beings are the abiding reality and apparent reality [respectively]. But in the Hinayana, Buddhas and sentient beings are held to be effect and cause, respectively. The [followers of the Hinayana] maintain that when a disciple in the lineage of sublime beings whose [spiritual destiny] is uncertain abides for a very long time and undergoes hardships on the path of the lesser vehicle as a cause, the result is the one supreme among two-legged creatures, who achieves the goal of perfect Buddhahood.

The Mahayana maintains that by practicing the path that is the antidote for the cloud-like mass of things that are to be abandoned, the final result is the Buddhas who have become free [of those things]. Having perfected and consummated the equality of primordial Buddhahood, which is the abiding nature of all appearances of samsara and nirvana, which are the apparent nature of things, apparent and abiding natures come into harmony, and they abide in the self-nature of utterly pure self-appearance. Nonetheless, that primordial Buddha nature that is the basic abiding reality of sentient beings is not understood [by those sentient beings]. For the sake of those who are worn out and daunted by searching for Buddhahood outside themselves, the Lord Maitreya taught that from the perspective of the three types of dharmata reasoning that are to be relied upon, it is established that the lineage of the nature of Buddhahood is present in the realm of sentient beings.

That kind of lineage undertakes the actions that achieve Buddhahood, and Buddhahood, in dependence upon the existence of the lineage in the realm of sentient beings, is proven to be manifest. If you wonder whether [sentient beings and Buddhas] are related as cause and effect, as taught in the small vehicle, the answer is no. Even if that were proven, because the apparent existence of things appears as cause and effect, nonetheless in the actual

nature of things both Buddhas and sentient beings abide without distinction in the state of thusness. Likewise, if both dharmata or thusness that is unfabricated and sentient beings are non-different, then sentient beings must be Buddhas, because Buddhas are non-different from that [dharmata].

The Uttaratantra says:

- ~ Although it has adventitious ills
- ~ It has good qualities by its very nature;
- ~ As before, so it is after:
- ~ The changeless dharmata.

And:

- ~ Luminous, uncreated, and inseparable,
- ~ It is completely endowed with the dharmas of
- ~ Past Buddhas as numerous as
- ~ The sands of the Ganges river.

Thus, this oceanic realm of fundamental Buddha-dharmas, which is inseparable from the unfabricated luminosity that is the nature of mind, is an authentic reason [for inferring that sentient beings are Buddhas, etc.]. If it is unfabricated and inseparable, then there is no reason for establishing it anew. So the Buddha that is apparently the result [of some cause] is spontaneously present in the basis. If it had to be established anew, it would become fabricated, and thus it would not be an immutable refuge, etc.—such would be faults [of such a position].

Moreover, Rong zom Pandita said, in accordance with the meaning of the Ye shes snang ba rgyan gyi mdo:

- ~ The permanently uncreated dharma is the Tathagata;
- ~ All dharmas are like the Tathagata.
- ~ The infantile apprehend substantial characteristics
- ~ And always interact with non-existent phenomena in the worlds.
- ~ According to this statement, all dharmas are the Tathagata, because those dharmas that are permanently uncreated are the Tathagata, like the Sugatas of the three times. How are they similar? The Sugata is not distinguished by body, speech, and mind; [the Sugata] is distinguished by dharmata. For, the distinction of dharmata is said to be [that of] a "sublime being." Just as the sublime ones have attained sublimity through attaining the unfabricated, likewise all dharmas, by having attained the unfabricated, have attained suchness and are the Tathagata. The domain of characteristics is not like that. Although they are not as they seem, those who interact with them are just reacting to things that do not exist.

Thus, the crucial point of the first two reasonings depends upon this dharmata reasoning, so since it depends upon the ultimate dharmata, there is no need to look for another reason.

From the Praise to the Attainment of Omniscience:

- ~ Among reasonings, with respect to dharmata,
- ~ Among liberations, with respect to non-wavering,
- ~ Among wisdoms, with respect to omniscience,
- ~ You are supreme among the embodied.

L13: [7.2.4.1.3.1.2.2.2.2 Therefore, as the Buddha nature is the definitive meaning [of all vehicles], it is not harmed by reasoning]

\ ###
 \ 7.2.4.1.3.1.2.2.2
 \ Because the way things are and the way they appear
 \ Are not posited as either the same or different,
 \ There is absolutely no logical fault, such as
 \ Sentient beings appearing as Buddhas,
 \ The path and practice being pointless,
 \ The cause residing in the effect.

¢(i.e. Staying away from the four extremes concerning the duality of the Two Truths permit to solve apparent contradictions and absurdities. So the Buddha-nature, the possibility of Liberation, the usefulness of the path, apparent causality, ... are not contradicted. This way, emptiness doesn't contradict dependent origination, nor lead to nihilism.)

There is no error whatsoever in this kind of exposition. Insofar as both reality and appearance are not claimed to be either wholly identical or wholly different, if sentient beings are Buddhas, there is no implication that they should appear as such, for the previous reason. If they are Buddhas, there is no implication that they must all appear as such. You might think, "All the Buddhas now living in the ten directions either appear to you or, if they don't, [you] are obscured by obscurations"—all sentient beings abide in the [nature of] Buddhahood, and though they don't appear [as such], they are obscured by that obscuration. If you think, "Even though we haven't met the Buddhas, previously there were many people who met them and bore witness to [the possibility]." There are many people who have experienced the fact that sentient beings are Buddhas. For example, the Brahma [god] "Locks of Hair" saw this realm as pure.

Moreover, even if [sentient beings] are Buddhas, there is no implication that the five paths, ten bhumis, and two accumulations, which are the antidotes for abandoning obscurations, are pointless; for they are the method for manifesting the fact that [sentient beings] are Buddhas. If you think that since they have been Buddhas from the beginning there is no need to manifest that anew: well then, there would be no need to accumulate merit and purify obscurations for realizing emptiness, because from the very beginning [sentient beings] are emptiness, and since the effect resides in the cause, if one ate tainted food, there would be no harm. As explained before, there is a distinction between the systems of the Hinayana and Mahayana, and you would have to want to make this pretentious philosophical system of yours the same as the system of the Hinayana! Thus, in such a position [as we have here] there are no faults as described earlier, because of the speciousness of [your] scriptural quotations and reasonings.

L13: [7.2.4.1.3.1.2.2.2.3 Showing that it is meaningful to purify the stains that obscure it]

\ ###
 \ 7.2.4.1.3.1.2.2.2.3
 \ However things may be in reality,
 \ They are obscured by obscurations,
 \ And do not appear as such.
 \ Everyone accepts the need to practice the path.

¢(i.e. So it is not because we have the Buddha-nature that we are already full Buddhas. We are still stuck in samsara, slaves of our illusions, obsessions, accumulated karma. But

there is a way out as we can see now. All of this is to develop that certainty.)

Thus, the Buddha nature and emptiness are both obscured by the obscuration of karma, afflictive emotions, and ripening effect, so [we and the opponent] are in all respects the same in [maintaining that Buddhahood] is not apparent. Therefore, in order to abandon obscuration, both we and others assert that one must try to practice the path.

L7: [7.2.4.2 Explanation of the Svatantrika Madhyamaka, which emphasizes the conceptual ultimate that is easy to understand [The concepts of the duality of the Two Truths is very useful as long as we specify the context, and always consider both together. This permits to stay away from all extremes.]]

L8: [7.2.4.2.1 A general discussion of their exposition of the two truths [Until we can transcend the Two Truths, we need to realize both essences about anything; and that they are inseparable: not the same, not different]]

L9: [7.2.4.2.1.1 The claim that the two truths have one essence and different isolates]

\ ###
\ 7.2.4.2.1.1
\ Because the two truths are not contradictory,
\ Though the two views of "existence" and "non-existence"
\ Are posited, how could they be contradictory?
\ Because they are not mutually inclusive,
\ The two positions are formulated.

¢(i.e. The Two Truths are inseparable; not different, not the same; non-dual: not two, not one. To think that they are the same, or ONE, would not be wise.)

Thus, in this context of the great Madhyamaka, if you should wonder if, in analyzing whether or not there is a position in the coalescence that is free of extremes of elaboration, the Svatantrika system is discussed, the answer is of course that it must be explained, because both contexts of having and not-having a position must be demonstrated. Why is that? The fruitional Madhyamaka, which is the gnosis of equipoise, and the causal Madhyamaka, which is the analytical wisdom of aftermath, are individually distinguished as the Prasangika Madhyamaka, which from the start emphasizes the non-conceptual ultimate free of positions, and as the Svatantrika Madhyamaka, which emphasizes the conceptual ultimate that involves a position. [The conceptual ultimate must be discussed first, because then, on the basis of that,] one must explain the experiential confidence, etc., in the final, non-conceptual ultimate free of all positions.

You might think that the difference between the two is determined only with respect to the conceptual and non-conceptual ultimates. Indeed, in positing the differences between the views of [these] philosophical systems, this alone is the fundamental distinction. The claim that valid cognition is or is not established, whether or not the distinction of ultimacy is applied to the negandum, whether logical reasons are prasangas or autonomous syllogisms, and so forth, are just auxiliary distinctions. In brief, the Svatantrikas' way of explanation is to distinguish the two truths individually, and the Prasangikas' is not to differentiate the two truths, but to explain them as the being experienced by the two kinds of validating cognition. All the distinctions explained above converge upon this crucial point.

The glorious and great Rong zom Chos bzang said:

~ All dharmas are ultimately pacified of elaborations. Though one considers that there is no probandum whatsoever to be proven, the [tendency] to apprehend something to be abandoned

or accepted as characteristics of authentic deceptive reality is an error in the extreme, and is cause for amazement.

And, from the Secret Commentary of the Great Omniscient One:

~ The Svatantrika Madhyamikas maintain that all dharmas are deceptively apparent, and that if one investigates them, they are ultimately without intrinsic nature. The dBu ma bden gnyis says, "This deceptive reality, which appears in this way; if analyzed with reason, nothing is found. It is the primordially abiding dharmata."

The Prasangika Madhyamikas maintain that whether one analyzes or not, all dharmas are pacified of all elaborations and free of any position.

The Avatara says:

~ While you claim that the paratantra is real,
~ I do not accept that deceptive reality [is real].

And:

~ If one differentiates that deceptive reality, there are both appearances that are not viable as they appear, like the reflection of the moon in water, and those that are viable, like the moon in the sky. Even if you analyze them, both authentic and mistaken (yang log gnyis ka) are equally appearances, and if you examine them, they are equal in not being established in fact. So to that extent, samsara and nirvana, actual and potential phenomena, abide in equality, without differentiation. Such an ultimate is beyond intellect, so in essence it is without differentiation. But if one were to loosely discern it intellectually, there the "emptiness with respect to the essence of dharmas themselves that is the actual ultimate," and so forth, and the birth of a mind that is free from elaboration in the yogi who meditates on that object, are called the conceptual ultimate. The bDen gnyis says:
~ The cessation of birth, etc.,
~ Is held to conform to the authentic;
~ The unborn, the pacification of all elaborations,
~ Signifies the ultimate.

Because just this is an object of the mind, it is explained as a definitive deceptive reality, and as a designation of ultimate reality.

Likewise, in the sGyu ma ngal so:

~ Here, proponents of true existence (dgnos smra ba) maintain deceptive establishment, and non-establishment ultimately, taking the two aspects separately. In that case, since dharmas are not established in their own context, it is not reasonable. For, from a mere intellectual concept of these two aspects of [non-existence and existence], there clearly manifests, on the basis of an appearance, a non-existence. And, by the thought that nothing is established, a thing does not become anything less [than what it is]. The system of the Prasangika Madhyamaka is this: from the moment of appearance, to be free of all positions is the quintessence of the Middle Way. Nagarjuna said:
~ Because its essence is just as it appears
~ Do not start analyzing this.

