

A Study and Translation of Atiśa's *Madhyamakopadéśa* with Indian and Tibetan Commentaries

James B. APPLE

Introduction

Dīpaṃkaraśrījñāna (982–1054 c.e.), also known under his honorific title of Atiśa,¹ is famous for coming to Tibet and revitalizing Buddhism there during the early eleventh century. Atiśa was a charismatic teacher and translator who, during his thirteen years in Tibet (1042–54 c.e.), influenced Tibetans to rethink the integration of mainstream and Mahāyāna Buddhist principles with the practices of secret mantra or Vajrayāna.

This article examines, and furnishes translations for, the *Madhyamakopadéśa* (“Special Instructions of the Middle Way”) of Atiśa, along with an Indian commentary by Prajñāmukti (Tib. Shes rab thar pa), the *Madhyamakopadeśavṛtti*, and a more extensive Tibetan commentary by an anonymous bKa’-gdams-pa (hereafter, Kadampa) author entitled *Collection on the Two Realities* (*bden gnyis kyi ’bum*). The *Madhyamakopadeśavṛtti* is translated in its entirety for the first time in English², while the *Collection on the Two Realities* is identified for the first time as a commentary on Atiśa’s *Madhyamakopadéśa*, as well as being an initial English translation. These three texts provide an important case study in the Madhyamaka (“Middle Way Philosophy”) of India and Tibet during the early eleventh to twelfth century. Although all three texts were composed in Tibet (see below), the base text by Atiśa and the brief commentary (*vṛtti*) by Prajñāmukti were written by Indian authors initially in Sanskrit, while the *Collection on the Two Realities* is by a Tibetan author. The texts demonstrate the distinctions between how an Indian Buddhist authored text was commented upon by an

¹ As noted by Eimer (1982:47n1) and Sopa (2001: 24n2), the form Atiśa is derived from the Sanskrit *atiśaya*, “eminent, superior” (Tib. *phul (du) byung (ba)*) rather than Sanskrit *ati + īśa*, “the great Lord” which is not permitted by the rules of Sanskrit grammar. Tibetans often refer to Atiśa as *jo bo*, “(The) Lord.”

² Tibetan critical editions of the *Madhyamakopadéśa* and *Madhyamakopadeśavṛtti*, along with annotated Japanese translations, may be found in Mochizuki 2002.

Indian commentator such as Prajñāmukti, who was a contemporary of Atiśa, and a later Tibetan commentator who belonged to the early twelfth-century lineage of Kadampa followers of Atiśa. In brief, Prajñāmukti is concise and to the point, providing the reader explanatory glosses on most of the words and phrases found in Atiśa’s basic text. The anonymous Kadampa commentator, on the other hand, provides extended explanations to unpack the overall doctrinal meaning of Atiśa’s text. The anonymous Tibetan author cites a number of well-known Kadampa figures with idiomatic Tibetan expressions in addition to his references of Indian Buddhist authors and *sūtras*.

The *Madhyamakopadeśa* is a brief text on the practice of Madhyamaka in meditation. The term *upadeśa* “special instructions” in the title of Atiśa’s basic text is a term that has a long history in Indian Buddhism with different connotations over the centuries. As Étienne Lamotte has remarked in his study of the *Mahāprajñāpāramitāsāstra* (Vol. 3, 1970:vii-viii), *upadeśa* is the name of the twelfth and last member of the “twelve-membered” word of the Buddha (*dvādaśāṅgabuddhavacana*) and generally signifies “instruction” or “teaching.” A number of scholastic Indian Buddhist texts preserved in the Chinese Tripiṭaka have *upadeśa* in their title, such as the *upadeśas* on the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* (T 1519, 1520), attributed to Vasubandhu. The Tibetan Tanjur has dozens of texts containing *upadeśa* in their titles. Atiśa authored and translated several texts with *upadeśa* in the title, such as the *Sūtrārthasamuccayopadeśa* (*Mdo’i sde’i don kun las btus pa’i man ngag*, Tōh. no. 3957) and the *Ekasmṛtyupadeśa* (*Dran pa gcig pa’i man ngag*, Tōh. no. 3928). The term *upadeśa* translated into Tibetan as either *gdams ngag* or *man ngag* generally means, as Kapstein (1996: 275) notes, “the immediate, heartfelt instructions and admonitions of master to disciple concerning directly liberative insight and practice.” The *Madhyamakopadeśa* is therefore special guidance or instructions concerning the practice of Middle Way philosophy. Several different lineages of this type of instruction and practice on Madhyamaka were brought into Tibet. Atiśa’s lineage of the *Madhyamakopadeśa* was commented upon at least up until the 13th century as Skyo-ston smon-lam tshul-khrims (1219-1299) wrote a brief text on this topic entitled *Explanation of Lord [Atiśa’s] Middle Way Special Instructions* (*jo bo rje’i dbu ma’i man ngag gi bshad pa*). Another lineage of similar instructions, *Guidance on the Great Middle Way* (*dbu ma chen po’i khrid*), was brought into Tibet by Zla-ba rgyal-mtshan (12th century) (Kapstein

1996:282). mChims nam-mkha' grags (1210-1285), a Kadampa author, also wrote a commentary on this lineage of instruction entitled *Guidance on the Middle Way* (*dbu ma'i khrid*), different than Atiśa's lineage. Other lineages of Middle Way practice instructions also existed in Tibet and this genre of Middle Way instructions influenced later Tibetans scholars such as Red-mda'-ba gzhon-nu blo-gros (1349-1412) and Tsong-kha-pa blo-gzang grags-pa (1357-1419) who composed their own Middle Way guidance instructions (*dbu ma'i khrid*). The historical relations between these lineages are a topic for future research. For now, Atiśa's *Madhyamakopadéśa* and its earliest known Indian and Tibetan commentaries are the focus. In the following sections, I introduce, contextualize, and translate each of these texts.

Atiśa's *Madhyamakopadéśa*

The *Madhyamakopadéśa*, “Special Instructions of the Middle Way,” along with the *Satyadvayāvātāra*, “Entry to the Two Realities” (Apple 2013), are considered by traditional Gelukpa (*dge lugs pa*) historians to be the two foremost textual teachings (*gzhung*) on the view (*lta ba*) within Atiśa's works.³ An early Kadampa commentary on the *Satyadvayāvātāra*, attributed to Rnal-'byor-pa shes-rab rdo-rje (ca. 1125) who was a direct disciple of Sha-ra-ba yon-tan grags (1070-1141), understands the *Madhyamakopadéśa* to be a text on meditation (*sgom pa*).⁴ Be that as it may, most all traditional sources mention that this teaching was given by Atiśa in Lhasa at the request of Rngog legs pa'i shes rab (11th century), also known as “Gsang phu ba,” who was a direct disciple of Atiśa (van der Kuijp 1987:105), and who later founded the early Kadampa monastery of Gsang-phu ne'u-thog around 1073 c.e. Sources state that, based on Rngog legs-pa'i shes-rab's request for Madhyamaka teachings (*dbu ma'i chos*), Atiśa and his translator-disciple Nag-'tsho lo-tsā-ba tshul-khrims rgyal-ba (1011-1064) then translated Bhāviveka's *Blaze of Reasoning* (*rTog-ge 'bar-ba*, Skt. *Tarkajvālā*)⁵

³ Las chen kun dga' rgyal mtshan (2003:10): / *lta ba gtso bor ston pa ni jo bo nyid kyis mdzad pa'i bden pa gnyis la 'jug pa dang / dbu ma'i man ngag la sogs pa yin la*. Texts on the “view” (*lta ba*), along with practice (*spyod pa*) and integration (*zung 'brel*), belong to the textual (*zhung*) lineage of teachings. The textual lineage belongs to a broader classification that includes advice (*gdams ngag*) and special instructions (*man ngag*).

⁴ *Bden gnyis kyi rnam par bshad pa* (fol. 2b7): *sgom pa rtan la 'bebs pa'i dbang du byas na / dbu ma'i man ngag...*

⁵ See now Huanhuan and van der Kuijp (2014) for the historical and philological issues in the Tibetan translation of this text and other works of Bhāviveka.

commentary to his *Madhyamakahrdayakārikās* at Lhasa’s main temple the *’Phrul-s nang gtsug-lag-khang*. In addition to this translation, Atiśa is said to have composed the greater and lesser *Special Instructions on the Middle Way* (*dbu ma’i man ngag che chung*). The “greater” special instructions is a reference to the *Ratnakaraṇḍodghāta–madhyamakopadeśa* (Tôh. no. 3930)⁶, while the “lesser” is the *Madhyamakopadeśa* (Tôh. no. 3929; also, no. 4468) translated below.⁷ However, according to the colophon of the canonical version of the *Ratnakaraṇḍodghāta*, this work was written in the great temple of Vikramaśīla, under the patronage of King Devapāla (Apple 2010:120). The colophon to the so-called short *Dbu ma’i man ngag* does mention that it was composed in the main temple of Lhasa and that Atiśa and Tshul-khrims rgyal-ba translated and edited the text together. Therefore, the *Ratnakaraṇḍodghāta* was composed first in India and then the *Madhyamakopadeśa* was composed years later in Tibet. As the *Madhyamakopadeśa* has similar content to some sections of the *Ratnakaraṇḍodghāta*, Atiśa may have composed the *Madhyamakopadeśa* as a brief instruction based on extracts from the latter work. Atiśa may have used both texts to give lectures on Madhyamaka during his time in Lhasa.

Translation of the *Madhyamakopadéśa*, “Special Instructions of the Middle Way”⁸

In the Indian language: *madhyama-upadeśa-nāma*

In the Tibetan language: *dbu ma’i man ngag ces bya ba* [Special Instructions of the Middle Way]

I bow down to the Protector of the World

⁶ A critical edition and Japanese translation of this work is found in Miyazaki (2007) and Apple (2010) provides an annotated English translation.

⁷ *Jo bo rje dpal ldan a ti sha’i rnam thar bka’ gdams pha chos* (2012: 1691.8): *yang rngog gis zhus sna mdzad dbu ma’i chos zhus pas / dbu ma rtog ge ’bar ba gsungs / de’i man ngag che chung gnyis mdzad nas rnal ’byor pa la gzigs su phul bas/ nged la lkog tu khrid pa bzhin du bris ’dug cung yang zab drags gsung / de lo tsā bas bsgyur ba’i zhabs na / ra sa ’phrul snang gtsug lag khang chen du / /shākya’i dge slong rngog btsun legs shes yis / /gsol ba btab nas yi ger bkod pa yin / /zhes pa jo bo’i gsung yin / . Bka’ gdams chos ’byung gsal ba’i sgron me* (2003:148): *lha sar ...rngog gis dbu mdzad pa’i bod ston kha cig la rim pa’i cho ga rgyas par gnang / rtog ge ’bar ba bsgyur ba’i zhu ba phul / jo bos gnang nas nag tshos tshang bar bsgyur / de’i zhar la dbu ma’i man ngag kyang mdzad / ; Blue Annals* (*deb ther sngon po*, 1984:316.15-17): *Der rngog gis lo paṅ la zhu ba phul nas / rtog ge ’bar ba bsgyur / de’i man ngag tu dbu ma’i man ngag che chung gnyis mdzad /*

⁸ *Madhyamakopadeśa*, Derge Tanjur, volume Ki, folios 95b1-96a7.

I bow down to that supreme holy person,
whose light rays of speech
Opens the lotuses of the hearts
Of all the deluded like me without exception.

The special instructions of the Mahāyāna's Middle Way are as follows: Conventionally, all things, from the perspective of the deluded whose vision is narrow, including all presentations of cause and effect and so forth, are real according to how they appear. Ultimately or actually, when the conventional as it appears is closely examined and clarified by the great reasonings, one should thoroughly understand with certainty that even something the size of the tip of a hair that is split a hundred times cannot be grasped.

While sitting in a cross-legged position on a comfortable seat, [contemplate] for awhile as follows: there are two kinds of entities, those having form and those not having form. In this regard, those that have form are collections of minute particles. When these are closely examined and broken up according to their directional parts, not even the most subtle [part] remains and they are completely without appearance. That which does not have form is the mind. In regards to this, the past mind has ceased and perished. The mind of the future has not yet arisen or occurred. Even the mind of the present is extremely difficult to examine: it has no color and is devoid of shape, since it is similar to space, it is not established, and since it is free of unity and multiplicity, unproduced, and having a luminous nature and so forth, when it is analyzed and examined with the weapon of reasoning, one realizes that it is not established.

In this way, when those two are not established as having any nature at all and do not exist, the very wisdom which individually discriminates is not established either. For example, through the condition of fire occurring by rubbing two sticks together, the two sticks are burned up and become non-existent. Just as the very fire [D96a1] which has burned subsides by itself, likewise, when all specific and generally characterized things are established as non-existent, wisdom itself, without appearance and luminous, is not established with any nature at all. All faults such as laxity and excitement and so forth are eliminated. In this interval of meditation, consciousness

does not at all conceptualize, does not apprehend anything at all. All recollection and mental engagement are eliminated. Consciousness should reside in this way for as long as the enemies or thieves of signs and conceptual thought do not arise. When you wish to arise, slowly release from the cross-legged position and stand up. Then, with a mind which sees all things like illusions,⁹ do as many virtuous deeds as you are able with body, speech, and mind.

Accordingly, when one practices with devotion, for a long time, and uninterruptedly, then those with good fortune will see reality in this very life and all things will be directly realized, effortlessly and spontaneously, like the center of space. Through the attainment [of wisdom] after [meditation], all things are understood to be like illusions and so forth. From the point of time onwards when the vajra-like concentration has been realized, [Buddhas] will not have any subsequent attainment as they are settled in meditative equipoise at all times.

I will not speak here regarding the reasonings and scriptures that make statements such as, “If it is not like that, what is the difference from bodhisattvas?” Through the power of gathering the accumulations and making aspiration prayers for countless aeons for the welfare of others, [Buddhas] will become just as those who are to be taught wish [them to be]. There are many scriptures and reasonings [on this topic], but I will not elaborate upon them here.

The [text] called Special Instructions of the Middle Way composed by the paṇḍita Dīpaṃkaraśrījñāna is completed. The Indian master himself and the great editor translator and monk, Tshul-khrims rgyal-ba, translated, edited, and set the final version at the 'Phrul-s nang temple in Lhasa.

The *Madhyamakopadeśavṛtti* of Prajñāmukti

Prajñāmukti's *Madhyamakopadeśavṛtti* is a commentary on the base text of Atiśa's *Madhyamakopadeśa* that provides glosses on individual words and phrases in the text, as well as citing various *sūtras* and *śāstras* to clarify points of Atiśa's concise teaching. Prajñāmukti furnishes important glosses for *apraṭiṣṭhita-nirvāṇa* and *madhyamaka* among others. He also notes (D.122a) that he considers Atiśa's *Madhyamaka* to be *Apraṭiṣṭhānavada* (*rab tu mi gnas par smra ba*). Prajñāmukti's commentary provides

⁹ Literally, “with an illusion like mind.”

responses to questions regarding the relationship between the two realities and the interpretation of a Buddha’s awakening completely lacking any conceptuality. The understanding that it is impossible for a Buddha to have any conceptual knowledge, based on Mahāyāna Buddhist *sūtras* and supported by Candrakīrti’s *Madhyamakāvātāra* exegesis, is a vital point in the Madhyamaka system of Atiśa and his early Kadampa followers.¹⁰ Along these lines, Prajñāmukti will mention several times conventional valid cognition (*tha snyad kyi tshad ma*), implying that it has applicability merely in a worldly transactual context (Apple 2013, 2014).

The *Madhyamakopadeśavṛtti* is the only work in the Tibetan Tanjur by Prajñāmukti. The colophon mentions that he was an Indian preceptor (*upādhyāya*) and that he translated the text along with Tshul-khrims rgyal-ba. He was most likely a member of Atiśa’s entourage that accompanied Atiśa during his journeys throughout Tibet. In the following translation I have highlighted in bold print words and phrases that reference Atiśa’s *Madhyamakopadeśa*.

Translation of the *Madhyamakopadeśavṛtti* (*Dbu ma’i man ngag ces bya ba’i ’grel pa*).¹¹

[116b7] In the Indian language: *madhyama-upadeśavṛtti*

In the Tibetan language: *dbu ma’i man ngag ces bya ba’i ’grel pa* [Commentary on the Special Instructions of the Middle Way]

I bow down to the Lord of the World (Lokeśvara).

[117a1] Having paid homage to the bodhisattva

as a cause for increasing wholesome qualities

and eliminating the suffering of beings

I will clarify the Middle Way Special Instructions

¹⁰ On the late Indian subclassifications of Madhyamaka into Māyopamādvayavāda (Tib. *sgyu ma lta bu gnyis su med par smra ba*), “the strand which maintains that [things] are one, inasmuch as they are like illusions,” and Apratiṣṭhānavāda, “the strand which maintains that all things have so substance whatsoever,” see Almogī 2010. See Newland (1992) for how Gelukpa authors utilize Prajñāmukti in interpreting the relationship between the two realities. See Dunne (1996) on Candrakīrti’s understanding of the nonconceptual knowledge of a Buddha and Apple (2013) on Atiśa and early Kadampa authors on this issue.

¹¹ *Madhyamakopadeśavṛtti*, Tōh. no. 3931. Dergé Tanjur, vol. KI, folios 116v.7-123v.2. Tr. by the author and Tshul khrims rgyal ba.

Those who sink in the mud of *saṃsāra*
Due to mistaken conceptuality
Through relying on the path of special instructions
Will achieve perfect awakening

I will explain just a little of the special instructions.

Regarding this, the text stating “**whose light rays of speech**” and so forth is stated at the beginning as a homage to the object that possesses virtuous qualities. The intention [of the homage] is for the purpose of the most excellent Ācārya himself to understand the ultimate itself, to pacify obstacles of interruption, and to make a commitment to explain [the instructions]. This verse indicates two condensed purposes. Offering worship through paying homage and worship by declaring virtuous qualities, the excellent object of other virtuous qualities is conceived as one’s own purpose. The purpose for others is cause and result. For this, the text stating “**whose light rays of speech**” indicates the most excellent cause. The text stating, “**Opens the lotuses of the hearts of all the deluded like me without exception**” indicates the most excellent effect. The text stating “**supreme holy person**” indicates the end point of one’s own purpose. The [plural marker] *rnams* indicates many¹². “**Bow down**” are words of paying homage.

I will now explain the meaning of the ancillaries. “**Whose**” is a word for an agent or as a general term clearly applies to only a Buddha as a support having abandoned other objects. This section makes offering by paying homage and worship to the qualities of a Buddha. It is like saying “oh pretty one” as a general word to interact with a cow for the purpose of milk. Stating “**light rays of speech**” indicates the light rays of body, speech, and mind. Like the lights of white, red, blue, or the sun and moon, the light when the sun rises clears away great black darkness, opens up flowers [117b] and so forth, ripens various medicines and fruits, pacifies the misery of touching cold frost and so forth, creates happiness for sentient beings who feel warmth, clarifies the path and what is not the path, as well as unclear objects, and subdues the brilliance of other

¹² This indicates that Prajñāmukti’s text states “bow down to **those** supreme holy persons.”

lights such as stars and so forth. In a similar fashion, the light of the teaching of the inconceivable Dharma that liberates by means of the body, speech, and mind of the Bhagavan eliminates the darkness of misknowledge of sentient beings, opens up the lotus of the mind, completely ripens the unripened continuum, pacifies the harm of demons and so forth, pacifies the suffering of all sentient beings, establishes [them] in unsurpassable happiness, abandons and eliminates bad views, and subdues the brilliance of the maturing light of gods and so forth. Furthermore, it is also indicated by saying “eclipsing and so forth.”¹³ The text stating “**light rays**” demonstrates the activity of the agent. The text stating “**Opens**” indicates the action which is done. Stating “**me and so forth**” is easy to understand as the Ācārya himself and so forth. “**Deluded**” means not directly realizing the meaning of suchness. The text states “**all...without exception**” because the compassion of the Bhagavan is not of limited scope but pervades everywhere and is engaged in for the purpose of all [sentient beings]. “**Opens the lotuses of the hearts**” means that the heart functions as support of the mind and is designated on the placed name of the support. Therefore, it is like saying “opens the lotuses of the minds.” Moreover, it is like a lotus. A lotus, when seen, produces joy and is a source for various kinds of scents and colors as well as honey and so forth. Although it is produced from mud, it is untainted by the mud, and is distinctively sublime. Likewise, the mind is the place for various kinds of joys and affections, provides the taste of the co-emergent nectar, [118a1] is the source of precious awakening and, although it has adventitious stains, is luminous by nature and pure. Further, “it is considered pure, just as water, gold and space are pure”¹⁴ and “The nature of the mind is the Buddha and one should not seek the Buddha elsewhere.”¹⁵ The text stating “**opens**” is likened to how a lotus blossom opens and as the mind is

¹³ Prajñāmukti cites the *Abhisamayālaṅkāra* and his text reads *mog mog por mdzad dang*. AA I.8: *śyāmīkaranatādīni śiṣyakhadgapathau ca yau / mahānuśaṃso dṛṣṭmārga aihikāmutrikairguṇaiḥ / / [8.] mog mog por byed la sogs dang / / slob ma bse ru'i lam gang dang / / 'di dang gzhan pa'i yon tan gyis / / phan yon che ba mthong ba'i lam / /*

¹⁴ *Madhyāntavibhāgākārikā*, I.17cd: *abdhātukanakākāśaśuddhivacchuddhriṣyate*. Hoornaert, 2003 page 157, note 6: “The comparison of the intrinsically pure nature of the mind with the intrinsically purity of water, gold, and space is used in e.g., MVK I.16 , MSA XI. 13 , XIII 16, 18 , YBh, T vol 30, 70 I b28-c3, 748b 1 3- 1 8 The parallel passage in PP quotes MVK I.16cd and MVK 1.21 -22 (see Eckel 1985, pp 57-59).

¹⁵ A similar verse is found in the *Ārya-ātajñāna-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra* (*'Phags pa 'da' ka ye shes shes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo*, “The Gnosis of the Moment of Passing Away”; see Jackson 2009:5)

expanded to the five aspects of knowledge. Further, “One who apprehends, recites, practices, studies and writes with to respect others, their awareness blossoms as a lotus by sunlight.¹⁶ It is also taught that “If he has not applied himself to the five sciences,¹⁷ even the supreme saint will never arrive at omniscience. Therefore, he makes effort in those [sciences], in order to criticize and care for others as well as for the sake of his own knowledge.”¹⁸ When the text states “**supreme holy person**” his nature is comprised of perfect and complete abandonment and wisdom as well as having the nature of the three bodies. The text stating “**I bow down to that**” indicates making homage and the virtuous actions of body, speech and mind. This directly teaches the special instructions. Regarding this, the text stating “**The special instructions of the Mahāyāna’s Middle Way are as follows**” is summarized and indicated through the cause, which is the three wisdoms of study, reflection, and meditation. With respect to this, **vehicle** is the vehicle of cause and the vehicle of effect and the cause is because of going from this path of the bodhisattvas. It is further explained in the manner of the vehicle of mantra and in the vehicle of the perfections as explained from others. The vehicle of the result has the nature of the three bodies because it is to be traversed. **Great** means the magnanimity of wisdom and compassion and so forth. In this regard, it is taught that “great in giving, great in mind, great in power.”¹⁹ In that, great wisdom understands all things to be like an illusion and [118b] is not attached to anything at all. Great compassion connects means and wisdom continuously for the benefit of sentient

¹⁶ Unidentified verse also cited by Vimalamitra, *Kramapraveśikabhāvanārtha* (*Rim gyis ’jug pa’i sgom don*): *gang zhig ’dzin dang ’don dang spyod pa dang / / gzhan la ’dri zhing thos pa ’dzin byed dang / / de yi blo ni nyi ma’i ’od zer gyis / / padma bzhin du rnam par kha ’byed do / /*

¹⁷ The five sciences (*pañcavidyā*): linguistic science (*śabda*), logical science (*hetu*), ‘inner’ science (*adhyātma*), medical science (*cikitsā*), and the science of fine arts and crafts (*śilapakarmasthāna*). Mahāvīyutpatti, 1554–59. The ‘inner’ science is the study and practice of the Buddha’s teachings. See Gold 2007: 11–16, 20–24.

¹⁸ Thurman et al, 2004:141: “If he has not applied himself to the five sciences, even the supreme saint will never arrive at omniscience. Therefore, he makes effort in those (sciences), in order to criticize and care for others as well as for the sake of his own knowledge.” MSA 11.60: *vidyāsthāne pañcavidhe yogamakṛtvā sarvajñatvaṃ naiti kathamcītparamāryaḥ / ityanyeṣāṃ nīgrahaṇānūgrahaṇāya svājñārthaṃ vā tatra karotyeva sa yogam //* MSA 11.60 // Tibetan: *rig pa’i gnas lnga dag la mkhas par ma byas na / / ’phags mchos gyis kyang thams cad mkhyen nyid thob par mi ’gyur te de phyir gzhan dag tshar gcad rjes su gsung phyir ram bdag nyid goms par bya phyir de la de brtson byed*. Levi: S’il ne s’est pas appliqué aux cinq Sciences classiques, le Saint par excellence n’arrive absolument pas à l’Omniscience; aussi il y met son Application pour empêcher les autres, ou pour les seconder, ou pour reconnaître par soi-même.

¹⁹ *Ratnaguṇasamcayagāthā* I.18a: *mahādāyako mahatābuddhi mahānubhāvo* (Yuyama 1976:13; Conze 1975:11)

beings and is the path of the bodhisattvas. As wisdom, compassion, and so forth are small, it is called the “small vehicle.”²⁰ With respect to this, it is taught that “Without method, disconnected from wisdom, one falls into being a *śrāvaka*.” Therefore, a *śrāvaka* falls to the extreme of *nirvāṇa* and by directly perceiving *nirvāṇa* with remnant of the aggregates and without remnant of the aggregates forsakes the benefit of sentient beings. Ordinary individuals fall to the extreme of *saṃsāra* and experience various sufferings. The bodhisattva abandons these extremes. With great wisdom they do not abide in the extreme of *saṃsāra*, with great compassion they do not abide in the extreme of *nirvāṇa*, this is called the “*nirvāṇa* which does not abide (*apraṭiṣṭhita*) in the two extremes.” Moreover, for non-abiding *nirvāṇa*, it is taught that “the means of achieving [the state of] lord of the world depends upon a continuum which has indivisible emptiness and compassion, this is explained by all the Buddhas.” Therefore, the great vehicle is wisdom and compassion. “**Middle**” means free from all extremes and middle has the meaning of heart/essence. With regards to the word and the ultimate meaning, the real middle will be explained below on the two realities. The word “middle” (*dbu ma*) is a sound which expresses middle and is only a designated term for abandoning the two extremes. The “**special instructions** of this” signifies to greatly cherish and as one realizes great meaning with little effort therefore it is special instructions. “**To meditate**” signifies practice and will be explained below. “**From beginningless time**” signifies *saṃsāra* without beginning and without end. Clinging to things as real means to fixate upon something as truly existent, like subjects and objects and so forth. “**To posit the two realities**” indicates in reality they are one *and* non-differentiated. If [the two realities] were one, just as conventionalities are abandoned, so the ultimate also would be abandoned; just as conventionalities have differences, [119a] so the ultimate would have differences; just as the conventionalities are defiled, so the ultimate also would be defiled.²¹ If [ultimate reality and conventional reality] were different, they would not be the real nature (*chos nyid*) and the possessor of the real nature (*chos can*), and [realization of ultimate reality] would not overcome the marks of conditioned things; cultivation of the path would also be

²⁰ The text mentions the “small vehicle” (*theg pa chung*) as opposed to the more common Tibetan translation of “inferior vehicle” (*theg dman*) for *hīnayāna*.

²¹ Translation based on Newland 1992:68.

meaningless.²² For this reason, it is inexpressible as anything other than suchness. A detailed explanation is taught from other sources. Moreover, if it is asked why, it is said, “the defining characteristic of the conditioned realm and of the ultimate are free from identity and difference. Those who conceptualize identity and difference are improperly oriented.”²³ Further, the meaning is briefly summarized by teaching that it is liberated from other and suchness like the whiteness of conch shells and so forth.

To explain in detail the elements: the text stating “**Conventionally, all things**” and so forth indicates that through the wisdom which arises from study and reflection one trains in the modes of the two realities. Regarding this, conventional means deluded awareness that is obscured for the object of reality, just as it is explained elsewhere. “**All things**” means all without exception and is easy to understand. “**The deluded whose vision is narrow**” are those who do not see reality. “**From the perspective of**” means what is applied with the thought of attachment. “**Cause and effect and so forth**” are the aggregates, elements, sense-spheres, and so forth. “**According to how they appear**” means that they are pleasing when unexamined, appearing while having no self-nature. Along these lines it is taught that, “Convinced that impermanent things are like the moon’s reflection in water, neither true nor false, one is not carried away by philosophical views.”²⁴ “**Real**” means that it is real in terms of causal efficacy, real as mere appearance, and when examined is not established as real. Along these lines it is taught that, “When examined by reason, [something] is not real. Otherwise, it is real. Therefore, how can it be contradictory for the very same entity to be both real and unreal?”²⁵ “**Ultimately**” [119b] is correct wisdom and since it is undeceiving towards a real object, since it issues forth a holy result, and since it is to be sought after, it is the utmost, and that, although pleasing when examined, is not established. “**The conventional as it appears**” are external and internal entities. “**The great reasonings**” are reasonings that, because they are not deceptive for the proof of what is to be proven, are reasonings and are implicitly if [something] exists connected with natures other

²² Translation also found in Newland 1992:64.

²³ *Samdhinirmocanasūtra* III.6; See Mathes 2008:79.

²⁴ *Yuktiṣaṣṭikā*, verse 45: *gang rten {brten} nas dngos po rnams //chu yi zla ba lta bur ni / yang dag ma yin log min par/ /dod pa de dag lhas {em. ltas} mi phrogs {var. 'phrogs} /* The reading in 45a, *rten*, follows the paracanonical edition of Pa tshab’s translation. See Scherrer-Schaub 1991:15.

²⁵ *Satyadvayavibhaṅgavṛtti* (Eckel 1987:172) slightly differs: *rigs pas brtags na bden ma yin // de las gzhan du bden pa yin {Prajñāmukti ste} // des na gcig la bden nyid dang // mi bden par ni ji ltar 'gal // {Prajñāmukti des na dngos po gcig nyid la // bden dang bden ji ltar 'gal }* See also Eckel 1987:86.

than conventional valid cognition. **Great** are great that rely on conventional reasoning such as smoke and so forth and those are undeceptive for conventional objects. Here, it is great because it is undeceptive for the object of reality, subjugates all distinctions of entities, pacifies all demons of wrong views, and negates all the extremes of conceptual proliferations. For that reason it is taught that, “The emptiness of all the Victorious Ones is to definitely eliminate all views.”²⁶ “**By the [great reasonings]**” indicates four types [of reasoning]. In this regard, “that which is dependently arisen is without cessation, without production,”²⁷ and “Not from itself, not from another, not from both, nor without cause: Never in any way is there any existing thing which has arisen,”²⁸ and “Many do not produce one, many do not produce many, one does not produce many, and one does not produce one,”²⁹ and “Those entities postulated as real by Buddhist and non-Buddhist schools have in reality not intrinsic nature, because they possess neither a single nor a plural nature, like a reflection.”³⁰ This is merely a single fraction of formal reasoning. A more extensive explanation is in other [texts]. Eradicating movement is by distinguishing the directional parts which when examined may consist of sixteen or ten parts and so forth. “**Something the size of the tip of a hair that is split a hundred times**” is a measurement which is extremely subtle. “**To thoroughly understand**” indicates that through the wisdom of study and reflection one should train in the principle of the two realities for all dharmas. Furthermore, the preliminaries of training [120a] are the wisdoms [arising from] study and reflection and having studied and reflected, one then meditates. Further, this is indicated by stating, “For those of great learning the happy place of aging and growing old is in the

²⁶ Prajñāmukti, 119b3-4: *rgyal ba kun kyi stong nyid ni / lta kun nges par sel ba yin* . MMK 13.8ab: Klu'i rgyal mtshan (ca. 8th century) Tibetan translation: *rgyal ba rnams kvis stong pa nyid / lta kun nges par 'byung bar gsungs/* Sanskrit: *sūnyatā sarvadr̥ṣṭinām proktā niḥsaraṇam jinaih* (Katsura and Siderits 2013:145)

²⁷ MMK, dedicatory verse a, c: *anirodham anutpādam...yaḥ pratīyasamutpādam...*

²⁸ MMK, 1.1: *na svato nāpi parato na dvābhyāṃ nāpy ahetutaḥ / utpannā jātu vidyante bhāvāḥ kva cana ke cana //* Translation Katsura and Siderits 2013:18. In the *Bodhipathapradīpapañjika* (Sherburne 2000:234) cited as example of diamond-particle proof.

²⁹ Jñānagarbha, *Satyadvayavibhaṅgakārikā* (verse 14, translation Eckel 1987: 80): *du mas dngos po gcig mi byed / du mas du ma byed ma yin / gcig gis du ma'i dngos mi byed / gcig gis gcig byed pa yang min //*

³⁰ Śāntarakṣita, *Madhyamakālaṃkāra* 1: *niḥsvabhāvā amī tattvataḥ svaparoditāḥ / ekānekasvabhāvena viyogāt pratibimbavat //* (Ichigō 1989:191). Cited also in the *Bodhipathapradīpapañjika* (Sherburne 2000:234). Proof which refutes identity and multiplicity.

inner purity of the forest,³¹” and “previously having sought correct knowledge...³²

Now, the stages of meditating on the special instructions will be indicated. Special instructions has been explained earlier. Meditation has three aspects: the application, the actual [session of practice], and the post-concentrative state. “**Sitting in a cross-legged position on a comfortable seat**” indicates the application of concentration while thinking to not abandon any sentient being and with immeasurable great effort having the intention to achieve great awakening. Stating “[**contemplate**] **for awhile as follows: there are two kinds of entities**” is to examine. “**Those having form and those not having form**” since it is contradictory for a characteristic to abide and abandon the mutually established, [it] pervades all entities and eliminates a third alternative. The text stating “**In this regard, those that have form**” indicates that forms are not established, and further, are accepted as cause and effect. For this, the cause is the four elements which are subtle atoms and furthermore, by observing many parts, a singular part-less [atom] is not established. In not establishing a singularity, a multiplicity is also not established, nor is multiplicity the nature of one and so forth. In this way, in examining the singular and the multiple other alternatives are not established. As it is explained, “There is not an entity which has a classification other than singularity or multiplicity, since these two [classifications] stand in the relation of mutual exclusion.”³³ In this way, when subtle atoms are not established, the form which is the result is also not established, similar to when there is not a seed, a sprout is refuted. Furthermore, “In this way, because a creator does not exist, substantial entities and so forth are eliminated.”³⁴ The text stating “**completely without appearance**” indicates that appearances are signs and means that signs do not occur since they are the cause of bondage. Now, since the signs of the mind are themselves taught not to be observed, the text mentions “**That which does not have form.**” [120b] Regarding that, since causal efficacy is momentary, to make subdivisions of the momentary furthermore, **the past** does not exist since it is a perished entity. If something exists, it

³¹ Cited in Bodhibhadra’s *Samādhisambhāraparivarta* (*ting nge ’dzin gyi tsogs kyi le’u zhes bya ba*, 81b) as from the *’phags pa nyan thos kyi so sor thar pa’i mdo*.

³² *Madhyamakālamkāravṛtti* (P, fols. 83b8-84a3; D, fol. 83a4-6; S, vol. 62, p. 973.7-14).

³³ *Madhyamakālamkāra* 62 (Ichigō 1989:211): *gcig dang du ma ma gtogs par // rnam pa gzhan dang ldan pa yi // dngos po mi rung ’di gnyis ni // phan tsun spangs te gnas phyir ro //*

³⁴ Śrīgupta, *Tattvāvatāravṛtti* (*De kho na la ’jug pa’i ’grel pa*), 40a. Tōh. no. 3892. Dergé Tanjur, vol. HA, folios 39v.4-43v.5.

will be right now in **the present**. **The future** does not exist since it is an unproduced entity. If something exists, it would not change in the future as it is in the present. Therefore, the text states “**the mind of the present is extremely difficult to examine.**” **Difficult to examine** since when it is searched for it does not exist as an observable object. **It has no color and is devoid of shape** means that it is devoid of blue, gold, etc. and long, short, and so forth. **Free of unity and multiplicity** means, as explained elsewhere, that it is unable to withstand analysis through [the relations of] unity and multiplicity. **Unproduced** since existence and non-existence are unproduced. **Having a luminous nature** since with respect to itself it is non-conceptual and free from defilements, it is naturally luminous. Stating “**and so forth**” indicates that it is like an illusion since it is devoid of being produced from the four extremes, devoid of being produced from itself, from another, from both, or without a cause, and in reality has passed beyond the extremes of existence and non-existence. **With the weapon of reasoning** indicates that reasoning itself cuts through and splits things apart similar to a weapon. The *Jñānālokāṅkāra* states, “I pay homage to the Buddhas who continually have purified all dharmas, unfounded mind and omniscient for all dharmas, through not having an object of observation.”³⁵ **One realizes that it is not established** by understanding of the application. The text stating “**In this way, when those two are not established**” is indicated through concentration. **Those two** are that which has form and that which does not have form. **Not established** means not established ultimately and negates other conceptual thoughts. **The very wisdom which individually discriminates is not established either** negates the cognition itself. Since wisdom is a particularity of an entity, when an entity is not established, the very wisdom itself is also not established just like when a tree is not established the wood and so forth are negated. [121a] As it is said, “In this regard, a fire which burns fuel, having burned its fuel does not remain.” Furthermore, according to the principle summarized above, when mind is not established, then mental factors are also not established like the sun and its rays of light. As it is said, “Because the mind is refuted

³⁵ Prajñāmukti’s text reads: *sangs rgyas rnam kyis nam yang ni / lgtan du chos rnam thams cad dag / sems ma rnyed cing chos mkhyen pa / dmigs mi mnga’ la phyag ’tshal bstod / / Cited in Madhyamakāloka, D 3887, 240b. Differs but close to Jñānālokāṅkāra JAA, p.73: cittaṃ na labdhaṃ buddhehi atyantāya kadācana / sarvadharmā ca sarvajña nirālamba namo ’stu te // 30 //*

in this way, the mental factors are also eliminated.”³⁶ The text stating, “**For example, through the condition of fire occurring by rubbing two sticks together**” is explained by means of scripture (*āgama*). The wisdom which individually discriminates is like a fire and all conceptual thought is taught to be like fire-wood. As it is said, “all the dharmas of beings are asserted to be the fire-wood of consciousness. Those will become pacified when burned by the fire of analysis” and “Through burning all non-virtuous conceptual thought in the fires of individual discrimination.” **All specific and generally characterized things**: generally characterized things are empty, selfless, and so forth. The specific character of things is happiness, anguish, and so forth. **Wisdom itself** is the very wisdom of meditative equipoise. **Freedom from hatred**³⁷ means to be devoid of the conceptual thoughts of self and other. Furthermore, it is taught that “When not subsequently perceiving knowledge, objects of knowledge, or self then because signs do not emerge, one’s concentration is firm, one does not get up.”³⁸ **Luminosity** because it is naturally pure. **Free from extremes** signifies being free from permanence, annihilation, and so forth. **Not established at all** is due to not being established through [reasonings like] neither-one-nor-many and so forth. **All faults such as laxity and excitement and so forth** are faults of concentration. Furthermore, laxity is internal lethargy. Excitement is mental distraction. “And so forth” indicates other signs. **In this interval** indicates an interval of meditative equipoise. **To not apprehend anything at all** is to be free from the concepts of apprehended object and apprehending subject. **All recollection and mental engagement are eliminated** means that one abandons the concepts which objectify the past and the future. [121b] One abandons pleasant forms and so forth. **Enemies of conceptual thought or enemies who steal, or like thieves** indicates that [signs] are enemies since they scatter the treasure of concentration and therefore these should be abandoned by the spy-watcher of conscientiousness. Further, as it is said, “Fasten the wayward elephant-like mind with recollection’s rope to the post of the [meditation]

³⁶ Śrīgupta, *Tattvāvātāravṛtti* (*De kho na la ’jug pa’i ’grel pa*, D 40b-41a): *sems ni de ltar* [41a] *med pa’i phyir / |sems las byung ba rnam kyang bsal / {Prajñāmukti reads bkag pa’i phyir / }*

³⁷ This indicates that Prajñāmukti’s text states “freedom from hatred.”

³⁸ Jñānagarbha, *Satyadvayavibhaṅgakārikā*, (Eckel, p.101, vs. 39; Tibetan Eckel 1987:187), Tib.: *gang tshe shes dang shes bya dang / | bdag nyid rjes su mi mthong ba / | de ni mtshan ma mi ’byung phyir // gnas pa brtan phyir mi bzheng so / | Prajñāmukti citation differs: gang tshe shes dang shes bya dag / | bdag nyid rjes su mi mthong bas / | de tshes mtshan ma mi ’byung phyir / | gnas pa brten phyir mi bzhengs so //*

object; Then gradually bring it under control Using the hook of Wisdom.”³⁹ Conventionally, it is like refuting the particularities of rising body hairs when perceiving a large fire.⁴⁰ Therefore, it is unreasonable to generate dual appearances when accumulating the two collections [of merit and wisdom].

[Question:] If the Bhagavan is like a master of an illusion who understands illusion as illusion and attachment to reality does not arise, is reality non-mistaken? [Response] In that case, those who adhere to a Self understand the Self as a permanent Self, śrāvakas, as well, understand entities as real entities, and those who adhere to Mind-only understand self-cognizing consciousness (*rang rig, svasaṃvedana*) as the ultimate which is the non-mistaken reality, as it has been said.

[Question] If the Self and so forth are entities which do not abide as objects of knowledge, and since it is invalidated by a valid cognition and it is not established by a valid cognition, by exhausting as a mere imputation, apprehending them would be mistaken, but as a mere illusion that is established by valid cognition and not invalidated by valid cognition, would not cognition according to that fact not be mistaken? [Response] That is unreasonable. The object of knowledge of non-erroneous wisdom that abides like an illusion is not anywhere established and the objects of knowledge of non-mistaken knowledge do not abide like blurred vision and so forth.

[Question:] If it is the case, if not understanding the conventional just as it appears, the wisdom of total omniscience would not occur? In that case, since illusory elephants, blurred vision, and so forth would not appear to the direct perception of faultless sense-faculties, there would not be direct perception. Therefore, it is unreasonable for the wisdom which abandons mistakes to be false. When there is false appearance, then even the wisdom itself would be mistaken, like understanding water in a mirage. [Response:] If it is not like that, then an object in this regard would be a real entity and any knowledge [122a] would not be mistaken. Therefore, how can signs of dual appearance occur for final complete wisdom? Dual appearances and mistaken signs are different as mere names but are not different objects. As it said from a *sūtra*, “Subhūti,

³⁹ Bhāviveka, *Madhyamakahrdayam*, 3.16. Skt. *nibadhyāmbanastambhe smṛtirajjvā manogajam / unmārgacāriṇaṃ kuryāt prajñānkuśavasam śanaiḥ*. Tib. *yiḍ kyi glang po log 'gro ba / dmigs pa'i ka ba britan po la / dran pa'i thag pas nges bcings nas / shes rab lcags kyuṣ rim dbang bya*. English translation Engle 2009:91-92. Prajñāmukti's citation differs in the first line: sems kyi glang po log 'gro ba

⁴⁰ Derge reads *ma chen po*.

forms are signs, sounds are signs.” Furthermore, “The *samādhi* of the Buddhas, the Great Sages, and the Conqueror’s children has abandoned signs. Signs are for those of the world,”⁴¹ and so forth.

[Question:] If it is the case through fear, the fright of worry, that the conventional is non-existent, when the conventional does not appear for wisdom, would the appearance be evident? [Reply:] That is unreasonable. By illuminating the non-appearance, since there is no entailment, there would not be an ascertainment. It is like the double moon, blurred vision, and so forth that does not appear to the knowledge of faultless sense-faculties. That knowledge does not illuminate them. When examined by insight and wisdom, since any dharma, truth, falsity, existence, or non-existence does not abide, it is called “non-abiding Madhyamaka.”

As it is said, “those whose intellect transcends existence and non-existence and does not abide [in any extremes], realize the meaning of ‘condition,’ which is profound and non-perceived.”⁴² With this is also explained the stages of study and reflection. Contrary to this, because all conventionalities abide as objects of conventional valid cognition, [they] are not refuted. **Concentration** is one-pointedness of mind on an object of observation and it has unhindered power as a cause to immediately achieve the inconceivable three bodies [of a Buddha]. Stating “**When one has realized** [the vajra-like concentration] **onwards**,” means that from the point onwards of attaining perfect complete buddhahood since it is identical with awakening although there are distinctions of wisdom, the realm of reality (*dharmadhātu*) is naturally one. Although there are different rivers of the Ganges, Sindhu, Pakṣu, and so forth, they are naturally one with the great ocean. As it is said, “Separate lineages are not proper, because the dharmadhātu does not have distinctions. [122b] The divisions are declared by

⁴¹ Cited from the *Vairocanābhisaṃbodhi tantra*.

⁴² *Yuktiṣaṣṭikā*, verse 1. *Dbu ma'i man nga gi 'bum* reads: *gang blo yod dang med pa las / rnam par 'das shing mi gnas pa // de dag zab mo dmigs med pa'i {var. yi} / rkyen gyi don la rnam par bsgsoms* / The citation of this verse is from the Tibetan translation by *Ye shes sde* (ninth century) of the commentary, the *Yuktiṣaṣṭikā-vṛtti* of Candrakīrti. The Tibetan translation by Pa tshab nyi ma grags of the this verse from the *Yuktiṣaṣṭikā* differs. See Scherrer-Schaub 1991: 7, 24-25. The verse is preserved in Sanskrit in the *Sekoddeśaṣṭikā* (Scherrer-Schaub 1991:116n42): *asti-nāsti-vyatikrāntā buddhir yeṣāṃ nirāśraya / gambhīras tair nirālambaḥ pratyaṃyārtho vibhāyate* / The commentary to this verse in the *Yuktiṣaṣṭikā-vṛtti* (Scherrer-Schaub 1991:24; P 4a6-7) mentions that “those who have meditated on emptiness in previous lives, as they have understood dependent-arising and have the seed for the vision of emptiness, have great power... (*gang dag 'das pa'i srid pa na stong pa nyid la goms pa de dag rten cing 'brel par 'byung ba rtogs shing stong pa nyid mthong ba'i sa bon yod pa'i phyir mthu che ba yin te /*)

distinguishing the supported dharmas.”⁴³ **[Buddhahood] does not have a post-contemplative state** because signs no longer occur. **[At all] times** means before, after, and so forth. **In meditative equipoise** signifies not wavering from the realm of reality. As it is said, “When an elephant sits, [he] sits evenly. When an elephant arises, [he] arises evenly.”

Stating “**If it is not like that**” means if it is the case that signs of dualistic appearance occur. **Without difference** means without difference from abiding in the path of training while not abandoning the proliferation into mistaken notions of apprehended object and apprehending subject, and because [one’s status] will not be totally the same as awakening, it is unacceptable as signs of dual appearance will occur. As it is said, “Awakening, the characteristic [of which is similar to that] of space, is due to the abandonment of all signs (*mtshan ma*).”⁴⁴ Furthermore, since it is taught that, “Subhūti, wisdom does not have an object. If there exists an object for wisdom, then wisdom will not be understood,” how can signs occur?

One may think, “As there will be the continuous appearance of wisdom when dual appearances no longer occur, then the making of aspirational prayers and the gathering of the accumulations is pointless.” Here, the statement **for the welfare of others** indicates that the two Buddha bodies of form occur from the non-conceptual state and perform inconceivable deeds for the purpose of sentient beings. Although not having conceptuality, it is not contradictory for the aims of sentient beings to occur. It is like waves emerging from the ocean, like light emerging from the sun, and like wishes and hopes being made possible from a wish-fulfilling jewel. Compared to other [things], the example of a stupa and so forth, although not having conceptual thought, are indicated to arise for the welfare of sentient beings. **Reasoning** is a valid cognition which invalidates. **Scripture** is the word of the Buddha. **I will not speak here** signifies having concern with being too verbose. **Welfare of others** means mundane and supermundane benefit. **Countless aeons** signifies beyond calculation. **The accumulations** means the benefit of the cause which is the accumulation of merit and

⁴³ *Abhisamayālaṅkāra* I.39: *dharmma-dhātor asaṃbhedāt gotrabhedo na yujyata / ādheya-dharmma-bhedāt tu tad-bhedaḥ parigṛiyata*. Sparham Volume 1, pp. 85-85. Cited also in Atiśa’s *Bodhipatha-pradīpapañjika* (Sherburne 2000:116).