Whenever Mipham Rinpoche ('jam mgon bla ma) spoke of the Prasangika system or the difference between Prasangika and Svatantrika, he always based himself on Rong zom Pandita and Klong chen Rab 'byams.

Moreover, since these two truths of appearance and emptiness, which are the object of the

validating cognition that analyzes the abiding nature or ultimate reality, are non-contradictory on a single basis—just as substantial entities, on their own ground, are not contradictory—the two validating cognitions that investigate them have search criteria (dpyod yul), which are conventionally existent, and ultimately non-existent, respectively. How could these be contradictory? They are not. Thus, although they only have one essence, the two isolates of appearance and emptiness are not mutually inclusive. Since they are different, they are formulated with two positions—those of deceptive existence, and ultimate non-existence.

L9: [7.2.4.2.1.2 The position that those two are equally potent, based as they are on [their respective] objects]

\ ###
\ 7.2.4.2.1.2
\ For this reason, as long as the two realities
\ Are engaged by minds for which
\ They appear separately,
\ Both realities are quite equivalent in force,
\ And there is no one-sided position about either of them.

¢(i.e. Until we can transcend the duality of the Two Truths and realize the Union of The Two Truths, the coalescence, we need both together all the time. We need to see those two aspects in everything, as inseparable. One alone is not enough.)

Therefore, on the basis of the foregoing explanation, as long as these two truths—appearance and emptiness—appear separately without being mixed, and the mind engages them thus, the isolate of appearance and the isolate of emptiness will be in all respects of similar value in being true and false, respectively. Thus one does not adhere one-sidedly to a position of existence or non-existence. From the realm of form to omniscience, they are equivalent.

L9: [7.2.4.2.1.3 Determining that the objects found by the two subjective validating cognitions are the two truths]

\ ###
\ 7.2.4.2.1.3
\ The determination of the emptiness of truth as
\ "non-existence"
\ And the determination of appearance as "existence"
\ Are the objects found or seen alternately by each
\ Of the two valid cognitions at the time of their engagement,
\ And are said to be the two truths.

¢(i.e. The two methods // correct reasonings: syllogism and Prasangika permits to find these Two Truths in everything. It is important to realize that one doesn't negate the other.)

For those reasons, if one analyzes ultimately, one determines "non-existence," which is the emptiness of [establishment in] truth. And if one analyzes deceptively, one determines "existence," which is the apparent aspect established by validating cognition. These two are not established at the same time. In proving emptiness by negating true existence by means of an ultimate truth-validating cognition, one does not negate or establish appearances. In proving the infallible relativity of appearances, while negating permanence and annihilation, etc., one establishes the infallibility of dependent origination, but one does

not negate or establish emptiness. Therefore, by alternating the two validating cognitions, whenever the two kinds of validating cognition meet with any object of cognition, the objects that are found or seen by them—the isolates of appearance and emptiness—are named or posited as the two truths.

L9: [7.2.4.2.1.4 Explaining that there is no choice but [to conclude that] those two are neither the same nor different]

\ ###
\ 7.2.4.2.1.4
\ Because those two are neither the same nor different,
\ It is not possible to one-sidedly discard one
\ And accept the other.
\ The wisdom that analyzes these two
\ Differentiates their respective positions.

¢(i.e. We need both. They are not different, not the same.)

Thus, those two truths of appearance and emptiness are different isolates, so they are not the same; and since they have no more than one essence, they are not different either. Therefore, one cannot apprehend one of the two truths in the absence the other. For although the isolate is insubstantial (dngos med) in relation to the "thing itself," the mind that engages it in that way, which accords with the "thing itself," has a single essence.

L8: [7.2.4.2.2 How qualifiers are applied [It is useful to specify the context of any statement: from a conventional or ultimate point of view. And to always consider these two aspects about anything.]]

L9: [7.2.4.2.2.1 The common way of explaining the reasonableness of applying the qualifier]

L10: [7.2.4.2.2.1.1 Showing through analogy the way Svatantrikas apply the qualifier at the time of ascertaining the two truths]

\ ###
\ 7.2.4.2.2.1.1
\ For example, when the dharmakaya is finally attained,
\ All minds and mental events without exception
\ Cease, conventionally speaking;
\ But ultimately there is no cessation.

¢(i.e. So it is useful, when talking about something, to specify if we are talking from the conventional point of view, or the ultimate point of view. Ex. Conventionally we speak of origination, duration, change, causality, and cessation. But from the point of view of the ultimate truth (emptiness) there is no such phenomena. There is no fault as long as we specify the context.)

Thus, in the context of the two truths, from the perspective of the two kinds of analytical wisdom derived from the ten reasonings, the different modes and contexts of positions are differentiated. Because a qualification is required, it is shown with examples. [For instance], at the time of attaining the ultimate fruition of dharmakaya, mind and mental factors are, conventionally speaking, "ceased." But with respect to ultimate reality, they are not [ceased], because they are not produced. Thus, if having specified the context, one explains "cessation" and "non-cessation," it is appropriate to use qualifiers; and if one does not use qualifiers, it is because the context does not require it.

L10: [7.2.4.2.2.1.2 How it is applied in the sutras and sastras]

\ ###
\ 7.2.4.2.2.1.2
\ In all the texts of all sutras and treatises,
\ Among the various kinds of proof and negation
\ Some posit ultimate reality,
\ And some are stated with respect to deceptive reality.

¢(i.e. So the context is usually specified in the texts.)

That application of qualifiers is also clearly present in all the texts of the great sutras and sastras. In relation to the exigencies of various and sundry negations and proofs in those texts, sometimes the exposition is framed as an ultimate-truth position, and sometimes it is framed as a deceptive-truth position. Those positions are stated in those ways for the sake of removing the delusion of disciples.

L9: [7.2.4.2.2.2 The reasonableness of specific cases of application]

L10: [7.2.4.2.2.2.1 The actual reasoning behind those qualifiers]

L11: [7.2.4.2.2.2.1.1 Applying a qualifier at the time of ascertaining ultimate reality]

\ ###
\ 7.2.4.2.2.2.1.1
\ With respect to ultimate reality alone,
\ The path, Buddhas, sentient beings, and so forth,
\ Are rightly said to be "non-existent."
\ It is not the case, however, that
\ Without relying on conventions, they are simply non-existent.

¢(i.e. So from the ultimate point of view, everything is empty of inherent existence. But that doesn't mean that they are completely non-existent, useless, or from the mind-only. That would be idealism or nihilism. So they are said to be conventionally existent, in order to insist on this point. But that doesn't mean that they are really existent conventionally; that there is something left on the base.)

It is appropriate to say, with exclusive reference to ultimate reality, that the path, Buddhas, sentient beings, and so forth, are "non-existent"; but why is that? Samsara, nirvana, and the path are not established as one or many, but they don't become completely non-existent without any connection to the apparent aspect of deceptive reality. Although they are ultimately non-existent, the apparent aspects of samsara, nirvana, and the path are established as manifestly appearing, infallibly and indisputably. Therefore one must teach by applying the qualifier in the context of ultimate reality. If one doesn't apply it, on the basis of the object [negated], the very "non-existence" one intends will not come about, because [the student] will not be able to discern the object of one's intention.

L11: [7.2.4.2.2.2.1.2 The necessity of likewise applying it to conventional systems]

\ ###
\ 7.2.4.2.2.2.1.2
\ Though they do not exist, all appearances of samsara and
\ nirvana
\ Appear, and are established through direct perception.
\ Therefore, with respect to conventional valid cognition,

- \ The path, Buddhas, sentient beings, and so forth,
- \ Are rightly said to be "existent."
- \ But this doesn't mean that they are really existent
- \ Without reference to ultimate reality.
- \ They exist, but are not established as such,

¢(i.e. On the other hand, from the conventional truths point of view, things are dependently arisen and functional. We then talk about specific causes and conditions, and specific effects. But that doesn't mean that dependent origination and those phenomena are real, or inherently existing. They are always dependent on the mind merely labeling them, dependent on accumulated karma.)

Likewise, in reference to a validating cognition that analyzes conventional systems, it is reasonable to say that the path, Buddhas, and sentient beings, etc., are all "existent." For conventionally the cause and effect of both samsara and nirvana are infallibly existent. Nonetheless, that doesn't mean that they are ultimately existent, without any connection to the non-establishment of ultimate reality, because although they are conventionally existent, they can be ascertained by a validating cognition as not being established in that way.

L10: [7.2.4.2.2.2.2 Its meaning summarized [they are inseparable]]

- \ ###
- \ 7.2.4.2.2.2.2
- \ Because they can be determined by
- \ An analytical cognition of ultimate reality.
- \ Thus, those two can never exist
- \ One without the other.

¢(i.e. Those two aspects are inseparable, and should always be considered together.)

For that reason, it is completely impossible for the empty aspect of ultimate reality and the apparent aspect of deceptive reality to exist separately, one without the other.

L8: [7.2.4.2.3 Disposing of criticisms:]

L9: [7.2.4.2.3.1 The criticism [does that mean that things are inherently existing]]

- \ ###
- \ 7.2.4.2.3.1
- \ "When both are true with equal force,
- \ Will existent things be non-empty?"

¢(i.e. The objection: wouldn't that mean that things are ultimately existent ?)

"Well then, if by analyzing ultimate reality one cannot eliminate deceptive reality, at that time of establishing the two truths as equally potent and true without qualification, the undesirable consequence of substances being non-empty would follow, because both of them are true with equal force."

L9: [7.2.4.2.3.2 Its disposal [both are empty of inherent existence, but not completely non-existent either]]

L10: [7.2.4.2.3.2.1 Summary demonstration that from the perspective of a final analysis of ultimate truth, both are without intrinsic reality]

\ ###
\ 7.2.4.2.3.2.1
\ Both are not established by their intrinsic nature,

¢(i.e. Emptiness of inherent existence doesn't mean existence , nor complete non-existence.
The Two Truths are not different, not the same.)

That is not a fault. The two truths are differentiated contextually. To ascertain the path
Madhyamaka, one meditates again and again, thinking, "inherent existence is not
established," as an antidote to beginningless adhesion to substantial realities, which is so
hard to stop. This is quite necessary, but in the final analysis, both truths are not
established intrinsically.

The Madhyamakalamkara says:

- ~ Finally, it is free of
- ~ The entire mass of elaborations.

The bDen gnyis says:

- ~ The negandum is not existent;
- ~ It is clear that ultimately it is not negated.

L10: [7.2.4.2.3.2.2 An extensive explanation of that]

L11: [7.2.4.2.3.2.2.1 The way in which one is liberated in emptiness, because appearance is
not established in truth]

\ ###
\ 7.2.4.2.3.2.2.1
\ Nor are they, as objects, really different;
\ Whatever appears is empty, so what can be non-empty?

¢(i.e. Appearance implies emptiness. Dependent origination implies emptiness.)

The object of the two validating cognitions has two isolates, which in respect to the thing
itself (don gyi steng na) are not different. For that reason, if one analyzes just the
essence of that appearance, it is empty. How could it not be empty?

L11: [7.2.4.2.3.2.2.2 The way relativity appears, because emptiness is not established in
truth]

\ ###
\ 7.2.4.2.3.2.2.2
\ Both are equally apparent,
\ So they are established as empty;
\ If they were not apparent, how would emptiness be known?