⁴⁴ Prajñāmukti reads *mtshan ma* for *kun tu rtog pa*. Cf. Miyazaki 2007:8n6, *Vairocanaḥhisambodhi*, D (494) tha 226b7-227a1: *byang chub nam mkha’i mtshan nyid do kun tu rtog pa thams cad spangs /*

wisdom. **Making aspiration prayers** [123a] is for the welfare of others. **Those who are to be taught** for the eyes and so forth of pure minds. **Just as those...wish** signifies whichever [teaching] will appear as the essence of whichever discipline and in accordance with various reasonings will be exactly according to the inclination. As it is said, “Various practices are taught to sentient beings who have diverse inclinations. If one is not inclined to the teaching of profound reality, then one should refrain from reviling and be endowed with inconceivable reality.” Actually, the Bhagavan does not have a Buddha-body, etc. and does not have signs of dual appearance. Moreover, [the Buddha] never departs from the realm of reality and remains in a non-conceptual state. As it is taught, “Whoever sees me as visible matter...”⁴⁵ Therefore, the Dharma-body is just like space. Although any distinctions of boundary, center, various colors and so forth do not exist in space, sentient beings conceptualize multiple distinctions of boundaries, center, blue, and yellow.

[Question:] If it is the case that the form-body and so forth does not have conceptual thought, then how can this be suitable to carry out the welfare of sentient beings? [Reply:] The meaning of this has already been explained. Even though the sun does not have conceptual thought various rays of light emerge from it and it illuminates things. The very disk of the sun is not light rays. If the disk of the sun itself were light rays then it would remain in the inside of a house, etc. and the very object and the disk itself would be different. The light rays themselves are not the disk of the sun. If the light rays themselves were then they would remain in space itself and would not illuminate all entities. Therefore, even though the light rays are not the sun disk, the light rays emerge from it and illuminate all entities. For this reason, since a *sūtra* states, “The Buddha is like space and sentient beings are like a mountain,” it is inconceivable.

The intention of Dīpaṃkara [123b] is difficult to measure and

The great meaning of Madhyamaka is not an object of the intellect.

Prajñāmukti has clearly described the special instructions

⁴⁵ “Whoever sees me as visible matter, whoever understands me as sound, has entered into a wrong path; that person will not see me. The buddhas are the *dharmakāya*; the ‘leaders’ see reality (*dharmatā*).” *Vajracchedikā*, 26, k.1–2ab: *yo māṃ rūpeṇa cādrākṣur yo māṃ ghoṣeṇa cānvaguḥ / mīthyāprahāṇapraṭṭā na māṃ drakṣanti te janāḥ / 1 / dharmato buddho draṣṭavyo dharmakāyā hi nāyakāḥ /*

For the purpose of teaching those without knowledge who wish for an explanation.

May one who has attained the merit of this virtue
attain the status of awakening
from having the precious teaching stay in the world
remaining for as long as the earth, water, fire, wind, and space.

The commentary of the special instructions of the Middle Way composed by the Paṇḍita Prajñāmukti is concluded. The Indian preceptor (*upādhyāya*) Prajñāmukti himself and the monk Tshul-khrims rgyal-ba translated, corrected and edited [the text].

Collection on the Two Realities (*bden gnyis kyi 'bum*)

The translation which follows consists of an anonymous Kadampa commentary on Atiśa's *Madhyamakopadéśa* entitled on the manuscript's title page *Bden gnyis kyi 'bum* "Collection on the Two Realities." The manuscript of the commentary is a facsimile reprint located in the recently published "Collected Works of the Bka'-gdams-pas" (*bka' gdams gsung 'bum*). This collection consists of a number of lost Tibetan manuscripts that were recovered from temples within Drepung (*'bras spungs*) and Sera monasteries outside of Lhasa in 2003. Currently comprised of over ninety volumes (with plans for another thirty volumes), the collection contains works related to Buddhist scholastic topics such as Madhyamaka (*dbu ma*), Pramāṇa (*tshad ma*), and Abhidharma (*chos mngon pa*) by Tibetan authors ranging from the late tenth century up to the early fifteenth century who are generally considered Kadampa (*bka'-gdams-pa*) authors. The volumes of these handwritten manuscripts were purportedly a part of the library of the fourth Tsang king, Kar-ma bstan-skyong dbang-po (r. 1622–1642).

The manuscript of the *Bden gnyis kyi 'bum* is from the monastic library of Drepung according to the *Bibliography of the Rare Texts that Reside at Drepung Monastery* (*'bras spungs dgon du bzhugs su gsol ba'i dpe rnying dkar chag*). In that catalog, the *Bden gnyis kyi 'bum* is listed under manuscript #015400 as *Bden gnyis kyi 'bum zhes pa jo bo'i dbu ma bden gnyis kyi 'grel ba*. Although the title on the manuscript and the

catalog listing imply that the content is related to Atiśa’s *Satyadvayāvatāra*, as the content clearly illustrates in the following translation, the text comments on Atiśa’s *Madhyamakopadéśa*. However, the first folio of the translation does focus on content related to the *Satyadvayāvatāra* and its title. I think this is because the first folio of the *Bden gnyis kyi ’bum* was either wrongly copied, or misplaced, and should be the first folio that precedes the content of the manuscript currently entitled *Dbu ma’i man ngag gi ’bum* “Collection of Madhyamaka Special Instruction,” whose actual content is a brief commentary on Atiśa’s *Satyadvayāvatāra* (translation in Apple 2013). The first folios of these two manuscripts were switched at some point in their history.

The manuscript of the *Bden gnyis kyi ’bum* consists of eighteen folios (Roman pp. 335–369), eight lines per page written in clear Tibetan headless cursive script (*dbu med*). The handwriting contains a number of archaic abbreviations in which some parts of the text are difficult to discern. The manuscript has the following orthographic characteristics:

- Consistent use of *tsheg* before a *shad*;
- Palatalisation of *ma* by *ya btags* before vowels *i* and *e* (e.g. *myed, myin*);
- Use of superabundant *’a rjes ’jug* (e.g. *mdo’, dbu’ ma ba*);
- The use of double *shad* to mark a new section of the commentary;
- Consistent spelling of *lasogs pa* for *la sogs pa*;
- Archaic transcription for Sanskrit terms (e.g. *bu ta* for *buddha*).

The text is found in volume 19 of the *Bka’ gdams gsung ’bum* published by Dpal brtsegs bod yig dpe rnyig zhib ’jug khang (2003). Volume 19 contains an *Abhisamayālamkāra* commentary by ’Chus Dar-ma brtson-’grus (1117– 1192) and five anonymous works on early Tibetan Madhyamaka. The early Kadam Madhyamaka works in this volume include:

- *Dbu ma la ’jug pa’i bsdus don* (6 fols., Roman number pp. 247–317). A brief topical outline to Candrakīrti’s *Madhyamakāvatāra*.
- *Bden gnyis rnam bshad ñik dang bcas pa* (35 fols., Roman number pp. 247–316). A commentary on Śāntarakṣita’s *Satyadvayavibhaṅgapañjikā* (Toh. #3883).
- *Dbu ma’i man ngag gi bshad pa, Pu to yab sras kyi lugs* (9 fols., pp. 317–334). A short work explaining the Madhyamaka special instructions of Po-ta-ba rin-chen gsal (1027–1105) and his spiritual son Sha-ra-ba yon-tan grags (1070–1141).

- *Dbu ma bden gnyis kyi 'bum* (18 fols., pp. 335–369). The text of the following translation.
- *Dbu ma'i man ngag gi 'bum, Bden chung gi 'bum* (16 fols., pp. 371–401). A commentary on Atiśa's *Satyadvayāvātāra*. Introduced and translated in Apple 2013.

The Kadampa author of *Collection on the Two Realities* (*bden gnyis kyi 'bum*) was affiliated with the monastic center of Reting (Ra sgren = Rwa sgren) founded by 'Brom-ston rgyal-ba'i 'byung-gnas (1004/1005-1064), also known as Dge-bshes Ston-pa, in 1056/1057. The author explicitly mentions Reting three times in the commentary (fol. 1b, 4a1, 14a). The commentary preserves a tradition of Atiśa's Madhyamaka that was upheld at Reting during the late eleventh to twelfth centuries. The author mentions a number of Kadampa figures in the commentary such as dGon-pa-ba dbang-phyug rgyal-mtshan (1016–1083), Po-to-pa rin-chen-gsal (1027-1105), Rnal-'byor-pa chen-po byang-chub rin-chen (1015-1078), and Spyan snga tshul khriims 'bar (1038-1103), who were all affiliated with Reting at some point in their lives.

The *Collection on the Two Realities* contains a number of important historical anecdotes, linguistic points, and philosophical discussions. In terms of historical anecdotes, the commentary notes in its beginning section that Atiśa had a dispute with Ratnākaraśānti (ca. 970-1030), traditionally considered to be one of Atiśa's teachers. Tibetans usually mention a pious story of King Lha bla-ma Ye-shes 'od offering his head's weight in gold as ransom for Atiśa to come to Tibet (see Schaeffer *et al* 2013:176-181), but the *Collection on the Two Realities* anecdote presents an alternative view from Atiśa's side, indicating a disagreement based on the fact that the Yogācāra Ratnākaraśānti did not approve of Atiśa's teaching of Madhyamaka. A traditional biography of Atiśa attributed to 'Brom-ston-pa Rgyal-ba'i byung gnas (2012:45-46) states that Atiśa first received Madhyamaka teachings under the tantric yogin Avadhūtipa with whom he studied for seven years. The biography mentions that Atiśa learned the Madhyamaka principles of subtle cause and effect under Avadhūtipa, a point specifically mentioned in the *Collection on the Two Realities* (fol. 7b). Atiśa's study of Madhyamaka under Avadhūtipa is also supported by the colophon to the *Sūtrasamuccayaśāncayārtha*, which mentions that he received the special instruction

(*upadeśa*) of *apraṭiṣṭhita* [*madhyamaka*] *darśana* under Avadhūtipa.⁴⁶ After study under Avadhūtipa, Atiśa learned the Yogācāra-madhyamaka system under Ratnākaraśānti based on this teacher’s commentary to the *Aṣṭasahāsrikāprajñā-pāramitā*. However, this caused Atiśa to be aware of clear differences between Avadhūtipa’s Madhyamaka and the Yogācāra-Madhyamaka, giving Atiśa strong faith in the Madhyamaka system of Candrakīrti.⁴⁷

Indeed, the *Collection on the Two Realities*, as well as the *Dbu ma’i man ngag gi ’bum* (Apple 2013), in commenting upon Atiśa’s *Madhyamakopadeśa* and *Satyadvayāvātāra*, elaborate upon Candrakīrti’s system of Madhyamaka where mind, mental factors, and conceptuality are “cut-off” in the state of Buddhahood. The text advocates a faith-based Madhyamaka based on Mahāyāna sūtras rather than *śāstras*, placing emphasis on scriptural authority (*āgama, lung*) rather than logic (*pramāṇa*) (fol. 4a2, 5b1-7). Along these lines, the Kadampa author will directly cite, or refer to, the Madhyamaka works of Nāgārjuna (nine times), Āryadeva, Śrīgupta (twice), Jñānagarbha (twice), Śāntarakṣita (three times), Bhāviveka, and Candrakīrti (twice) without mentioning any divisions between them. The commentary exhibits an understanding of Madhyamaka thinkers as not being in conflict with each other. Unexpectedly, the author will cite Dharmakīrti’s *Pramāṇavārttika* as proof for the reasoning that things do not arise without a cause as found in the first chapter of Nāgārjuna’s *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā*. The Kadampa author, like other Indian and Tibetan scholar between the 11th and 13th century, may have considered Dharmakīrti as a Mādhyamika (Steinkellner 1990).

In the translation which follows I have placed in bold print text which corresponds with Atiśa’s *Madhyamakopadeśa*. I have also formatted the text with paragraph divisions that correspond to the sections marked with a double *shad* in the manuscript where the content of the commentary is differentiated.

⁴⁶ *Sūtrasamuccayasāñcayārtha*, extended colophon not in Derge Tanjur but *Bstan’gyur gser bris ma, mdo ’grel a*, fol. 513r: ...*lha khang ke ru’i khyams smad kyi ban de bdag gyi zhus te gdams ngag dang bcas te gnang ngo/ jo bo’i bla ma a wa dhū ti pas rab tu mi gnas pa’i lta ba dang / las mtha’ sems bskyed pa’i cho ga dang / mdo kun las btus pa’i don man ngag tu byas pa ’di gsum stabs gcig tu gnang ba lags so // Cf. Chattopadhyaya 1967:462.*

⁴⁷ Rgyal ba’i ’byung gnas (2012:46.13-16): *nga’i bla ma shānti pa brgyad stong pa gsung tsa na dbu mar bshad pa thams cad re re nas sun phyung bas / nga’i dbu ma’i lta ba de nyid gsal btab pa bzhin du song / rnal ’byor spyod pa’i dbu ma shin tu gsal bar gyur / nga zla ba grags pa’i lugs la shin tu dad pa yin gsung /*

Translation

[1a] *Collection on the Two Realities* (*bden gnyis kyi 'bum*)

[1b] I pay homage to the omniscient one
Who liberates from all faults and
Who is adorned with all virtuous qualities;
A friend of all sentient beings.

I will speak a little bit about the dharma teaching of the Lord [Atiśa] to cause faith in the faithful. May it consist for others in three [aspects of being] practical, an exposition, and equal in collections [of merit and wisdom]. It is not Tibetans who accuse Lord [Atiśa]. There are many who rely on Secret Mantra and it is not suitable as an object of explanation to study in collecting [merit and wisdom]. Even all the sayings of the Hymn of Practice (*spyod pa'i glu*) and the Vajra Hymn (*rdo rje'i glu*) are completion stage practices which rely on Secret Mantra. There may be a small precipice in the single purpose in all those [Secret Mantra teachings] so this dharma teaching is all. Although there are many systems of positing the two realities, for the followers of Reting [Monastery] (*ra-sdren*), this dharma teaching is sufficient as it is comparable to all [others]. An abundance of useless talk has no purpose. Among the three purposes formerly stated in the Indian language, only gratitude (*byas pa gzo' ba*) is essential, similar to writing other works. [This text] was written by Lord [Atiśa] as his own guru, Gser-gling-ba, wrote a letter that requested Atiśa to provide a means of defining the Madhyamaka system of the two realities. Since it is written and taught with respect, [this text] is established as a pure source. The Madhyamaka [thought] of Atiśa is due to the kindness of Āvadhutipa who [Atiśa] served and followed for seven years. Since [Atiśa] had great reverence for Gser-gling-ba, it is [due to] previous karma that [he] apprehended the Madhyamaka view of a sharp minded paṇḍita like him. The teaching that it is beneficial to cultivate a forceful elimination of the conceptual elaborations of cognizer and cognized is unacceptable. At the onset, [Atiśa] did not have great reverence for Śāntipa. Later, when [Śāntipa] heard him [i.e., Atiśa] among

Tibetans like a bull stating that “the proper object is that all things do not have inherent existence,” [Śāntipa] was not pleased. It is said that Lord [Atiśa], immediately upon initiating a discussion on a little bit of Madhyamaka, was thrown out due to [Śāntipa] being annoyed. For the benefit of quickly apprehending the language, *svad tya* is reality (*bden pa*), *dho ya na* is two, *a ba ta ra na* is “to enter.” In the future this will be a seed of the condition for quickly apprehending, having met with and encountered, the Sanskrit language (*saṃ kri ta’i skad*). The system of assigning the title is like “The story of the ravishment of Sītā and the killing of Mkhār ba.”⁴⁸ The actual *Entrance to the Two Realities*: with regard to all the pronouncements of the Buddha being grouped into two realities, there is the mistaken conventional, since the activity of an object, or the measure of its appearance, is empty, and the correct conventional, which has causal efficacy as a measure of its appearance, being some thing (*chos can*) that is pleasing when unexamined, a dependent arising for affliction and purification, that arises and ceases. As it occurs from India as a dharma teaching for the world [2a1], it is a subject that is known in India. Moreover, it is written with gratitude by him. As this was written as a letter for the sake of students in future generations, when one has made conditions to encounter dharma teachings to practice, when one encounters dharma teachings by the conditions of dwelling in harm, one should understand with gratitude and kindness. [This teaching] should be understood as created for the total benefit for the world. When the previous spiritual teacher (*bla ma*), in the process of protecting [this teaching], was passing away, stated that “I am protecting this [teaching], with the loss of life or letting go the force of life, having taken to entrust this to you.” This is just as it was spoken at the time of the passing of Dge-bshes Ston-pa when he handed [the teaching] over to another spiritual teacher. If it is not handed over like this, not a single word of the spoken transmission of that spiritual teacher will be granted. Oneself should meditate, supplicate, make offerings, pay homage, rely on the spiritual teacher with respectful faith, establish aspirational prayers to meet [the spiritual teacher] from here on in future lifetimes, staying at ease in not seeking out other spiritual teachers.

⁴⁸ This story relates to how the titles of texts should be made up. See De Jong, “An Old Tibetan Version of the Rāmāyaṇa” page 191. Das (1902) relates it from Atiśa’s biography. See Ulrike Roesler, “The Great Indian Epics in the Version of Dmar ston Chos kyi rgyal po,” in *Tibet, Past, and Present: Religion and Secular Culture in Tibet* (2002) edited by Blezer and Ardussi, pp. 447, notes 40, 41, 43.

Likewise, when making prayers throughout this lifetime do not become satisfied. Later, from here on, when reflecting upon something like reality, having met with a superior one, having held previous thoughts, other oral instructions will come into being as meditation. In dependence on that high approach, moreover, make offerings and request at once—“for me, may I be able to have complete strength. And formerly, with respect to that, since I had disbelief I was incapable of receiving previous blessings. Even future blessings may also be incapable as unwholesome, negativities have increased.” Potaba has said, “Now, everyone is like when the owner of a young bull seeks out the young bull after it has gone down a path. When the bull stops, he goes again while being pursued having turned away from the owner. The neighbors recognize that [the bull] desires to go back to its own home again. When straying from the path, [the bull] is killed having been carried away by a robber. We will be similar to the bull so we must try to reside straight up not straying from the path. [The bull] did not listen at all, and having strayed from the path, was killed by a robber. When the chick of a grouse does not completely die, the other chicks will protect the grouse when dwelling in the same nest. Its wings are not fully formed and it jumps from the nest in an untimely manner. When limping around a hawk and weasel will eat [the chick]. We are also like this as we sit up in the nest. When we have an untimely fall, the hawk and weasel will carry us away. Not listening, everyone will be carried away by the hawk and weasel. [2b1] So like that, everyone who dwells will likewise be slaughtered by the robber, carried away by the hawk and weasel.” All three brothers and Geshe Ston-pa having passed away, the paṇḍita himself went, and having listened to the last testament of Geshe Ston-pa, all those did not stretch the heart of expectation to exist longer than before we achieved the purpose. In general, this action is of special great importance for a trustworthy source for dharma to be established as a pure source similar to what was previously stated. The benefit to learn the language quickly, at that time the king and all his ministers arranged Indian texts according to a rule since scholars and translators would have many benefits even by understanding merely this much through the aim of knowing the translation. That which is taught as *ma-dha-ma*, that which is said as *mahā-ma-ka* has the meaning of “the middle”; *+u-pa dhe-sha* is called special instruction; *na-ma* has the meaning of “what is called.” In the future, a translator will be incapable of pure knowledge through relying on merely this, yet even now, it is

repeated as a cause to produce familiarity when meeting with the Sanskrit language in the future through creating predispositions. The meaning of the title: regarding this, outsiders accept a Self or a person to exist and since they assert cause and effect, truth, and the [three] jewels to not exist, they fall into the extremes of either superimposition or deprecation. Two of our own schools and the Yogācāra, since they assert both a subject and object, the other-powered nature (*paratantra*), and mere representation as substantially established, they are said to fall to the extreme of superimposition. In this regard, when one upholds the two realities by being free from the two extremes it is the Middle. Through being easy to understand it is Special Instructions because, through a little bit of the basic text and words, one is able to understand the meaning of the two realities through hearing and contemplation and directly realize through meditation. Furthermore, the Ācārya [Nāgārjuna] has taught,

“To those who seek reality, at first, one should state ‘Everything exists.’ When they have understood things and become detached, then later declare things as isolated (*viviktatā*).”⁴⁹

Āryadeva has stated,

“At first overturn non-virtue; midway one should overturn [the notion of] self; in the end one should overturn everything. One who understands in this way is Wise.”⁵⁰

Since all these sayings are special instructions, first, for this life, and for after that also, by accumulating actions for this [life], later one comes to understand that the experiencing of happiness and suffering exists, and one has faith which has confidence

⁴⁹ *Yuktiṣaṣṭika*, verse 30: *de nyid tshol la thog mar ni // thams cad yod ces brjod par bya // don nams rtogs shing chags med nas de yi 'og tu dben pa'o //* Loizzo 2007:180 (Eng), 318 (Tib). Sanskrit: *sarvam astīti vaktavyam ādau tattvagaveśiṇaḥ | paścād avagatārthasya niḥsaṅgasya viviktatā* (Lindtner 1982: 110)

⁵⁰ *dang por bsod nams min las bzlog / bar du bdag las bzlog bya zhing / tha mar kun las bzog bya ba / de ltar shes pa rigs par ldan / Canonical Tibetan: bsod nams min pa dang por bzlog / bar du bdag ni bzlog pa dang / phyi nas lta zhig kun bzlog pa / gang gis shes de mkhas pa yin / Catuḥśataka*, ch.8, verse 15: *vāraṇaṃ prāg apuṇyasya madhye vāraṇaṃ ātmanaḥ / sarvasya vāraṇaṃ paścād yo jānīte sa buddhimān.*

in impermanence and karmic causes and effects. Since a similar point has been established from the *Ratnāvāli*, it is essential that one does not [3a1] deprecate conventional reality, and that one overturns non-virtue. Then, through offering up an awareness that accumulates virtue and through relying on the special instructions of the guru, one will understand the conditions of the successive relations of previous karma and its results, one will understand that even the rebirths among the five lineages of transmigration do not have even a mere moment of happiness apart from suffering. Through realizing the faults of all of conditioned existence, one will have disgust and detachment. The cause that establishes existence with its faults is both karma and mental afflictions. The root of karma and the root of afflictions is the view for a Self. The view for a Self is not held when merely establishing some self but holding a Self is through mistaking it for the collection of the aggregates and so forth. Since the aggregates and so forth are incompatible with the characteristics of a Self, up until one understands the nature of selflessness one should overcome the Self and eliminate superimposing the nature of a Self.

Then, at the time of wandering in infinite cyclic existence consisting of a successive continuum of cause and effect, as it is the case that all sentient beings are one's mother, all sentient beings who are construed as one's mother, who are deluded with respect to the two realities, who suffer as a Self in existence by the force of delusion, one relies upon great compassion in desiring to establish all sentient beings in complete buddhahood, the everlasting liberation from the suffering of cyclic existence. For the purpose of the wish to set sentient beings in that [state], oneself realizes the goals of the aspiration for awakening, compassion, love that wishes to attain that [state] and being detached from one's own liberation. Since it is necessary to engage in the causes for achieving the result of complete buddhahood, realize all the uncommon points of the cause, the six perfections, and without attachment to them, make firm the factors of method inclusive of concentration. Then, one will be unable to abandon the view of a Self if one has not abandoned apprehending dharmas as substantially existent (*chos kyi dngos por 'dzin pa*). Even if one is able to eliminate the view of a Self, if one does not meditate on all dharmas as unproduced, because of not eliminating the obscurations for objects of knowledge, therefore not attaining total omniscience, one must eliminate the extreme of superimposition which is devoid of essence of dharmas and reverse any

apprehension [of things] as real through relying on ultimate reality. In this way, ascertaining the characteristics of the two realities through listening and contemplation is called “view.” At the time of meditating on reality, having sat in a cross-legged posture on a comfortable seat and [3b1] while practicing, ascertain the unproduced by means of examining with reasoning, determining all entities, and cutting off duality. One should understand that even the knowledge through the force of unestablished objects of knowledge itself becomes pacified. At the time of actual practice, having cleared away the faults of laxity and excitement, one should be established in the non-conceptual nature for as long as the enemies or robbers of signs and conceptuality do not arise. At the time after [meditation], bearing in mind that all dharmas are like an illusion, one should make effort in the collection of merit by means of pure activity of the three spheres [of agent, action, and object]. In this way, from practicing with devotion, for a long time, and uninterruptedly, at the time of seeing reality, in both meditation and after [meditation], one directly realizes the aims of the two realities. These very aims are to become gradually accustomed to, and traverse, the ten [bodhisattva] stages, and through the vajra-like concentration one will abandon without exception the most subtle latencies of apprehending things as real and from that point on one will make manifest the highest limit of reality (*yang dag pa'i mtha'*). Abiding in this very condition of meditative equipoise at all times, the awakened activities (*'phrin las*) which achieves the aims of sentient beings by the impelling force of previous accumulations and aspirational prayers gradually takes rebirth as a continuum of a person that uninterruptedly occurs exactly according to the good fortune of those to be trained. Having imputed this as the actual special instructions of the middle way, words like this are also set in letters in a book and are the general meaning of terms which appear to the mind. The translator's homage is naturally pure when contemplating **lord Avalokiteśvara**. Since all buddhas are lords of the world, when contemplating in this way it is in harmony with the śāstra and since the *Sūtra on the Meeting of Father and Son* states “The Tathāgata has realized both the conventional and the ultimate. The objects to be known are exhausted here in the two realities,” it is only omniscience which understands the two realities exactly as they are. Generally, it is an appropriate aim (*skab su bab pa'i don*) to pay homage to only Mañjuśrī in Madhyamaka treatises. The Ācārya Nāgārjuna, having declared an homage to

omniscience in both the *Root of the Middle Way* and the *Precious Garland*, dwell in the middle. The *Sixty Stanzas on Reasoning* and so forth all pay homage to the feet of Gautama. The purpose of paying homage is so that obstacles will not occur and that the composition will be completed. The composition of the translator will be completed having established a translation in Tibetan letters; up to present times this is for making an oral explanation of the teaching.