¢(i.e. Emptiness implies appearance; it cannot exist without appearance. Emptiness implies
dependent origination.)

As for emptiness, both substantiality and non-substantiality are equivalent in being the
appearance of the mere relativity of depending upon one another. Therefore, emptiness is
without nihilistic negation or true existence, and is established as empty. Why is that? If
both substantiality and non-substantiality were not the appearance of dependent origination,
how could one cognize emptiness? One could not.

L11: [7.2.4.2.3.2.2.3 The ways of cognizing arise as cause and effect, are of equal force, and are inseparable]

\ ###
\ 7.2.4.2.3.2.2.3
\ Thus, both appear together as cause and effect,
\ Without contradiction.
\ If one is certain that one exists, the other does too:
\ They are always inseparable.

¢(i.e. One cannot be without the other. They are inseparable, non-dual: not two, not one.)

For that reason, appearance and emptiness are non-contradictory in a single basis. If one analyzes with the two validating cognitions, the objects of appearance and emptiness appear in a mutual relation of cause and effect; if one has, on the one hand, appearance, one will have, on the other hand, its nature, which is emptiness. If one acquires an extraordinary certainty in this, appearance and emptiness will always be inseparable.

"Well, if they are equally viable, how can they be truths?" They just are. Appearance and emptiness are mutually inclusive, and for that reason, whichever validating cognition one uses to access [one of them], its object is infallibly existent according [to that validating cognition], so they are both truths.

L11: [7.2.4.2.3.2.2.4 Being known to be thus indivisible, they cannot revert to truly existing;]

\ ###
\ 7.2.4.2.3.2.2.4
\ There is no case where one does not
\ Encompass the other; therefore,
\ Whichever one investigates, it is correct.
\ By knowing appearance as emptiness,
\ One realizes appearance as realitylessness;
\ And by knowing emptiness as appearance,
\ One will not conceive emptiness as real.
\ Therefore, when they are seen as inseparable,
\ One will not revert to seeing them as real.

¢(i.e. One cannot exist without the other. So investigating either of them will lead to the other. One is the antidote of the extreme tendency of the other. So emptiness cannot lead to nihilism; and appearance cannot lead to realism.)

"If it is a truth, then isn't it non-empty?" That is not the case. When something appears, by knowing it to be empty one is not carried away with the appearance, and one knows that appearance is not true according to [its mode of] appearance. And if one knows that emptiness appears unobstructedly as relativity, one does not get carried away with emptiness, and one will not think that an absolute emptiness is real. For that reason, those two [truths] are inseparable on the basis of a knowable object; and when one sees them that way, neither of them will ever revert to true existence.

L11: [7.2.4.2.3.2.2.5 The proof that they are that way]

\ ###

- \ 7.2.4.2.3.2.2.5
- \ The abiding character of whatever appears
- \ Is emptiness, so they are inseparable.
- \ If one rejects appearance,
- \ Emptiness cannot be established independently.

¢(i.e. The inseparability of appearances and emptiness. Everything is not existent, not non-existent, not both, not neither. The Union of The Two Truths. The coalescence, ... But all of these are still merely pointing at the moon.)

Because the abiding reality of whatever appears in samsara and nirvana does not go beyond emptiness, on the basis of that mere appearance, they are inseparable. An independent emptiness existing apart from that appearance is never, ever established to exist.

Accordingly, in the *Sems nyid ngal gso*, it says:

- ~ This appearance is primordially non-produced, like a reflection.
- ~ Without essence, there are various appearances.
- ~ Having seen relativity, which is naturally pure,
- ~ One quickly realizes the supreme, non-abiding goal.

L7: [7.2.4.3 Combining the Prasangika (non-conceptual ultimate) and Svatantrika (conceptual ultimate) into a single stream : [Using the duality of the Two Truths, then realizing its emptiness, and later transcending it]]

L8: [7.2.4.3.1 The reason why one should meditate upon the view in gradual stages, starting with the causal small Madhyamaka;]

L9: [7.2.4.3.1.1 On the sutra path, in dependence upon dichotomizing analytical wisdom, non-dual gnosis is generated]

L10: [7.2.4.3.1.1.1 If one does not rely upon the two stainless forms of valid cognition, the forces contrary to gnosis will prevent it from arising]

- \ ###
- \ 7.2.4.3.1.1.1
- \ Therefore, one cultivates the wisdom
- \ Of meditating on the two realities alternately.
- \ In the context of this samsara of dualistic perception,
- \ Gnosis does not appear,
- \ So the two stainless analytical wisdoms
- \ Should be upheld without ambivalence.

¢(i.e. On the sutra path we use much of conceptualization, analysis about the Two Truths, to reach the very ultimate truths beyond all conceptualization. Without this we would easily fall into one extreme or the other.)

Thus, the ascertainment [of reality] in the Prasangika and Svatantrika schools is practiced gradually. Therefore, as long as the view or realization of equipoise is not fully manifest, one meditates upon the two truths alternately; this is "analytical wisdom." Why is that? In this context of samsara, where one has the dualistic appearances that are the antithesis of non-dual gnosis, the activity of mind and mental factors prevents non-dual gnosis from manifesting. Therefore, the two stainless validating cognitions that are analytical wisdom, which is in turn the cause of gnosis, should be maintained without accepting, abandoning, or hesitation, because they are an indispensable cause.

L10: [7.2.4.3.1.1.2 If the causal factors of either of those two forms of analysis are not complete, gnosis is not generated]

\ ###
\ 7.2.4.3.1.1.2
\ When one of these is incomplete,
\ The coalescence of gnosis
\ That arises from them will definitely not arise,
\ Just as fire will not occur without
\ Two pieces of wood rubbed together.

¢(i.e. One alone is not enough. Indulging in dependent origination alone, like in the Hinayana, is not enough. Indulging in emptiness alone, like thinking it is the very ultimate truths, is not enough. If we don't use both on the path, then we will never be able to reach their Union beyond all conceptualization.)

When one practices in that way, if either of the two validating cognitions that alternately analyze both appearance and emptiness is deficient, the result that arises from those two causes, the gnosis of equipoise coalescence, will definitely not be produced. For example, if one lacks the fire-producing stick or the wood that it rubs, fire will not be produced as a result.

L10: [7.2.4.3.1.1.3 Thus, to separate them is not the authentic path]

\ ###
\ 7.2.4.3.1.1.3
\ Therefore, a path where method and emptiness
\ Are separated is inauthentic
\ According to all the Buddhas and vidyadharas.

¢(i.e. That is why, on the sutra path, it is said that we need the two accumulations: merit and wisdom together. We need to use adapted virtuous methods, but also to gradually realize the emptiness of the three: subject, object, action. That is the meaning of the perfections – paramitas.)

For that reason, emptiness that is separate from the apparent method aspect of compassion, and so forth, and" method that is separate from the analytical wisdom of emptiness, are said to be inauthentic paths because of this separation. This has been taught by the Victor, the perfect Buddha, and all the great learned and accomplished lineage-holding masters of India and Tibet. The non-path where the two are separate, and the true path where they are coalescent, are exemplified by various examples, such as one clutching an umbrella with both hands and jumping into an abyss, etc., and by many similes.

The Sutrasamuccaya says:

- ~ If that is completely embraced by method and wisdom,
- ~ Without harm, one will come to realize the enlightenment of the tathagatas.

And, from the Sutra Insistently Requested by Rab rTsal:

- ~ By analytical wisdom that is bereft of method
- ~ It has not arisen, nor will it arise.
- ~ Method bereft of wisdom will also
- ~ Not satisfy the learned.

The glorious Saraha said:

- ~ If one views emptiness without compassion,
- ~ One will not discover the supreme path.
- ~ Moreover, if one only meditates on compassion,
- ~ One will remain in samsara—why even mention liberation?

According to these statements, if one abandons the dual cause of gnosis, no other method for generating the fruitional gnosis is possible.

L9: [7.2.4.3.1.2 On the mantra path, there are many methods that can indicate the essence of gnosis, by means of empowerment and symbolic means]

```
\    ###
\    7.2.4.3.1.2
\    Therefore, if one abandons these two causes,
\    There is no other way for the great gnosis to arise.
\    The essence of gnosis
\    Is beyond thought and expression.
\    Therefore, aside from symbolic means and mere words,
\    It cannot actually be indicated.
\    Thus, the teaching of the word empowerment in the
\    Mantrayana,
\    In the tantras of the vajra essence, and so forth,
\    It is taught by words and methods.
```

¢(i.e. In the Tantras also we need both method and wisdom together. But, here, the conceptual analysis are replaced by symbolic means, and minimal instructions. There is no need to develop complex reasonings. The work is done at a level bellow conceptualization. That is why it is more direct and fast. But it is also more dangerous, and should be done only under the supervision of someone who has gone through it before.)

The result of the sutric method and wisdom, namely gnosis, is essentially beyond conceptual thinking and verbal expression. Therefore, there is no other method in the sutra path besides cultivating the coalescence of method and analytical wisdom. However, the tantras only teach by symbolic means, such as empowerment, and by verbal indications, hence the teaching of the "word empowerment" in the Mantrayana. In the uncommon tantric classes of the vajra essence, and so forth, [gnosis] is demonstrated by verbal introduction and various symbolic methods.

L9: [7.2.4.3.1.3 Summary:]

L10: [7.2.4.3.1.3.1 Showing the Madhyamika path that differentiates the two truths and their purpose]

```
\    ###
\    7.2.4.3.1.3.1
\    The supramundane gnosis
\    Cannot be understood without relying on
\    Some kind of verbal expression,
\    So the path of the Madhyamaka of the two realities is taught.
```

¢(i.e. So, one way or another, one needs to rely on some form of conceptualization in order to get to the very ultimate truth beyond all conceptualization. Much conceptualization in

sutra, much less with Tantras. The important point taught in both case is about the Two Truths.)

As for that gnosis that is beyond the world and free of conceptual thought and expression: the self-arising gnosis cannot, as explained above, be attained without relying upon some extrinsic cause and method, nor can it be comprehended. Therefore, a path Madhyamaka is taught that differentiates the two truths and cultivates them alternately.

L10: [7.2.4.3.1.3.2 Summarizing by explaining that the non-conceptual gnosis of coalescence that is the result [of the two truths] is a crucial point common to both sutra and tantra]

```
\    ###
\    7.2.4.3.1.3.2
\    The result of analyzing in the manner of two realities
\    Can be established as coalescence itself.
\    Therefore, when the two realities are ascertained,
\    Appearance and emptiness are taught alternately
\    As negation and negandum.
\    Their result, the gnosis of coalescence,
\    Is taught by many synonyms in tantra.
```

¢(i.e. So, one way or another, one needs to rely on some form of conceptualization in order to get to the very ultimate truth beyond all conceptualization. Much conceptualization in sutra, much less with Tantras. The important point taught in both case is about the Two Truths. The result though is beyond all conceptualization, analysis, beyond the duality of the Two Truths.)

Thus, by teaching the two truths through differentiating them, as the result of their analysis one is able to accomplish the gnosis that is the coalescence of appearance and emptiness. Therefore, when one ascertains both truths of appearance and emptiness, the negandum—appearance—and negation—emptiness of "appearance-emptiness"—are taught as alternating practices. The result [of that practice] is the gnosis that integrates the expanse and awareness without contradiction. [That coalescence] is taught by many synonyms in the tantric classes, as the gnosis that arises from the many practices of generation and completion on the path, as the "actual luminosity," and so forth.

L8: [7.2.4.3.2 The fact that this requirement [the Two Truths] represents the intention of the scriptures and treatises]

```
\    ###
\    7.2.4.3.2
\    Thus, all Madhyamika systems
\    Are established by way of the two realities;
\
\    Without relying on the two realities,
\    Coalescence will not be understood.
\    Whatever the Buddhas have taught
\    Has relied entirely on the two realities;
```

¢(i.e. One way or another, someone has to be introduced to the Two Truths in order to get to the very ultimate Liberating truth beyond all conceptualization.)

The fact that this is the meaning of the scriptures and interpretive commentaries: Thus...

Therefore, because one must practice without separating method and wisdom, all the Madhyamikas take as their point of departure the system of the two truths. The reason for that is that if one does not know how to integrate the two truths as a basis, one does not know the basic character of reality. Thus, if one does not rely on that knowledge of the coalescence of the basic character of reality, one will not come to practice the path as the coalescence of method and wisdom. Without that, one will not comprehend the coalescence of the result, the bodies and gnosis of a Buddha. Therefore, all the teachings taught by the Victor, in all contexts of the basis, path, and result, are taught entirely with reliance upon the two truths. The Root Stanzas on Wisdom says:

- ~ The Dharmas taught by the Buddhas
- ~ Rely entirely upon the two truths—
- ~ Worldly deceptive truth
- ~ And ultimate truth.

L8: [7.2.4.3.3 The consciousness and gnosis that meditate in this way are the context for applying the conventional designations "small," "great," and so forth]

L9: [7.2.4.3.3.1 The causal small Madhyamaka of analytical wisdom]

L10: [7.2.4.3.3.1.1 The two truths maintained as a position in our own tradition]

L11: [7.2.4.3.3.1.1.1 The reason for being "small"]

- \ ###
- \ 7.2.4.3.3.1.1.1
- \ Therefore, the Madhyamaka that contains
- \ The positions of each of the two truths
- \ Is the little Madhyamaka of alternation,
- \ Which gives the result's name to the cause.

¢(i.e. So there is a need to use the duality of the Two Truths as a skillful means on the paths. But ultimately one has to transcend this duality.)

Therefore, according to what has been said above, the designation "Madhyamaka" is given to the Madhyamaka that has the positions of the two truths, vis-à-vis "ultimately non-existent" and "deceptively existent." This is giving the name of the fruitional gnosis to the cause, namely, all situations where one ascertains appearance and emptiness alternately and meditates upon them accordingly. This is the "small Madhyamaka."

L11: [7.2.4.3.3.1.1.2 The reason for having a position]

- \ ###
- \ 7.2.4.3.3.1.1.2
- \ The emptiness of the analyzed five aggregates
- \ Is the mere absolute negation exclusive of the negandum;
- \ In that respect there is the position of "non-existence."

¢(i.e. So from the conventional point of view, the Two Truths are in apparent opposition. One is the antidote of the extreme tendency of the other. They seem to represent opposite position; but by using both together one can stay away from all extremes.)

The emptiness that is the object of analysis, insofar as all dharmas subsumed by the five aggregates are not immune to analysis as being one or many, is a bare absolute negation that eliminates the negandum, true existence. In dependence upon that [negation], there is the position of "ultimately non-existent."

L11: [7.2.4.3.3.1.1.3 The fact that the two truths are our own system]

\ ###
\ 7.2.4.3.3.1.1.3
\ Whatever the causal or path Madhyamaka
\ Posits as the two truths,
\ Both are our own system.
\ It makes no sense to posit the ultimate as our system,
\ And say that conventional reality
\ Is only from other people's perspective.

¢(i.e. We need both. One alone is not enough. Emptiness alone is not enough. It is not the very ultimate truth.)

Thus, that causal or path "small Madhyamaka," which causes the attainment of the fruitional gnosis, maintains whatever position is posited by the two truths—non-existence with respect to ultimate reality and the systems of deceptive reality. Both of these are maintained as the position of our own Madhyamika tradition, but we do not take that ultimate non-existence as our own system and then posit deceptive reality in terms of [what is known by] others in the world.

L10: [7.2.4.3.3.1.2 The fact that to do otherwise would be unreasonable]

L11: [7.2.4.3.3.1.2.1 That denigrating view is not reasonable as a basis, path, or result]

\ ###
\ 7.2.4.3.3.1.2.1
\ If that were so, then our own system of the ultimate
\ Would be a blank nothingness,
\ And we would wind up totally denigrating
\ All appearances of the basis, path, and result
\ As "delusions to be abandoned."
\ Then a mere expanse of emptiness without obscuration
\ Would be left over, while the two types of omniscience
\ Would be negated. This would be similar to the sravaka path,
\ Which asserts a remainderless nirvana,
\ Just like the blowing out of a candle.

¢(i.e. To grasp at emptiness as the very ultimate truth beyond conceptualization would not be wise. That would lead to nihilism.)

If [our view] were like that, our own tradition's view of the absence of true existence would be an ultimate reality of exclusive emptiness or exclusive non-existence, and we would underestimate what exists as being non-existent, thinking all of these various infallibly existent appearances of deceptive reality, such as the basis, path, and result, were nothing but illusions and things that should be abandoned. Finally, at the time of establishing the result, we would have nothing left over but an expanse of emptiness, free of obscurations, which would exclude appearances altogether, and we would have to assert that the two types of omniscience—which know everything that is just as it is—as well as the bodies and gnosis, were completely absent. For example, just as the sravakas and pratyekabuddhas are held to pass into a remainderless nirvana on their respective paths, this type of Madhyamaka is also no different than extinguishing a candle.

L11: [7.2.4.3.3.1.2.2 It can be refuted by both scripture and reasoning]

\ ###
\ 7.2.4.3.3.1.2.2
\ Thus, the Buddha said that these
\ Spaced-out people who denigrate
\ The expanse of coalescence as mere nothingness
\ Are thieves who destroy the Sakya Dharma.
\
\ With reasoning, one can see how
\ That system denigrates the existent as non-existent,
\ And one is able to destroy the mountain of bad views
\ With the vajra-fire of certainty.

¢(i.e. To teach that the very ultimate truth beyond all conceptualization is emptiness is to jump to one extreme, and to steal the hope of people. On the other hand, teachings like this text, restore the certainty and faith in the result, and the path. The dharmadhatu is not complete non-existence, no more than inherent existence, or both, or neither. There is no absolute emptiness to realize; it is more like the Union of The Two Truths, their inseparability, their non-duality.)

Someone who denigrates the dharmadhatu that is the coalescence of appearance and emptiness, which abides as the basic reality of all dharmas, as being absolutely non-existent like empty space, was said by the Victor to be a thief of Sakyamuni's teaching and a destroyer of the holy Dharma.

The Sutra, of the Samadhi of the Mudra of Gnosis says:

- ~ Emptiness is not born, nor produced by anyone,
- ~ Not seen, neither come nor gone.
- ~ Having imagined [it falsely, and saying,] "I have mastered it well"—
- ~ Those prattlers are thieves of the Dharma.

Such an inferior way [of understanding], which is not authentic, is a way of denigrating the cause and effect of karma, the path, and the result—which are infallibly existent appearances—as being non-existent. With rational analysis— the downpour of the indestructible vajra-fire of certainty that it is impossible for an absolute emptiness without appearance to become an object of knowledge on the path of validating cognitions that analyze the two truths—one will be able to destroy the mountain of bad nihilistic views without remainder from the foundation.

On that, the Great Omniscient One said:

- ~ If he doesn't understand this, he will talk about
- ~ An absolute emptiness "free of extremes of existence and non-existence."
- ~ (i.e. That would be the fourth point of the Tetralemma: neither existence, nor non-existence.)
- ~ But without understanding the basis free [of those extremes], this is the view of the peak of existence.
- ~ As he has gone beyond the pale of this doctrine,
- ~ That space cadet should be smeared with ashes.

L9: [7.2.4.3.3.2 On the fruitional Madhyamaka [the Great Perfection]]

L10: [7.2.4.3.3.2.1 The reason why it is both "Madhyamaka" and "great"]

L11: [7.2.4.3.3.2.1.1 The way of meditating on the essence of the intentions of the causal and fruitional vehicles, the Madhyamaka that is the gnosis of the coalescence of the two truths]

\ ###
\ 7.2.4.3.3.2.1.1
\ Thus, in all Madhyamika texts,
\ Without establishing the causal Madhyamaka
\ Of analytical wisdom through rational analysis,
\ The fruitional coalescence is not established.
\ Therefore, even if one has rationally determined
\ The character of the two realities,
\ The fruition is the establishment of the inseparability
\ Of the two realities. This is the quintessence of all vehicles.

¢(i.e. The Great Perfection meditation. See sections 4.2.2.2.2.3.3.2.2.1 & 4.2.2.2.2.4)

For that reason, Madhyamika texts that do not teach the view and meditation progressively, do not analyze with potent reasoning the meaning of the causal Madhyamaka of analytical wisdom. And without authentically establishing the meaning of selflessness, they do not establish the fruitional Madhyamaka, which is the gnosis of coalescence. Therefore, although the reasoning that perfectly analyzes all knowable dharmas in the system of the two truths ascertains the crucial meaning, it is not the final nature of things. So the result of that very ascertainment, the inseparability of the two truths, the coalescent equality that is thus established, is the essence of all the causal and fruitional vehicles. Thus, the ultimate thing to be realized is precisely that.

The Avatara says:

~ When conceptions are turned back, that
~ Is said by the learned to be the result of analysis.

L11: [7.2.4.3.3.2.1.2 Such a gnosis is the great Madhyamaka]

\ ###
\ 7.2.4.3.3.2.1.2
\ Therefore, gnosis
\ Does not abide alternately in the two extremes,
\ And is beyond intellect;
\ Thus it is Madhyamaka, and also great.

¢(i.e. This method of meditation does not analyze the Two Truths in sequence. It consist of going directly to the result beyond conceptualization. It is obviously for those who can do it without going through a gradual path (after having been introduce to the real nature by the master), or after going through it. It is when the conceptualization are dropped automatically after having realized its real non-dual nature.)

Therefore, the final result to be realized, the self-cognizant pristine awareness, is beyond mind and free of elaborations, and does not abide in the two extremes, having cut off those two extremes by alternating [the focus on the two truths]. Thus, it is Madhyamaka, and also great.

L11: [7.2.4.3.3.2.1.3 If that is not touched upon, then it is neither Madhyamaka nor great]

\ ###
 \ 7.2.4.3.3.2.1.3
 \ As long as one has not reached gnosis
 \ By means of alternation, this is not
 \ The ultimate Madhyamaka that is
 \ The heart of all Buddhas' realization (dgongs pa).

¢(i.e. It is not about dropping conceptualization artificially like with the Hashang's method. And it is not there yet if there is still analysis and conceptualization.)

As long as the forms of appearance and emptiness appear to the mind in the manner of alternating [one's focus] on appearance and emptiness, that is not the final essence of the intention of all the victors, and does not touch upon the ultimate gnosis. It is a progressive stage in the context of the Madhyamika path.

L10: [7.2.4.3.3.2.2 The reason for positing coalescence and fruition]

L11: [7.2.4.3.3.2.2.1 The gnosis of sublime beings that is free of elaboration is designated as the state of coalescence and fruition]

\ ###
 \ 7.2.4.3.3.2.2.1
 \ Like fire stirred up by a fire-stick,
 \ The fire of coalescent gnosis induced
 \ By the stainless analytical wisdom of the two realities
 \ Pacifies all elaborations of the four extremes
 \ Such as existence, non-existence, both, and neither.
 \ This is the gnosis of sublime equipoise,
 \ And is considered the fruitional Madhyamaka of
 \ coalescence.