[4a1] It is said that a person from Lhasa views a person from Reting (*rwa-dreng-ba*) in the desire for a deity and that the view is only desire for a deity. Likewise, those who are on the Mahāyāna path, since it is to undertaken in order to realize the two realities, undertake and supplicate through paying homage, worshipping, and offering to actualize omniscience with the mind and to cut through all karmic obscurations that impede realizing the two realities. Other than realizing the two realities through the blessings of [these activities] when supplicating, one is not able to discern the meaning of the two realities through logic.

The homage statement of the treatise itself, the statements related from “**One who**” through to “**supreme holy person**” since he has become the chief or supreme of all, he is the supreme of two-legged beings, the omniscient one, who himself has stated “I am the supreme in this world.” Since his **light rays of speech** are likened to a rising sun, the Lord himself is mentioned through stating “**like me and so forth**” through clearing away the darkness of **delusion in its entirety** without prejudice in the distinctions of sentient beings, the multitude gathered in the midst. According to a scholar who has an extensive commentary on entering to the Abhidharma, “heart” is explained as mental consciousness (*vid kyi rnam shes*). It is a meaning which abides in the heart or in the center and the darkness which deludes objects of knowledge, the two realities, is produced within the sphere of that [mental consciousness] and since the wisdom which opens the mind to objects of knowledge, the two realities, is produced within the sphere of that, it is only reasoning. He states “I bow down to the **supreme holy person**” who extensively makes joy in opening his mouth to one closed to the two realities at the lotus of the mental consciousness of the heart. Generally, when praising a complete, perfect buddha one praises the three qualities of cause, effect, and awakened activity, but here, by stating “**supreme holy person**” both the final end of abandonment and wisdom, the result, and the awakened activity of speech are praised.

[4a7] How is the **lotus of the heart** opened up through clearing away the darkness of **delusion**? Prior to the Buddha arriving in the world, all the world was darkened by the darkness of delusion. He taught dharma when he arrived [in this world] to the fortunate ones who dwelled in the central land [of India], the cause and effect consisting of affliction and purification or the meaning of the two realities, which opens up the lotus of the heart and clears away the darkness of delusion. Then, gradually, commonly, including all of Tibet, [4b1] for the humans who had accumulated merit, immediately the Buddha Sarvārthasiddhi “He who achieves all aims” spoke two verses and so forth. After forty-nine days from awakening, in Ba-ra-na-se [=Varanasi] he turned the wheel of dharma of the four truths, and by teaching at first their characteristics, the Noble Kun-shes go’u-di [=Ārya ājñātakauṇḍinya] saw the dharma. Three times [the Buddha] stated “Do you perfectly understand the dharma?” and in replying that “I understand” gave him the name of “all-knowing” (*kun-shes = ājñāta*). Having turned two answers to “suffering should be understood” arhatship was realized by the five other ones who saw the dharma. Having turned three answers stating “I realize suffering is to be known and now that which is to be known does not exist” the six became arhats, the five [disciples] were five [arhats] and the sixth was the Buddha.” Then the teachings taught gradually may be grouped into the twelve limbs and the two or three *piṭakas*. The teacher in his final words at the time of the final *nirvāṇa* gave the *pratimokṣa*, the teaching of the four applications of mindfulness gathered in the three basket collections as the group of six monks themselves had trained. “I truly reside in having done what is to be done, my relics are mere grains and I have given the twelve limbs without disinction.” The Buddha having passed, the *saṃgha* requested to the noble Ānanda “Where was it that the Blessed One expounded the *Turning the Wheel of the Dharma Sūtra*? Child of the Sugata, speak! One of great wisdom, speak!” in this way the teaching and collections exist through a continuous lineage up to the present day. In regards to **clearing away the darkness of delusion and opening the lotus of the heart**, uncommonly [the Buddha] dwells opening up the lotus of the heart and clearing away delusion through teaching innumerable teachings while dwelling in Tuṣita heaven or in the womb of the Mother. **Delusion** includes all misknowledge, mistaken consciousness, and doubt. From among these, the greatest mistaken consciousness is solely to view other lifetimes as non-existent. The protector of all beings, the

characteristics of the three jewels will become mistaken. Even when other lifetimes exist, [they are thought to] occur without a cause or are caused by a creator like Ívara and so forth. One then accepts the occurrence from a discordant cause. Permanence, happiness, and purity [5a1] are mistaken as a Self, one upholds sentient beings as adversaries, and one has attachment to all dharmas as substantially existent entities and so forth. In order to clear these away, the Buddha teaches preliminary dharma teachings, at first, all beings die, and except for the three [types] of Arhats, all will take rebirth. He teaches *The Sūtra on Impermanence* and so forth to clear away initial delusion. In this way, one produces an awareness which seeks out a place of refuge due to fear and terror based on a definite understanding of the endless cycle of birth and death. At that time, it is only the speech of the Buddha that **opens up the lotus of the heart** having cleared away delusion on the greatness of the [three] jewels as a place of refuge. By that [speech], one is protected by principle blessings from the hostilities of this life and in this manner one is protected principally by scriptural teachings from the lower realms of rebirth up through the inferior vehicle in **opening up the lotus of the heart and clearing away the darkness of delusion**. The magnificent Buddha qualities of the Buddha himself and the bodhisattvas who dwell on the tenth stage teach later like this but an *ācārya* never knows all according to Ge-shes Ston-pa.

[5a4] Then, through the force of being protected by the teaching transmission from the three lower realms of rebirth, in all rebirths one experiences happiness and suffering and takes rebirth just in accordance with one's accumulated karma. Even though one takes rebirth in happy realms of rebirth through having performed contaminated virtuous deeds, all that has a deceptive quality which is impermanent, even its intrinsic nature is nothing other than a mistaken happiness for suffering. Therefore, is it necessary to meditatively cultivate an uncontaminated path that wishes to attain transcendence from the suffering of existence. One understands that by meditatively cultivating an uncontaminated path one achieves everlasting liberation from cyclic existence, although one does not attain Buddhahood but merely one's own liberation. It is nothing but shameless when achieving merely one's own liberation having abandoned sentient beings, who are considered as one's kinsmen, who suffer in cyclic existence. All sentient beings at the time of being intoxicated are punished by the stream of birth and death in limitless cyclic existence are my mother. Through making

firm great compassion for all sentient beings considered as [one's] mother who experience various sufferings in cyclic existence I produce the mind which aspires [and] solemnly promises great awakening for the sake of sentient beings. As one understands the necessity of engaging in the cause based on a wish to attain the result, one ascertains and practices the defining features of the cause, the five perfections. Having relied on conventional reality [5b], one **clears away the darkness of delusion and opens the lotus of the heart**, abandoning the extreme of deprecation. In this way, even by being accustomed to the factors of method which rely upon conventional reality, if one does not realize ultimate reality whose meaning is the unproduced, complete omniscience will not be attained and all obstructions without exception will not be abandoned. The *Noble Perfection of Wisdom Sutra* and the *Sutra which Teaches All Things Do Not Arise* and so forth settle the meaning of the unproduced, and through **clearing away the darkness of delusion and opening the lotus of the heart** for ultimate reality one abandons the extreme of superimposition, comprehending exactly as they are the meaning of the two realities. Since it is only complete omniscience, the only point of relevance is to bow down to that [omniscience]. An *ācārya* who perceives the truth of reality construes as authoritative only that [omniscience] itself. It is said that the special instruction of paying homage to complete omniscience was made at the time of translating the Vinaya. The collected bits of scriptural authority in the Vinayasutra provide many contradictory answers through examining contradiction and non-contradiction based on only oral scriptural authority. However many answers to objections occur throughout the *Abhidharmakośaṭika* and the *Commentary to the Great Dependent-Arising* that are settled by only scriptural oral authority (*āgama, lung*). Bhāviveka, even when ascertaining the meaning of the profound, does not settle it by merely withered logic but reaches a conclusion only through scriptural oral authority. Geshe Ston-pa has stated that the meaning of the unproduced is taught later in a similar way by buddhas and bodhisattvas who reside on the tenth stage but that *ācāryas* do not know this. In his last words at the time of his passing, at the time of the passing of the guru [Geshe Ston-pa], the other disciples searched [for a teacher] and he said, “Since a spiritual friend to be entrusted to you alone does not appear in Tibet, for your mutual support take the *sūtrapīṭaka* as your spiritual friend.”⁵¹ Thus, in special

⁵¹ See Vetturini 2007: 108 for later historical accounts of this saying.

instructions that do not rely on the Buddha’s scriptural authority, any intelligent one would not be confident nor go along the path. [Scriptural statements say] “The view is indicated by seeing” and “see the Buddha,” which is to produce a view which realizes the abiding nature from his scriptural oral tradition but is not realized by logic.

[5b8] The practical purpose is, as previously mentioned, to cut off hindrances, and moreover, to produce a genuine intellectual understanding that increases in all future rebirths. As previously mentioned, arising from the blessings of the Buddha study, contemplate, and meditate at all times. [6a] As when the Lord [Atiśa] argued with [non-Buddhist] outsiders, the force of faith is without a biased mind. The obstacles of a small man are produced by one’s bad intelligence. This is overturned when paying homage, worshipping, and supplicating omniscience. Through relying on conventional reality, one is said to abandon the extreme of deprecation and is said to enter the middle way. The actual **middle way special instructions**, the **middle way special instructions of the great vehicle** is said to be this and so forth. Generally, even the schools from among the four great buddhist traditions, along with those who are as outsiders, superimpose since a Self and so forth does not exist. Those of the Great Vehicle state that my assertion that the Self of a person does not even conventionally exist is falling to the extreme of deprecation. They rely on the mere dharma of subject and object, the experience of happiness or suffering arising from the carrying out of virtuous or non-virtuous actions. They attain liberation from cultivating the uncontaminated path and all cause and effect of affliction and purification is all that exists and that is said to be the middle way free from the two extremes. The Yogācāra state that the outsider [non-Buddhists] accept the Self and that the Sautrāntika assertion that the material elements and that which arises from the material elements are the apprehended object and the six groups of consciousness which apprehends them are substantially existent is a superimposition. The Madhyamakas who assert that the dependent-nature of mere cognition only does not exist at all is a deprecation. That is according to the way the *Madhyānta*[*vibhāga*]⁵² states “because [false imagining]

⁵² Cf. Nagao 1964:17-18: *abhūtaparikalpo ’sti dvayan tatra na vidyate / śūnyatā vidyate tv atra tasyām apī sa vidyate // na śūnyaṃ nāpi cāśūnyaṃ tasmāt sarvaṃ vidhīyate / sattvād asattvāt sattvāc ca madhyamā pratīpac ca sā //* Translation based on Mathes 2000:197-197: “false imagining exists. Duality is not found in that. But emptiness is found there, [and false imagining] is found in relation to [emptiness] as well. Therefore, everything is taught as neither empty nor non-empty, because [false imagining] exists, because [duality] does not exist, and because [false imagining] exists [in relation to

exists, because [duality] does not exist, and because [false imagining] exists [in relation to emptiness, and emptiness in relation to false imagining]. And this is the middle path.” The dependent-nature exists as mere cognitive representation, and since the apprehended object and apprehending subject, the imagined nature, does not exist, the perfect nature, reality which is empty of the imagined nature in the dependent-nature does exist. They say only this is called the middle. In this particular sense the **middle way special instructions of the great vehicle** is mentioned. [6a7] **Conventionally** all dharmas existent just in the manner they are presented and through the principle that states⁵³ “that which is the real nature of the conventional is considered the same as the ultimate,” ultimately the conventional itself when examined by reason, **something the size of the tip of a hair that is split a hundred times** does not exist. In this way, by the expression two realities, since it is free from the two extremes of deprecation and superimposition by extension it is called middle way and special instructions is like as before. Through this, the introduction (*gleng bslang ba, *upodghāta*) of the treatise is indicated and the “purpose-connection” (*dgos ’brel*) is taught in four parts. [6b] The subject matter (*brjod bya, abhideya*) of this is the two realities. The purpose (*dgos pa, prayojana*) is to realize the [two realities] by [the wisdoms arising from] hearing and contemplation. The purpose of the purpose (*dgos pa’i dgos pa, prayojanaprayojana*) is to integrate means and wisdom through relying on the two realities. In the time period after seeing reality, those on the tenth [stage] directly realize the two realities. At the time of final buddhahood one abides in the nature of only meditative equipoise and will uninterruptedly appear just as the good fortune of beings for the aims of others. The relation (*’brel pa, sambandha*) is the relation between the purpose and the treatise. The relation between the purpose of the purpose and the purpose is in the manner of the means (*thabs, upaya*) and that which arises from the means (*thabs las byung ba, upeya*).⁵⁴ [6b3] At first, when settling the characteristics of the two realities by hearing

emptiness, and emptiness in relation to false imagining]. And this is the middle path.”

⁵³ Jñānagarbha’s *Satyadvayavibhaṅgakārikā*, 17a (Eckel 1987:87, Tibetan, p.173): *kun rdzob de bzhin nyid gang yin // de nyid dam pa’i don gyis bzhed //* Sanskrit in Haribhadra’s AAA: *saṃvṛtes tathatā yaiva paramārthasya sā matā / abhedāt so ’pi ni nyāyo yathādarśanam āstshitaḥ*

⁵⁴ This echoes the relationship between the two realities found in Atiśa’s *Satyadvayāvatāra* and Candrakīrti’s *Madhyamakāvatāra* (6.80). The *Satyadvayāvatāra*, vs. 19 (Ejima 1983:365-366; Apple 2013:314): [The Ācārya Candrakīrti has stated as follows: “Conventional reality functions as a means, and ultimate reality functions as the goal. Those who do not understand the difference between the two have a bad understanding and get a bad rebirth.” *slob dpon zla grags ’di skad du* {om. Ejima} //

and thinking, “conventionally” and so forth the four truths are certainly grouped within the two realities but in this regard the great amount of the expressible existents have been sorted into five. The two words the *sūtras* use for the two realities are not grouped or are not incomplete. Regarding this, “*kun*” has the meaning of all or the limits and “*rdzob*” is in the Zhang-zhung language. Since it has the meaning of false, the limits or all is false or obscured is the meaning of “*kun rdzob*” (“all-obscured”, i.e. the conventional). **All dharmas** includes the aggregates, elements, and sensory media, or all that is afflicted and that which is to be purified. All that is construed **from the perspective of the ordinary individual, one with narrow vision**, one who habitually clings to things as substantially existent. One states, “indicate the nature having established in mind the worldly relation of cause and effects of actions.” [6b5] Generally, the conventional is not at all existent other than **cause and effect**. “**True just as it is established**” is true as measured and apprehended as real by those of narrow vision but that nature is a false object as mentioned before:

“Whatever near and other, that appearance does not exist and is like a reflection. The essence of just how it is is artificial.”

Through this manner, it is a mere **appearance** through dependence on similar cause and condition. For example, like a reflection which appears through dependence on mere similarity with that in a mirror. Here, Spyan-nga⁵⁵ and Rnal-'byor-pa Chen-po⁵⁶ say that is it like the legend of foolish talk in the language of pigeons. The very appearance for one of narrow vision is an incompatible inferior appearance and “stating all is true for all that is false” in the section of the *Śikṣasamuccaya* which

thabs su gyur pa kun rdzob bden pa dang // thabs las byung ba don dam bden pa dag / gnyis po'i dbye ba gang gis mi shes pa // de dag log par rtogs pas ngan 'gror 'gro // 19 // Madhyamakāvātāra, 6.80 (La Vallée Poussin [1907-11], p.175.3-6): tha snyad bden pa thabs su gyur pa dang // don dam bden pa thabs byung gyur pa ste // de gnyis rnam dbye gang gis mi shes pa // de ni rnam rtog log pas lam ngan zhugs / 6.80 / /. Cited in the Subhāṣitasamgraha (Bendall 1905:22.7-10): upāyabhūtaṃ vyavahārasatyam upeyabhūtaṃ paramārthasatyam / tayor vibhāgaṃ na paraiti yo vai mithyāvikalpaiḥ sa kumārgayātaḥ // As noted by Lindtner (1979:89n13), this verse is also cited in the Bodhisattvayogācāracatuḥśatakaṭikā, chapter III (Peking bstan 'gyur, vol.98, dbu ma Ya 63a.1-2).

⁵⁵ Spyan-snga tshul-khrims-'bar (1038-1103) was the youngest of the three Kadampa brothers, the other two being Po-to-ba rin chen (1027-1105) and Phu-chung-ba gzhon-nu rgyal-mtshan, 1031-1106).

⁵⁶ Rnal-'byor-pa Chen-po Byang-chub-rin-chen (1015–1078) was a direct disciple of Atiśa and later became abbot of Reting monastery after 'Brom-ston rgyal-ba'i 'byung-gnas.

investigates the water element, the water itself appears up to twenty aeons as spoken in the [Abhidharma-]Kośa is not spoken according to the world. [7a1] Whenever the conventional is asserted as the mind, it is the **appearance** of the ordinary mind. When construed through the force of existent external objects, all incompatible appearances, as a measure of appearance, are true, but since that which is established as substantial does not exist, is it called “false.” It is false since it is not established substantially and in the section of the activity of the Mother [Perfection of Wisdom] it states that everything, all dharmas from form up through omniscience, are indicated by conventional transactions. For as long as one does not abandon clinging to things as real, and the mountain-like [notion] of “I,” the occurrence of causes and effects, the accumulation of causes and conditions, are undeceiving and undeniably occurs as they are not distinct [7a3] from being established as substantially existent and as real in the purview of one with narrow vision. It is called “conventional reality” and by the force of delusion for both cause and effect and the meaning of suchness, the delusion for the cause and effect and karma and its effects which produce the three lower realms of rebirth from sinful unvirtuous actions does not exist for the object of suchness. By the force of delusion, through contaminated virtue the cause and effect of birth among gods and humans and freedom from the delusion of both those by understanding all existence as suffering, one generates detachment. For the purpose of abandoning the cause of that [suffering] by training in the two trainings, one attains one’s own liberation through the cause and effect of the inferior vehicle (*theg dman, hīnayāna*). Through the training of a bodhisattva who is impelled by the aspiration for awakening (*bodhicitta*), who produces [the aspiration] spontaneously and continually for the purpose of all sentient beings that pervade the limits of space, is the cause and effect of the great vehicle (*theg chen, mahāyāna*). The six or eight groups of consciousness of ordinary individuals and the wisdom of Noble beings are all from the cause and effect of birth from four conditions [perceived] as real along with their appearances. The appearances to sentient beings in hell of the four levels of red-hot irons and so forth; the appearances of skeletons, pus, and blood and so forth for hungry ghosts; the appearances to animals, those who abide in and are scattered throughout the outer oceans and continents; the appearances to humans among the four continents; the appearance of the six types of desire realms gods; the appearances that appear at

certain times of the mansions of the Brahmā-realm gods of the first concentration up through the individual mansions of the gods of the fourth concentration; and even all the appearances of the pure fields, the extremely pure fields of the Buddhas, are **in the perspective of one with narrow vision** (*tshu rol thong ba, arvāgdarśana*). Therefore, since it is true [from this perspective], the Buddha did not contradict teaching the world. [However,] it is said that the correct teaching is nothing [7b] whatsoever. Therefore, those who let go by dividing the ultimate as emptiness, and then, throughout existence conventionally apprehend [things] as real, [understand] that by taking life a sentient being is reborn as hell-beings, hungry ghosts, or as animals; that when one is reborn as a human, one issues forth the maturation of harmonious life and sickness and so forth; that when one abandons the taking of life, one is reborn as a god or human among the happy realms. Moreover, through issuing forth the maturation of long-life and little sickness, one places trust in all that is said about abandoning non-virtue and persevering in virtue having relied on conventional reality. The great vital point is that one is free from the extreme of deprecation. The spiritual teacher of Lord [Atiśa], Avadhūtipa, bestowed to Lord [Atiśa] the special instruction of non-arising. It is according to the nature [of this teaching] that, as long as one has not exhausted the view for a Self, it is not suitable to belittle or waste even the most subtle action. The yogin who has attained the great power of concentration, the scholar *paṇḍita* who is a great master, the elders (*sthavira*) of the *saṃgha*—one should not belittle them thinking, this one has merely attained concentration, this is merely a scholar, and these are merely elders. Great supersensory powers see much in understanding that this fault and this belittling leads to rebirth now as a hell-being in this place, a hungry ghost in that place and so forth. Geshe Ston-pa said, “O followers of the Elder [Atiśa], great pretension is inappropriate.”⁵⁷ Entities are emptiness. One should imagine in meditation that one’s hands are placed in a fire with nothing to help one. Since it is both the burned and the burner, the hand scorched by fire is said to be reality. Generally, by attaining confidence, when one belittles, that is deceptive. This occurs without independence by the force of the afflictions. Relying on regret when engaging in practice, it is possible to not produce a result. [7b6] Therefore, for as long as one

⁵⁷ Quoted in Tsong-kha-pa’s *Lam rim chen mo*, p. 195, for English see Cutler and Newland, 2000, volume 1, p.251.

does not exhaust the view for a Self, from a cattle herdsman up to one training in the the five knowledges, all appears as agreeable. It is real as merely that. All your rebirths are understood as like an illusionary person by this principle. One on the first [bodhisattva] level that follows after seeing reality, by cognizing the fundamental nature of the conventional—the rebirths of the three lower realms, the rebirths of the two happy realms, attaining the liberation of a *śrāvaka* or *pratyekabuddha* by training in the three trainings, obtaining Buddhahood which performs actions for the purpose of all sentient beings who pervade the extent of the sky, the training of a bodhisattva which is impelled by the aspiration for awakening, the consciousness and wisdom which arises from the four conditions, and all the former appearances of these—although the **appearances** exist, they are not fixated upon as truly existent and are understood to be like an illusion. Since they are understood as being like an illusion from attaining the first ground onward, it is proper to send out a hundred emanations instantaneously. It is never at all suitable if substantially established. There are different tenets for whether appearances exist or do not exist for one in reality or on the Buddha level. If they exist, there is not any invalidation from mere evanescent appearances. In this way, through the vajra-like concentration post-meditative appearances are not accepted and there is only meditative stabilization on reality from this point onward that abandons without exception the subtle latencies of grasping things as real. Therefore, while the fundamental nature of the aggregates and so forth is like an illusion, the childish apprehend them as real having relied upon a delusive basis, from which occurs the view for a Self and being bound in *samsāra* by the misknowledge which is deluded in regards to reality. The fundamental reality of the conventional is like an illusion, and one should study, reflect, and repeatedly contemplate like gSang-phu-ba who repeatedly diminished the grasping of things as real. From producing the path of seeing onward, since one realizes the fundamental nature is like an illusion, it is just like being taken by the hand. The highest of objects and the undeceiving object or since it is the object of holy wisdom it is the ultimate (*don dam*) or the real (*yang dag pa*) and when construing the unfabricated way things are, through the principle that “when the conventional that appears is analytically examined just as it, nothing whatsoever is found. The unfindable is itself the ultimate”⁵⁸

⁵⁸ *Satyadvayāvātāra*, vs. 21abc: / kun rdzob ji ltar snang ba 'di // rigs pas brtags na 'ga' mi rnyed //

the text says “**when the conventional as it appears**” and the very nature of this is non-arising. By examining with **the great reasonings**, that which is the nature is realized. If the conventional is substantially established, it is not of benefit since the ultimate is unproduced. Relying on a conventional reality that is substantially established is the source of all faults.