¢(i.e. It is called that way, but this is merely conceptually pointing at something beyond all conceptualization, beyond causality space and time; merely pointing at the moon.)

Just as fire arises as the result of rubbing firewood, the fire of self-arisen gnosis, the integrated expanse and awareness, is the result brought about by its cause, stainless analytical wisdom that analyzes the two truths. That fire, in turn, is the fruitional Madhyamaka, which is the sublime gnosis of equipoise, in which all elaborations of the four extremes, such as existence, non-existence, both, and neither, are pacified.

The Root Stanzas on Wisdom says:

~ Not known in dependence upon another, peaceful,
 ~ Not elaborated by elaborations,
 ~ Without conceptualization, not multifarious:
 ~ That is the characteristic of reality.

L11: [7.2.4.3.3.2.2.2 From the perspective of that equipoise, deceptive elaborations are eliminated]

\ ###
 \ 7.2.4.3.3.2.2.2
 \ Not falling into the extremes of the two realities—
 \ For the analytical wisdom of meditative aftermath
 \ This may be considered the "coalescence of

\ Appearance and emptiness,"

¢(i.e. idem – ultimate equanimity, beyond discrimination and non-discrimination, beyond conceptualization and non-conceptualization, beyond thought and no-thought, beyond the duality of the Two Truths.)

Such an abiding reality of things, which does not fall into partiality with respect to the two truths, is posited with mere conventionalities and terms as "the coalescence of appearance and emptiness" by the analytical wisdom that differentiates it in the context of meditative aftermath. Because such terms and conventions are not established in any way whatsoever from the perspective of the great gnosis of equipoise, the essence of the coalescence of appearance and emptiness is not something that can be imagined. They are deceptive elaborations of the meditative aftermath, and this [equipoise] is the complete pacification of elaborations.

L11: [7.2.4.3.3.2.2.3 How all conventionalities are engaged in the aftermath state through words and concepts]

\ ###
\ 7.2.4.3.3.2.2.3
\ But for the great gnosis of equipoise,
\ Appearance, emptiness, and coalescence
\ Are not reified as having some essence.
\ Appearance is the object of conventional valid cognition,
\ Emptiness is the object of ultimate analysis,
\ And coalescence combines these two components.
\ Since these are objects of words and concepts,

¢(i.e. Beyond doesn't mean rejection; it means transcendence.)

For that reason, cause and effect, and so forth, are all objects of validating cognitions that analyze conventionalities, and emptiness, which is non [establishment]-in-truth, is the object of validating cognitions that analyze ultimate reality. The "coalescence" that depends upon them both is analyzed and thought through a combination of both [types of valid cognition]. Because it is [only] the object of words and thoughts in the meditative aftermath state, it cannot be imagined in equipoise itself.

L11: [7.2.4.3.3.2.2.4 How, from the perspective of that equipoise, neither the presence nor absence of appearance is established]

\ ###
\ 7.2.4.3.3.2.2.4
\ The equipoise that transcends them
\ Is merely designated as "gnosis known for oneself."
\ [In the context of sublime equipoise,]
\ "Apparent," "non-apparent," and so forth,
\ Are not established by authentic reasoning.

¢(i.e. So it is not about eliminating conceptualization or appearances, but about transcending them, like directly seeing their two aspects simultaneously – but in reality it is beyond description. Like still using them, but not being fooled by them.)

The equipoise that is beyond words and thoughts is, as a mere conventionality, said to be

"gnosis realized individually." [In it] the object and subject called "expanse and gnosis," and "existence and non-existence," and all such dichotomies, are elaborations that are pacified. The implicative negation that has an apparent aspect, the absolute negation that has no appearance, emptiness, and so forth, are also not imagined in the state of equipoise. If one analyzes accordingly, they are not in the slightest bit established [in that context].

Nagarjuna said:

- ~ Because I have no negandum,
- ~ I do not negate anything.
- ~ Therefore by saying "I negate,"
- ~ It is you who denigrates.

L7: [7.2.4.4 The differences among Madhyamika, Mahamudra, and the Great Perfection:]

L8: [7.2.4.4.1 The differences in practicing the path]

L9: [7.2.4.4.1.1 The differences in the view of analytical wisdom]

L10: [7.2.4.4.1.1.1 In the sutric path, by gradually practicing the path, one realizes the views of Mahamudra and the Great Perfection]

\ ###
\ 7.2.4.4.1.1.1
\ Thus, as long as one meditates on the two realities
\ Alternately, this is analytical wisdom,
\ And when there is no such alternation,
\ One attains the coalescent gnosis.
\ Then one transcends the bare emptiness
\ That is the absolute negation that
\ Is the analytical exclusion of the aggregates.
\ Negation and negandum no longer appear separately.
\ The great non-elaborated emptiness that
\ Is consummately endowed with the aspect
\ Of appearance as method,
\ Mahamudra of coemergence, and so forth,
\ Have many synonyms.
\ Because these are all the gnosis that transcends mind,
\ They are inconceivable by any other concepts.

¢(i.e. In the sutric path one uses much conceptualization, analysis, correct reasonings, about the Two Truths in order to ultimately realize the very ultimate truth beyond all conceptualization that is called the Union of The Two Truths, or the coalescence. The tantric path is similar; much of the conceptualization is replaced by symbolic methods; but the Two Truths are still present, and the result is the same.)

In the final analysis, the significance of both sutra and tantra is compatible. Therefore, as long as one is meditating upon the two truths of appearance and emptiness alternately, that is "analytical wisdom." And when one realizes the gnosis of integrated appearance-emptiness without alternation, that is the attainment of the supreme realization of the peak of the dialectical vehicle. At that time, one is beyond the absolute negation of bare emptiness, which is the absence of true existence of the negandum—true existence—brought about by analysis of the two truths, and by the elimination of true existence in relation to the aggregates. When the modalities of negation and negandum do not

appear individually, and appearances arise as aspects of method, that is the emptiness "fully endowed with characteristics."

The Summary for Those Who Want the View says:

- ~ The emptiness that is the analysis of the aggregates
- ~ Is like a plantain tree, without essence.
- ~ The emptiness fully endowed with all characteristics
- ~ Is not like that.

Accordingly the great Madhyamaka that is free of elaborations, the all-pervasive Mahamudra of coemergence, and so forth, have many synonyms, but since their actual being is the gnosis beyond mind, they cannot be conceived by other kinds of superimposing concepts that involve a subject-object duality.

The Comfort of Mind says:

- ~ With its antidote, the gnosis of awareness,
- ~ One gains confidence that all samsaric habits are empty,
- ~ And by determining the nature of emptiness to be appearance,
- ~ One knows the meaning of the two truths, inseparable appearance and emptiness.
- ~ By practicing the Madhyamaka, which dispels the two extremes,
- ~ One does not abide in samsara or nirvana, but is liberated in space.
- ~ This is the ultimate essence of the definitive meaning.
- ~ This is the reality of the natural Great Perfection.

L10: [7.2.4.4.1.1.2 Such a view is explained as effortless in the path of the Great Perfection]

\ ###
\ 7.2.4.4.1.1.2
\ Because this gnosis is not the object of words and concepts,
\ It is not differentiated by
\ Implicative and absolute negations,
\ Nor as different, non-different, apparent, or empty, etc.
\ Because it does not fall into any extreme or partiality,
\ It is beyond having and not having a position,
\ And appears as the non-abiding self-arisen gnosis of
\ The coalescent Evam.

¶(i.e. With the Great Perfection, Mahamudra or Dzogchen, there is no conceptualization, no analysis, not symbolic methods. One meditate directly on the result beyond all conceptualization, beyond all dualities. It is the great equanimity.)

Because such an abiding reality is not an object of words and concepts, it is indivisible by any concept such as "absolute negation," "affirming negation," or "different," "non-different," "appearance," "emptiness," and so forth. Therefore, because it is free of divisions and partiality, it is beyond all positions of philosophical systems, such as "existing" and "non-existing." It is the Evam of the indivisible purity and equality of the extraordinary dharmakaya. The appearance of non-abidingly abiding in that very state of self-arisen gnosis, the coalescence of awareness and emptiness, is the final mastery and consummation of the kingly method of the innate dharmakaya.

Likewise, from the Secret Essence:

- ~ Thusness is free from one and many,
- ~ Center and periphery,
- ~ Is not seen even by Buddhas,
- ~ Is the non-abiding appearance of gnosis.

L10: [7.2.4.4.1.1.3 By realizing it, one comprehends the profound doctrine, and is able to help others]

\ ###
 \ 7.2.4.4.1.1.3
 \ Thus, the ultimate meaning, free of reification and negation,
 \ That is beyond all positions,
 \ The state of awareness and the expanse inseparable,
 \ Is held to be without any expression or indication of "this"
 \ or "that."
 \
 \ However, unlike the "thoughtless agent," (i.e. Hashang's ?)
 \ It is not something that cannot be known by anyone,
 \ Because the Dharma lamp of certainty
 \ Is the consummate gnosis attained subsequent
 \ To the individually cognized gnosis induced
 \ By the analysis of stainless reasoning,
 \ What appears directly to those [yogis] who
 \ Are free of the darkness of doubt.

¢(i.e. And this ultimate direct vision beyond all is not complete nothingness, not complete rejection of everything. The result is not a Buddha that does not think, talk, act, or teach, etc. That would be nihilism. It is the realization of the complete purification of our body, speech and mind. It is the realization of our own Buddha-nature, the inseparable tri kayas, with the five wisdoms, and the Buddha deeds.)

As explained above, "beyond all positions" means the claim that the unfabricated ultimate reality of the expanse and awareness inseparable is without the superimposition of existence upon what is non-existent, and the denigration of non-existence where something exists, and that there is no indication of "this" through signs, words, or concepts, nor any verbal expression.

The Ornament of the Perfection of Wisdom says:

- ~ The path of meditation is profound,
- ~ And profundity is explained as emptiness.
- ~ That profundity is liberated from the extremes
- ~ Of superimposition and denigration.

Although that is the case, it is not the same as saying that there is nobody who realizes anything, like the non-Buddhist theory of a "thoughtless actor." The yogi has to make it manifest in equipoise. That means that it is seen directly through the self-cognizant pristine awareness that is produced by the rational analysis of stainless validating cognition that analyzes the two truths. Not only that, a person for whom it becomes manifest in that way has modes of reasoning—such as this treatise, which is a Dharma beacon of the certainty of subsequently attained gnosis—that can dispel the darkness of doubt about extremely profound subjects for those disciples on this excellent path of perfect reason, by

means of inferential reasoning and direct perception.

L9: [7.2.4.4.1.2 The differences in both analytical wisdom and skillful means]

\ ###
\ 7.2.4.4.1.2
\ In the sutra path, both method and wisdom
\ Are considered in light of each other,
\ But here both method and wisdom
\ Are realized and cultivated inseparably.

¢(i.e. Like in the sutra path Shamatha and Vipashyana are practiced alternatively. But here, with the Great Perfection, Mahamudra or Dzogchen, the practice consists of the Union of Shamatha and Vipashyana. The method and wisdom are perfectly united. The two kayas are produced inseparably.)

The different ways of entering through skillful means and wisdom on the path: In the sutra path... Although the object seen, the dharmadhatu, has no divisions, there are various ways of entering it. On the sutric path, the apparent aspect of method such as compassion and the emptiness aspect of the analytical wisdom of selflessness are engaged by a mind that differentiates them each with respect to the other, though it is not the case that they are newly mixed together or superimposed upon one another.

Nagarjuna says:

~ Emptiness, which has the nature of compassion,
~ Is the attainment of enlightenment.

Accordingly, on this Vajrayana path, the great bliss of method, which has the nature of compassion, and the emptiness of analytical wisdom, which is endowed with all characteristics, are primordially inseparable, and are realized by the view of the basic expanse of reality, the dharmadhatu, and habituated by being cultivated in meditation; they are not newly combined together.

The Great Omniscient One said:

~ The causal vehicles claim that like a seed and sprout,
~ Method and wisdom produce the two kayas.
~ The result vehicles posit types of conditions
~ That dispel the two bodies' obscurations.
~ Method relies upon the path of immeasurable compassion.
~ In fact they are one, for emptiness has the nature of compassion.
~ Thus, one practices by harmonizing cause and effect.

L8: [7.2.4.4.2 Differences in the manner of ascertaining the basis:]

L9: [7.2.4.4.2.1 The dharmadhatu free of elaborations is the unique object]

\ ###
\ 7.2.4.4.2.1
\ Both the Great Madhyamaka of coalescence and
\ The Great Perfection of luminosity
\ Have the same meaning, and their names are synonymous.
\ There is no view higher than that,

¢(i.e. The object of meditation of Dzogchen or Mahamudra is the dharmadhatu, which has many

names)

Therefore, the great Madhyamaka that is free of all elaborations of the four extremes and the luminous Great Perfection of the vast expanse free of extremes are both identical with respect to their object, the dharmadhatu that is the coalescence of appearance and emptiness, but with respect to mere names, they are different. Insofar as they realize such an abiding reality, there is no view higher [than them]. Except for the speed with which they realize the primordially pure abiding reality free of elaborations, they are similar.

L9: [7.2.4.4.2.2 Differences in the analytical wisdom that meditates upon it—whether it has an intentional apprehension or not]

- \ ###
- \ 7.2.4.4.2.2
- \ For anything other than the absence of the elaborations
- \ Of the four extremes—which is the non-apprehension
- \ Of appearance and emptiness alternately—
- \ Is nothing but some sort of elaboration.

¢(i.e. It is the perfect equanimity, free of all extremes.)

Why doesn't one need a view higher than that? Because it is free of elaborations of the four extremes, and is without the intentional apprehension that apprehends appearance and emptiness alternately, and because, were it otherwise, it would have elaborations.

Sakya Pandita said:

- ~ If there were a view higher
- ~ Than the non-elaboration of the perfection [of wisdom],
- ~ It would be a view with elaboration.
- ~ If it were without elaboration, there would be no difference.

L9: [7.2.4.4.2.3 In the view that ascertains that, the difference between the expanse and direct or inferential [valid cognition]]

- \ ###
- \ 7.2.4.4.2.3
- \ However, the meaning of coalescence in the sutra system
- \ Is ascertained through analysis;
- \ In mantra, it is established through directly experiencing
- \ The expanse of intrinsic awareness.

¢(i.e. The difference between the sutra and tantra systems.)

Third, the difference in the speed with which the basis is ascertained: However... Although the dharmadhatu is the unique object [of all these systems] as mentioned before, nonetheless that very meaning—the coalescence of appearance and emptiness—of the vehicle of philosophical dialectics is principally based upon the practice of analytical meditation, which ascertains through an inferential valid cognition that analyzes in dependence upon an authentic reason. Thus, analytical meditation is most important [here]. In the pinnacle of the Vajra Vehicle, the tradition of mantras, without wavering from the dharmadhatu, one directly practices with one's own awareness, and establishes [the nature of reality] from within that state.

As it is said:

~ With few hardships, great meaning, and infinite methods, Its pith instructions are easy to practice but hard to fathom.

Therefore, the stages of the different vehicles are progressively more profound and sublime. For that reason, the abiding character of reality that is equanimity is extremely esoteric, and is only partially understood in dependence upon mere scripture. The ascertainment through valid inferential cognition, or being able to experience the object through direct valid cognition, etc., are characteristic of the differences among disciples and vehicles.

L8: [7.2.4.4.3 A summary:]

L9: [7.2.4.4.3.1 How to show that those stages of the various vehicles have different subjective views]

L10: [7.2.4.4.3.1.1 Understanding the views of sutra and tantra by explaining the difference between the great and small Madhyamakas to be that of mind and gnosis]

\ ###
\ 7.2.4.4.3.1.1
\ Therefore, "Madhyamaka" refers to the
\ Path Madhyamaka of analytical wisdom that
\ Investigates each of the two realities,
\ And the single savor of the two realities induced by it,
\ Which is the Result Madhyamaka of coalescence.

¢(i.e. The causal and resultant Madhyamaka)

For the reason explained above, "Madhyamaka" means, in the context of an outstanding wisdom that analyzes the two truths individually, without mixing them into one taste, the causal or path Madhyamaka. And the certainty in the expanse of the equality of coalescence where appearance and emptiness and the two truths are of one taste, which the [former] Madhyamaka induces, is the fruitional Madhyamaka. Those two have an invariable relation of cause and effect, and the views of sutra and tantra are also like that. Therefore, if one comprehends the equality state of the causal vehicle of the sutras, one will be able to realize the utter purity of all dharmas that is non-different from that.

On that, the Great Omniscient One said:

~ Moreover, the way in which beginningless virtue, like a seed,
~ Is primordially present without being produced, is stated in the sutras.
~ That, and the assertion that the adventitious obscurations of the
~ Three primordially present Buddha kayas is purified, is the same in mantra.
~ In brief, the identity of the sutric and tantric paths
~ Is explained exoterically and esoterically by the learned and accomplished.

L10: [7.2.4.4.3.1.2 Praising the state of gnosis with the word "great."]

\ ###
\ 7.2.4.4.3.1.2
\ With respect to the causal and resultant views of sutra
\ and mantra,
\ The former is the aspect of analytical wisdom,
\ And the latter is just gnosis.
\ Therefore, this latter is praised
\ With the word "great."

¢(i.e. The causal and resultant Madhyamaka)

Moreover, of the two Madhyamakas, the former is the aspect of analytical wisdom, and for that very reason the former is small and the latter is specially praised with the word "great." The term "Great Perfection" is thus lauded for the same reason. If by inferring that very gnosis and making it the path, it is praised with the word "great," why shouldn't the vehicle that actually uses it as the path also be praised with the word "great"? It should be extremely praiseworthy in that respect.

L9: [7.2.4.4.3.2 Likewise, though its name is the same, the object also has a different meaning understood in accordance with different contexts]

\ ###
\ 7.2.4.4.3.2
\ As for the "the way things are":
\ There is the way things are as the emptiness of entities,
\ And the way things are as the inseparability of the two truths.
\ The term is the same in both cases, but in fact
\ The difference is like the earth and sky.
\ Accordingly, the terms "nature of things," "expanse
\ of reality,"
\ "Emptiness," "non-elaboration," "limit of cessation,"
\ "Ultimate," and so forth, function similarly in different
\ contexts,
\ But their difference—in terms of final or partial significance—
\ Is great, so one must explain them in context,
\ Like the word sendhapa.

¢(i.e. So when we talk about the real nature of everything, this should be put into a context. It has a different meaning depending on the stage. And all of these synonyms are merely pointing at the moon.)

Moreover, the object that is engaged by the term and convention of "reality" (gnas lugs) is above called "great" and "small" in relation to its aspects of analytical wisdom and gnosis. Likewise, the reality of emptiness with respect to substantial entities, and the reality of the inseparable two truths that is emptiness with respect to both substantial and non-substantial entities, are both called "abiding reality." But, in fact, in terms of one-sidedly cutting off true existence, or cutting off all elaborations of the four extremes, and with respect to differences in equipoise and aftermath, etc., they are like the earth and the sky. Likewise, "dharmata," "dharmadhatu," "sunyata," "non-elaboration," "ultimate cessation," and "ultimate truth," etc., are similarly [used in different systems], but since they are very different in being greater [or lesser] in being either final or partial, having discriminated the various contexts [in which they are employed], without confusing them, one should unerringly explain them according to their distinct meanings. It is like the word "sendhapa"; in [the context of land] travel, it means "mount," and in traveling by water, it means "boat," etc.

I say:

- ~ Propped up on a pillow, truthless but conventionally existent,
- ~ Those self-proclaimed "Madhyamikas" would sleep in peace!
- ~ That rather unfortunate misery of extremism—

- ~ A bogus "freedom from extremes"—
- ~ Is cured by this medicine for obstinate slumber?

L1: [9.8. Conclusion]

L2: [0.3 Thirdly, the final virtue, knowing well the complete and perfect conclusion:]

L3: [0.3.1 The reason why the interlocutor should be humbled and awed at the extensive explanation]

L4: [0.3.1.1 The way the interlocutor generates humility]

\ ###
 \ 0.3.1.1
 \ Thus, when the seven profound questions
 \ Were explained with profound, vast, meaningful words,
 \ The questioner said, with great respect:

Thus, according to the meaning of the text explained above, in response to the seven questions about the profound meaning that is difficult to realize, he has explained in accordance with the path of perfect reasoning, with good words, those good meanings that are extremely vast and profound, without delusion or straying [from the point]. At that time, the interlocutor, with a humble mind, said the following:

L4: [0.3.1.2 The destruction of his arrogance]

\ ###
 \ 0.3.1.2
 \ "Alas! Like a frog at the bottom of a well,
 \ Having not seen the depths
 \ Of the Dharma ocean of other textual traditions,
 \ And having tasted only the flavor of the well
 \ Of our own arrogant view, our pride is crushed
 \ By these words of yours!
 \ In the great ocean of sublime spirituality,

¢(i.e. Jumping from one well to another one, even if bigger, is not seeing the ocean, or going to the moon. It is still just a story. But it seems to be a useful story ...)

Kye ma means "with regret" or "alas!": "Alas! Like the fabled frog who lived in a small well, we wandering intellectuals are surrounded by a vast ocean of other traditions' textual corpora—the sutras, tantras, and their interpretive commentaries—but we have not seen their subtle points by means of valid cognition. Stuck in the well of our own opinions, we have only experienced the taste of our own arrogance, which has been completely eradicated by this eloquent discourse!"

L3: [0.3.2 Joyfully praising the undertaking and explanation of the profound and extensive meaning]

L4: [0.3.2.1 The greatness of the teaching and lineage holders of Padmasambhava]

L5: [0.3.2.1.1 Although the author has not simply repeated the words of others, Rong zom's and Klong chen pa's tradition is like a treasure-house of jewels]

\ ###
 \ 0.3.2.1.1
 \ The ecstatic dance of Manjusri,
 \ Known as "Rong zom" and "Klong chen pa,"
 \ Is an ocean of the sublime enlightened mind,
 \ Which possesses many and sundry bejeweled Dharma treasures.
 \ Those who abandon them and hanker after
 \ The trinkets of other systems are surely deceived!