[8a7] For this, the **reasonings** when construed at the base all production and cessation is called dependent-arising (*rten ’brel gyi gtan tshigs, pratītyasamutpādahetu*), one and the many (i.e. *gcig du bral gyi gtan tshigs, ekānekaviyogahetu*) is the second. By dividing into three production and cessation there is four: the reasoning of dependent-arising, the vajra-slayers (*rdo rje gzegs ma’i gtan tshigs, vajrakaṇahetu*), and the reasoning of the production and cessation of the four limits (*mu bzhi skye ’gog gi gtan tshigs, catuṣkoṭyutpādapraṭiseḍdhahetu*).⁵⁹ For this, generally, the production and cessation of the existence or non-existence of the result and the cause, when examined by the three times, is not suitable to produce a result is called dependent-arising. The Ācārya [Nāgārjuna] teaches that since cause and effect are only through mutual dependence, [8b1] there will be a result only in dependence upon a previous cause and just as it is dependent on a former cause, the cause and effect is fabricated, does not have an independent nature, and this is regarded as the reasoning of dependent-arising.

[8b1] For this, to refute the arising of the existent and nonexistent, Nāgārjuna states in his *Śūnyatāsaptati*:

“The existent cannot be produced, since it is [already] existent; the non-existent cannot be produced since it is non-existent.”⁶⁰

Since they are incompatible dharmas, there is not both. Because birth does not exist, permanence and cessation do not exist. The Sāṃkhyas assertion is clarified by the condition single existent result from the beginning, and our own school, the Vaibhāṣika, when on the ground of a future result is presently pulled along by the condition of a

ma rnyed pa nyid don dam yin / See Apple 2013: 315-317.

⁵⁹ The Kadampa author is following Atiśa’s tradition of “four great reasons” (*gtan tshigs chen po bzhi*) as articulated in the *Bodhipathapradīpa* (Sherburne 2000: 15, 229-235). Atiśa’s system of positing four reasons for proving emptiness is different than Kamalaśīla who discusses five reasons (See Keira 2004:10-13).

⁶⁰ *Śūnyatāsaptati* (vs. 4ab): *yod pa yod phyir skye ma yin / med pa med pa’i phyir ma yin /*

single exist cause; this present existence, accepted as going on the ground of the past, the three times are substantially established and both are accepted as an existent that is produced. The majority of others assert production as non-existent. The *Catuḥśataka* unanimously condemns this. Further, not including most of the sūtras, [some] accept the existent as produced. For all this, the *Śūnyatāsaptati* (vs. 4) states:

“The existent cannot be produced, since it is [already] existent; the non-existent cannot be produced since it is non-existent since they are incompatible dharmas, there is not both.”

The *Madhyamakāvātāra* states that it is not acceptable by reasoning that

“Pillars and so forth as ornaments of houses are meaningless to those who assert a result as existent and to those who assert a result as nonexistent.”⁶¹

Through being established as existent it is unnecessary to produce. Since there does not exist a time of non-produced when it is produced as a nature which is already established, there would be the endless production. When supported by a cause that is existent, since a non-existent production would not occur there would be pointless production. Through the reasoning which states “even by a one hundred million causes a non-existent will not be subject to change”⁶² in this way a cause even with great power is not able to produce a non-existent. It will be a production of a rabbit’s horn when produced from a cause which is non-existent. Since existence and nonexistence are contradictory dharmas that are not possible, it is not acceptable to produce as being both [existent and non-existent]. For this, how is it acceptable to produce as being both if there is a non-existent result for a cause that is existent? When examining whether something exists through production or exists as not produced, the existent as a cause

⁶¹ This citation is actually from Āryadeva’s *Catuḥśataka* (11.15) rather than from verses of the *Madhyamakāvātāra*: ‘bras bu yod par gang ’dod dang / /’bras bu med par gang ’dod la / /khyim gyi don du ka ba sogs / /brgyan pa’i don yang med par ’gyur/ Skt. *stambhādīnām alaṃkāro gṛhasārthe nirarthakaḥ / satkāryam eva yasyeṣṭaṃ yasyāsatkāryam eva ca /* However, the verse is found in Candrakīrti’s *Madhyamakāvātārabhāṣya* (La Vallée Poussin 1907-12: 99.13-14), cited without source, indicating that early Tibetans may have attributed the verse to Candrakīrti.

⁶² *Bodhicaryāvātāra* 9.147: *nābhāvaṣya vikāro ’sti hetukoṭīśatairapi /*

itself is not established, and since a cause is posited having relied on a result, it is not acceptable for existence as a cause itself of a non-existent result and since there is a consequence for the faults of both, both are not possible. When examining from the point view of the cause, Nāgārjuna states,

“No thing anywhere is ever born from itself, from something else,
from both or without a cause.”⁶³

Arising is not acceptable from itself, from other, from both [itself and other], or without a cause. First, arising is not necessary if established from itself because when arising is established, it would be endless and because when independent entities like seeds [9a] and so forth themselves are [already] produced, consciousness, sprouts and so forth would be without a cause. When [that] itself is not established, it will not obtain even its own conventional [status] as it would be unsuitable as a cause because of similarity with what is produced. Through the reasoning that

“It is not even from other, the other is other in dependence upon the other.
Without the other, the other would not be other”⁶⁴

since the result is not itself established it is not established as an otherness which is related to that. This is because when an other is produced from an other then everything would be produced from everything. It does not exist from either a permanent or impermanent other. A permanent [other] is not acceptable as a result would be produced gradually and instantaneously. It would be impermanent if produced gradually, and if instantaneously, all results would be perceived at one time. One is not

⁶³ *Mūlamadhyamakārikā* 1.1 (Derge bsTan 'gyur, tsa 1a3 - 2b1): *bdag las ma yin gzhan las min // gnyis las ma yin rgyu med min // dngos po gang dag gang na yang // skye ba nam yang yod ma yin // LVP 1904: 12.13): na svato nāpi parato na dvābhyāṃ nāpy ahetutaḥ / utpannā jātu vidyante bhāvāḥ kva cana ke cana // 1 //*

⁶⁴ This verse is an old Tibetan translation of MMK 14.5 which reads: */gzhan las kyang ma yin te / gzhan ni gzhan la bsten te gzhan / /gzhan min gzhan du mi ltar 'gyur /* This version differs from the canonical Tibetan translation which reads */gzhan ni gzhan la brtan te gzhan/ /gzhan med par gzhan gzhan mi 'gyur/ /gang la brten te gang yin pa//de ni de las gzhan mi 'thad/* The Sanskrit is: *anyad anyat pratīyānyan nānyad anyad rte 'nyataḥ / yat pratītya ca yat tasmāt tad anyan nopapadyate* (Katsura and Siderits 2013: 149-150).

able to assert because successively perceived impermanence is not suitable as a cause because things of the past from among the three times would not arrive, disintegratedness and production would not exist. Since in the present at the same time there would not exist assistance or imputation, cause and effect would be pointless. Since the consequence of both faults and both being contradictory dharmas are not acceptable, it is not from both. In the view of production from the condition of one's own seed or cause, from the perspective produced from an other condition and it is produced of itself, since it is produced from an other, production would be from both [one's own cause and a other]. For the Sāṃkhyas, since an entity of a result exists from the beginning, it is eliminated by conditions that exist from the perspective of the result existing from the beginning. If it is from itself and if it is from an other condition which clarifies, how can it be both? The condition of the seed and the cause is not itself established, because it is cause and effect, as the former and later are different. Likewise, since the conditions themselves are not established, as both product and non-product are different, one is not released from the previous defect of the consequence of both faults.

“Because that which is causeless does not depend on anything else, it would be either permanently existent or permanently nonexistent. Things occur intermittently because they are dependent.”⁶⁵

This reasoning [indicates] there is not arising without a cause. Regarding this, for those who advocate causeless arising: Who is cut by a sharp thorn? Who draws the colorful tail of the peacock? Who makes the stem, leaves, and flowers of the lotus?, if all these arise without a cause? This refutes those who advocate causeless arising. Since it is without distinction if it is causeless, the qualities of a peacock would exist for a crow and so forth. The qualities of a lotus would exist for a willow, a rhododendron bush, and so forth. [9b] Since Jñānagarbha states from his *Two Realities* that, “Many do not produce one, many do not produce many, one does not produce

⁶⁵ *Pramāṇavārttika* 1.35. Dunne 2004: 336-337, PV 1.35: *tathā ca nityaṃ sattvaṃ asattvaṃ vāhetor anyānapekṣaṇāt / apekṣāto hi bhāvānāṃ kādācitkatva-sambhavaḥ* // Tib. *rgyu med gzhan la mi ltos phyiir/ rtag tu yod pa'am med par 'gyur/ dngos po rnam ni res* (P k418b.3) 'ga' zhig/ 'byung ba ltos pa las yin (D273a.5) no (PV 1.35 = PVin 2.58). Verse is preserved in Candraripā's *Ratnamālā*.

many, and one does not produce one,”⁶⁶ production is not acceptable when examining the four extremes. Conventionally, it is only fundamental for the arising of one result from a collection of many causes and conditions while ultimately this is not acceptable. Although there exists many potencies for the faculties, objects, appearances, and mental engagements as a cause because it is not agreeable for cause and effect as there is not other than a single quality of consciousness that is the result, a single result will be causeless. Would not the arising of many results by many causes since there is arising which has the immediately preceding condition similar to the cause, the eye faculty, and the apprehension of form and the self which cognizes the consciousness that is a result from the object such as form? Accordingly, the nature of the consciousness and realization and so forth would either be one or many. If you ask would it be one, is it one as the nature of a single consciousness or many distinct? If according to the first, there would be the previous fault of one arising from many and if according to the second there would be many visual consciousnesses. If there are many, an arising of the nature and so forth which is realized by many conditions but since consciousness is not produced, consciousness would be causeless. Furthermore, when many produce many, are each and every result that is produced applied to all the causes or is each and every cause applied to each and every result? If according to the first, there would be the fault of producing one by many and if according to the second, there would be the fault of producing one by one. The cause, the faculty of the eye itself, produce later a concordant of its own type and eye consciousness produced, does one produce the many? Accordingly, is the faculty which produces a concordant type and the faculty which produces consciousness an identical or distinct nature. Is it identical? Accordingly, it is not suitable for many natures of a result to arise from a single nature of a cause. If it is distinct, there would be many which are produced from many. Furthermore, since the nature of the cause, not different than one, would arise, many qualities for the result, cause and effect would be discordant. Many results would be without a cause and by a single cause many results would be produced simultaneously or would be produced gradually. If according to the first, all the results, many simultaneously would be cognized at one time and when according to the second, there would occur the fault of producing many by many. What if one cause produced

⁶⁶ See Jñānagarbha, *Satyadvayavibhāṅgākārikā* (verse 14, translation Eckel 1987: 80).

only one result? Accordingly, would the sense-faculty at the time of producing a single result produce only that which accords with its own type or would it produce only a consciousness? If according to the first, by not producing consciousness, all sentient beings would obtain the status of matter at the first moment. [10a] If according to the second, by interrupting what is concordant with its own type in the two kinds of moments, all sentient beings would become deaf and blind, and so forth. Both cause and effect, when examined by one and many, are not established. Śāntarakṣita from his *Madhyamakālaṃkāra*, at first analyzes the Self and so forth determining that they are not suitable as entities as they do not have causal efficacy to produce a result when empty. If causally efficacious, is it instantaneous or gradual? It is not the first, since all results are cognized successively. It is not the second as existing sequentially for the result the cause is impermanent by a consequence as many, the permanent, and the single alone would degenerate. Likewise, with respect to directional parts do they exist differently or do they exist in singularity?

“[It is claimed that] the atom in the center is in contact with [the other atoms forming one particle], or that it is surrounded [by them with intervals remaining in between], or that it is in non-dimensional contiguity [with them, being neither contact nor intervals between them].”⁶⁷

“[However], if some say, [the atom in the center] entirely faces one atom in the front and also entirely faces another atom, then how can there be gross things like earth, water and so forth?”⁶⁸

Through such reasoning, by having various parts the form aggregate is not established as a unity. In this way, many is not established as well, since not establishing many the support and the object are not established. The five sense-doors, consciousness are not established and since those are not established, the mind as soon as it stops is not established, and since that is not established, the consciousness of the

⁶⁷ *Madhyamakālaṃkāra* 11 (Ichigo 1989:192-193); TS 1989 *saṃyuktaṃ dūradeśasthaṃ nairantaryavyavasthitam / ekāṅvabhimukhaṃ rūpaṃ yang aṅor madhyavarttinaḥ //*

⁶⁸ *Madhyamakālaṃkāra* 12 (Ichigo 1989:195); TS 1989: *aṅvantarābhimukhyena tad eva yadi kalpyate / pracayo bhūdarādīnām evaṃ sati na yujyate //*

mind is not established, and in this way, since the six-fold collection of consciousness does not establish the mind, the mental factors such as happiness which are unified with those are also not established. In this way, since form, mind, and mental factors are not established, the non-associated factors that are determined on the status of those are not established. Thus, since the aggregates are not established, the elements and the sensory-spheres are not established and mere cognitive representations, by the reasoning of the many aspects and the non-differentiated, are not established as a unity. The unconditioned, space, and so forth, since they are connected with forms having various parts, are not established as a unity. The unconditioned, if it is not an object of knowledge, then it is established as not having intrinsic nature. If it is an object of knowledge, since knowledge is connected successively, the unconditioned also would be impermanent and would be as many, therefore it is not established as a unity. The *Madhyamakālamkāra* states:

“When any entity is examined, no unity is found in it. Where there is no unity, plurality cannot be found either.”⁶⁹

Thus by this reasoning the many is also not established and the Ācārya [Nāgārjuna] states:

“Because the aggregate of form is only a name, space also is only a name. Without the elements [10b] how can forms exist? Therefore, even name-only does not exist.”⁷⁰

Thus, space is not substantially established and that nature is suitable. The *Madhyamaka Pañcaskandhaka* asserts the unconditioned to be four including space, the two cessations, and suchness. The unconditioned itself is also established as lacking inherent existence. In this way, when examined by settling dependent-arising, **even something the size of the tip of a hair that is split a hundred times cannot be**

⁶⁹ *Madhyamakālamkāra* 61 (Ichigo 1989:210-211); TS 1995 *tad evaṃ sarvapakṣeṣu naivaikātmā sa yujyate / ekāniṣpattito 'nekasvabhāvo 'pi na sambhavī //*

⁷⁰ *Ratnāvalī* 1.99: gzugs kyi dngos po ming tsam phyir / /nam mkha' yang ni ming tsam mo / /'byung med gzugs lta ga la yod / / de phyir ming tsam nyid kyang med

grasped. That is established and afterwards all that exists is sharply examined like this. The Ācārya [Nāgārjuna] states:

“When an explanation is made through emptiness, whoever claims a fault about it all of that is not designated a fault as that is equivalent to what is to be proven.

When there is an argument about emptiness, whoever gives an answer any of that is not a answer as that is equivalent to what is to be proven.”⁷¹

The *Madhyamakāvātāra* (6.68a-c) states:

“Since their giving such and such a reply is seen as similar to this and that thesis,”⁷²

This teaching is comprehensive in regards to everything. Through hearing and reflection the two realities are ascertained just like this.

[10b4] The text discusses meditation itself when it states “**on a comfortable seat**” and so forth. First, just as it is taught from the *Bodhi[patha]pradīpa*, through having conviction in the karmic principal of cause and effect, one does not disregard even the most subtle transgression. One should stay with the factors of method to the extent that one can achieve the five perfections through being impelled by the aspiration for awakening. With a single teaching, even a mere incense bowl as the object of meditation, one should practice in the concentration of emptiness. In this way, by indicating the factors of method at the time of cultivating wisdom, it is necessary to

⁷¹ Kadam author cites an old Tibetan translation of *Mūlamadhyamakārika* of verse 4.8 and 4.9 in inverse order that reads: *stong pa nyid skyis bshad byas tshe / /gang zhig skyon 'dogs smra byed pa / /de'i thams cad skyon btags min / /bsgrub par bya dang mtshung par 'gyur / [4.9] /stong pa nyid kyi brtsad byas tshe / /gang zhig lan 'debs smra byed pa / /de'i thams cad lan btob min / /bsgrub par bya dang mtshung par 'gyur / [4.8].* The Tibetan Kanjur reads 4.8 and 4.9 as: */stong pa nyid kyi brtsad byas tshe/ /gang zhig lan 'debs smra byed pa/ /de yi thams cad lan btob min/ /bsgrub par bya dang mtshungs par 'gyur/[4.8] / /stong pa nyid kyi bshad byas tshe/ /gang zhig skyon 'dogs smra byed pa/ /de yi thams cad skyon btags min/ /bsgrub par bya dang mtshungs par 'gyur/ [4.9] MMK Skt. 4.8-4.9;Katsura and Siderits 2013:56-57.*

⁷² *Madhyamakāvātāra* 6.68a-c (La Vallée Poussin 159.6-7): *'di yis lan ni gang dang gang btob pa / /de dang de ni dam bcas {LVP bca'} mtshungs mthong nas {LVP mthong bas}/*

remain in solitude for the acquisition of meditative serenity (*zhi gnas, śamatha*). All worldly activities are to be settled as one is incapable [of settling them] in the time frame of remaining in solitude. If a little bit [of worldly activity] occurs during solitude that is not satisfying. As the Kam⁷³ say, as soon as one closes the eyes it would not do to remember all the lower worldly activities. As the elements of solitude have few activities, one must not have any activities at all which are not meditation. Furthermore, by having few desires and being easily satisfied, the concordant conditions of meditation, one will be easily satisfied with the bare necessities. One should keep distant from the place of one's birth, abandoning kinsmen. Just as teaching in fives the accumulation of special insight, [11a] ascertain well the characteristics of the two realities through studying and contemplation, as well as the well-received special instruction of cultivating special insight in accordance with the spiritual friend. At first, one should have compassion by considering sentient beings as one's parents, who are confused in the meaning of the two realities, and who, through the power of apprehending non-existent things, wander in *saṃsāra* and are differentiated by various sufferings which do not [actually] exist. All sentient beings have previously discarded the ability to realize the meaning of the two realities as well as the ability to cultivate the meaning of non-arising as a means to eliminate apprehending things as real. Pay homage, worship with offerings, confess transgressions, and supplicate in order to manifest all the buddhas and bodhisattvas who reside in the ten directions and all the three jewels. The *Bhāvanākrama* states that all the activities of the path of activity including greater and lesser external actions should be well done. Sit on a comfortable seat cross-legged or in a half-crossed legged pose; the path of activity is the method for being able to remain [in meditation] for a long time. Remember to keep the body very straight as one should be fully directed toward the object of meditation. One should place the nose and the navel as one would cast a line. One should bend in front slightly to the left and right. Place the teeth and lips as usual and set the tongue against the upper front teeth. Do not keep the eyes wide open nor closed but rather, in the path of activity, set [the eyes] at a mere four fingers widths at the tip of one's nose as mentioned in the middle *Bhāvanākrama*. As for mental applications such as impermanence and so forth on the path of application do freely as you like. It is

⁷³ According to Dan Martin, Bru II 291.2, Kam is a Tibetan clan name.

suitable to lie down or rest on one's back even on a road. Consider spreading ten fingers out on one's chest. Then, examine this [object] with reasoning. This is the special instructions. One goes astray by forcing the breath through the means of mantra as a method of mental stability remaining as if everything is existent. Examine with reasoning all objects of knowledge entities and non-entities are classified as two. Non-existent unconditioned entities are not necessary to negate as they are non-entities. Others' imputations of a Self of a person and so forth or the appearances to one's own mind, since they are actually empty, are not substantially established and are not objectified externally, internally, or something other than that. Efficacious entities are exhausted as merely two [,those having form and those not having form]. Regarding that, having form, from the perspective of the aggregates is the aggregate of form and there are four forms of cause. The forms of result include five faculties and five objects that make ten. When summarized together [11b] this makes fourteen. As the forms of cause and effect are classified into two, they are not established as a unity. The elements that pertain to a cause are distinguished as four and are not established as a unity. Each individual element is not independently established even though they are not included within the other three. Even something solid is not established as a unity when distinguished by directional parts. Resultant forms are not established as a unity when distinguished into sense faculties and objects. Since there are five [sense faculties] and five [sense objects], each one individually is not established as a unity when distinguished by directional parts. Soundless are the eight substances of subtle atoms. Possessing the sense of touch is the ninth substance. Through the principle which is called "tenth substance for another faculty," there is a dissimilar substance of an atom. The four elements from the four sense-organs, the four substances according to the atoms of color, odor, taste, and tangible object makes eight. Since the body sense power pervades everywhere, the ninth substance are those atoms. [11b4] The eye and so forth have an individual atomic substance for each one that makes ten, and they are grouped as ten. One should closely view the atoms of an existent sound. The body sense-power has nine or ten. The objects not comprised by the sense-powers are eight or nine. If comprised of eight or nine they are not established as a unity as each individual atom when divided by directional parts will become either six or ten. The measure of a subtle atom: the most subtle [atom] in the dust mote of a sunbeam will

become a little more than two hundred thousand by six distinctions of stages from an “ox particle.”⁷⁴ With respect to a subtlety such like this, when distinguished by six or ten directions, it is extremely subtle without remainder and does not appear as an object of the mind. In this way, as the aggregate of form is not established, the elements and the sensory-spheres which have form are also not established because the ten elements and sense-spheres which possess form in regards to the aggregate of form itself are posited as ten. [11b6] The name basis of **that not having form** is the aggregates and that itself is posited on the side of the seven elements of mind, the sensory-sphere of the mental (*manāyatana*), and the element (*dhātu*) and sensory-sphere (*āyatana*) of dharma. Grouped together, all awarenesses are called “**mind**.” It is clear to designate mental factors in the context of the mind so that one does not think to group things beyond [mind and mental factors] when examining the status of those two. Furthermore, the unestablishment of that which has form is not established as mentioned before but, when examining the nature of that itself, the past and so forth will change into the three times [of past, present, and future] and the mind is asserted by all as impermanent. Furthermore, in general, since it is the special instructions to break things down from the coarse at first, from previous rebirths up to the present [life] and future rebirths from here on make three. [12a] Then this [life] itself is gradually broken down into years, months, days, and moments. Here, in terms of the very moment itself, the past and the future are non-existent. Candrakīrti teaches that since everything is impermanent, there is nothing other than mere cause and effect. Since cause and effect is mere dependence, it is conventional, but is itself not at all ultimately established. Here, the present moment is **extremeley difficult to examine**. That which does not have form **does not have color** like white and so forth and is **free from shapes** like a square and so forth. When it has such a nature of that, apart from being devoid of touch which obstructs, since it is not established as a material nature, it is not established like space. In another way, it is devoid of unity and multiplicity. When considering an object of mental awareness called “mind” for all awarenesses and classifying that into mind (*sems*) and mental factors (*sems las byung ba*) it is not

⁷⁴ According to *Rangjung Yeshe Dictionary* an 'ox particle' (6) is a measure the size of seven {*lug rdul*}, dust raised by a flock of sheep (5), a measure the size of seven rabbit particles {*ri bong gi rdul*} (4), a measure the size of seven water particles' (*chu rdul*) (3), which are equal to seven *lcags rdul*, 'iron particles' (2), a measure the size of seven minute particles {*rdul phran*} (1).

established as a unity. This applies to mental factors also, for the feeling which is produced as the nature of experience, the perception which apprehends signs, and the conditioning factor which are produced as the nature of effort and exertion, may be classified into three and are not established as a unity. The mind, [12a4] which has the nature of ideation and feeling itself by dividing at the base is three. Through classifying those into being produced in an assembly of six groups of consciousness that is distinguished into eighteen that are not established as a unity. There are even more than that when divided by the apprehension of signs. Even more than that, when produced as the nature of effort and striving and conditional factors are like a mass of a plantain tree. Consciousness also, from among six or eight groups, is various when divided for the object for each and every one. Since it observes the accumulation of consciousness for the five organs, the consciousness of the eye perceives various colors and shapes up to the bodily consciousness perceiving various objects of touch. Since mental consciousness has the nature to perceive the various eight conditioned dharmas and eight unconditioned dharmas and so forth, that which is called an aggregate is not established as singular. If one asserts that the mental factors do not exist and that consciousness exists as one group, the *Ratnāvalī* states,

If the instant has a final moment, we must assume that it has the other two moments as well, viz. the initial and the middle; but inasmuch as the instant consists of three moments, the world cannot have the duration of the instant. (I.69) Again, beginning, middle, and end must be considered to be like the instant, viz. divided each one into three moments; the condition of being beginning, middle, and end [is not existent by itself nor by another.]⁷⁵

Thus, consciousness is not established as a unity and is accepted by all as being momentary. From this it is necessary to accept an end point. [12b] Further, since the beginning is dependent upon a middle, it becomes three. When contemplating each and

⁷⁵ *Ratnāvalī* I.69-70abc; English Dunne/McClintock 1997. Tib. *ji ltar skad cig mtha' yod pa // de bzhin thog ma dbus brtag go // de ltar skad cig gsum bdag phyir // 'jig rten skad cig gnas pa min / [1.69] / thog ma dbus dang tha ma yang // skad cig bzhin du bsam par bya // thog ma dbus dang tha ma nyid / [1.70abc].* Skt. *yathānto 'sti kṣaṇasyaivam ādimadhyaṃ ca kalpyatām / tryātmakatvāt kṣaṇasyaivam na lokasya kṣaṇam sthitiḥ //69// ādimadhyāvasānāni cintyāni kṣaṇavat punaḥ / ādimadhyāvasānatvaṃ //70abc.*

every one of the three as momentary, by the same reasoning the three will each have three making nine parts. At any rate, the measure of a instant is taught as one finger snap in the refutation of sixty-two [views] from [Candrakīrti's] *Catuḥśatakaṭīka*. In other [texts] that to be refuted is one hundred twenty or three hundred sixty. It is worthless to examine it down to this extent as it occurs without an intrinsic nature. In another way, it is unproduced when examined by the five reasonings which refute production. Alternatively, there is natural luminosity and through breaking down through these reasonings [things] are not made empty but since they are naturally unproduced, when they are not elaborated by elaborations or not conceptualized by conceptions of this is form, this is not form, low and excellent, large and middle-sized and so forth, it is called “**luminious.**”

“Abiding, arising, and ceasing, existence and non-existence, low, middle, and superior—the Buddha spoke of these under the power of wordly transactions, not under the power of reality.”⁷⁶

How is the mind accepted as naturally luminous? This is through the principle that it is unsuitable to be comprised of adventitious defilements. The nature of the mind is luminosity and that itself is also called the element of sentient beings or the essence of the Tathāgata (*tathāgatagarbha*). Since all conceptual elaborations are adventitious defilements, that nature is suitable to actualize through familiarizing in study and reflection in purifying the adventitious defilements. [12b6] It is like the Yogācāras who teach that it is considered pure just as water, gold, and space are pure. In this way, **when analyzed and broken down by the weapons of reasoning**, objects of knowledge, in the perspective of either having form or not having form are not at all established since **the very wisdom which individually discriminates** is not established. This illustration is suitable as form, experience, and so forth are **specific characteristics**. The **general characteristics** of all conditioned things are impermanent, the general characteristic of all contaminated things are suffering, and the general characteristic of all things is that they are selfless and so forth. Since all

⁷⁶ *Śūnyatāsaptati* 1: *gnas pa dang* {Lindtner 'am} *skye 'jig yod med dang* {Lindtner dam}/ *dman dang khyad par can rnam ni* {Lindtner dman pa'i am mnyam pa'am khyad par can} / *sangs rgyas 'jig rten snyad dbang gis / gsung gi di nyid* {Lindtner yang dag} *dbang gis min //*

things are unestablished, the very wisdom is without appearance. Since the wisdom itself in the interval of refuting is without appearance, as an object of mind it does not exist. However, since the final relation is said to not be established at all in the explanation of reality, that which is form, that which is not form, and the very wisdom itself are naturally unestablished. The explanation of **luminosity** means that it is free from the extremes of elaboration and it is free from all the eight extremes of elaboration, such as distinctions of dharmas like cessation and production and so forth. { When many, the five former are indicated by each following one. }

[13a1] In this way, having settled at the time of application, one eliminates the faults of **laxity and excitement** from being established in the non-conceptual state at the time of meditative equipoise. **Laxity** is gathering the mind uncontrollably in practice by being overcome with sleepiness, lethargy, and so forth. In going to sleep one arises not apprehending the object of meditation. It is taught in divisions of great and middling like entering non-darkness, like blinking one's eyes, and like a blind person. **Excitement** is being totally scattered to other objects of meditation, a distraction derived from attention being scattered to other virtues. Eradicating those: Through meditating on entities that are clear and bright, laxity passes away. When a time of hardship occurs, select an antidote to both just as Śāntideva has taught that one should meditate on only the remembrance of death. One should sprinkle water on the face if one has gone to sleep or, at the time of great noise it is suitable to proceed in reciting the stories of a father's death. It is said to be like a great medicine that eradicates all unharmonious positions when meditating on only emptiness. To summarize in brief, it eradicates all others like the five faults and the five obscurations. Moreover, during the time of meditative equipoise in which any knowledge or objects of knowledge are not at all established, even objects of knowledge, that which has form, that which does not have form, and wisdom itself are not cognized. [13a6] Anything whatsoever is non-conceptual. The apprehended object and apprehending subject, or the obstruction and the antidote, are also non-conceptual. Applying the three later words as a cause of non-conceptual, or in another way, by not apprehending anything at all **memory** does not exist and through not comprehending anything one abandons all **mental activity** and stands firm. As for this, the practitioners of the Great Completion (*rdzogs chen*), the practitioners of non-mentation (*amanasikāra*) (see

Higgins 2008), and those who enter instantaneously assert that [meditation] is through merely being without memory and mental attentiveness which overturns the scattering of knowledge for the object. Just as one will not be free from the fear of demons by meditating that demons are not in the castle, likewise one will not be free from the fear of apprehending things as real. As previously mentioned, it is necessary to develop non-conceptual concentration in a way which cuts off attachment by means of not finding when searching through reasoning. [13b] It is like when an intelligent person having hoisted up a lamp, through searching but not finding, is free from the fear of a demon. Distinguishing **signs** include the five objects of form and so forth, the three times, persons, and the distinguishing signs of women make ten. Many more occur in the section on signlessness as a door of liberation from the Mother [Perfection of Wisdom] sūtras. Of concern at present, the grasping of signs of that which has form, that which does not have form, and wisdom or even conceptuality, the conceptuality of the obscuration and the antidote. A **sign** is an object that scatters [the mind] like **a thief** who sneakily steals non-conceptual concentration. **Conceptuality** is a coarse object that is like an enemy by scattering the actual non-conceptual concentration. One should abide in the non-conceptual state being free from these [signs and conceptions]. When they arise, through eradicating as mentioned before the grasping at signs and the very object of conceptuality, one will train in the non-conceptual mental continuum for objects of knowledge not yet accomplished. The chapter which brings forth the [teachings of the] Ācārya [Nāgārjuna] which was bestowed by the Lord [Atiśa] to Gsang-phu-ba.

[13b3] Then, if one decides to go beyond one hour twenty minutes and so forth for the duration of the [meditation] session, one should rise up when the body and mind become fatigued. As well, if not knowing the time by oneself, one should do the right amount according to one's teacher or superior. Similar to that, when suddenly interrupted afterwards, it is unacceptable for the mind in meditation. It is unacceptable for the mind to sit again in the same seat after [immediately] going away while not meditating. One should sit down continually in meditation without being suddenly interrupted when there is adequate focus on a little bit for the object of meditation. When rising from the meditation mat, make a clap. Since harm or sickness may occur as there is danger to harm the body and mind, just as Dgon-pa-ba and Pu-to-ba have

done, extend all the limbs, rub smoothly all the muscles, and with a pleasant and pliable body rise up and go. Moreover, the cross-legged posture should be disrupted without rising in the same way. The way things are should be examined as before by oneself and meditate just as there is indeed non-production. However, one should dedicate roots of virtue for perfect buddhahood to the extent to reach all the things grasped as real by sentient beings [13b7] by projecting compassion for sentient beings who wander in *samsāra* by the force of not cognizing [things as unproduced]. At the time of meditation, having closed the door or covered the window, sit in meditation. Having arisen [from meditation], it is said that one should not eat in the field or give mother's milk to a calf, or grass to a horse. For all fields and commerce and so forth, it will not do to ask if they are accomplished or not accomplished. [14a] This is to get distracted with imputing imputations while all phenomena are like an illusion; mental engagement and so forth is like thick mist or like a rainbow. One should do virtuous acts and so forth as much as possible for the two collections or the six perfections by body, speech, and mind through the method of three-fold perfect purity [of agent, action, and object]. One should dedicate as much as one achieves for the purpose of complete awakening. As in the interval on emptiness, it is taught that afterwards [things] are like an illusion. Generally, since this is settled after the unmistakable treasure of meditative equipoise, it is necessary to weaken attachment for this life after meditative equipoise on impermanence. It is necessary to shun evil and increase virtue after meditative equipoise on the relations of cause and effect. In this manner, one should ascertain all meditations with postcontemplative knowledge. Both quantities of meditative equipoise can be purified in Reting (*rwa-sgreng*). Later on it can even exist in all places. Postcontemplative knowledge is in disagreement with all the world. One should uphold a large part of harmonious practices of a bodhisattva which is taught from all the *sūtras* and *śāstras* of the Mahāyāna and rejoice in altruism for others, Pu-to-ba has [discussed] this. Right now in one's own meditative equipoise, cultivate only the aspect of integration. In this lifetime's postconcentrative state there is not another which is desired. Just a few greatly invoke mindfulness **in this lifetime**, the extremes of the head and shoulder are like one who hears that leads a blind person. The great majority of people do not live apart from desirable things in addition to food, clothing, and dear ones like one's relatives. The beginner should create as much virtue

as possible at the time of being unable to fully subdue, doing as much as possible for each [meditative] fixation with respect to different factors during each individual juncture will become meaningful. Finally, it is necessary to offer aspirational prayers and cultivate devotion completely engaging in what is necessary to be done to achieve complete buddhahood. Having done this in this way, by meditating on emptiness, one will surely become a master and it will serve as an antidote of all unfavorable conditions. The conduct of the postconcentrative state produces multiple virtues in one's own mental continuum and one will nourish sentient beings. In cultivating emptiness alone which is not like that, one will not cognize suchness, and even if cognizing, it will be from the point of view of a *śrāvaka*.

[14a8] In this way, the measure of **devotion**, from the *Śikṣasamuccaya*, just as one wishes for a cool water source in a burning house, oneself and [14b] all mother-like sentient beings, through gathering the evil spirit of grasping things as real or through the darkness of delusion, accumulate various bad actions which are motivated by that and have extensive passionate attachment. One wanders in cyclic existence which is like a house blazing everywhere. Then, through emerging from [cyclic existence], by cultivating the meaning of non-production, it is by great devotion that one thinks that grasping things as real is to be avoided, but it is the undegenerated essence. Moreover, one is said to reach the boundary at the point of the fundamental state of awakening, the essence, when not falling into scattering while meditating for as long as one is able and **for a long time**. Furthermore, it is necessary to employ both meditative equipoise and posterior practices continuously for multiple years, months, days, or even for an instant. After eliminating unceasing evil deeds, it is necessary to have a basis of meditation. Then, at that time, unconscientious behaviour will be eliminated. With solid erroneous predispositions, not to abandon the taste of alcohol would not do; it is just like pursuing after an agitated cooked rotten fish while not knowing the pure portions. It is necessary to go without concern even in the time interval after meditation. From the point of view of **those with** incalculable **good fortune**, who have done what is needed to do, even the great amount of good fortune for the Noble Sadāprarudita⁷⁷ was mainly through practicing the factors of method. At the time of Geshe

⁷⁷ The story of the bodhisattva Sadāprarudita (Tib. *rtaḡ tu ngu*; “Ever Weeping”) is found in the *Aṣṭasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā*.

gZhon 'byung arriving at Reting (*rwa-sgreng*) saying that there exists the special instructions for obtaining the accomplishment of the Great Seal (*mahāmudrā*) in this very lifetime {there is from each an existent even though not all (???)}. Pu-to-bas [has taught that] the fortune of attaining the accomplishment of the Great Seal **in this very lifetime** is not [innately] produced like our own complexion. Rather, it is said to be produced on the ground of one's own [effort] like the eighteen different craftsman of the great city of the central land and those skilled in the five topics of science and so forth. The understanding of all phenomena is said to be the only thing that counts. Reality is again said to be only the single truth, the object of only the unproduced. It is just suchness. The worldly meditate on the state of non-production as emerging dimly as substantially existent and that does not pass beyond the conventional itself. All seeing is seeing false conventionalities. Meditative equipoise and the exact perception of the postconcentrative state during the time of a bodhisattva from the point of seeing reality onwards are precepts of the *Samdhinirmocana* [*sūtra*]. Called the **center of the sky** by being free from extremes, there does not exist a center which has a reference point. It is an example that illustrates nothing at all is established. The other eight examples of an illusion [15a] and so forth exist as mere appearances from collecting and assembling. The establishment of a real nature is an example which is established as non-existent. Geshe Ston-pa widely taught that correct conventional activities are said to be mundane postconcentrative appearances. Since it is likewise, **the post-meditative attainment** after seeing reality realizes the true nature of the conventional. All the eight examples of illusion along with the plaintree, through the blessing of the Buddha, come forth as a means to understand the meaning of non-production. After the subsiding of the teachings, all those who are incapable are taught the [analogy of the] echo from this moment on as a measure of disappearance.

[15a2] The text states “**From the point of time when**” indicating to ascertain the meaning at the level of a Buddha. The text states that the **concentration** is like the example of a **vajra**. Just as the vajra destroys all entities while not being able to be destroyed by any other entity, likewise when attaining this concentration all the latencies of apprehending things as real are destroyed while whichever apprehension of things as real is unable to create a nature which apprehends things as real. The teaching of Candrakīrti asserts that, from this point on, all movements of mind and mental

factors are perpetually cut off. Here, it is a system which does not assert the activity of postconcentrative attainment other than only meditative equipoise. Even if accepting postconcentrative attainment, alternations [between meditative equipoise and postconcentrative attainment] are not accepted. The object of meditation of meditative equipoise at all times is taught to be reality. The *Daśabhūmika sūtra*, through questions and answers, teaches that it is only the welfare of sentient beings. The meaning is that by the first moment of exalted wisdom in the second moment of attaining the vajra-like concentration through the principle “that totally pervades the sphere of objects of knowledge,” all objects of knowledge just as they are (*ji lta ba, yathāvad-bhāvika*) and to their utmost extent (*ji snyed pa, yāvad-bhāvika*) are spontaneously realized just as they are. After that, shining like a great sun that never declines is the meaning of abiding. We settle this awkwardly only on the Buddha stage. That is understood as merely *nirvāṇa* of the *sūtras* in not having a continuum of utmost highest wisdom. One is unable to measure as merely entering into the stabilizing on the meditation of cessation since at the time it is only the meditative equipoise not possessing subsequent knowledge. It would not do to understand it as time that is opposite from blinking the eyes or deep sleep. [15b] One proceeds only with faith in following Mahāyāna *sūtras* alone on the qualities of the Buddha level. However, that is not realized from the *śāstras*. Since even the lords of the tenth stage are said not to realize [things] other than the sun among the clouds or merely the space of a needle’s eye, how could we realize [reality] by stating only what is picked out by our own conceptuality? At the time of asking Geshe Ston-pa whether a continuum of wisdom was possessed or not and whether subsequent attainment was possessed or not at the level of a buddha, [he replied.] “I say that I have not known awakening indivisibly and exactly as it is because it is not known previously by anyone other than a Buddha himself.” Therefore, it is suitable if ill at ease in the world for the Buddha to be the source of one’s own refuge. It is suitable even if ill at ease with the thought in mind to save sentient beings in order to attain buddhahood. The purpose of sentient beings is suitable whether or not it is suitable for there to be a continuum of wisdom or whether or not subsequent attainment is suitable or not. This is like the conceptual thought which precedes the preparation for wisdom. Furthermore, it is said to be from only being projected at the time of generating the initial aspiration thought [for awakening]. Stating “if it is not so that

there is not subsequent attainment on the level of a Buddha then what is the distinction with a bodhisattva?, these and similar words, it may be that this teaching is not indicated in reasoning and scripture but since the activity of subsequent attainment is a quality of training to be done, it is only taught in the sūtras of reasoning themselves. Isn't it deceiving sentient beings who are entertained at first by cutting off the benefit of others when abiding on the ground of only permanent meditative equipoise? How does the benefit for others arise? This is as follows. At first by generating compassion one produces the altruistic aim for sentient beings. Then, the accumulations are gathered for the purpose of only sentient beings. Aspirational prayers are also set for the purpose of only [sentient beings]. One does not meet with the purpose of sentient beings from the power of meditative equipoise itself from the perspective of a Buddha who is proper to sentient beings. Furthermore, from the beginning of buddhahood, because of the ability to completely accomplish the welfare of sentient beings, until sentient beings are exhausted, [the Buddha's] appearance and disappearance does not exist and [he] comes forth spontaneously independent of exertion. Therefore, there is also not forgetting. There is forgetfulness when it is necessary to rely on effort and exertion. In this way, from the purview of a Buddha there is not conceptuality. This does not conflict with the forces of the fortune of sentient beings who are different due to outward actions and actions based on the five sense objects into differences of higher and lower. From the *Tathāgatotpattisambhāva-sūtra*,

“At the time when the orb of the sun arises initially, it reflects on the elevated mountain peaks [16a] then gradually it heroically reflects in all the deep forests and in the lower areas as it is taught that the qualities of the buddha level are in every way a system of deeds for the benefit of others. Through the qualities of the Tathāgata and his inconceivable wisdom: some are in the circle of attendents; some slope towards becoming a monk of the Tathāgata and are known to renounce the family; some become monks; some practice austerities; some proceed to the seat of awakening; some understand him to sit at the seat of awakening; some understand that he conquers over Māra; some know that he manifests Buddhahood; some understand that he is requested to turn the

wheel of dharma by Brahmā and so forth; some understand that he turns the wheel of dharma; some hear him give a discourse on the *śrāvaka* vehicle; some hear him give a discourse on the *pratyekabuddha* vehicle; some hear him give a discourse on the Great Vehicle; some see a six fold tall Tathāgata; some instantly hear him from far away; some see him in the body of a Tathāgata hundreds of thousands of *niyutas* of *koṭis* long; some see him as a golden colored Tathāgata; some see him as the color of a precious wish-fulfilling jewel; some understand him to pass into complete *nirvāṇa*; some understand him to achieve complete *nirvāṇa*; some understand him to be inclined to engagement; some understand him as one incorruptible body; some understand him to establish relics of a Tathāgata; some understand him to mature ten years after attaining complete buddhahood; some understand him to pass ten years from his complete *nirvāṇa*; some understand him to arrive at the terrace of awakening; some understand the teaching of Bhagavan Śākyamuni to disappear; some understand ten, twenty, thirty, forty, or hundreds of thousands of *niyutas* of *koṭis* of aeons since his complete *nirvāṇa*; some understand an ineffable number of aeons since Bhagavan Śākyamuni's buddhahood. The Tathāgata perpetually grows in these activities through the force of considering the welfare of sentient beings nonconceptually, without conceptuality, even more so in a spontaneous non-conceptual manner.”

The *Ārya Avatamsaka Sūtra* states:

“Mañjuśrī, it is as follows: [16b] For example, there is an ocean which is five thousand *yojanas* in size. A bird sits at the edge [of the ocean] as it is suitable to drink. There are some lotus leaf coverings. With respect to this, a man has a thousand spoked wheel iron chariot. The chariot is drawn speedily by a strong horse who is like a *garuḍa* bird, the axels do not touch the water when pulled by the horse, and the lotus petals are not injured when drawing the chariot in this way. A poisonous snake springs forth from the ocean. Instantly, in the moments of the turning of the chariot, [the snake] encircles the chariot seven times. In the moment of encircling the chariot one time by the poisonous snake,

the monk Ānanda explains and understands ten qualities of ten dharmas. In a moment of explaining a single dharma by Ānanda, the monk Śāradvatipūtra is able to understand in a single moment one thousand aspects of dharma. In a single moment of the aspects of dharma which Śāradvatipūtra explained, the monk Maudgalyāyana passes through eighty thousand world-realms. In the moment of which Maudgalyāyana passes through a world-realm, in that moment, the Tathāgata instantly teaches everywhere spontaneously in a non-conceptual manner, easily through the realm of reality (*dharmadhātu*), in world-realms of the ten directions to the limits of the realm of space, in each and every world-realm in all the ocean of galaxies, in each and every continent, to each and every hair on your head. Furthermore: dying and passing from the realm of Tuṣita; entering the womb; being born; being received by Indra and Brahmā; [16b6] arranging a dwelling place; taking seven steps; looking in the ten directions; making a great lion's roar; training in arts, crafts, athletics and all the five sciences; being taught in the stages of royalty; sporting in the retinue of female attendants; going forth to the forest grove; tending toward omniscience; departure from home; taking up the homeless life; performing austerities; forsaking the eating of food; departing to and entering the seat of awakening; conquering over Mara; awakening into buddhahood; viewing with his eyes unblinking at the tree of awakening; being requested to teach by great Brahmā; turning the wheel of dharma; going to the divine realms; providing different aspects to the object of complete awakening; [17a] turning the wheel of the law; giving the name of the aeon, the measure of time, the array of the retinue, the manner in which the arrangement of the buddha-field is purified; the activity and aspiration of the mind for awakening, the perfections, grounds, supersensory knowledges, the patiences, the dhārāṇis, concentrations, liberations; the offerings for that; the immeasurable objects of dharma of the bodhisattvas and the Tathāgatas; the different engagements in the immeasurable cloud of dharma; the ripening of sentient beings; the different aspects of setting forth skillful means; emanating great miraculous emanations; indicating the great complete *nirvāṇa*; distributing solid relics in a single body; teaching great complete *nirvāṇa*; distributing solid relics in a single body;

teaching at all times during the flourishing of the practices of dharma; the conflicts, the diminishment, and even disappearance of the holy dharma. All the practices in the places of non-Buddhists even in all the succession of previous rebirths through teaching continuously through blessings to the limit of aeons until the end of time, on each and every mere hair, from the ten directions the very momentary object up through each and every hair-pore, the Tathāgatas in the three times, all along with the oceanic assembly of bodhisattvas, all the extensive array of buddha-qualities, all the arrays of the abodes of the lineages of sentient beings, the extensively designated sensory-spheres of the lineage of sentient beings, all of the extensively arranged, perfectly established activities of bodhisattvas, and all the extensive arrangement of the object of a Tathāgata, are instantly taught in a non-conceptual spontaneous manner. All the extensive array of omnipresent continuous blessings to the limit until the end of time he teaches down to the mere measure of a hair in that very moment through ten directions instantly teaching spontaneously and non-conceptually in all realms of sentient beings without exception, every sentient being without a body, all sentient beings with a body, and other distinctions of shape, color, voice, language, and different aspects of teaching dharma and so forth. [17b] Through the force of the thoughts of other sentient beings he teaches in all ways continuously through blessings to the limit until the end of time. Mañjuśrī, it is as follows, at the time of midnight of the fifteenth day of the waxing phase of the moon, the arising of the orb of the moon over Jambudvīpa is seen in places in front of all women, children, and young maidens. The orb of the moon non-conceptually without thought, yet spontaneously, arises like this having unshared qualities that are non-conceptual. Likewise, all sentient beings just as they resolve and just as they are to be trained are seen to dwell in front of the Tathāgata. The Tathāgatas, non-conceptually, without thought, yet spontaneously, arise with such deeds through the unshared qualities of a Buddha.”

Thus through all sides is the benefit illustrated. Although there are many scriptures and reasonings for completely ascertaining the meaning of the two realities and

ascertaining the level of a Buddha, here, I will not elaborate. As the special instructions of meditating on the meaning of non-production is taught in the manner of pointing out with a finger, therefore, it is only instructions of the Middle Way. This is in accordance with engaging in the teachings of the methods of the non-conceptuality of non-production in all the texts of secret mantra. Teaching sometimes with another terminology is difficult to understand. Entering the spindle of that is a great abyss that is unsuitable for meditation.

Through illuminating the special instructions of the middle way,
 whatever virtue I have have obtained,
 may all beings become omniscient
 through entering the path of the Middle Way.

[18a] In cutting off all affairs [of worldly life] one does not meet with evil friends. In meeting with good friends through proper measures, one should greatly progress in the protective commitments that one has promised. One should mainly refrain from material things such as food, clothing, and so forth of this life. However, do not fall into decay. Whatever dharma that has been produced in the present that is unfinished should not diminish. One should be greatly concerned about faulty moral virtue and spoiled vows. May it be auspicious.