The omniscient ones, Rong zom and Klong chen pa, indisputably reached the goal of learning and accomplishment in maintaining the philosophical system of the authentic tradition of the Early Translation school of the early Indian mahapanditas, Padmasambhava, Vimalamitra, Santaraksita, and so forth. The white umbrella of their fame encompasses the triple world. Together with their spiritual sons, who embody the gnosis of the victors and sport the joyous dance of Manjusrivadasimha, like a great ocean, their wisdom minds see everything that is, just as it is. These persons, who have the nature of utmost sublimity, have mastered the inconceivable Dharma treasury of jewels, which contains the various profound and extensive Dharmas, and with many elegant explanations, they make them radiate with brilliance. The key for opening this [treasury] of things that can be known is this elegant explanation of the lama Manjusri, and if one should abandon this opportunity to enjoy that wealth [of Dharma], and instead place one's hope only in the trinket tradition that offers the "realization" of vast and extensive words, such a person who just repeats the ideas of others is without realization, and deluded.

Thus, the All-Powerful Great Fifth [Dalai Lama] composed a praise:

- ~ The explanation of emptiness by pretentious scholars
- ~ Who hope to find Buddhahood somewhere else,
- ~ Is like placing a ransom [glud] in the north
- ~ For a ghost in the eastern direction.
- ~ The distinctive Dharma of the great secret Nyingmapa
- ~ Is that, when one sees [reality], the defiled body dissolves into light.

L5: [0.3.2.1.2 Therefore, by taking up those important points of the good Dharma of the Nyingmapas on the path of reasoning and explaining them properly, confidence is gained]

\ ###
 \ 0.3.2.1.2
 \ Those who have the discerning intellect
 \ Born of the analysis of the excellent Dharma (chos bzang)
 \ Are never obstructed by demons.
 \ As this great lion's roar of the path of reasoning
 \ Is proclaimed, will they not find confidence in
 \ This outstanding tradition of the Lake-born's teaching?

Therefore, the consummate abode of words and meanings is the glorious Dharma.

As it is said:

- ~ The Dharmas of enlightenment, which is naturally endowed with good qualities,
- ~ Are all consummated in the Great Perfection.
- ~ It is the reliquary of the dharmakaya of all Buddhas.
- ~ As a field of merit, nothing is better than this.

Accordingly, those whose minds have attained a firm certainty through rational analysis of the provisional and definitive, as well as the apparent and actual aspects [of reality] through that Dharma and the doctrine of the Early Translation school in general, [such as] the sutras and tantras with their interpretive commentaries, at all times and places are always blessed with freedom from obstructing demons and philosophical antagonists. For that reason, by proclaiming the lion's roar of an authentic path of reason such as this one, which is victorious in all directions, one will gain irrevocable confidence in the supreme good qualities of the extraordinary Dharma of our own system, the Early Translation school of the second Buddha, Padmasambhava, which is supreme amongst all.

L5: [0.3.2.1.3 Moreover, in dependence upon this path of reasoning, one can prove and refute with explanation and debate]

\ ###
\ 0.3.2.1.3
\ Please grant us the opportunity to firmly grasp
\ The handle of wisdom's sword, which cannot be stolen away
\ By the refutations of arrogant extremism!

Moreover, by simply following the words of others and being motivated by rigid arrogance and extreme views of existence and non-existence, without investigating reality, some foam at the mouth as they refute others and prove themselves right. But please bestow on those other disciples the fortunate opportunity to grasp the handle of this sword of discriminating analytical wisdom, which cannot be revoked by any demon or disputant!

L5: [0.3.2.1.4 Therefore, it is reasonable to rely upon this kind of Dharma, which is the supreme jewel of the profound meaning that dispels ignorance]

\ ###
\ 0.3.2.1.4
\ The profound meaning that is found in the
\ Nectar ocean of Dharma learning
\ Is like a jewel that should be taken, wherever it happens to be;
\ One should not just follow the external behavior of
\ another person.

Listening to the ways of the holy Dharma that is not deluded with respect to all the vast and profound textual traditions causes the faithless to conceive faith, and is said to be like nectar for the ears. It is like an ocean of nectar that expands the pristine realm that is free of suffering. To see and realize the domain of the gnosis of definitive meaning is like finding a wish-fulfilling jewel that dispels sickness. Since one can attain the good qualities of abandonment and the gnosis of realization, it is like a gem. Whatever philosophical system or person such a profound and vast meaning may abide in should be accepted with the three kinds of wisdom. Since one should rely not on the person but on the Dharma, one should not simply follow after a person who appears to be good.

L4: [0.3.2.2 This treatise's praise for the holders of that [lineage]]

L5: [0.3.2.2.1 Whoever is able to hold an authentic Dharma teaching like this receives the name of "bodhisattva"]

\ ###
\ 0.3.2.2.1

\ It's not enough to receive a lot of teachings and talk about them,
 \ For though one seems talented and well trained, one's analysis cannot get this
 profound point, like a buried treasure.
 \ But whoever does get it should be known as a spiritual genius.

Even if one has studied many textual traditions with others and proclaims various and sundry syncretisms and speculations regarding one's own and other traditions, this misses the point. Though one's talent and expertise seem quite profound, one analyzes in dependence upon spurious scriptural references, and does not get the point. This extremely profound meaning is like a treasure buried in the ground; whoever gets it, however they appear— good or bad—should be known as a spiritual genius (blo ldan), an actual bodhisattva.

L5: [0.3.2.2.2 Because the meaning of the Dharma, like a treasury of gems, is attained, how to study and contemplate common and uncommon subjects]

\ ###
 \ 0.3.2.2.2
 \ As if it were a jewel-encrusted vessel
 \ For a hundred thousand spiritual treasures,
 \ My mind realized that it was time
 \ To accept the beneficence of instructions
 \ Accomplished in the great ocean of profundity and vastness,
 \ And I joyfully drank the ocean of the glorious King of Nagas.

The vessel in whom this [teaching] is contained is like a hundred-thousand-gem treasure of intellect and eloquence that realizes the extremely profound meaning of the pith instructions. "In order to accomplish the great ocean of profound and vast [teachings], when I, the author of the text, recognized the appropriate time for undertaking practical instructions of the vidyadhara lineage and the well-written texts of scholars and siddhas, just as the Naga king Sri joyfully dove into the ocean, I poured all the textual traditions of scriptures and interpretive commentaries down the throat of hearing, reflection, and meditation." Not only that, he also implores others to drink.

L5: [0.3.2.2.3 This elegant explanation is not something made up, but is the oral tradition of the vidyadhara lineage]

\ ###
 \ 0.3.2.2.3
 \ Having definitely realized the vast extent of the analytical mind
 \ By the river of eloquent explanations that descend from him,
 \ One should realize that the source of these explanations
 \ Is the oral tradition of the vidyadhara lineage,
 \ Which is like the Lord of Nagas himself.

Whence springs this very text, which is like a great river of elegant explanations? The author of this text certainly realized the analytical intellect that is as broad as the ocean and vast as the sky. The origin of that mind should be understood to be the oral tradition, as vast as the ocean of the Naga king, of the lineages of the Buddhas and bodhisattvas of India and Tibet, the panditas and siddhas, as well as the vidyadharas, beginning with dGa' rab rDo rje, down to Rong zom and Klong chen pa, and so forth.

L3: [0.3.3 Once again to summarize the meaning and give advice:]

L4: [0.3.3.1 An exhortation to be a vessel containing meaning that condenses the quintessence of vastness]

\ ###
\ 0.3.3.1
\ Please brighten the lamp of the amazing Dharma,
\ Which causes the mind to acquire great strength
\ By receiving the springtime nectar that benefits the heart,
\ The quintessence that is imbibed
\ All at once from the limits of space!"

Recalling all knowable phenomena that pervade the limits of space in one gulp, one ingests them as juice and they manifest as a pure essence abiding in one's heart. If one wants to inhale that utterly perfect juice of springtime nectar, which bestows happiness and benefit both temporary and final, one should quickly undertake to accomplish that intention by cultivating the great power of the three kinds of analytical wisdom in one's mind; this is the advice given. What fulfills and perfects that intention is the amazing beacon of the Dharma, so please give advice that makes that text most easily apparent.

L4: [0.3.3.2 The actual advice]

L5: [0.3.3.2.1 The way of giving advice with respect to the establishment of a profound and vast intellect]

\ ###
\ 0.3.3.2.1
\ When he had shown his respect with these words,
\ The sage advised him again,
\ Condensing the meaning of what he said before,
\ Which converts a shallow mind to a deep one:
\ "The lion's milk of the supreme Dharma
\ Is only contained by the vessel of a sound mind.
\ Though others may try, it won't stay in place.
\ A vessel that can hold it is like this:

When the mendicant with the staff who had suddenly appeared [earlier] said those words and bowed humbly, in order to establish the mendicant, who previously lacked a profound understanding, in profound and vast understanding, the sage summarized all the points made earlier, and gave them as advice in this way: This excellent juice of the supreme holy Dharma, like the milk of a lion, can only be held by an excellent container, such as a golden vessel. Otherwise, just as a clay vessel does not hold the milk of a lion even if one tries very hard to make it do so, it will not stay put. Therefore, the golden vessel for these profound meanings is "A," etc.

L4: [0.3.3.2.2 The actual meaning of that advice]

L5: [0.3.3.2.2.1 The six-syllable mantra, which is explained before, etc., is the entrance way for these [résumé of the seven answers]]

\ ###
\ 0.3.3.2.2.1
\ A is the door of unborn dharmas;
\ Ra is the door free of particles;
\ Pa is the door of the appearance of the ultimate;

- \ Tsa is the absence of death, transmigration, and birth;
- \ Na is the absence of names;
- \ Dhih is the door to profound intelligence.

What are those?

The letter "A" is the name for birthlessness. Since, without wavering from that emptiness that is an absolute negation of a thing, it appears as relativity, the entrance to the Dharma of birthlessness in terms of the two truths is shown by the first question as the meaning of the main practice, the coalescence of appearance and emptiness.

Ra means "free of dust," and thus the realization of equanimity, which is the door free of the dust of being afraid of existence, or being attached to thoughts of one's own benefit. It shows the profound, because it is not an object for sravakas and pratyekabuddhas. This indicates the profound, because in the second question it is shown not to be the domain of sravakas and pratyekabuddhas, etc.

Pa means that although the equipoise of ultimate reality has no grasping, it is not a thick darkness devoid of mindfulness and the light of special insight. From the perspective of that equipoise of ultimate reality, the entrance to appearance is addressed by the third question, and shows the meaning of how to meditate on coalescence.

Tsa is the extraordinary equipoise that is induced by analysis. It is unstained by non-understanding and misunderstanding and doubt, and is without fabricated mental activities of death, transmigration, and birth, which agitate like waves. How to preserve the natural abiding and flow of the equanimous dharmakaya is the subject of the fourth question, which shows how to generate that meditation in the mind.

Na means that neither of the two truths is more important than the other, because appearance and emptiness are inseparable. Even conventionally, they are of equal status, and both are objects of words and concepts. Ultimately, the abiding reality of their inseparability is beyond the path of words and concepts; that namelessness itself is inconceivable and inexpressible, to be discerned by individual cognition alone. This indicates the subject of the fifth question, which shows how the two truths arise from the perspective of generating realization of the profound in one's mind.

Dhih ascertains such a profound meaning on the basis of a subject such as an atom. To know the equality of all dharmas, one investigates the basis of appearances that are compatible or incompatible. Having adduced examples there, there is a way in which there is no position in the equanimity of ultimate reality free of elaborations, and there is a way in which there is a position conventionally. Having joined them together without contradiction, there are [two ways] of understanding them, [namely] the way of limited intellectual perception, and in the systems of Prajnaparamita up through mantra, there is [the way of understanding] just how things are. This [latter] is the way of profound intellect, the sixth question.