Abbreviations

- AA *Abhisamayālamkāra* (Th. Stcherbatsky and E. Obermiller, 1929)
 D Tshul khirms rin chen, *Bstan 'gyur (sde dge)*, 1982-1985
Dbu ma bden gnyis *Dbu ma bden gnyis kyi 'bum (Bka' gdams gsung 'bum, 2003)*
Dbu ma'i mang ngag *Dbu ma'i man ngag gi 'bum, Bden chung gi 'bum (Bka' gdams gsung 'bum, 2003; Apple 2013)*
Jo bo rje'i gsung 'bum *Jo bo rje dpal ldan a ti sha'i gsung 'bum (2006)*
 LVP La Vallée Poussin
 MA *Madhyamakāvatāra* (La Vallée Poussin (1907-12))
 MABH *Madhyamakāvatārabhāṣya* (La Vallée Poussin (1907-12))
 MMK *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā* (La Vallée Poussin (1903-13))

MSA *Mahāyānasūtrālaṅkāra* (Lévi reprint 1983)

MVK *Madhyāntavibhāgakārikā* (Pandeya 1999)

Pu to yab sras *Dbu ma'i man ngag gi bshad pa, Pu to yab sras kyi lugs* (*Bka' gdams gsung 'bum*, 2003)

SDA *Satyadvayāvatāra* (Ejima 1983; Apple 2013)

References

Indian Sources

Abhisamayālaṅkāra of Maitreya-nātha. Edited by Th. Stcherbatsky and E. Obermiller (1929). *Abhisamayālaṅkāraprajñāpāramitopadeśaśāstrakārikā*. Leningrad. (Bibliotheca Buddhica, XXIII, fasc. 1.) Sri Satguru Publications, 2nd edition (Delhi, 1992).

Akṣayamatīnirdeśanāmamahāyānasūtra (*'Phags pa blo gros mi zad pas bstan pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo*). Tōh. no. 175. Dergé Kanjur, vol. MA, folios 79a1–174b7. Jens Braarvig, *Akṣayamatīnirdeśasūtra*. Solum Forlag (Oslo, 1993).

Kramapraveśikabhāvanārtha (*Rim gyis 'jug pa'i sgom don*) of Vimalamitra. Tōh. no. 3938. Dergé Tanjur, vol. KI, folios 340v.7-358r.7. Tr. by Prajñāvarma and Ye shes sde.

Catuṣṭatakaśāstrakārikā (*Bstan bcos bzhi brgya pa zhes bya ba'i tshig le'ur byas pa*) of Āryadeva. Tōh. no. 3846. Dergé Tanjur, vol. TSHA, fols. 1v.1-18r.7. Tr. by Sūkṣmajāna and Pa tshab Nyi ma grags in last half of 11th century. Sanskrit, Karen Lang, *Āryadeva's Catuṣṭataka: On the Bodhisattva's Cultivation of Merit and Knowledge*, Akademisk Forlag (Copenhagen 1986).

Jñānālokālaṅkāra ≈ *Sarvabuddhaviṣayāvatārajñānālokālaṅkāra-nāma-mahāyānasūtra* (*'Phags pa sangs rgyas thams cad kyi yul la 'jug pa'i ye shes snang ba'i rgyan zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo*). Tōh. no. 100. Dergé Kanjur, vol. GA, folios 276r.1-305r.7. Tr. by Surendrabodhi and Ye shes sde. Study Group on Buddhist Literature, *Jñānālokālaṅkāra: Transliterated Sanskrit Text Collated with Tibetan and Chinese Translations*, The Institute for Comprehensive Studies of Buddhism, Taisho University (Tokyo 2004).

Tattvāvatāravṛtti (*De kho na la 'jug pa'i 'grel pa*) of Śrīgupta (Dpal sbas). Tōh. no. 3892. Dergé Tanjur, vol. HA, folios 39v.4-43v.5.

- Dharmadhātustava* (*Chos kyi dbyings su bstod pa*) of Nāgārjuna. Tōh. no. 1118. Dergé Tanjur, vol. KA, folios 63v.5-67v.3. Tr. by Kṛṣṇa Paṇḍita and Tshul khrims rgyal ba.
- Bhāvanākrama-1* (*Bsgom pa'i rim pa*) of Kamalaśīla. Tōh. no. 3915. Dergé Tanjur, vol. KI, folios 22a1-41b7. Giuseppe Tucci, *Minor Buddhist Texts, Parts I and II*. Motilal Banarsidass (reprint, Delhi, 1986), pp. 465-592.
- Bhāvanākrama-2* (*Bsgom pa'i rim pa*) of Kamalaśīla. Tōh. no. 3916 (also, no. 4567). Dergé Tanjur, vol. KI, folios 42a1-55b5. K. Goshima, *The Tibetan Text of the Second Bhāvanākrama* (Kyoto, 1983). Tenzin Gyatso, *Stages of Meditation, root text by Kamalashila*, translated by Ven. Geshe Lobsang Jordhen, Losang Choephel Ganchenpa and Jeremy Russell, Snow Lion (Ithaca, 2001).
- Bhāvanākrama-3* (*Bsgom pa'i rim pa*) of Kamalaśīla. Tōh. no. 3917. Dergé Tanjur, vol. KI, folios 55b6-68b7. Parmananda Sharma, trans., *Bhāvanākrama of Kamalaśīla*. Aditya Prakashan (New Delhi, 1997).
- Bodhipathapradīpa* (*Byang chub lam gyi sgron ma*) of Dīpaṃkaraśrījñāna. Tōh. no. 3947. Dergé Tanjur, vol. KHI, folios 238a6-141a4. H. Eimer, *Bodhipathapradīpa: Ein Lehrgedicht des Atiśa (Dīpaṃkaraśrījñāna) in der tibetischen Überlieferung*. Asiatische Forschungen 59, (Wiesbaden, 1978).
- Bodhicaryāvatāra or Bodhisattvacaryāvatāra* (*Byang chub sems dpa'i spyod pa la 'jug pa*). Tōh. no. 3871. Dergé Tanjur, vol. LA, folios 1b1-40a7. P.L. Vaidya, ed., *Bodhicaryāvatāra of Śāntideva with the Commentary Pañjikā of Prajñākaramati*, Buddhist Sanskrit Texts series no. 12. The Mithila Institute (Darbhanga, 1960; reprint 1988).
- Prajñāpāramitāratna-guṇa-saṃcaya-gāthā* (*'Phags pa shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa sdud pa tshigs su bcad pa*). Tōh. no. 13. Dergé Kanjur, vol. KA, folios 1b1-19b7. E. Obermiller, *Prajñāpāramitā-ratna-guṇa-saṃcaya-gāthā*. Bibliotheca Buddhica no. 29 (1937). Reprinted with a Sanskrit-Tibetan-English index by Edward Conze, Indo-Iranian Reprints no. 5 (1960). Edited with an introduction, bibliographical notes, and a Tibetan version from Tunhuang by Akira Yuyama, *Prajñā-pāramitā-ratna-guṇa-saṃcaya-gāthā*. Cambridge University Press (Cambridge, 1976).
- Prajñāpāramitopadeśa* (*Shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa'i man ngag*, Tōh. no. 4079,

- Dergé Tanjur, vol. HI, folios 133v.7-162v.1. Tr. by Zhi ba bzang po and 'Gos Lhas btsas.
- Prajñāpradīpa* of Bhāviveka. Tōh. no. 3853 Tsha 45b4-259b3, P. 5253 tsha 53b3-326a6.
- Prajñāpradīpaṭīkā* of Avalokitavrata. Tōh. no. 3859 wa 1-287a7, zha 1-338a7, za 1-341a7, P. 5259 wa 1-333a6, zha 1-394&5, za 1406a8.
- Pramāṇavārttikakārikā* (*Tshad ma rnam 'grel gyi tshig le'ur byas pa*) of Dharmakīrti. Tōh.no. 4210. Dergé Tanjur, vol. CE, folios 94v.1-151r.7. Tr. by Subhūtiśrīśānti and Dge ba'i blo gros. Yusho Miyasaka, *Pramāṇavārttikakārikā* (Sanskrit and Tibetan), *Acta Indologica* (Indo koten kenkyū), vol. 2 (1971-1972).
- Prasannapadā*, of Candrakīrti ed. by La Vallée Poussin [1903-13].
- Madhyāntavibhāgakārikā* of Maitreyañātha. *Dbus dang mtha' rnam par 'byed pa'i tshig le'ur byas pa*). Tōh. no. 4021. Dergé Tanjur, vol. PHI, folios 40v.1-45r.6. Tr. by Jinamitra, Śīlendrabodhi and Ye shes sde. Sanskrit, Ramchandra Pandeya, *Madhyānta Vibhāga Śāstra, containing the Kārikā's of Maitreya, Bhāṣya of Vasubandhu and Ṭīkā by Sthiramati*, Motilal Banarsidass (Delhi 1999).
- Madhyamakālaṃkāra* of Śāntarakṣita, Tōh. no. 3884, P. 5284. Tibetan edition. M. Ichigō, *Madhyamakālaṃkāra of Śāntarakṣita: With his own commentary or Vṛtti and with the subcommentary or Pañjikā of Kamalaśīla*. Kyoto, 1985.
- Madhyamakālaṃkāravṛtti* (*Dbu ma'i rgyan gyi 'grel pa*) of Śāntarakṣita. Tōh. no. 3885. Dergé Tanjur, vol. SA, folios 56v.4-84r.1. Tr. by Śīlendrabodhi and Ye shes sde. See Ichigō 1985.
- Madhyamakāvātāra* of Candrakīrti. Edited by La Vallée Poussin (1907-12). D. no. 3861 'a 201b1-219a7, P. 5262 'a 245a2-264b8.
- Madhyamakāloka* (*Dbu ma snang ba*) of Kamalaśīla. Tōh. no. 3887. Dergé Tanjur, vol. Sa, folios 133v.4-244r.7. Tr. by Śīlendrabodhi and Dpal brtsegs rakshi ta.
- Madhyamakāvātārabhāṣya* of Candrakīrti. Edited by La Vallée Poussin (1907-12).
- Madhyamakahrdayakārikā* (*Dbu ma'i snying po'i tshig le'ur byas pa*). Tōh. no. 3855. Dergé Tanjur, vol. DZA, folios 1b1-40b7. Christian Lindtner, *Madhyamakahrdayam of Bhavya*. Adyar Series no. 123. The Theosophical Society (Chennai, 2001).
- Madhyamakahrdayatarkajvālā* (*Dbu ma'i snying po'i 'grel pa rtog ge 'bar ba*). Tōh. no.

3856. Dergé Tanjur, vol. DZA, folios 40b7–329b4, P. 5256 dza 43b7–380a7. Edited by Iida (1980). Annette L. Heitmann, *Nektar der Erkenntnis, Buddhistische Philosophie des 6. Jh.: Bhavyas Tarkajvālā I–III.26*. Shaker Verlag (Aachen, 2004).
- Madhyamakopadeśa (Dbu ma'i man ngag)*. Tôh. no. 3929 (also, no. 4468). Dergé Tanjur, vol. KI, folios 95b1–96a7.
- Mahāyānasūtrālaṅkāra–nāma–kārikā (Theg pa chen po mdo sde'i rgyan zhes bya ba'i tshig le'ur byas pa)*. Tôh. no. 4020. Dergé Tanjur, vol. PHI, folios 1b1–39a4. Sylvain Lévi, ed., *Mahāyāna–Sūtrālaṅkāra, Exposé de la doctrine du Grand véhicule selon le système Yogācāra*. Champion (Paris, 1907, 1911), reprinted in two volumes by Rinsen Book Company (Kyoto, 1983). Asaṅga, L. Jamspal, Robert Clark, Joe Wilson, Leonard Zwillling, Michael J. Sweet, Robert A. F. Thurman, and Vasubandhu, *The Universal Vehicle Discourse Literature: Mahāyānasūtrālaṅkāra*. Center for Buddhist Studies, Columbia University and Tibet House US (New York, 2004).
- Mūlamadhyamakārikā (Dbu ma rtsa ba'i tshig le'ur byas pa shes rab)* of Nāgārjuna. Tôh. no. 3824. Dergé Tanjur, vol. TSA, folios 1v.1–19r.6. Tr. by Jñānagarbha and Cog ro Klu'i rgyal mtshan. Revised by Hasumati and Pa tshab Nyi ma grags. Revised again by Kanaka and Pa tshab Nyi ma grags. For Sanskrit see La Vallée Poussin 1903–13. For English translation see Katsura and Siderits 2013.
- Yuktiśāṣṭikāvṛtti (Rigs pa drug cu pa'i 'grel pa)*. Tôh. no. 3864. Dergé Tanjur, vol. YA, folios 1v.1–30v.6. Tr. by Jinamitra, Dānaśīla, Śīlendraboḍhi and Ye shes sde. See Scherrer-Schaub 1991.
- Ratnakaraṇḍodghāṭa–nāma–madhyamakopadeśa (Dbu ma'i man ngag rin po che'i za ma tog kha phye ba)*. Tôh. no. 3930. Dergé Tanjur, vol. KI, folios 96b1–116b7. See Apple 2010.
- Ratnāvalī (Rājaparīkathāratnamālā, Rgyal po la gtam bya ba rin po che'i phreng ba)*. Tôh. no. 4158. Dergé Tanjur, vol. GE, folios 107a1–126a4. Michael Hahn, *Nāgārjuna's Ratnāvalī, Vol. 1: The Basic Texts (Sanskrit, Tibetan, Chinese)*. Indica et Tibetica no. 1 (Bonn, 1982). John Dunne and Sarah McClintock, *The Precious Garland: An Epistle to a King*. Wisdom (Boston, 1997).
- Vajracchedikā–nāma–prajñāpāramitāsūtra ('Phags pa shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa*

- rdo rje gcod pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo*). Tôh. no. 16. Dergé Kanjur, vol. KA, folios 121a1–132b7. Paul Harrison & Shogo Watanabe, “Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitā,” in: Jens Braarvig, Paul Harrison, Jens–Uwe Hartmann, Kazunobu Matsuda & Lore Sander, eds., *Buddhist Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection*. Hermes (Oslo, 2006), pp. 89–132. Paul Harrison, “Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitā: A New English Translation of the Sanskrit Text Based on Two Manuscripts from Greater Gandhāra,” in: op. cit., 133–59.
- Vigrahavyāvartanīkārikā (Rtsod pa bzlog pa'i tshig le'ur byas pa)* of Nāgārjuna. Tôh. no. 3828. Dergé Tanjur, vol. TSA, folios 27r.1-29r.7. Tr. by Jñānagarbha and Ska ba Dpal brtsegs. Revised by Jayānanda and Khu Mdo sde 'bar. Sanskrit edited by Yonezawa 2008.
- Śikṣāsamuccaya (Bslab pa kun las btus pa)*. Tôh. no. 3940. Dergé Tanjur, vol. KHI, folios 3a2–194b5. Cecil Bendall, ed., *Çikshāsamuccaya: A Compendium of Buddhist Teaching*. Bibliotheca Buddhica no. 1 (St. Petersburg 1897–1902), reprinted by Motilal Banarsidass (Delhi, 1971). C. Bendall and W.H.D. Rouse, *Compendium of Buddhist Doctrine*. J. Murray (London, 1922), reprinted by Motilal Banarsidass (Delhi, 1971).
- Śūnyatāsaptatikārikā (Stong pa nyid bdun cu pa'i tshig le'ur byas pa)* of Nāgārjuna. Tôh. no. 3827. Dergé Tanjur, vol. TSA, folios 24r.6-27r.1. Tr. by Gzhon nu mchog, Gnyan Dar ma grags and Khu. See Lindtner 1997.
- Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-nāma-mahāyānasūtra*. Translated by Surendrabodhi and Snam Ye shes sde. *Dam pa'i chos padma dkar po zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo*. Tôh. no. 113. Dergé Kanjur, vol. JA, folios 1v.1-180v.7. Sanskrit ed. by Hendrik Kern and Bunyiu Nanjio, St. Petersburg 1908-12: Académie Imperiale des Sciences (Bibliotheca Buddhica X); Reprint: Tokyo 1977: Meicho-Fukyū-Kai.
- Satyadvayavibhaṅgakārikā* of Jñānagarbha ed. by Eckel (1987). Tôh. no. 3881 sa 1-3b3.
- Satyadvayavibhaṅgavṛtti* of Jñānagarbha ed. by Eckel (1987). Tôh. no. 3882 sa 3b3-15b1.
- Satyadvayāvātāra (Bden pa gnyis la 'jug pa)* of Atiśa Dīpamkaraśrījñāna. Tôh. no. 3902 (also, no. 4467). Dergé Tanjur, vol. A, folios 72a2–73a7. Yasunori Ejima, 1983. Christian Lindtner, trans., “Atiśa’s Introduction to the Two Truths, and Its

Sources.” *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, vol. 9 (1981), pp. 161–214. James B. Apple, “An Early Tibetan Commentary on Atiśa’s *Satyadvayāvātāra*,” *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 2013, 41:263-329.

Samādhisambhāraparivarta (*Ting nge ’dzin gyi tshogs kyi le’u*) of Bodhibhadra. Tôh. no. 3924. Dergé Tanjur, vol. KI, folios 79v.7-91r.6. Tr. by Vinayacandrapa and Chos kyi shes rab.

Sūtrasamuccayasañcayārtha (*Mdo kun las btus pa’i don bsdus pa*) of Dīpamkaraśrī-jñāna. Tôh. no. 3937. Dergé Tanjur, vol. KI, folios 338v.7-340v.7. *Bstan’gyur gser bris ma*, volume 118 (*mdo ’grel a*), ff. 510r-513r. Tr. by the author and Rgya Brtson ’grus seng ge.

Tibetan Sources

Skyo ston smon lam tshul khirms (1219-99). 2007. *Jo bo rje’i dbu ma’i man ngag gi bshad pa*. Volume 50, pp. 417-420 in *Bka’ gdams gsung bum phyogs bsgrigs thengs gnyis pa*. Khreng tu’u: Si khron dpe skrun tshogs pa/ si khron mi rigs dpe skrun khang /

Rgyal ba’i ’byung gnas, Atiśa Dīpamkaraśrījñāna. 2012. *Jo bo rje dpal ldan a ti sha’i rnam thar bka’ gdams pha chos*. One Vol. Zi ling: mtsho sngon mi rigs dpe skrun khang.

’Gos lo tsā ba gzhon nu dpal (1392–1481) written in 1476. *Deb ther sngon po*. 2 vols. Edited by Dung dkar blo bzang ’phrin las. Chengdu: Si khron mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 1984.

mChims nam mkha’ grags (1210-1285). 2007. *Dbu ma’i khrid*. Volume 31, pp. 177-214 in *Bka’ gdams gsung bum phyogs bsgrigs thengs gnyis pa*. Khreng tu’u: Si khron dpe skrun tshogs pa/ si khron mi rigs dpe skrun khang /

Jo bo rje dpal ldan a ti sha’i gsung ’bum. 2006. *Works attributed to Atiśa and his early disciples*. Compiled by dPal-brtsegs-bod-yig dpe-rnying-zhib-’jug-khang. bKa’ gdams dpe dkon gces btus. Zi-ling: Krung-go’i-bod-rig-pa-dpe-skrunkhang.

rNal ’byor pa shes rab rdo rje (ca. 1125). 2007. *Rnal ’byor pa shes rab rdo rjes mdzad pa’i bden gnyis kyi rnam par bshad pa*. Volume 21, pp. 513-625 in *Bka’ gdams gsung ’bum phyogs sgrig thengs dang po*. Khreng tu’u: Si khron dpe skrun tshogs

- pa/ si khron mi rigs dpe skrun khang /
- 'Bras spungs dgon du bzhugs su gsol ba'i dpe rnying dkar chag*. TBRC W28949. 2 vols. pe cin: mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 2004. <http://tbrc.org/link?RID=W28949>
- Dbu ma'i mang gi 'bum*. 2003. Pages 371{1a}-401{16a} in *Bka' gdams gsung 'bum phyogs bsgrigs glegs bam bcu dgu pa zhugs*. Compiled by dPal-brtsegs-bod-yig dpe-rnying-zhib-'jug-khang. bKa' gdams dpe dkon gces btus. Zi-ling: Krung-go'i-bod-rig-pa-dpe-skrun-khang.
- Dbu ma'i mang gi 'bum*. 2006. Pages 642-668 in *Jo bo rje dpal ldan a ti sha'i gsung 'bum*. Works attributed to Atiśa and his early disciples. Compiled by dPal-brtsegs-bod-yig dpe-rnying-zhib-'jug-khang. bKa' gdams dpe dkon gces btus. Zi-ling: Krung-go'i-bod-rig-pa-dpe-skrun-khang.
- Dbu ma'i man ngag gi bshad pa, Pu to yab sras kyi lugs*. 2003. Pages 317 {1a} -334 {9a} in *Bka' gdams gsung 'bum phyogs bsgrigs glegs bam bcu dgu pa zhugs*. Compiled by dPal-brtsegs-bod-yig dpe-rnying-zhib-'jug-khang. bKa' gdams dpe dkon gces btus. Zi-ling: Krung-go'i-bod-rig-pa-dpe-skrun-khang.
- Dbu ma la 'jug pa'i bsod don*. 2003. Pages 247-317 in *Bka' gdams gsung 'bum phyogs bsgrigs glegs bam bcu dgu pa zhugs*. Compiled by dPal-brtsegs-bod-yig dpe-rnying-zhib-'jug-khang. bKa' gdams dpe dkon gces btus. Zi-ling: Krung-go'i-bod-rig-pa-dpe-skrun-khang.
- Dpa' bo gtsug lag phreng ba. 2006. *Dam pa'i chos kyi 'khor lo bsgyur ba rnam kyi byung ba gsal bar byed pa mkhas pa'i dga' ston*. Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang.
- Tshul khriims rin chen. Bstan 'gyur (sde dge). Tibetan Buddhist Resource Center W23703. 213 vols. Delhi: Delhi karmapae choedhey, gyalwae sungrab partun khang, 1982-1985. <http://tbrc.org/link?RID=W23703>.
- Las chen kun dga' rgyal mtshan (1432-1506). *Bka' gdams kyi rnam par thar pa bka' gdams chos 'byung gsal ba'i sgron me*. Lha sa: Bod ljongs mi dmangs dpe skrun khang, 2003.
- Yongs 'dzin ye shes rgyal mtshan. 1980. *Dge bshes dgon pa ba'i rnam thar*. In *Lam rim bla ma brgyud pa'i rnam thar*, vol. 1, pp. 276-287. 'Bar khams: Rnga khul bod yig rtsom sgyur cus. Also: 1990. *Dpal ldan mgon pa ba'i rnam thar*. In *Lam rim bla ma brgyud pa'i rnam thar*, vol. 1, pp. 206-214. Lhasa: Bod ljongs mi dmangs dpe skrun khang.

Secondary Sources

- Almogi, Orna. 2009. *Rong-Zom-Pa's Discourses on Buddhology: A Study of Various Conceptions of Buddhahood in Indian Sources with Special Reference to the Controversy Surrounding the Existence of Gnosis (Jñāna : Ye Shes) As Presented by the Eleventh-Century Tibetan Scholar Rong-Zom Chos-Kyi-Bzang-Po*. Tokyo: The International Institute for Buddhist Studies of the International College for Postgraduate Buddhist Studies.
- Apple, James B. 2008. *Stairway to Nirvāṇa: A Study of the Twenty Saṅghas based on the Works of Tsong kha pa*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Apple, James B. 2010. "Atiśa's Open Basket of Jewels: A Middle Way Vision in Late Phase Indian Vajrayāna." *The Indian International Journal of Buddhist Studies* 11: 117-198.
- Apple, James B. 2013. "An Early Tibetan Commentary on Atiśa's *Satyadvayāvātāra*," *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, 41:263-329.
- Blo-bzang-chos-kyi-nyi-ma, Roger R Jackson, and Geshe Lhundup Sopa. 2009. *The Crystal Mirror of Philosophical Systems: A Tibetan Study of Asian Religious Thought*. Boston; [Montreal]: Wisdom Publications; In association with the Institute of Tibetan Classics.
- Chandra, Lokesh, ed. 1982. *Biography of Atiśa and his disciple ḥBrom-ston*. International Academy of Indian Culture.
- Chattopadhyaya, Alaka. 1967. *Atiśa and Tibet: Life and Works of Dīpaṅkara Śrījñāna in Relation to the History and Religion of Tibet*. [Calcutta]: distributors: Indian Studies: Past & Present.
- Cutler, Joshua W.C. and Guy Newland. 2000. *The Great Treatise on the Stages of the Path to Enlightenment. Volume one*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Snow Lion Publications.
- Davidson, Ronald M. 2005. *Tibetan Renaissance: Tantric Buddhism in the Rebirth of Tibetan Culture*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Deroche, Marc-Henri. 2011. "Instructions on the View (*lta khrid*) of the Two Truths: Prajñāraśmi's (1518-1584) *Bden gnyis gsal ba'i sgron me* (1518-1584)." *Revue d'Etudes Tibétaines* 22: 139-214.
- De Jong, J.W. 1962. "La Madhyamakaśāstrastuti de Candrakīrti." *Oriens Extremus* 9,

- pp. 47-56.
- De Jong, J.W. 1972. "An Old Tibetan version of the Ramāyāna, *T'oung Pao* 58:190-202.
- De Jong, J.W. 1989. "Review of Eli Franco, *Perception, knowledge and disbelief*." *Indo-Iranian Journal* 32, pp. 209-212.
- Del Toso, Krishna. 2011. "Il Madhyamakārthasaṃgraha di Bhāviveka: introduzione, edizione del testo tibetano e traduzione annotata." *Escercizi Filosofici* 6, pp. 347-365.
- Dreyfus Georges and Drongbu Tsering. 2010. "Pa tshab and the Origin of Prāsaṅgika." *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*, Vol. 32, No. 1-2 2009, pp. 387-418.
- Duerlinger, James. 1997. "Vasubandhu's Philosophical Critique of the Vātsīputrīyas' theory of person." *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 25: 307-335.
- Dunne, John D. 2004. *Foundations of Dharmakīrti's Philosophy*. Boston: Wisdom Publications.
- Eckel, Malcolm David. 1987. *Jñānagarbha's Commentary on the Distinction between the Two Truths*. Albany, New York: State University of New York Press.
- Eckel, Malcolm David. 2008. *Bhāviveka and His Buddhist Opponents: Chapters 4 and 5 of Bhāviveka's Madhyamakahrdayakārikā with Tarkajvālā Commentary*. Distributed by Harvard University Press.
- Eimer, Helmut. 1979. *Rnam thar rgyas pa: Materialien zu einer Biographie des Atiśa, Dipaṃkaraśrījñāna*. Wiesbaden: O.Harrassowitz.
- Eimer, Helmut. 1982. "The Development of the Biographical Tradition concerning Atiśa (Dīpaṃkara Śrījñāna)." *The Journal of Tibet Society* 2: 41-51
- Ejima, Yasunori 1983. "Atiśa no Ni-shinri-setsu" (Atiśa's Theory of the Two Truths), *Ryūjyūkyōgaku no kenkyū (Studies of Teaching of Nāgārjuna)*. (in Japanese).
- Eltschinger, Vincent. 2009. "On the Career and Cognition of Yogins". Eli Franco (ed.): *Yogic Perception, Meditation and Altered States of Consciousness*. Vienna 2009: Verlag der Öster-reichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften (Beiträge zur Kultur- und Geistes-geschichte Asiens, no. 65), 169–213.
- Eltschinger, Vincent. 2010. "Studies in Dharmakīrti's Religious Philosophy: 4. The cintāmayī prajñā". Piotr Balcerowicz (ed): *Logic and Belief in Indian Philosophy*.

- Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass (Warsaw Indological Studies, 3), 565–603.
- Gokhale, V.V. 1955. “Der Sanskrit-Text von Nāgārjuna's Pratītyasamutpāda-
hṛdayakārikā,” in: Spies, O., ed., *Studia Indologica, Festschrift für Willibald Kirfel
zur Vollendung seines 70. Lebensjahres* (Bonn, vol. 3 of Bonner Orientalische
Studien), pp. 101-106.
- Gold, Jonathan C. 2007. *The Dharma's Gatekeepers: Sakya Paṇḍita on Buddhist
Scholarship in Tibet*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Hahn, Michael. 1990. *Hundert Strophen von der Lebensklugheit: Nāgārjunas
Prajñāśataka*. Indica et Tibetica 18. Bonn: Indica et Tibetica Verlag.
- Higgins, David. 2008. “On the Development of the Non-Mentation (*Amanasikāra*)
Doctrine in Indo-Tibetan Buddhism.” *Journal of the International Association of
Buddhist Studies*, Vol. 29, No. 2, pp. 255-303.
- Hoornaert, Paul 2003. “An Annotated Translation of *Madhyamakahrdayakārikā/
Tarkajvālā* V.85-114.” *Kanazawadaigaku bungakubu ronshū, Kōdōkagakkahen –
Studies and Essays, Behavioural Sciences and Philosophy*, Faculty of Letters,
Kanazawa University 23, 2003, 139-170.
- Huanhuan, He and Leonard W.J. van der Kuijp. 2014. “Further Notes on Bhāviveka's
Principal Oeuvre.” *Indo-Iranian Journal* 57: 299-352.
- Huntington, C. W., Jr. 2003. “Was Candrakīrti a Prāsaṅgika?” In *The Svātantrika-
Prāsaṅgika Distinction: What Difference Does a Difference Make?* Edited by
Georges B. J. Dreyfus and Sara L. McClintock. Boston: Wisdom Publications, pp.
67-91.
- Ichigō, Masamichi. 1989. “Śāntarakṣita's Madhyamakālamkāra.” pp. 141-240 in Luis
Gómez and Jonathan A. Silk, *Studies in the Literature of the Great Vehicle: Three
Mahāyāna Buddhist Texts*. Ann Arbor: Collegiate Institute for the Study of
Buddhist Literature and Center for South and Southeast Asian Studies, University
of Michigan.
- Jackson, Roger R. 2009. “Two Bka' 'gyur Works in Mahāmudrā Canons: The
Ārya-ātajñāna-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra and the Anāvila-tantra-rāja.” *Journal of the
International Association of Tibetan Studies*, no. 5 (December 2009): 1-24.
- Kano, Kazuo. 2008. “Rngog blo ldan shes rab's Topical Outline of the
Ratnagotravibhāga Discovered at Khara Khoto.” In *Contributions to Tibetan*

- Literature. Proceedings of the Eleventh Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies, Königswinter 2006. Beiträge zur Zentralasienforschung.* Edited by O. Almogi. Halle: International Institute for Tibetan and Buddhist Studies, pp. 127-194.
- Kapstein, Matthew. 1996. “gDams ngag: Tibetan Technologies of the Self,” in: *Tibetan Literature: Studies in Genre*, ed. José Ignacio Cabezón and Roger R. Jackson, pp. 275–89. Ithaca: Snow Lion.
- Kapstein, Matthew T. 2000. “We Are All Gzhan stong pas: Reflections on *The Reflexive Nature of Awareness: A Tibetan Madhyamaka Defence*. By Paul Williams.” *Journal of Buddhist Ethics*. Volume 7, pp. 105-125.
- Katsura, Shōryū. 1976. “A Synopsis of the Prajñāpāramitopadeśa of Ratnākaraśānti.” *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 25/1, 487-484.
- Katsura, Shōryū and Mark Siderits. 2013. *Nāgārjuna’s Middle way: the Mūlamadhyama-kārikā*. Boston: Wisdom.
- Keira, Ryusei. 2004. *Mādhyamika and Epistemology: A Study of Kamalaśīla’s method for proving the voidness of all Dharmas: introduction, annotated translations and Tibetan texts of selected sections of the second chapter of the Madhyamakāloka*. Wien: Arbeitskreis für tibetische und buddhistische Studien Universität Wien.
- Klein, Anne C. 1991. *Knowing, Naming, and Negation: A Sourcebook on Tibetan Sautrāntika*. Ithaca, N.Y., USA: Snow Lion Publications.
- Klong-chen ye-shes-rdo-rje, & Nāgārjuna. 2005. *Nagarjuna’s Letter to a Friend: with commentary by Kangyur Rinpoche*. Ithaca, N.Y., Snow Lion Publications.
- Krasser, Helmut. 2004. “Are Buddhist Pramāṇavādins non-Buddhistic? Dignāga and Dharmakīrti on the impact of logic and epistemology on emancipation.” *Hōrin* 11:129-146.
- Krasser, Helmut. 2011. “Bhāviveka, Dharmakīrti and Kumāriila,” in T. Funayama (a cura di), *Chūgoku-Indo syūkyō-shi tokuni bukkyō-shi ni okeru syomotsu no ryūtsū-denpa to jinbutsu-idō no chiikitokusei* 中国印度宗教史とくに仏教史における書物の流通伝播と人物移動の地域特性 [Regional characteristics of text dissemination and relocation of people in the history of Chinese and Indian religions, with special reference to Buddhism] (A Report of Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (B): Project Number 19320010. March, 2011), 193–242.

- Kumagai, Seiji. 2011. "The Two Truths from Indian Buddhism to Tibetan Buddhism and Bon." In *The Two Truths of Bon*. Kathmandu: Vajra Publications, 9-35.
- Lang, Karen. 1986. *Āryadeva's Catuḥśataka*. Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag.
- Lang, Karen. 1990. "Spa-tshab Nyi-ma-grags and the Introduction of Prāsaṅgika Madhyamaka into Tibet." In L. Epstein and R.F. Sherburned, eds., *Reflections on Tibetan Culture: Essays in Memory of Turrell V. Wylie*. Studies in Asian Thought and Religion, vol. 12. Lewiston/Queenston/Lampeter: The Edwin Mellen Press, pp. 127-141.
- Larson, Gerald James. 1998. *Classical Sāṃkhya: An Interpretation of its History and Meaning*. 2nd revised edition. Delhi: M. Banarsidass.
- La Vallée Poussin, Louis de. 1903-13. *Mūlamadhyamakakārikās (Mādhyamikasūtras) de Nāgārjuna avec la Prasannapadā Commentaire de Candrakīrti*. Bibliotheca Buddhica 4, SI. Petersbourg.
- La Vallée Poussin, Louis de. 1907-12. *Madhyamakāvātāra par Candrakīrti*. Bibliotheca Buddhica 9, SI. Petersbourg.
- La Vallée Poussin, Louis de. 1913. *Théorie des douze causes*. Gand: E. van Goethem.
- Lindtner, Christian. 1979. "Candrakīrti's *Pañcaskandhaprakaraṇa*. I. Tibetan Text." *Acta Orientalia* 40:87-145.
- Lindtner, Christian. 1981. "Atiśa's Introduction to the Two Truths, and its Sources." *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 9: 161-214.
- Lindtner, Christian. 1982. "The Praṭītyasamutpādahṛdayakārikā-a reply" in "Adversaria Buddhica," *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 26: 167-194.
- Lindtner, Christian. 1997. *Master of Wisdom*. Oakland: Dharma Publishing
- Lopez, Donald S. 1987. *A Study of Svātantrika*. New York: Snow Lion.
- MacDonald, Anne Elizabeth. 1988. *Blo gsal grub mtha'*. Thesis (M.A.)--University of British Columbia.
- Mathes, Klaus-Dieter. 2008. *A Direct Path to the Buddha within: Gö Lotsāwa's Mahāmudrā Interpretation of the Ratnagoṭravibhāga*. Boston: Wisdom Publications.
- McClintock, Sara L. 2008. "Rhetoric and the Reception Theory of Rationality in the work of Two Buddhist Philosophers." *Argumentation* 22: 27-41.
- McClintock, Sara L. 2010. *Omniscience and the Rhetoric of Reason: Śāntarakṣita and*

- Kamalaśīla on Rationality, Argumentation, and Religious Authority*. Boston: Wisdom Publications.
- Mimaki, Katsumi. 1979. “Le Chapitre du *Blo gsal grub mtha’* sur les Sautrāntika: Présentation et édition.” *Zinbun: Memoirs of the Research Institute for Humanistic Studies, Kyoto University* 15: 175–210.
- Mimaki, Katsumi. 1980. “Le chapitre du *Blo gsal grub mtha’* sur les Sautrāntika: Un essai de traduction. *Zinbun* 16: 143-172.
- Mimaki, Katsumi. 1982. *Blo gsal grub mtha’: chapitres IX (Vaibhāṣika) et XI (Yogācāra) et chapitre XII (Mādhyamika)*. Kyoto: Université de Kyoto.
- Mimaki, Katsumi. 1992. “Annotated Translation of the Chapter on the Yogācāra of the Blo Gsal Grub Mtha’. Part One.” *Kyōtodaigaku-Bungakubu-Kenkyū-Kiyō* 31: 1–49.
- Miyazaki, Izumi. 2007. “Atiśa (Dīpaṃkaraśrījñāna)—His Philosophy, Practice and its Sources.” *The Memoirs of the Toyo Bunko* 65: 61-89.
- Mizuno, Kōgen, and Gaynor Sekimori. 1996. *Essentials of Buddhism: basic terminology and concepts of Buddhist philosophy and practice*. Tokyo: Kōsei Pub, pp. 121-134).
- Mochizuki, Kaie. 2002. “On the *Madhyamakopadeśa* of Dīpaṃkaraśrījñāna.” *Bulletin of the Faculty of Buddhism, Minobusan University*, No. 3, pp. 9-48.
- Mochizuki, Kaie. 2007. “Is Dīpaṃkaraśrījñāna a Mādhyamika?” *Nagoya Studies in Indian Culture and Buddhism: Saṃbhāṣā* 26: 99-126.
- Nagashima, Jundo. 2004. “The Distinction between Svātantrika and Prāsaṅgika in Late Madhyamaka: Atiśa and Bhavya as Prāsaṅgikas.” *Nagoya Studies in Indian Culture and Buddhism: Saṃbhāṣā* 24: 65-98.
- Nakamura, Hajime. 1983. *A History of Early Vedānta Philosophy*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Nance, Richard. 2007. “On what do we rely when we rely on reasoning?” *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, Volume 35, Number 2, pp. 149-167.
- Nattier, Jan. 2003. *A Few Good Men: The Bodhisattva Path according to The Inquiry of Ugra (Ugraparipṛcchā)*. University of Hawai’i Press: Honolulu.
- Newland, Guy. 1992. *The Two Truths in the Mādhyamika Philosophy of the Ge-luk-pa Order of Tibetan Buddhism*. Ithaca, New York: Snow Lion Publications.

- Newland, Guy and Tom J.F. Tillemans. 2011. "An Introduction to Conventional Truth." In *Moonshadows: Conventional Truth in Buddhist Philosophy*, authored by The Cowherds, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 3-22.
- O'Brien, Paul Wilfred. 1953. "A Chapter on Reality from the Madhyantavibhaga-castra." *Monumenta Nipponica* 9 (1/2) (January 1): 277-303.
- Qvarnström, Olle. 1989. *Hindu philosophy in Buddhist perspective: the Vedānta-ttvaviniścaya chapter of Bhavya's Madhyamakahrdayakārikā*. Lund: Plus Ultra.
- Rāhula, Walpola, (trans. Sara Boin-Webb). 2001. *Abhidharmasamuccaya. The Compendium of the Higher Teaching (Philosophy)*. Fremont, CA: Asian Humanities Press.
- Roerich, G., trans. 1979. *The Blue Annals*. New Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Roesler, Ulrike. 2002. "The Great Indian Epics in the Version of Dmar ston Chos kyi rgyal po," in *Tibet, Past, and Present: Religion and Secular Culture in Tibet* (2002) edited by Blezer and Ardussi.
- Ruegg, David Seyfort and Rin-chen-rnam-rgyal. 1966. *The Life of Bu Ston Rin Po Che, with the Tibetan Text of the Bu Ston Rnam Thar*. Roma: Istituto italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente.
- Ruegg, David Seyfort. 1969. *La théorie du tathagatagarbha et du gotra; études sur la sotériologie et la gnoséologie du bouddhisme*. Paris: École Française d'Extrême-Orient.
- Ruegg, David Seyfort. 1981. *The Literature of the Madhyamaka School of Philosophy in India*. A History of Indian Literature, V. 7, Fasc. 1. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Ruegg, David Seyfort. 1989. *Buddha-nature, mind and the problem of gradualism in a comparative perspective: on the transmission and reception of Buddhism in India and Tibet*. London: School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London.
- Ruegg, D. S. 2000. *Three studies in the history of Indian and Tibetan Madhyamaka philosophy. Studies in Indian and Tibetan Madhyamaka thought, part I*. Vienna: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien Universität Wien.
- Ruegg, David Seyfort. 2010. *The Buddhist Philosophy of the Middle. Essays on Indian and Tibetan Madhyamaka*. Boston, MA: Wisdom Publications.
- Saito, Akira. 2000. *A Study of the Dūn-huáng Recension of the 'Bodhisattva-caryāvatāra'*. University of Mie, Mie (Project Number 09610021). A report of

- Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (C). Term of Project 1997.4-2000.3, University of Mie).
- Sastri, N. Aiyasvami. 1968. "Nāgārjuna's Exposition of Twelve Causal Links", *Bulletin of Tibetology*, vol. 5(2), pp. 5-27.
- Schaeffer, Kurtis R., Matthew Kapstein, and Gray Tuttle. 2013. *Sources of Tibetan Tradition*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Scherrer-Schaub, Cristina. 1991. *Yuktiṣāṣṭikāvṛtti: Commentaire à la soixantaine sur le raisonnement ou Du vrai enseignement de la causalité par le Maître indien Candrakīrti*, Bruxelles.
- Scherrer-Schaub, C.A. 1999. "Towards a Methodology for the Study of Old Tibetan Manuscripts: Dunhuang and Tabo." Scherrer-Schaub, C.A. and E. Steinkellner (eds) *Tabo Studies II: Manuscripts, Texts, Inscriptions and the Arts*. Rome: Is.I.A.O, 3–36.
- Scherrer-Schaub, Cristina A. 2002. "Enacting Words. A Diplomatic Analysis of the Imperial Decrees (*bkas bcad*) and their Application in the *sGra sbyor bam po gñis pa* Tradition." *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 25/1–2: 263–340.
- Scherrer-Schaub, C.A. and George Bonani. 2002. "Establishing a Typology of the Old Tibetan Manuscripts: A Multidisciplinary Approach." Whitfield, S. (ed.) *Dunhuang Manuscript Forgeries*. London: The British Library, pp. 184–215.
- Scherrer-Schaub, C.A. and George Bonani. 2008. "Establishing a Typology of the old Tibetan Manuscripts: A Multidisciplinary Approach." In Klimburg-Salter, Deborah E., Helmut Tauscher, Junyan Liang, and Yuan Zhou. *The Cultural History of Western Tibet: Recent Research from the China Tibetology Research Center and the University of Vienna*. [Beijing]: China Tibetology Research Center, pp. 299-337.
- Schroeder, Ulrich von. 2006. *Empowered masters: Tibetan wall paintings of mahāsiddhas at Gyantse*. Chicago: Serindia Publications.
- Sherburne, Richard. 1983. *A Lamp for the Path and Commentary of Atisa [The Wisdom of Tibet Series, 5]*. London; Boston: Allen & Unwin.
- Sherburne, Richard. 2000. *The Complete Works of Atīśa Śrī Dīpaṅkara Jñāna. Jo-Bo-Rje: The Lamp for the Path and Commentary, Together with the Newly*

- Translated Twenty-Five Key Texts (Tibetan and English Texts)*. New Delhi: Aditya Prakashan.
- Silk, J. A. 2007. "Good and evil in Indian Buddhism: The Five Sins of Immediate retribution." *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 35 (3): 253–86.
- Skilling, Peter. 2004. "Mahāyāna and Bodhisattva: An Essay Towards Historical Understanding." In *Phothisatawa Barami Kap Sangkhom Thai Nai Sahatsawat Mai* [Bodhisattvaparami and Thai Society in the New Millennium], edited by Pakorn Limpanusorn, and Chalermpon Iampakdee, 139–56. Bangkok: Chinese Studies Center, Institute of East Asia, Thammasat University.
- Sopa, Geshe Lhundup, Michael J Sweet, Leonard Zwillling, and Dharmarakṣita. 2001. *Peacock in the Poison Grove: Two Buddhist Texts on Training the Mind: The Wheel Weapon (Mtshon Cha 'Khor Lo) & the Poison-Destroying Peacock (Rma Bya Dug 'Joms) Attributed to Dharmarakṣita*. Boston: Wisdom Publications.
- Sørensen, Per K. 1999. "The Prolific Ascetic lCe-sgom Śes-rab rdo-rje *alias* lCe-sgom žig-po: Allusive, but Elusive." *Journal of the Nepal Research Centre*, Vol. XI, pp. 175-200.
- Sørensen, Per K., Guntram Hazod, Ṅag-dbañ-bstan-'dzin-'phrin-las, and Tshal-pa Kun-dga'-rdo-rje. 2007. *Rulers on the Celestial Plain: Ecclesiastic and Secular Hegemony in Medieval Tibet: A Study of Tshal Gung-thang*. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Stein, Rolf Alfred, and Arthur P. McKeown. 2010. *Rolf Stein's Tibetica Antiqua: With Additional Materials*. BRILL.
- Steinkellner, Ernst. 1990. "Is Dharmakīrti a Mādhyamika?" In: David Seyfort Ruegg, Lambert Schmithausen (eds.), *Earliest Buddhism and Madhyamaka*. Leiden etc., pp. 72-90.
- Sweet, Michael J. 1996. "Mental Purification (*Blo Sbyong*): A Native Tibetan Genre of Religious Literature." In *Tibetan Literature: Studies in Genre*, ed. José Ignacio Cabezón and Roger R Jackson, pp. 244–260. Ithaca, N.Y.: Snow Lion.
- Takchoe, Sonam. 2007. *The Two Truths Debate. Tsongkhapa and Gorampa on the Middle Way*. Boston: Wisdom Publications.
- Tauscher, Helmut. 1988. "Paramārtha as an Object of Cognition. Paryāya and aparyāyaparamārtha in Svātantrika-Madhyamaka." In: H. Uebach, J. L. Panglung

- (eds.), *Tibetan Studies. Proceedings of the 4th Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies, Schloss Hohenkammer, München 1985*. München, pp. 483-490.
- Tauscher, Helmut. 1999. “Phya ba Chos kyi seng ge’s Opinion on *prasaṅga*.” *Dharmakīrti’s Thought and Its Impact on Indian and Tibetan Philosophy. Proceedings of the Third International Dharmakīrti Conference, Hiroshima, November 4-6, 1997*. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, pp. 387-393.
- Tauscher, Helmut. 2003. “Phya Pa Chos Kyi Seng Ge as a Svātantrika.” In *The Svātantrika - Prāsaṅgika Distinction*, ed. Georges B. J. Dreyfus and Sara L McClintock, 207–255. Boston: Wisdom.
- Thiễn Châu, Thich. 1999. *The Literature Of The Personalists Of Early Buddhism*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Tillemans, T. J. F. (1999a). “Dharmakīrti, Āryadeva and Dharmapāla on scriptural authority.” In *Scripture, logic, language: Essays on Dharmakīrti and his Tibetan successors* (pp. 27–36). Boston: Wisdom Publications.
- Tillemans, T.J. F. (1999b). “How much of a proof is scripturally based inference?” In *Scripture, logic, language* (pp. 37–51). Boston: Wisdom Publications.
- Tillemans, T.J.F. 2007. “Trying to be Fair to Mādhyamika Buddhism.” In K. Preisendanz, *Expanding and Merging Horizons Contributions to South Asian and Cross-Cultural Studies* (Austrian Academy of Sciences: Vienna).
- Tola, F. and C. Dragonetti. 1987. “Śūnyatāsaptati: The Seventy Kārikās on Voidness (according to the Svavṛtti) of Nāgārjuna.” *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 15:1-55.
- van der Kuijp, Leonard W.J. 1987. “The Monastery of Gsang-phu Ne’u-Thog and Its Abbatial Succession from ca. 1073 to 1250.” *Berliner Indologische Studien* 3: 103-127.
- van der Kuijp, Leonard W. J. 1991. “Review of Jñānagarbha's Commentary on the Distinction between the Two Truths: An Eighth-Century Handbook of Madhyamaka Philosophy by Malcolm D. Ecker.” *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. 111, No. 2, (Apr. - Jun., 1991), pp. 402-405.
- van der Kuijp, Leonard W. J. 1992. “Notes Apropos of the Transmission of the *Sarvadurgatipariśodhana-tantra* in Tibet.” *Studien Zur Indologie Und Iranistik*

(16): 109–125.

- Vose, Kevin. 2009. *Resurrecting Candrakīrti: Disputes in the Tibetan Creation of Prāsaṅgika*. Boston: Wisdom Publications.
- Vose, Kevin. 2010a. “Authority in Early Prāsaṅgika Madhyamaka.” *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 38:553-582.
- Vose, Kevin. 2010b. “Making and Remaking the Ultimate in Early Tibetan Readings of Śāntideva.” *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*, Vol. 32, No. 1-2, pp. 285-318.
- Vetturini, Gianpaolo. 2007. *The bKa’ gdams pa School of Tibetan Buddhism*. Unpublished PhD dissertation. School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London.
- Westerhoff, Jan. 2010. *The Dispeller of Disputes: Nāgārjuna’s Vigrahavyāvartanī*. Oxford U. Press.
- Yonezawa, Yoshiasu. 2008. “Vigrahavyāvartanī: Sanskrit transliteration and Tibetan translation.” *Journal of the Naritasan Institute of Buddhist Studies* 31:209-333.
- Zimmermann, Michael. 1999. “The *Tathāgatagarbhasūtra*: Its Basic Structure and Relation to the *Lotus Sūtra*.” *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology*, Soka University, No. 2, pp. 143-168.

Associate Professor
University of Calgary
jbapple@ucalgary.ca