The seventh question concerns how one is to advise others about the profound view, according to one's own realization of the equality of all dharmas.

Thus all seven questions comprehend the crucial points of all systems, which are like the precious lifeblood of the profound and vast philosophical systems of the sutras and tantras, so one automatically generates certainty in all Dharmas.

L5: [0.3.3.2.2.2 Those ways are accomplished in dependence upon the yogas of calm abiding

and special insight [the Union of Shamatha and Vipashyana]]

L6: [0.3.3.2.2.2.1 By practicing in that way, the individually realized analytical wisdom blazes]

\ ###
\ 0.3.3.2.2.2.1
\ If one focuses on all of these six doors
\ In the manner of the two truths
\ And accomplishes the samadhi of illusion,
\ With one gulp, one will be able to stomach
\ The water of the great infinite ocean of phenomena,
\ And in the stainless gem of one's heart,
\ The dharani of spiritual brilliance will blaze with glory.

Thus, by focusing on each syllable of the six doors of the dharani according to the two truths, one generates certainty. It is indisputably and infallibly the case that one develops clear understanding of these dharmas, such as birthlessness, by these [syllables] A, etc., which express them. But if one analyzes with respect to ultimate truth, both the expression A, etc., and the expressed, "birthlessness" and so forth, are not produced on the basis of expression. Thus, equanimity does not have anything to express in the state of equanimity, like space drawing a picture in space.

Likewise, if one analyzes the other five syllables, Ra and so forth, the expressions with their expressed [meanings], and any other names that arise from the combination of letters, there is no expression or expressed [meaning] established [in reality]. Accordingly, one generates the certainty that expression per se is "amazing." Therefore, since all dharmas are just expressed through names, even if one expresses them for eons, the dharmadhatu is not exhausted or increased. To dwell in the equanimity of this [dharmadhatu] is to focus in the manner of ultimate reality.

Moreover, as for the way of entering conventionally: as one does not waver from equanimity, one understands the dharmas that have their birthplaces in these five syllables, such as A, and all other afflicted and purified dharmas that are just infallible relativity. This is an unrivaled, wondrous miracle. Because existence and peace appear, wisdom, like an eye, pervades existence everywhere and manifests all kinds of displays. This understanding depends upon a conventional mode of analysis.

If one thus accomplishes the eyes of analytical wisdom that analyze the two truths, then in dependence upon the skillful means of mantra, one quickly accomplishes all of one's goals. Therefore, if one practices with illusion-like samadhi on the coalescence of the two truths, one will accomplish the eloquence dharani through the emanation and retrieval of lights from the mantra at the heart of oneself visualized clearly as a deity. The qualities of that are as follows:

One will be able to take into one's stomach in a gulp, with the force of one's analytical mind, all knowable objects, like the water of the great ocean; the jewel of one's heart [that can do that] is the hero Manjusri, the radiance of whose wisdom is stainless. In that state, the dharani of total recall, the treasures of brilliance, and the noble intellect of discrimination blaze gloriously.

As it is said:

~ The dharmakaya-terton of the effulgence of awareness

- ~ Has taken out this treasure from the expanse of wisdom.
- ~ It is not like [treasures that are] the essence of earth and stone.

L6: [0.3.3.2.2.2.2 Its result is consummation in the non-conceptual state of the perfectly pure Manjusri]

\ ###
 \ 0.3.3.2.2.2.2
 \ By the path of certainty that eliminates
 \ The elaborations of four extremes,
 \ May we abide in the expanse of fundamental luminosity
 \ Beyond mind that reaches the original state,
 \ The state of the Great Perfection Manjusri.

The nature of those syllables is the effulgence of one's own mind, which appears everywhere unobstructedly, because it is the original emptiness that is inseparable awareness and emptiness. In that state, the fundamental expanse, which is free of center and extremes, the luminosity beyond mind, which is the abiding reality reached by means of the path of certainty in the equanimity that is free of the four extremes of elaboration, and which is the coalescence of the two truths, is the Great Perfection—Manjusri. To abide in that state is the supreme dharani entrance to the inseparability of the two truths.

L6: [0.3.3.2.2.2.3 Having abandoned obscuring stains through that, one attains eloquence with respect to the ultimate meaning]

\ ###
 \ 0.3.3.2.2.2.3
 \ Having seen the real meaning of remaining in the equanimity of
 \ The vast expanse of the regal view without extremes,
 \ All the darkness of the crude mind of the four extremes
 \ Will naturally disappear as the sun of luminosity rises."

Thus, by equipoise in the vast expanse of the king of views, free of extremes, one sees the true meaning. Because of that, one does not need to make efforts to eliminate the darkness of the low-mindedness of intentional apprehension of the four extremes—namely, nescience in general or philosophical superimpositions in particular. Instead, the unobstructed effulgence of the sun of the self-luminous wisdom of luminosity, which knows everything just as it is, eliminates them automatically.

L3: [0.3.4 Stating the meaning of the treatise, including both questions and answers]

L4: [0.3.4.1 Including both questions and answers, the way of composing the crucial points of scripture]

\ ###
 \ 0.3.4.1
 \ Thus, the questions asked by that wanderer
 \ Were explained in the number corresponding to
 \ The [seven] accoutrements of royalty.

This great sage analyzes in an honest and upstanding way; sudden, adventitious thoughts are the mendicant. By means of the questions posed by the mendicant to that sage, these seven questions, equal in number to the accoutrements of royalty, were explained.

The Uttarat Tantra says:

- ~ Someone who only refers to the teaching of
- ~ Buddha and unwaveringly practices it
- ~ Is on the way to attaining liberation.
- ~ By the sage's command, I revere that one on crown of my head.

L4: [0.3.4.2 Having cast away arrogance, the presence of profound and extensive meaning in this treatise]

\ ###
\ 0.3.4.2
\ Thus, a feeble-minded intellectual like myself
\ Has received this extremely profound and abstruse meaning
\ From the heart of sublime great-minded beings
\ And presented it here.

Having cast away arrogance, a feeble-minded (blo chung) intellectual like myself has taken from the mind treasury of sublime, great-minded beings these profound and abstruse subjects—the topics that are difficult to understand, namely the profound exposition of ultimate reality and the extensive exposition of deceptive reality—and composed this text accordingly. For example, it is like the wish-fulfilling tree of the gods taking root in the world of humans.

L4: [0.3.4.3 Differentiating joyfully the meaningful speech that posed questions in that way]

\ ###
\ 0.3.4.3
\ This elegant explanation like a shower of Dharma
\ Is the path trodden by millions of bodhisattvas;
\ By listening joyfully, hoping to attain the great goal,
\ And by inquiring, the joyous opportunity for blessing has
\ appeared.

This excellent gentle shower of Dharma, the elegant explanation spoken above, is the only path trodden by millions of previous bodhisattvas. And by listening to the words with pleasure and enthusiasm and thinking about the meaning, all beings who become disciples in the future, by thinking about the attainment of the great temporary and final purposes, will rejoice in these questions, and open the door to this opportunity for receiving the nectar of the holy Dharma.

L4: [0.3.4.4 Stating the colophon, which is made for the sake of those with profound and extensive minds]

\ ###
\ 0.3.4.4
\ Therefore, I have considered these profound
\ And vast subjects again and again,
\ And just as they arose in the face of the mind's mirror,
\ The Dhih-named one arranged them playfully.

Therefore, as there is a great meaning involved, for the benefit of many disciples who think about the profound and vast meaning again and again as explained in this way, the Dhih-named

one has playfully written and arranged all the profound and vast meanings of the scriptures and commentaries, just as they arose in the lucid surface of his mirror-mind, which is free from any stain of confusion.

L4: [0.3.4.5 In dependence upon this, finding the excellent path of the supreme vehicle]

\ ###
\ 0.3.4.5
\ The profound way of the Buddha-dharma, like the limit
\ of space,
\ Cannot be put into words entirely,
\ But if you rely on this Beacon of Certainty,
\ You can discover the amazing path of the supreme vehicle.
\ .
\ Mangalam

The profound Dharma of the Sugata cannot in any way be expressed, just as space cannot be measured. But relying upon the light of this Beacon of Certainty and abiding in it through study, reflection, and meditation, one will find the excellent supreme path and be able to gradually comprehend all the Dharmas of the Sugata.

Mangalam!

After the syllable Dhih the author's colophon reads,

\ ###
\ "When I was very young and had just begun my studies, this text, the Beacon of Certainty, was written just as it came to mind. Looking at them now, some of the words seem a bit awkward, but since they are not contradictory and since there are important points to be understood here, I have not changed them but left them as is. Thus, this was spoken by Mipham at age seven."

I say:

~ Wishing to see the palace of Rang zom and Klong chen pa, which is filled with the jewels of eloquent explanations,
~ If one upholds this jeweled beacon with one's innate and acquired intellect,
~ One will have the good fortune to enjoy this profound and extensive treasure;
~ But others, alas, see only a fragment of it, and intend to possess it without aspiration?
~ The royal banner of the teaching of the early translations, possessed of six superiorities,
~ Is festooned with supreme divine ornaments, the scriptural knowledge and reasoning of the lion of philosophers.
~ Beautifully adorned, it flies high in the heavens of Tibetan philosophy;
~ With this beacon of brilliance held aloft, one should be able to see it perfectly.
~ By searching with the floodlight of this excellent text,
~ The sharp reasoning of its elegant explanations is unsheathed, like a sword.
~ Grasping its handle by means of this commentary, one can embark on its study,
~ And cut off one's doubts about the peerless, secret profundity.
~ The teachings of Rang zom and Klong chen pa, ornaments of the essence
~ Of the Buddha's teaching, were clarified by the reasoning of Ajita.
~ May we uphold the system of these peerless lords of scholarship,

- ~ Through study, reflection, and meditation!
- ~ Without a second thought you overwhelmed the arrogance
- ~ Of a thousand elephants of wicked disputation,
- ~ With the roaring laughter of a philosopher-lion.
- ~ May you prevail, Mipham Victorious in all Directions
- ~ May intellectuals, with their dry words and willful misinterpretations,
- ~ Confess their faults with heartfelt regret.
- ~ May the brilliant white moon of fresh merit
- ~ Cause the Buddha's teaching to spread and increase,
- ~ And may the holders of the teaching remain among us.
- ~ May all sentient beings with a connection to me
- ~ Be blessed with happiness and follow the teachings,
- ~ Find bodies of miraculous rebirth in pure realms,
- ~ And finally reach perfect Buddhahood.

Some time ago, since there were others whose interest in this text was similar to my own, I wrote a little bit about it. At that time, [Zhe chen rgyal tshab] 'Gyur med Padma rnam rgyal—the lord of the lineage possessing the three forms of kindness of the all-compassionate protector Zhe chen kong sprul—requested that I write a short commentary, so, to the best of my ability, I wrote an outline. Later, the one whose life epitomizes the liberation of a learned, ethical, and noble person, 'Jam dbyangs mkhyen brtse Chos kyi blo gros, proofread it and asked that I write a commentary based upon it. With a white scarf, a silver coin, and, in particular, the implements of method and wisdom—a vajra and bell—plus paper to write on, his command fell on my head. Someone who should be embarrassed even to take the dust of their feet on the crown of his head—who is known as the nephew of the lord of siddhas, 'Gyur med mtha' yas, and of the lord of scholars, Tshul khrims rgya mtsho—the Buddhist monk 'Jam dpal rdo rje was assisted by the scribe Khri dpon mkhan po Blo gros rab gsal. Virtue!

[End]